CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

VOLUME XLVII.

WASHINGTON:
1911.



VOLUME XLVII, PART I.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *April 4, 1911.*

The first session of the Sixty-second Congress commenced this day at the Capitol, in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the proclamation of the President of the United States of the 4th day of March, 1911.

The VICE PRESIDENT (JAMES S. SHERMAN, of New York) took the chair and called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

PRAYER.

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, upon the opening of this Congress we humbly confess our dependence upon Thee and earnestly implore Thy help in the labors to which Thou hast called us. We are not sufficient unto ourselves and, unaided by Thee, are utterly unable to bear the burdens of this Thy people. Wherefore we beseech Thee to help us by Thy spirit. The way before us we know not; yet full well do we know that, if we humbly submit ourselves to Thee, Thou wilt direct our steps. Even so, Father, guide and direct us.

For the President of the United States and for all who are in authority we pray. Endue them with wisdom from above, enrich them with Thy spirit, and uphold them by Thy strength, that as they rule by Thy favor, so also they may serve in Thy fear.

Bless, we pray Thee, this Thy people, upon whom Thy favor has rested. Deliver us from strife within and from warfare without. Grant us to dwell in peace and in unity. Teach us, we pray Thee, to love Thy law and incline our hearts to do Thy will.

So, our Father, may this Congress, begun in Thy name, be continued in Thy fear and ended to Thy glory. And unto the name which is above every name will we ascribe praise now and for evermore. Amen.

THE PROCLAMATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proclamation of the President of the United States convening Congress in extraordinary session.

The Secretary (Charles G. Bennett) read the proclamation, as follows:

Whereas by the special message dated January 26, 1911, there was transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives an agreement between the Department of State and the Canadian Government in regard to reciprocal tariff legislation, together with an earnest recommendation that the necessary legislation be promptly adopted; and

Whereas a bill to carry into effect said agreement has passed the House of Representatives, but has failed to reach a vote in the Senate; and

Whereas the agreement stipulates not only that "the President of the United States will communicate to Congress the conclusions now reached and recommend the adoption of such legislation as may be necessary on the part of the United States to give effect to the proposed arrangement," but also that "the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and at Ottawa":

Now, therefore, I, William Howard Taft, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power vested in me by the Constitution, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the convening of both Houses of the Congress of the United States at their respective Chambers in the city of Washington on the 4th day of April, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon, to the end that they may consider and determine whether the Congress shall, by the necessary legislation, make operative the agreement.

All persons entitled to act as Members of the Sixty-second Congress are required to take notice of this proclamation.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States at Washington the 4th day of March, A. D. 1911, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-fifth.

[SEAL.] WM. H. TAFT.

By the President:

P. C. KNOX, *Secretary of State.*

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. ROOT presented the credentials of JAMES A. O'GORMAN, chosen by the Legislature of the State of New York a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1911, which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. DIXON. I present the credentials of the Senator elect from the State of Montana, Hon. HENRY L. MYERS, who is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials of HENRY L. MYERS, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Montana a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1911, were read and ordered to be filed.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair ascertains by an examination of the RECORD that there has not been uniformity of procedure at the opening of a Congress. Sometimes a call of the roll has preceded the swearing in of Senators elect; at other times a call of the roll has been omitted altogether. It seems to the Chair that the better practice would be first to call the names of the Senators elect and have them take the constitutional oath of office before the roll of the Senate is called. Unless the Senate desires some other procedure taken, that will be the course followed this morning.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, in view of the statement by the Chair that the particular method of procedure has been one of uncertain observance heretofore, and in view of what I consider to be important that it should be a fixed rule, I simply rise to say that I do not recall that in any time other than the one I am about to mention the matter was ever challenged in the Senate and considered by the Senate as to what was the proper method of procedure. I think it was two years ago that the question arose and was discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Four.

Mr. BACON. Four years ago. That is only an evidence of the way in which time passes rapidly as the years grow upon us. I thought it was two years ago. The matter was then discussed, and after discussion it was determined in the way the Chair has now suggested as the proper way, and in that conclusion I very cordially agree. I only rose for the purpose of saying that I think it should not pass simply with a statement that it has been a procedure in which one method has been followed at one time and another at another time, and I would like, by the emphasis now given to it, to have it recognized that the Senate, upon due consideration, determined that it is the proper method that the Senators elect who are present should be sworn in before the roll is called.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I would dislike to see that become the settled rule of the Senate, for the reason that it might transpire that some Senator elect would have some question raised about the form of his credentials or about his right to take the oath of office, and if that should come to pass then obviously the Senate must proceed otherwise.

It seems to me that the first thing to do is to ascertain the presence of a quorum so that the Senate may be in a condition to proceed to any business; and after the presence of a quorum has been ascertained, then proceed to the business of administering the oath to Senators elect.

I was not going to say "yea" or "nay," except that I believe the orderly and proper way is first to ascertain that the Senate is in a condition to proceed to business. Obviously, if there were not a quorum of the Senators present, a Senator elect could not take the oath if that question were raised.

228540

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair's thought was that this time is the same as at the daily convening of the Senate, and that in the absence of a question being raised it would be assumed that a quorum is present.

Mr. BAILEY. Then it would be unnecessary to call the roll after the Senators elect were sworn.

Mr. BACON. I want to make this suggestion: That the very case suggested by the Senator from Texas proves to my mind conclusively the necessity of the method of procedure now proposed to be adopted.

Suppose, Mr. President, it should be so that less than a quorum of Senators who had already been sworn in were present and that there were enough Senators duly elected present who when sworn in would make a quorum; would it be contended for a moment that such Senators could not be sworn in and that the body could then proceed to the transaction of business?

Mr. President, it might happen in some very great misfortune that a majority of the Senators, or rather a majority of the Senate, had not been sworn in. There might be not only a complete political revolution which would bring to us 30 or 31 new Senators, as the case might be, but there might be a disaster in which 12 or 15 others had been killed; would it be said that the wheels of legislation should be forever blocked? There would be a case where it would be an impossibility for a quorum of Senators sworn in to assemble, because it would not be in existence; and yet there might be 30 Senators present duly qualified and duly elected and competent when sworn in to proceed with business.

It seems to me it rests upon the fundamental principle that less than a quorum can always do that which is necessary to obtain a quorum, and that is the only office of a minority—to secure the presence of a quorum.

It might be so, I repeat, that there was no quorum present of those who had already been sworn in; yet there might be 31 Senators sitting here with their credentials already on file, if you please, with their names on the pay roll, and, according to the contention of my learned friend from Texas, the Senate would be powerless to swear them in and proceed with the transaction of business.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the argument of a calamity is not persuasive, because that might happen to all of the Senators as to a part of them, and it might happen to the House of Representatives as well as to the Senate. If some great pestilence or other misfortune should strike down more than one-half of the House of Representatives, it would be disabled, although they would have been elected and they are on the roll.

I am not so sure about our practice; but I think that a Senator does not draw a salary, as I understood the Senator from Georgia to say, before he takes the oath of office.

Mr. BACON. Oh, yes; undoubtedly. I would not be surprised if the Senator would examine that he would find he had done the same thing.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I was sworn in the day my term began. Consequently I was not put to the necessity of making that inquiry. I would doubtless have done it had it been otherwise. I want to say that I think it better that there should be a rule, even if it is not the best rule, and make no contest over it.

Mr. BACON. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Texas to one thing. I have noticed that in the many very valuable acquisitions which we secure from the House, which we are always very glad to have, and by which the membership of the Senate is greatly enriched, and one of them is my distinguished friend from Texas, they are very apt to bring with them to the Senate some of the traditions, and prejudices, and methods, and habits, and customs of the House. I want to call the attention of my distinguished friend to the fact that so far from his having been loyal to the traditions of the House, in which he was once so great an ornament, he has absolutely forgotten the fact that the House before swearing in anyone, and when there is not a single Member who is competent to constitute a quorum, elect and swear in a Speaker.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true because of the necessities of the case. The body is not a continuing body like the Senate. I was going to say that whether that be the practice or not, I am absolutely certain it is a bad practice for any man to vote as a member of a body until he has taken the oath and become a member of it. Again, and of course I yield to the Senator from Georgia in knowledge of that, but I have always been surprised that the Members elect a Speaker before they take the oath of office. The law provides for the way they shall take the oath from the Clerk.

But I have seen this, Mr. President. I have seen a Member of that House with the certificate of a sovereign State certifying to his right to a seat there stood aside and denied his right to take the oath of office.

It seems to me that all questions of that kind ought to be decided before the organization is complete, and that such questions can only be decided when it is ascertained that the body is in a condition to proceed.

But I repeat, I think it is better that the Senate should have a rule even though it should not be the best one.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I will not detain the Senate further than to suggest that the custom of swearing in a Speaker before the Members themselves have taken the oath does not grow out of any necessity. The law provides that the roll of the Members shall be called by the Clerk of the House of Representatives. It is perfectly competent for them to be then sworn in and afterwards proceed to the election of the Speaker, and yet it is a fact that in the House they elect a Speaker before the Members are sworn in.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO SENATORS ELECT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Secretary will call, in groups of four, the roll of Senators elect, and as their names are called the Senators, if there be no objection, will present themselves to take the constitutional oath of office. The Secretary has the roll made up alphabetically. If there be no objection to the procedure the names of Senators-elect will be called alphabetically rather than by States.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. BRYAN, Mr. CHILTON, Mr. CLAPP, and Mr. CLARK of Wyoming.

These Senators were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. WATSON, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. WARREN, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Maine.

These Senators were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. BAILEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRYE, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. KERN, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. LEA, and Mr. LIPPITT.

These Senators were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. STEPHENSON, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WETMORE, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. LODGE, Mr. MCCUMBER, Mr. MCLEAN, and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey.

These Senators were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. CRANE, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. BRIGGS, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. MYERS, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'GORMAN, and Mr. OLIVER.

These Senators were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. DIXON, Mr. NEWLANDS, Mr. ROOT, and Mr. PENROSE, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. PAGE, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. RAYNER, and Mr. REED.

These Senators (with the exception of Mr. POINDEXTER, who was absent) were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. BURTON, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, and Mr. STONE, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

The Secretary called the names of Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. TOWNSEND, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WORKS.

These Senators were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. SMOOT, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas, and Mr. PERKINS, respectively, and the oath was administered to them by the Vice President.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will now call the roll of the Senate.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Clapp	Foster	Lea
Bailey	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Lippitt
Borah	Clarke, Ark.	Gallinger	Lodge
Bourne	Crane	Gamble	Lorimer
Bradley	Crawford	Gore	McCumber
Brandegee	Culberson	Gronna	McLean
Briggs	Cullom	Guggenheim	Martin, Va.
Bristow	Cummins	Heyburn	Martine, N. J.
Brown	Curtis	Hitchcock	Myers
Bryan	Davis	Johnson, Me.	Nelson
Burnham	Dillingham	Johnston, Ala.	Newlands
Burton	Dixon	Jones	Nixon
Chamberlain	du Pont	Kern	O'Gorman
Chilton	Fletcher	La Follette	Oliver

Overman	Reed	Smoot	Warren
Owen	Richardson	Stephenson	Watson
Page	Root	Stone	Wetmore
Paynter	Shively	Sutherland	Williams
Penrose	Simmons	Swanson	Works
Perkins	Smith, Md.	Taylor	Young
Pomerene	Smith, Mich.	Thornton	
Rayner	Smith, S. C.	Townsend	

Mr. BACON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. TERRELL] is detained necessarily from the Chamber by personal illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERN in the chair). Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum of the Senate present.

LIST OF SENATORS.

The list of Senators, by States, is as follows:

Alabama—John H. Bankhead and Joseph F. Johnston.
Arkansas—James P. Clarke and Jeff Davis.
California—George C. Perkins and John D. Works.
Colorado—Simon Guggenheim.
Connecticut—Frank B. Brandegee and George P. McLean.
Delaware—Henry A. du Pont and Harry A. Richardson.
Florida—Nathan P. Bryan and Duncan U. Fletcher.
Georgia—Augustus O. Bacon and Joseph M. Terrell.
Idaho—William E. Borah and Weldon B. Heyburn.
Illinois—Shelby M. Cullom and William Lorimer.
Indiana—John W. Kern and Benjamin F. Shively.
Iowa—Albert B. Cummins and Lafayette Young.
Kansas—Joseph L. Bristow and Charles Curtis.
Kentucky—William O. Bradley and Thomas H. Paynter.
Louisiana—Murphy J. Foster and John R. Thornton.
Maine—William P. Frye and Charles F. Johnson.
Maryland—Isidor Rayner and John Walter Smith.
Massachusetts—Winthrop Murray Crane and Henry Cabot Lodge.
Michigan—William Alden Smith and Charles E. Townsend.
Minnesota—Moses E. Clapp and Knute Nelson.
Mississippi—Le Roy Percy and John Sharp Williams.
Missouri—James A. Reed and William J. Stone.
Montana—Joseph M. Dixon and Henry L. Myers.
Nebraska—Norris Brown and Gilbert M. Hitchcock.
Nevada—Francis G. Newlands and George S. Nixon.
New Hampshire—Henry E. Burnham and Jacob H. Gallinger.
New Jersey—Frank O. Briggs and James E. Martine.
New York—James A. O'Gorman and Elihu Root.
North Carolina—Lee S. Overman and F. M. Simmons.
North Dakota—Asle J. Gronna and Porter J. McCumber.
Ohio—Theodore E. Burton and Atlee Pomerene.
Oklahoma—Thomas P. Gore and Robert L. Owen.
Oregon—Jonathan Bourne, jr., and George E. Chamberlain.
Pennsylvania—George T. Oliver and Boies Penrose.
Rhode Island—Henry F. Lippitt and George Peabody Wetmore.
South Carolina—Ellison D. Smith and Benjamin R. Tillman.
South Dakota—Coe I. Crawford and Robert J. Gamble.
Tennessee—Luke Lea and Robert L. Taylor.
Texas—Joseph W. Bailey and Charles A. Culberson.
Utah—Reed Smoot and George Sutherland.
Vermont—William P. Dillingham and Carroll S. Page.
Virginia—Thomas S. Martin and Claude A. Swanson.
Washington—Wesley L. Jones.
West Virginia—William E. Chilton and Clarence W. Watson.
Wisconsin—Robert M. La Follette and Isaac Stephenson.
Wyoming—Clarence D. Clark and Francis E. Warren.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed as the committee Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. BACON.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. BROWN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 4), which was considered by unanimous consent:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

Mr. BAILEY. I move to strike out "twelve" and insert "two."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment ought not to be adopted without some consideration, and I would ask the Senator from Texas to withhold his proposition until to-morrow. This is a matter which has been discussed some, but never at length, by the Senate. I think the Senator from Texas ought to let the resolution take the usual course and be adopted without amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. It is absolutely certain that for a month or more the Senate will not average a daily session of 60 minutes, and, therefore, if we come here at 2 o'clock, we will adjourn before 5 o'clock, and in almost every instance before 4 o'clock. The only result of coming at 12 o'clock will be to interrupt our committee meetings, if we are to have any, and to interrupt our morning work, and, if we hold a session of two hours, beginning at 12 o'clock, a majority of the Senate will spend the better part of those two hours in the lunch room.

Whatever may be the necessity later in the session for longer hours of work in the Senate, it is absolutely certain that for the first 60 days of every session three-fourths of the time must be applied to work in the committee room. Yet under the rule which we have pursued we meet in our committee rooms at 10 o'clock and must adjourn at 12 o'clock to come here. We meet here and in two hours we adjourn, thus interrupting our work in the committee without accomplishing any good results here.

If the Senator from Nebraska will take the trouble to examine the record of Congress, he will find that at every session for more than 60 days it seldom happens that we are in daily session beyond 2 hours. Just exactly why we should want to leave our committee work, or leave our work in our individual rooms, and come here to spend an hour, thus breaking the day, and then return to our rooms—because we do not return to our committee rooms—is more than I can understand.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BAILEY. I do.

Mr. LODGE. I merely desire to suggest to the Senator from Texas that to-morrow we will receive the message, and it would probably be desirable for to-morrow, at least, that we should meet at 12 o'clock, and we can decide at that time whether we will make it a general rule to meet at 12 or at 2.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Massachusetts can perhaps advise us whether that message is to be of such length that we need an early session to hear it.

Mr. LODGE. I am not advised as to the probable length of the message. The reason I made the suggestion was that I supposed the time of release of the message has been given to the press throughout the country for a certain hour, and I think it would be more convenient to the press and to the public if the old hour might be maintained to-morrow. We could allow this resolution to go over, and the Senator from Nebraska could move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at noon to-morrow.

Mr. BAILEY. It is immaterial to the press and to the country whether they obtain the message from the House or from the Senate. It will be read in both bodies, and I assume that the House will meet at 12 o'clock, and therefore the newspapers would be subjected to no embarrassment on that account.

But, Mr. President, I simply wanted to call attention to this matter. I recognize that until there are some other amendments to the rules it would not be practicable, without a certain degree of confusion, to change the hour of meeting. I will therefore allow this to go, with the understanding that there will be no objection to taking up the matter and disposing of it within the next three or four days. The Committee on Rules has been charged with the duty of investigating and reporting on this question, and my part of that committee is ready to report, and I only want the matter determined. With that understanding I withdraw the amendment.

I wish it were possible, under the rules, to leave the amendment on the desk, so that we might dispose of it without delay. But, of course, the amendment can not be left there while the resolution is disposed of, and I simply give notice that after to-morrow I shall attempt to secure a change in the hour of daily meeting, proposing such other changes as will conform to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. CURTIS. Pending that motion, I desire to give the following notice and to have it read and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maine withhold his motion for that purpose?

Mr. FRYE. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine withholds his motion. The Senator from Kansas gives the following notice, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 3), as follows:

I hereby give notice that when the committees of the Senate are appointed I shall propose the following amendment to the standing rules of the Senate:

"*Resolved*, That Rule XIX of the standing rules for conducting business in the Senate of the United States be amended by adding the following proviso at the end of the first paragraph of said rule, to wit:

"*Provided*, That after any question has been considered upon 5 separate calendar days, or when any question has been debated for 10 consecutive hours, it shall be in order for any Senator to rise to a question of privilege and move to close all debate and vote at a fixed time upon the pending question before the Senate after 3 hours' additional consideration. Said motion shall be submitted to the Senate and shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote. If two-thirds of the Senators present vote in favor of the motion, it shall be declared carried, debate shall close, and a vote taken upon the question as provided in the motion. If less than two-thirds vote for the motion, the same shall be declared lost."

RECESS.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m., when it reassembled.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Cullom	Lea	Rayner
Bailey	Cummins	Lippitt	Richardson
Borah	Curtis	Lodge	Root
Bourne	Dillingham	Lorimer	Shively
Bradley	Dixon	McCumber	Simmons
Brandegee	du Pont	McLean	Smith, Md.
Briggs	Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Foster	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Brown	Frye	Myers	Stephenson
Bryan	Gallinger	Nelson	Sutherland
Burnham	Gamble	Newlands	Swanson
Burton	Gronna	Nixon	Taylor
Chamberlain	Guggenheim	O'Gorman	Thornton
Chilton	Heyburn	Oliver	Warren
Clapp	Hitchcock	Overman	Watson
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Page	Wetmore
Clarke, Ark.	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Williams
Crane	Jones	Penrose	Works
Crawford	Kern	Perkins	Young
Culberson	La Follette	Pomerene	

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I again announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. TERRELL] on account of personal illness. I will not repeat the announcement. It will not be necessary for me to do so. I will simply add that the condition of my colleague's health is such that I hope he will be with us before the expiration of many days.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

William J. Browning, Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, appeared and delivered the following message:

Mr. President, I am directed by the House of Representatives to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled and that CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri, has been elected Speaker; that South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, has been elected Clerk; and that the House is ready to proceed to business.

Also, that a committee of three members has been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join a committee of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States, and to inform him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may have to make, and that Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. MANN have been appointed members of the committee on the part of the House.

RELATIONS WITH JAPAN AND MEXICO.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that I will address the Senate at its convenience upon our relations with Japan and Mexico and the Monroe doctrine as distinguished from the Roosevelt doctrine in connection therewith.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 5, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 4, 1911.*

This being the day fixed in the proclamation of the President for the assembling of the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, the House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by Mr. Alexander McDowell, Clerk of the last House.

The Chaplain of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first Congress, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, above all, through all, and in us all, from whom cometh all wisdom, power, and goodness. Open Thou our spiritual eyes, quicken our susceptibilities, and make us conscious of Thy presence. The past is ours by inheritance, the future depends upon our use of the present opportunities; make us therefore wise and strong and pure in our generation, that we may move forward to the larger possibilities which wait on the faithful. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

Increase, we beseech Thee, our faith and confidence in that overruling Providence which hitherto has shaped and guided the destiny of our Republic, that each citizen throughout the length and breadth of the land may vie with each in a faithful and patriotic service to his country, and grant, O God our Father, that the coordinate branches of our Government may work in harmony together with Thee; that the sacred rights of the people, civil, political, and religious, may be safeguarded and every legitimate interest advanced till the desert places shall blossom as the rose and peace, prosperity, and happiness fill every home; that the genius of our Republic may find its full fruition in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, who taught us to pray:

"Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen."

PROCLAMATION OF THE PRESIDENT.

The Clerk read the following:

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—A PROCLAMATION.

Whereas by the special message dated January 26, 1911, there was transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives an agreement between the Department of State and the Canadian Government in regard to reciprocal tariff legislation, together with an earnest recommendation that the necessary legislation be promptly adopted; and

Whereas a bill to carry into effect said agreement has passed the House of Representatives, but has failed to reach a vote in the Senate; and

Whereas the agreement stipulates not only that "the President of the United States will communicate to Congress the conclusions now reached and recommend the adoption of such legislation as may be necessary on the part of the United States to give effect to the proposed arrangement," but also that "the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and at Ottawa";

Now, therefore, I, William Howard Taft, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power vested in me by the Constitution, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the convening of both Houses of the Congress of the United States at their respective Chambers, in the city of Washington, on the 4th of April, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon, to the end that they may consider and determine whether the Congress shall, by the necessary legislation, make operative the agreement.

All persons entitled to act as Members of the Sixty-second Congress are required to take notice of this proclamation.

Given under my hand and the seal of the United States at Washington the 4th day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eleven and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and thirty-fifth.

[SEAL.] WM. H. TAFT.

By the President:

P. C. KNOX, *Secretary of State.*

RETIRING ADDRESS OF THE CLERK.

The CLERK. Now that the hour of my departure is at hand, I take the opportunity of expressing my sincere and heartfelt thanks to the Members of the past eight Congresses for their uniform kindness and courtesy to me. [Applause.]

During my eight terms as Clerk 87 Members of Congress have died while in office, and they are silently and patiently waiting beyond the river for the supreme committee on committees to properly place them.

For the Members of the last eight Congresses, living and dead, I have the most profound respect and veneration, and in passing the graves of the dead would in all sincerity drop a tear and a sprig of myrtle upon their last resting places.

And the living, wherever and whenever I meet them, will receive a cordial greeting and a glad hand.

To the Members of the Sixty-second Congress, now assembling, for what they are about to do to me I thank them in advance and wish them well. [Applause and laughter.]

ROLL CALL BY STATES.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll by States, and the following Members answered:

ALABAMA.

George W. Taylor.
S. H. Dent, jr.
Henry D. Clayton.
F. L. Blackmon.
J. Thomas Heflin.
Richmond Pearson Hobson.
John L. Burnett.
William Richardson.
Oscar W. Underwood.

ARKANSAS.

Robert Bruce Macon.
William A. Oldfield.
John C. Floyd.
Ben Cravens.
H. M. Jacoway.
Joe T. Robinson.
W. S. Goodwin.

CALIFORNIA.

John E. Raker.
William Kent.
Joseph R. Knowland.
Julius Kahn.
Everis A. Hayes.
James Carson Needham.
William D. Stephens.
Sylvester C. Smith.

COLORADO (AT LARGE).

Edward T. Taylor.
Atterson W. Rucker.
John A. Martin.

CONNECTICUT (AT LARGE).

John Q. Tilson.
E. Stevens Henry.
Thomas L. Reilly.
Edwin W. Higgins.
Ebenezer J. Hill.

DELAWARE (AT LARGE).

William H. Heald.

FLORIDA.

Stephen M. Sparkman.
Frank Clark.
Dannitte H. Mays.

GEORGIA.

Charles G. Edwards.
S. A. Roddenbery.
Dudley M. Hughes.
William C. Adamson.
William Schley Howard.
Charles L. Bartlett.
Gordon Lee.
Samuel J. Tribble.
Thomas M. Bell.
Thomas W. Hardwick.
William G. Brantley.

IDAHO.

Burton L. French.

ILLINOIS.

Martin B. Madden.
James R. Mann.
William W. Wilson.
James T. McDermott.
Adolph J. Sabath.
Edmund J. Stack.
Frank Buchanan.
Thomas Gallagher.
Lynden Evans.
George Edmund Foss.
Ira C. Copley.
Charles E. Fuller.
John C. McKenzie.
James McKinney.
George W. Prince.
Claude U. Stone.
John A. Sterling.
Joseph G. Cannon.
William B. McKinley.
Henry T. Rainey.
James M. Graham.
William A. Rodenberg.
Martin D. Foster.
H. Robert Fowler.
Napoleon B. Thistlewood.

INDIANA.

John W. Boehne.
William A. Cullop.
William E. Cox.
Lincoln Dixon.
Ralph W. Moss.
Finly H. Gray.
Charles A. Korbly.
John A. M. Adair.
Martin A. Morrison.
Edgar D. Crumpacker.
George W. Rauch.
Cyrus Cline.
Henry A. Barnhart.

IOWA.

Charles A. Kennedy.
I. S. Pepper.
Charles E. Pickett.
Gilbert N. Haugen.
James W. Good.
N. E. Kendall.
S. F. Prouty.
Horace M. Towner.
Frank P. Woods.
Elbert H. Hubbard.

KANSAS.

Daniel R. Anthony, jr.
A. C. Mitchell.
Philip P. Campbell.
Fred S. Jackson.
Rollin R. Rees.
I. D. Young.
E. H. Madison.
Victor Murdock.

KENTUCKY.

Ollie M. James.
Augustus O. Stanley.
R. Y. Thomas, jr.
Ben Johnson.
Swagar Sherley.
Arthur B. Rouse.
James C. Cantrill.
Harvey Helm.
W. J. Fields.
John W. Langley.
Caleb Powers.

LOUISIANA.

Albert Estopinal.
H. Garland Dupre.
John T. Watkins.
Joseph E. Ransdell.
Robert C. Wickliffe.
Arsène P. Pujo.

MAINE.

Asher C. Hinds.
Daniel J. McGillicuddy.
Samuel W. Gould.
Frank E. Guernsey.

MARYLAND.

J. Harry Covington.
Joshua F. C. Talbott.
George Konig.
John Charles Linthicum.
Thomas Parran.
David J. Lewis.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George P. Lawrence.
Frederick H. Gillett.
John A. Thayer.
William H. Wilder.
Butler Ames.
Augustus P. Gardner.
Ernest W. Roberts.
Samuel W. McCall.
William F. Murray.
James M. Curley.
Andrew J. Peters
John W. Weeks.
William S. Greene.
Robert O. Harris.

MICHIGAN.

Frank E. Doremus.
William W. Wedemeyer.
J. M. C. Smith.
Edward L. Hamilton.
Edwin F. Sweet.
Samuel W. Smith.
Henry McMorran.
Joseph W. Fordney.
James C. McLaughlin.
George A. Loud.
Francis H. Dodds.
H. Olin Young.

MINNESOTA.

Sydney Anderson.
W. S. Hammond.
Charles R. Davis.
Frederick C. Stevens.
Frank M. Nye.
Charles A. Lindbergh.
Andrew J. Volstead.
Clarence B. Miller.
Halvor Steenerson.

MISSISSIPPI.

Ezekiel S. Candler, jr.
Hubert D. Stephens.
Benjamin G. Humphreys.
Thomas Upton Sisson.
Samuel A. Witherspoon.
B. P. Harrison.
William A. Dickson.
James William Collier.

MISSOURI.

James T. Lloyd.
William W. Rucker.
Joshua W. Alexander.
Charles F. Booher.
William P. Borland.
Clement Cabell Dickinson.
Courtney Walker Hamlin.
Dorsey W. Shackleford.
Champ Clark.
Richard Bartholdt.
Theron E. Catlin.
L. C. Dyer.
Walter L. Hensley.
Joseph J. Russell.
James A. Daugherty.
Thomas L. Rubey.

MONTANA (AT LARGE).

Charles N. Pray.

NEBRASKA.

John A. Maguire.
C. O. Lobeck.
James P. Latta.
Charles H. Sloan.
George W. Norris.
Moses P. Kinkaid.

NEVADA (AT LARGE).

E. E. Roberts.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Cyrus A. Sulloway.
Frank D. Currier.

NEW JERSEY.

Henry C. Loudenslager.
John J. Gardner.
Thomas J. Scully.
Ira W. Wood.
William E. Tuttle, jr.
William Hughes.
Edward W. Townsend.
Walter I. McCoy.
Eugene F. Kinkead.
James A. Hamill.

NEW YORK.

Martin W. Littleton.
George H. Lindsay.
James P. Maher
Frank E. Wilson.
William C. Redfield.
William M. Calder.
John J. Fitzgerald.
Daniel J. Riordan.
Henry M. Goldfogle.
William Sulzer.
Charles V. Fornes.
Michael F. Conry.
Jefferson M. Levy.
John Joseph Kindred.
Thomas G. Patten.
Francis Burton Harrison.
Henry George, jr.
Steven B. Ayres.
John E. Andrus.
Thomas W. Bradley.
Richard E. Connell.
William H. Draper.
Henry S. De Forest.
George W. Fairchild.
Theron Akin.
George R. Malby.
Charles A. Talcott.
Luther W. Mott.
Michael E. Driscoll.
John W. Dwight.
Sereno E. Payne.
Henry G. Danforth.
Edwin S. Underhill.
James S. Simmons.
Daniel A. Driscoll.
Charles Bennett Smith.
Edward B. Vreeland.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John H. Small.
Claude Kitchin.
John M. Faison.
Edward W. Pou.
Charles M. Stedman.
Hannibal L. Godwin.
Robert N. Page.
Robert L. Doughton.
Edwin Y. Webb.
James M. Gudger.

NORTH DAKOTA.

L. B. Hanna.
H. T. Helgesen.

OHIO.

Nicholas Longworth.
Alfred G. Allen.
James M. Cox.
J. H. Goeke.
Timothy T. Ansberry.
Matthew R. Denver.
J. D. Post.
Frank B. Willis.
Isaac R. Sherwood.
Robert M. Switzer.
Horatio C. Claypool.
Edward L. Taylor, jr.
Carl C. Anderson.
William G. Sharp.
George White.
W. B. Francis.
William A. Ashbrook.
John J. Whitacre.
E. R. Bathrick.
Paul Howland.
R. J. Bulkley.

OKLAHOMA.

Bird S. McGuire.
Dick T. Morgan.
James S. Davenport.
Charles D. Carter.
Scott Ferris.

OREGON.

Willis C. Hawley.
A. W. Lafferty.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry H. Bingham.	Martin B. Olmsted.
J. Hampton Moore.	Jesse L. Hartman.
Reuben O. Moon.	Daniel F. Lafean.
Michael Donohoe.	Charles E. Patton.
George D. McCreary.	Curtis H. Gregg.
Thomas S. Butler.	Thomas S. Crago.
Robert E. Difenderfer.	Charles Matthews.
William W. Griest.	Arthur L. Bates.
John R. Farr.	A. Mitchell Palmer.
Charles C. Bowman.	J. N. Langham.
Robert E. Lee.	Peter M. Speer.
John H. Rothermel.	Stephen G. Porter.
George W. Kipp.	John Dalzell.
William B. Wilson.	James Francis Burke.
John G. McHenry.	Andrew J. Barchfeld.
Benjamin K. Focht.	

RHODE ISLAND.

George F. O'Shaunessy.	George H. Utter.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George S. Legare.	David E. Finley.
James F. Byrnes.	J. Edwin Ellerbe.
Wyatt Aiken.	Asbury F. Lever.
Joseph T. Johnson.	

SOUTH DAKOTA (AT LARGE).

Charles H. Burke.	Eben W. Martin.

TENNESSEE.

Sam R. Sells.	Joseph W. Byrns.
Richard W. Austin.	Lemuel P. Padgett.
John A. Moon.	Thetus W. Sims.
Cordell Hull.	Finis J. Garrett.
William C. Houston.	George W. Gordon.

TEXAS.

Morris Sheppard.	George F. Burgess.
Martin Dies.	Albert S. Burleson.
James Young.	Robert L. Henry.
Choice B. Randell.	Oscar Callaway.
Jack Beall.	John H. Stephens.
Rufus Hardy.	James L. Slayden.
Alexander W. Gregg.	John N. Garner.
John M. Moore.	William R. Smith.

UTAH (AT LARGE).

Joseph Howell.

VERMONT.

David J. Foster.	Frank Plumley.

VIRGINIA.

William A. Jones.	Carter Glass.
E. E. Holland.	James Hay.
John Lamb.	Charles C. Carlin.
R. Turnbull.	C. Bascom Slemp.
E. W. Saunders.	Henry D. Flood.

WASHINGTON.

William E. Humphrey.	William La Follette.
Stanton Warburton.	

WEST VIRGINIA.

John W. Davis.	John M. Hamilton.
William G. Brown.	James A. Hughes.
Adam B. Littlepage.	

WISCONSIN.

Henry A. Cooper.	John J. Esch.
John M. Nelson.	James H. Davidson.
Arthur W. Kopp.	Thomas F. Konop.
William J. Cary.	E. A. Morse.
Victor L. Berger.	Irvine L. Lenroot.
Michael E. Burke.	

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

Three hundred and eighty-eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Clerk presents for the information of the House a statement showing the changes that have occurred since the regular election of Members of the Sixty-second Congress.

The statement is as follows:

Districts.	Names.	Date of vacancy.
Second Pennsylvania	Joel Cook [1]	Dec. 15, 1910
Ninth Iowa	Walter I. Smith [2]	Mar. 15, 1911

[1] Died. [2] Resigned.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

The CLERK. The next business is the nomination and election of a Speaker.

Mr. BURLESON. The will of the Members elect of the Sixty-second Congress who are Democrats, as unanimously declared in caucus action, favors the selection of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, a Member elect from the State of Missouri, for the position of Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to place in nomination the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for that office. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the unanimous vote of the Republican caucus to nominate for the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Sixty-second Congress Hon. JAMES R. MANN, a Member elect from the State of Illinois. [Applause.]

The CLERK. Are there any other nominations? If not, the nominations are closed. I have selected as tellers the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPEER], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEGARE], who will please take their places at the desk.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote viva voce for Speaker.

The following is the vote in detail:

FOR MR. CHAMP CLARK—220.

Adair	Donohoe	Humphreys, Miss.	Rauch
Adamson	Doremus	Jacoway	Reilly
Aiken, S. C.	Doughton	James	Richardson
Alexander	Driscoll, D. A.	Johnson, Ky.	Riordan
Allen	Dupre	Johnson, S. C.	Robinson
Anderson, Ohio	Edwards	Jones	Roddenbery
Ansberry	Ellerbe	Kindred	Rothermel
Ashbrook	Estopinal	Kinkead, N. J.	Rouse
Ayers	Evans	Kipp	Rubey
Barnhart	Faison	Kitchin	Rucker, Colo.
Bartlett	Ferris	Konig	Rucker, Mo.
Bathrick	Fields	Konop	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Finley	Korbly	Saunders
Bell, Ga.	Fitzgerald	Lamb	Scully
Blackmon	Flood, Va.	Latta	Shackleford
Boehne	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Ga.	Sharp
Booher	Fornes	Lee, Pa.	Sheppard
Borland	Foster, Ill.	Legare	Sherley
Brantley	Fowler	Lever	Sherwood
Brown	Francis	Levy	Sims
Buchanan	Garner	Lewis	Sisson
Bulkley	Garrett	Lindsay	Slayden
Burke, Wis.	George	Linthicum	Small
Burleson	Glass	Littlepage	Smith, N. Y.
Burnett	Godwin	Littleton	Smith, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Goeke	Lloyd	Sparkman
Byrns, Tenn.	Goldfogle	Lobeck	Stack
Callaway	Goodwin	McCoy	Stanley
Candler	Gordon	McGillicuddy	Stedman
Cantrill	Gould	McHenry	Stephens, Miss.
Carlin	Graham	Macon	Stephens, Tex.
Carter	Gray	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Clark, Fla.	Gregg, Pa.	Maher	Sulzer
Claypool	Gregg, Tex.	Martin, Colo.	Sweet
Clayton	Gudger	Mays	Talbott, Md.
Cline	Hamill	Moon, Tenn.	Talcott, N. Y.
Collier	Hamilton, W. Va.	Moore, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.
Connell	Hamlin	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Conry	Hammond	Moss	Thayer
Covington	Hardwick	Murray	Thomas
Cox, Ind.	Hardy	Oldfield	Townsend
Cox, Ohio	Harrison, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Tribble
Cravens	Harrison, N. Y.	Padgett	Turnbull
Cullop	Hay	Page	Tuttle
Curley	Heflin	Palmer	Underhill
Daugherty	Helm	Patten, N. Y.	Underwood
Davenport	Henry, Tex.	Pepper	Watkins
Davis, W. Va.	Hensley	Peters	Webb
Dent	Hobson	Post	Whitacre
Denver	Holland	Pou	White
Dickinson	Houston	Pujo	Wickliffe
Dickson, Miss.	Howard	Rainey	Wilson, N. Y.
Dies	Hughes, Ga.	Raker	Wilson, Pa.
Difenderfer	Hughes, N. J.	Randell, Tex.	Witherspoon
Dixon, Ind.	Hull	Ransdell, La.	Young, Tex.

FOR MR. JAMES R. MANN—131.

Ames	Foster, Vt.	Lawrence	Prouty
Anthony	Fuller	Longworth	Rees
Austin	Gardner, Mass.	Loudenslager	Roberts, Mass.
Barchfeld	Gardner, N. J.	McCall	Roberts, Nev.
Bartholdt	Gillett	McCreary	Rodenberg
Bates	Good	McGuire, Okla.	Sells
Bowman	Greene	McKinley	Simmons
Bradley	Griest	McKinney	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Guernsey	McLaughlin	Sloan
Burke, S. Dak.	Hamilton, Mich.	McMorran	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Hanna	Madden	Smith, Saml. W.
Calder	Harris	Madison	Speer
Campbell	Hartman	Malby	Steenerson
Cannon	Hawley	Martin, S. Dak.	Stephens, Cal.
Catlin	Hayes	Matthews	Sterling
Copley	Heald	Miller	Stevens, Minn.
Crago	Helgesen	Mitchell	Sulloway
Crumpacker	Henry, Conn.	Mondell	Switzer
Currier	Higgins	Moon, Pa.	Thistlewood
Dalzell	Hill	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Danforth	Hinds	Morgan	Towner
De Forest	Howell	Mott	Utter
Dodds	Howland	Needham	Volstead
Draper	Hubbard	Norris	Vreeland
Driscoll, M. E.	Hughes, W. Va.	Nye	Wedemeyer
Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Olmsted	Weeks
Dyer	Kendall	Parran	Wilder
Esch	Kennedy	Patton, Pa.	Willis
Fairchild	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Payne	Wilson, Ill.
Farr	Knowland	Porter	Wood, N. J.
Focht	Lafean	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Fordney	Langham	Pray	Young, Kans.
Foss	Langley	Prince	

FOR MR. HENRY A. COOPER—16.

Akin, N. Y.	French	Lafferty	Morse
Anderson, Minn.	Jackson	La Follette	Murdock
Davidson	Kent	Lenroot	Nelson
Davis, Minn.	Kopp	Lindbergh	Warburton

FOR MR. GEORGE W. NORRIS—1.

Cooper

VOTED PRESENT—1.

Berger

The CLERK. The total number of votes cast is 368. GEORGE W. NORRIS of Nebraska has received 1 vote, HENRY A. COOPER

of Wisconsin 10, JAMES R. MANN of Illinois 131, and CHAMP CLARK of Missouri 220. [Applause.] CHAMP CLARK having received a majority of votes, is duly elected Speaker. [Applause.] The following committee will wait upon the Speaker elect and escort him to the chair: Mr. MANN of Illinois, Mr. UNDERWOOD of Alabama, and Mr. VREELAND of New York.

The committee appointed to conduct the Speaker elect to the chair having returned with him,

Mr. MANN said: It is a great office, filled by a great man. [Applause.] I present to you your Speaker, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK. [Long-continued applause.]

ADDRESS OF THE SPEAKER ELECT.

The SPEAKER ELECT. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, election to the high position of Speaker is an exceptional honor, for which you have my profoundest gratitude. To be a Member of the House, to represent 200,000 American citizens in the more numerous branch of the greatest legislative body on earth, is a distinction to which, in the nature of things, comparatively few men may attain. To be chosen by the Representatives of 92,000,000 people to preside over your deliberations is a signal mark of your favor, for which the best return is to discharge the onerous and important duties of the station to which you have assigned me with such impartiality, constancy, industry, courtesy, and good temper as to expedite the public business, thereby promoting the public weal.

The pleasure of being elected Speaker is much enhanced by the perfect unanimity with which it is conferred by my party fellows and the universal good will with which it is accepted by our colaborers of the minority. [Applause.]

Coming into the Speakership under these fortunate circumstances, the hearty cooperation of all Members of whatever political persuasion is hereby earnestly invoked in maintaining order and decorum and in placing upon the statute books laws for the good of the country and the whole country, working out promptly, patiently, courageously, wisely, and patriotically those measures necessary for the betterment of governmental methods and for the amelioration of the conditions under which we live. [Applause.]

My Democratic brethren, coupled with the joy of once more seeing a House a large majority of which is of my own political faith is a keen sense of our responsibility to our country and our kind. It is an old adage worthy of acceptation that where much is given much is required.

After 16 years of exclusion from power in the House and 14 years of exclusion from power in every department of government, we are restored to power in the House of Representatives and in that alone. We are this day put upon trial, and the duty devolves upon us to demonstrate, not so much by fine phrases as by good works, that we are worthy of the confidence imposed in us by the voters of the land, and that we are also worthy of their wider confidence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We could not if we would, and we would not if we could, escape this severe test. We will not shirk our duty. We shrink not from the responsibility. That we will prove equal to the situation in which we find ourselves placed through our own efforts and by our own desires there can be no doubt, and the way to accomplish that is to fulfill with courage, intelligence, and patriotism the promises made before the election in order to win the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By discharging our duty thoroughly and well, subordinating personal desires to principle and personal ambition to an exalted love of country, we will not only receive the indorsement of the people, but, what is far better, we will deserve their indorsement.

Chief among these promises were:

1. An honest, intelligent revision of the tariff downward, in order to give every American citizen an equal chance in the race of life, and to pamper none by special favor or special privilege; to reduce the cost of living by eradicating the enormities and cruelties of the present tariff bill; and to raise the necessary revenue to support the Government. Bills are already far advanced in preparation looking to the accomplishment of these beneficent ends. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

2. The passage of a resolution submitting to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by the popular vote. This resolution has already been introduced and will soon be passed by the House. Let us hope that we will send it to the Senate by the unanimous vote of the House, thereby giving to our action the maximum of force. [Applause.]

3. Such changes in the rules of the House as are necessary for the thorough and intelligent consideration of measures for the public good, several of which changes are accomplished facts; if other changes are deemed wise, they will be promptly made.

I congratulate the House and the country, and particularly do I congratulate the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, upon the success of the important and far-reaching experiment of selecting committees through the instrumentality of a committee, an experiment touching which dire predictions were made and concerning the operation of which grave doubts were entertained, even by some honest reformers.

4. "Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened." The literal fulfillment of that promise which so nearly affects the comfort and happiness of millions we have begun—and we began at the proper place—by cutting down the running expenses of the House by more than $188,000 per annum. Economy, like charity, should begin at home. That is where we began. We can not with straight faces and clear consciences reform expenses elsewhere unless we reform them here at the fountain head. The Democratic caucus deserves well of the country for taking this long and important step in the direction of economy all along the line.

The Constitution gives the House the practical control of the purse strings of the country, and the House should insist, resolutely and firmly, on exercising that control to the end that the appropriation bills may be reduced to the needs of the Government economically and effectively administered. It is our duty to provide every dollar needed for the proper and economical conduct of the Government, but it is equally our duty to prevent waste and extravagance in public expenditures, for we should never forget that it is a difficult task for millions of families to live now in decency and comfort. Surely it is the part of wisdom, statesmanship, humanitarianism, and patriotism to legislate so as to reduce their burdens to the minimum. The resuscitation of the Holman rule will help along in this matter. No good citizen desires to cripple the Government in any legitimate function, but no good citizen desires that the people be loaded down with unnecessary taxes.

5. The publication of campaign contributions and disbursements before the election. The bill to accomplish that desired reform has been prepared and introduced. It will be speedily passed by the House. The average citizen, whatever his politics, is absolutely honest. He demands honesty and cleanliness in politics; he believes that too much money is spent in election matters; and he proposes to put an end to it. As the Representatives of the average man it is our duty to carry out his patriotic wishes in that regard to the end that all men desirous of serving the public may have a fair chance in politics, and to the end that this puissant Republic, the political hope of the world, may not be destroyed by corruption in elections.

6. The admission of both Arizona and New Mexico as States. [Applause.] I violate no confidence in stating that so far as the House is concerned, they will be speedily admitted and they will be admitted together. [Applause.]

These are a few of the things which we promised. We are not only going to accomplish them, we have already begun the great task. What we have done is only an earnest of what we will do. We this day report progress to the American people. The rest will follow in due course.

No man is fit to be a lawgiver for a mighty people who yields to the demands and solicitations of the few having access to his ear but is forgetful of that vast multitude who may never hear his voice or look into his face. [Applause.]

I suggest to my fellow Members on both sides of the big aisle—which is the line of demarcation betwixt us as political partisans, but not as American citizens or American Representatives—that he serves his party best who serves his country best. [Applause.]

I am now ready to take the oath and ask that it be administered by Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland.

The oath of office was administered to the Speaker by Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS ELECT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll by States, and as Members' names are called they will come in front of the Clerk's desk and be sworn.

The roll was called, the Members presented themselves as their names were called by States, and took, respectively, the oath of office provided by law.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the names of those who desire to affirm instead of swear.

Mr. BUTLER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. GRIEST, of Pennsylvania; Mr. HEALD, of Delaware; and Mr. PALMER, of Pennsylvania, appeared and were affirmed.

SWEARING IN OF DELEGATES ELECT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the names of the Delegates, who will present themselves and be sworn.

The Delegates elect from the Territories presented themselves and took the oath of office.

CLERK AND OTHER OFFICERS.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and request that it be reported, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 5.

Resolved, That Hon. South Trimble, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That W. Stokes Jackson, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph J. Sinnott, of the State of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That William M. Dunbar, of the State of Georgia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives; and

That Rev. Henry N. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following as a substitute for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Alexander McDowell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be elected Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Henry Casson, of the State of Wisconsin, be elected Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That Frank P. Lyon, of the State of New York, be elected Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; and

That Samuel A. Langum, of the State of Minnesota, be elected Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURRIER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer that, not as a substitute but as an amendment; to strike out all the names in the resolution except that of Mr. Couden and offer this as an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The vote will first be taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the resolution, so that we may have a separate vote on the election of Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the last clause of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Henry N. Couden, of the State of Michigan, be, and he is hereby, chosen chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

SWEARING IN OF OFFICERS.

The SPEAKER. The officers elect of the House of Representatives will present themselves at the bar of the House.

The officers elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and the oath of office was administered to them by the Speaker.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. CLAYTON. I offer and move the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 1.

Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri, Speaker, and South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, Clerk, of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 2.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled, that CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri, has been elected Speaker, that South Trimble, a citizen of the State of Kentucky, has been elected Clerk, and that the House is ready for business.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 3.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate, to wait on the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as such committee on the part of the House Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. MANN.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 4.

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

And that in compliance with the foregoing the Vice President had appointed as said committee Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. BACON.

SELECTION OF SEATS.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 6.

Resolved, That the House do now proceed to draw seats for Members and Delegates of the present Congress, and when names of Members absent from the city or on account of sickness are called that seats be selected by their colleagues, the drawing to be in the following manner:

The Clerk shall place in a box, prepared for that purpose, a number of small balls, of marble or other material, equal to the number of Members and Delegates, which balls shall be consecutively numbered and thoroughly intermingled, and at such hour as shall be fixed by the House for that purpose, by the hands of a page, draw said balls one by one from the box and announce the number as it is drawn, upon which announcement the Member or Delegate, whose name on a numbered alphabetical list shall correspond with the number on the ball, shall advance and choose his seat for the term for which he is elected.

Before said drawing shall commence, each seat shall be vacated and so remain until selected under this rule, and any seat having been selected shall be deemed forfeited if left unoccupied before the call of the roll is finished; and whenever the seats of Members or Delegates shall have been drawn, no proposition for a second drawing shall be in order during that Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY] sent a message to me, requesting me, on account of his absence, to draw his seat for him when his number was called. I notice the resolution provides that the colleagues of Members who are absent shall draw for them. The question is whether under this resolution as drawn I would be authorized to comply with the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY].

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. That is an inquiry with respect to a question of fact. The Chair has no objection to the gentleman from Illinois doing it if the House has none.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent, then, Mr. Speaker, that I may be allowed to draw for the gentleman who made the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent to be allowed to draw a seat for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY]. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say one word before the resolution is adopted, so that all may under-

stand it. We have realized that there are not sufficient seats on this side of the aisle to accommodate all of the Democrats who have been elected, so that it is necessary for some of us to take seats on the other side of the aisle. Heretofore the practice, when this side was in the majority, was to select the row of seats next to the wall over there; so that our people would be compelled, under this arrangement, to take the tier of seats over there on that side, next to the wall.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it may be understood that no Member on this side of the House will take a seat in the further tier of seats to the left of the Speaker, so that it will be left clear for Members on that side of the House.

The SPEAKER. All Members will understand, then, that that is the agreement. The question is on the adoption of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to draw a seat for Mr. CARY, who is absent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois for unanimous consent to draw a seat for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY], who is absent? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, pending the drawing of the seats under the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, of Illinois, ex-Speaker of this House; Hon. H. H. BINGHAM, of Pennsylvania; the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois, the minority leader selected at this session of Congress; and Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, of New York, on the Republican side; and Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama; Hon. W. A. JONES, of Virginia; Hon. J. F. TALBOTT, of Maryland; and Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, of New York, on the Democratic side, be permitted to select seats where they see fit.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask leave to amend the request of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that, in accordance with the action taken in the last House on this same subject, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] assent to the additional proposal that the same privilege be given to the gentleman from Ohio [Gen. SHERWOOD] and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. BURLESON. In pursuance of an agreement with the gentleman from Illinois, I accept that amendment.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] add to his request the name of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], the chairman of the Committee on Rules soon to be appointed.

Mr. BURLESON. I have no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to the privilege being given to the gentlemen who have been named and who were at the last session of Congress entitled to select their seats, but I give notice that I shall object to any additional gentlemen being given that privilege. Of course, that covers the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] for unanimous consent to allow the gentlemen named to select their seats?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection that these men who have been suggested be allowed to select their seats, but I do not know where on any occasion heretofore the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the chairman of the Committee on Rules has been accorded this privilege.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the last House was accorded that privilege when Mr. Tawney was chairman, and I think the same privilege ought to be accorded now to the chairman of that committee in the new Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] for unanimous consent?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that before we begin to draw seats the Doorkeeper be instructed to see to it that everybody except Members and others entitled to the floor shall retire.

Mr. MANN. It will be impossible, Mr. Speaker, for Members to take their places back of the rail unless other people retire.

The SPEAKER. All persons within the Hall of the House, except Members and others entitled to the floor, will now retire, and the Doorkeeper and Sergeant at Arms will enforce this order.

All Members, except those to whom the privilege of drawing their seats in advance has been extended, will please retire behind the railing. Members, as their names are called, will select their seats, Democrats on the right side until it is filled, Republicans on the left side, and then Democrats over on the left side beyond the Republicans.

Members then proceeded to draw their seats in accordance with the above provisions.

THE RULES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 11.

Resolved, That the following shall be the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress——

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pending the reading of the rules, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

The request is, that the rules as set out in the resolution just read be printed in the RECORD of to-day's proceedings for the benefit of Members, in order that they may inspect them to-morrow morning; that the first reading of the resolution be dispensed with, and that the resolution for the consideration of the rules go over until to-morrow, to be taken up immediately after the reading of the Journal and after the reading of the President's message should it be received.

Mr. MANN. I suggest——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANN. I do not wish to ask the gentleman a question. I desire to make a suggestion.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield for the suggestion.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that in asking unanimous consent he also ask to have a sufficient number of copies of the resolution printed in ordinary resolution form for the use of Members of the House.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. How many would the gentleman like to have?

Mr. MANN. Oh, 500.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I make that modification of my request, that it include the printing of 500 copies of the proposed rules in document form.

The SPEAKER. You have heard the request of the gentleman from Texas for unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman further whether it would be feasible to have the proposed rules printed in connection with the rules of the last House, in parallel columns, so that Members may be easily able to tell what changes are proposed.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I hardly see how that would be feasible, but I will state to the gentleman that the rules of the Fifty-third and the Sixty-first Congress have been printed in parallel columns, and there are some extra copies of those, and other copies can be printed.

Mr. MANN. Of course, Members of the House, except those who have been studying the rules of the Fifty-third Congress, or who served in the Fifty-third Congress, are not as familiar with the rules of that Congress as they are with the rules of the last Congress. I see no reason why it is not easily feasible to print in parallel columns the proposed rules and the rules of the last Congress, as a matter of information.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I suggest to the gentleman that that is hardly feasible. The other rules are printed in parallel columns, and can be placed in the RECORD alongside those proposed to-day. I should like to accommodate the gentleman, but think it is hardly practicable.

Mr. MANN. I am very frank to say to the gentleman that if they are not printed that way, I shall take the rules, clip them up myself, and put them in parallel columns. I think it would be very easy for the printing clerk to have them printed in that way.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Personally I should be very glad to extend to the gentleman every facility possible for such comparison.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will yield.

Mr. DALZELL. Are these proposed rules printed in pamphlet form?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Not as I offer them.

Mr. DALZELL. The only access Members of the House can have to the rules will be in the RECORD to-morrow morning?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. No; there will be 500 copies in document form, and they will also be printed in the RECORD. They will appear in the RECORD at 8 o'clock, and I shall insist that the documents be here as early as the gentleman wishes.

Mr. DALZELL. But Members of the House will have no opportunity to study the rules.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; there will be opportunity to study the rules and to discuss them. As the gentleman from

Pennsylvania knows, he has already personally seen a copy of the rules about as introduced to-day.

Mr. DALZELL. I have not. I have seen the rules of the Fifty-third Congress and of the Sixty-first Congress, but I have not seen the rules as now reported.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Some gentlemen on that side of the House have seen them, as there has been no effort to prevent their inspection.

Mr. MANN. I will suggest to the gentleman that if he wishes to call up his resolution to-morrow, when the rules will not be so that they are available until to-morrow morning, it will be difficult for Members to determine what changes are made by the new rules, and it is very advisable to have them printed in parallel columns, so that Members can see just what changes have been made.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have no objection to their being printed in parallel columns, and, Mr. Speaker, will ask to modify my original request to that extent, and to make the number of copies to be printed in document form 1,000 instead of 500.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Comparison of the rules of the Sixty-first Congress, third session, with the proposed rules of the Sixty-second Congress, first session, House of Representatives.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

[Changes from the rules of the Fifty-third Congress and additional text indicated by *italics*.]

RULE I.

DUTIES OF THE SPEAKER.

1. The Speaker shall take the chair on every legislative day precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting, immediately call the Members to order, and on the appearance of a quorum, cause the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same.

2. He shall preserve order and decorum, and in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries or in the lobby may cause the same to be cleared.

3. He shall have general control, except as provided by rule or law, of the Hall of the House, and of the corridors and passages, and of the unappropriated rooms in that part of the Capitol assigned to the use of the House, until further notice.

4. He shall sign all acts, addresses, joint resolutions, writs, warrants, and subpœnas of, or issued by order of, the House, and decide all questions of order, subject to an appeal by any Member, on which appeal no Member shall speak more than once, unless by permission of the House.

5. He shall rise to put a question, but may state it sitting; and shall put questions in this form, to wit: "As many as are in favor (as the question may be) say 'aye';" and after the affirmative voice is expressed, "As many as are opposed, say 'no.'" If he doubts, or a division is called for, the House shall divide; those in the affirmative of the question shall first rise from their seats, and then those in the negative; if he still doubts, or a count is required by at least one-fifth of a quorum, he shall name one from each side of the question to tell the Members in the affirmative and negative; which being reported, he shall rise and state the decision.

6. He shall not be required to vote in ordinary legislative proceedings, except where his vote would be decisive, or where the House is engaged in voting by ballot; and in all cases of a tie vote the question shall be lost.

7. He shall have the right to name any Member to perform the duties of the Chair, but such substitution shall not extend beyond an adjournment: *Provided, however*, That in case of his illness, he may make such appointment for a period not exceeding 10 days, with the approval of the House at the time the same is made; and in his absence and omission to make such appointment, the House shall proceed to elect a Speaker pro tempore to act during his absence.

RULE II.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

There shall be elected by a viva voce vote, at the commencement of each Congress, to continue in office until their successors are chosen and qualified, a Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, and Chaplain, each of whom shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and for the true and faithful discharge of the duties of his office to the best of his knowledge and ability, and to keep the secrets of the House; and each shall appoint all of the employees of his department provided for by law.

RULE III.

DUTIES OF THE CLERK.

1. The Clerk shall, at the commencement of the first session of each Congress, call the Members to order, proceed to call the roll of Members by States in alphabetical order, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, call the House to order, preserve order and decorum, and decide all questions of order, subject to appeal by any Member.

2. He shall make and cause to be printed and delivered to each Member, or mailed to his address, at the commencement of every regular session of Congress, a list of the reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, referring to the act or resolution and page of the volume of the laws or Journal in which it may be contained, and placing under the name of each officer the list of reports required of him to be made.

3. He shall note all questions of order, with the decisions thereon, the record of which shall be printed as an appendix to the Journal of each session; and complete, as soon after the close of the session as possible, the printing and distribution to Members and Delegates of the Journal of the House, together with an accurate and complete index; retain in the library at his office, for the use of the Members and officers of the House, and not to be withdrawn therefrom, two copies of all the books and printed documents deposited there; send, at the end of each session, a printed copy of the Journal thereof to the Executive and to each branch of the legislature of every State and Territory; preserve for and deliver or mail to each Member and Delegate an extra copy, in good binding, of all documents printed by order of either House of the Congress to which he belonged; attest and affix the seal of the House to all writs, warrants, and subpœnas issued by order of the House, certify to the passage of all bills and joint resolutions, make or approve all contracts, bargains, or agreements relative to furnishing any matter or thing, or for the performance of any labor for the House of Representatives, in pursuance of law or order of the House, keep full and accurate accounts of the disbursements out of the contingent fund of the House, keep the stationery account of the Members and Delegates, and pay them as provided by law. He shall pay to the officers and employees of the House of Representatives, the last day of each month, the amount of their salaries that shall be due them; and when the last day of the month falls on Sunday he shall pay them on the day next preceding.

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Resolved, That the following shall be the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress:

RULE I.

DUTIES OF THE SPEAKER.

1. The Speaker shall take the chair on every legislative day precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting, immediately call the Members to order, and on the appearance of a quorum, cause the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same.

2. He shall preserve order and decorum, and in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries or in the lobby may cause the same to be cleared.

3. He shall have general control, except as provided by rule or law, of the Hall of the House, and of the corridors and passages, and the disposal of the unappropriated rooms in that part of the Capitol assigned to the use of the House until further order.

4. He shall sign all acts, addresses, joint resolutions, writs, warrants, and subpœnas of, or issued by order of, the House, and decide all questions of order, subject to an appeal by any Member, on which appeal no Member shall speak more than once, unless by permission of the House.

5. He shall rise to put a question, but may state it sitting; and shall put questions in this form, to wit: "As many as are in favor (as the question may be) say 'aye';" and after the affirmative voice is expressed, "As many as are opposed, say 'no';" if he doubts, or a division is called for, the House shall divide; those in the affirmative of the question shall first rise from their seats, and then those in the negative; if he still doubts, or count is required by at least one-fifth of a quorum, he shall name one from each side of the question, to tell the Members in the affirmative and negative; which being reported, he shall rise and state the decision.

6. He shall not be required to vote in ordinary legislative proceedings, except when his vote would be decisive, or where the House is engaged in voting by ballot; and in cases of tie vote the question shall be lost.

7. He shall have a right to name any Member to perform the duties of the Chair, but such substitution shall not extend beyond an adjournment: *Provided, however*, That in case of his illness he may make such appointment for a period not to exceed 10 days, with the approval of the House at the time the same is made; and in his absence and omission to make such appointment, the House shall proceed to elect a Speaker pro tempore, to act during his absence.

RULE II.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

There shall be elected by a viva voce vote at the commencement of each Congress, to continue in office until their successors are chosen and qualified, a Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, and Chaplain, each of whom shall take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and for the true and faithful discharge of the duties of his office, to the best of his knowledge and ability, and to keep the secrets of the House, and each shall appoint all of the employees of his department provided for by law.

RULE III.

DUTIES OF THE CLERK.

1. The Clerk shall, at the commencement of the session of each Congress, call the Members to order, proceed to call the roll of the Members by States in alphabetical order, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, preserve order and decorum and decide all questions of order, subject to appeal by any Member.

2. He shall make and cause to be printed and delivered to each Member, or mailed to his address, at the commencement of every regular session of Congress, a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress, referring to the act or resolution and page of the volume of the laws or Journal in which it may be contained, and placing under the name of each officer the list of reports required of him to be made.

3. He shall note all questions of order, with the decisions thereon, the record of which shall be printed as an appendix to the Journal of each session; and complete, as soon after the close of the session as possible, the printing and distribution to Members and Delegates of the Journal of the House, together with an accurate and complete index; retain in the library at his office, for the use of the Members and officers of the House, and not to be withdrawn therefrom, two copies of all the books and printed documents deposited there; send, at the end of each session, a printed copy of the Journal thereof to the Executive and to each branch of legislature of every State and Territory; preserve for and deliver or mail to each Member and Delegate an extra copy, in good binding, of all documents printed by order of either House of the Congress to which he belonged; attest and affix the seal of the House to all writs, warrants, and subpœnas issued by order of the House; certify to the passage of all bills and joint resolutions; make or approve all contracts, bargains, or agreements relative to furnishing any matter or thing, or for the performance of any labor for the House of Representatives, in pursuance of law or order of the House; keep full and accurate accounts of the disbursements out of the contingent fund of the House; keep the stationery accounts of Members and Delegates, and pay them as provided by law. He shall pay to the officers and employees of the House of Representatives, on the first day of each month, the amount of their salaries that shall be due them; and when the first day of the month falls on Sunday he shall pay them on the next day preceding.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

RULE IV.

DUTIES OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS.

1. It shall be the duty of the Sergeant at Arms to attend the House and the Committee of the Whole during their sittings, to maintain order under the direction of the Speaker or Chairman, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, under the direction of the Clerk; execute the commands of the House, and all processes issued by authority thereof, directed to him by the Speaker; keep the accounts for the pay and mileage of Members and Delegates, and pay them as provided by law.

2. The symbol of his office shall be the mace, which shall be borne by him while enforcing order on the floor.

RULE V.

DUTIES OF THE DOORKEEPER.

1. The Doorkeeper shall enforce strictly the rules relating to the privileges of the Hall and be responsible to the House for the official conduct of his employees.

2. At the commencement and close of each session of Congress he shall take an inventory of all the furniture, books, and other public property in the several committee and other rooms under his charge, and report the same to the House, which report shall be referred to the Committee on Accounts to ascertain and determine the amount for which he shall be held liable for missing articles.

3. He shall allow no person to enter the room over the Hall of the House during its sittings; and 15 minutes before the hour of the meeting of the House each day he shall see that the floor is cleared of all persons except those privileged to remain, and kept so until 10 minutes after adjournment.

RULE VI.

DUTIES OF THE POSTMASTER.

The Postmaster shall superintend the post office kept in the Capitol for the accommodation of Representatives, Delegates, and officers of the House, and be held responsible for the prompt and safe delivery of their mail.

RULE VII.

The Chaplain shall attend at the commencement of each day's sitting of the House and open the same with prayer.

RULE VIII.

OF THE MEMBERS.

1. Every Member shall be present within the Hall of the House during its sittings, unless excused or necessarily prevented; and shall vote on each question put, unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question.

2. Pairs shall be announced by the Clerk, after the completion of the second roll call, from a written list furnished him, and signed by the Member making the statement to the Clerk, which list shall be published in the RECORD as a part of the proceedings, immediately following the names of those not voting: *Provided*, That pairs shall be announced but once during the same legislative day.

RULE IX.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions, except motions to adjourn.

RULE X.

OF COMMITTEES.

(The principal changes in this rule consist of an increase of from 1 to 3 members in many of the committees; also the addition of 4 recently provided committees.)

1. Unless otherwise specially ordered by the House, the Speaker shall appoint, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees, viz:

On Elections, *3 committees, to consist of 9 members each, to be called No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3, respectively.* (This committee divided into 3 committees in the Fifty-fourth Congress.)
On Ways and Means, to consist of *19* members.
On Appropriations, to consist of 17 members.
On the Judiciary, to consist of *18* members.
On Banking and Currency, to consist of *19* members.
On Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to consist of *18* members.
On Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of *18* members.
On Rivers and Harbors, to consist of *20* members.
On the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of *19* members.
On Agriculture, to consist of *18* members.
On Foreign Affairs, to consist of *19* members.
On Military Affairs, to consist of *19* members.
On Naval Affairs, to consist of *19* members.
On the Post Office and Post Roads, to consist of *18* members.
On the Public Lands, to consist of *19* members.
On Indian Affairs, to consist of *19* members.
On the Territories, to consist of *16* members.
On Insular Affairs, to consist of 19 members.
On Railways and Canals, to consist of *14* members.
On Manufactures, to consist of *13* members.
On Mines and Mining, to consist of *14* members.
On Public Buildings and Grounds, to consist of *17* members.
On the Pacific Railroads, to consist of 15 members.
On Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, to consist of *13* members.
On Education, to consist of *15* members.
On Labor, to consist of 13 members.
On the Militia, to consist of *15* members.
On Patents, to consist of *14* members.
On Invalid Pensions, to consist of *16* members.
On Pensions, to consist of *15* members.
On Claims, to consist of *16* members.
On War Claims, to consist of *15* members.
On Private Land Claims, to consist of 13 members.
On the District of Columbia, to consist of *19* members.
On Revision of the Laws, to consist of 13 members.
On Reform in the Civil Service, to consist of 13 members.
On Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, to consist of 13 members.
On Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, to consist of 11 members.

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

RULE IV.

DUTIES OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS.

1. It shall be the duty of the Sergeant at Arms to attend the House during its sittings, to maintain order under the direction of the Speaker or Chairman, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, under the direction of the Clerk; execute the commands of the House and all processes issued by authority thereof, directed to him by the Speaker; keep the accounts for the pay and mileage of Members and Delegates, and pay them as provided by law.

2. The symbol of his office shall be the mace, which shall be borne by him while enforcing order on the floor.

RULE V.

DUTIES OF THE DOORKEEPER.

1. The Doorkeeper shall enforce strictly the rules relating to the privileges of the Hall and be responsible to the House for the official conduct of his employees.

2. At the commencement and close of each session of Congress he shall take an inventory of all the furniture, books, and other public property in the several committee and other rooms under his charge, and report the same to the House, which report shall be referred to the Committee on Accounts to ascertain and determine the amount for which he shall be held liable for missing articles.

3. He shall allow no person to enter the room over the Hall of the House during its sittings; and 15 minutes before the hour of the meeting of the House each day he shall see that the floor is cleared of all persons except those privileged to remain, and kept so until 10 minutes after adjournment.

RULE VI.

DUTIES OF THE POSTMASTER.

The Postmaster shall superintend the post office kept in the Capitol and House Office Building for the accommodation of Representatives, Delegates, and officers of the House, and be held responsible for the prompt and safe delivery of their mail.

RULE VII.

The Chaplain shall attend at the commencement of each day's sitting of the House and open the same with prayer.

RULE VIII.

OF THE MEMBERS.

1. Every Member shall be present within the Hall of the House during its sittings, unless excused or necessarily prevented; and shall vote on each question put, unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question.

2. Pairs shall be announced by the Clerk, after the completion of the second roll call, from a written list furnished him, and signed by the Member making the statement to the Clerk, which list shall be published in the RECORD as a part of the proceedings, immediately following the names of those not voting: *Provided*, That pairs shall be announced but once during the same legislative day.

RULE IX.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually, in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions, except motions to adjourn.

RULE X.

OF COMMITTEES.

There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees, viz:

On Elections, 3 committees, to consist of 9 members each, to be called No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3, respectively.

On Ways and Means, to consist of 21 members.
On Appropriations, to consist of 21 members.
On the Judiciary, to consist of 21 members.
On Banking and Currency, to consist of 21 members.
On Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to consist of 18 members.
On Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to consist of 21 members.
On Rivers and Harbors, to consist of 21 members.
On the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to consist of 21 members.
On Agriculture, to consist of 21 members.
On Foreign Affairs, to consist of 21 members.
On Military Affairs, to consist of 21 members.
On Naval Affairs, to consist of 21 members.
On the Post Office and Post Roads, to consist of 21 members.
On the Public Lands, to consist of 21 members.
On Indian Affairs, to consist of 19 members.
On the Territories, to consist of 16 members.
On Insular Affairs, to consist of 21 members.
On Railways and Canals, to consist of 14 members.

On Mines and Mining, to consist of 14 members.
On Public Buildings and Grounds, to consist of 17 members.

On Education, to consist of 15 members.
On Labor, to consist of 13 members.

On Patents, to consist of 14 members.
On Invalid Pensions, to consist of 16 members.
On Pensions, to consist of 15 members.
On Claims, to consist of 16 members.
On War Claims, to consist of 15 members.

On the District of Columbia, to consist of 21 members.
On Revision of the Laws, to consist of 13 members.
On Reform in the Civil Service, to consist of 13 members.
On Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, to consist of 13 members.
On Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, to consist of 11 members.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

On Irrigation of Arid Lands, to consist of *13* members.
On Immigration and Naturalization, to consist of *15* members.
On Ventilation and Acoustics, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the State Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Treasury Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the War Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Navy Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Post Office Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Interior Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures on Public Buildings, to consist of 7 members.

On Accounts, to consist of 9 members.
On Mileage, to consist of 5 members.
On the Census, to consist of 18 members.
On Industrial Arts and Expositions, to consist of 16 members.
Also the following joint standing committees, viz:
On the Library, to consist of 5 members.
On Printing, to consist of 3 members.
On Enrolled Bills, to consist of 7 members.

2. He shall also appoint all select *and conference* committees which shall be ordered by the House from time to time.

3. The first-named member of each committee shall be the chairman; and in his absence, or being excused by the House, the next-named member, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, unless the committee by a majority of its number elect a chairman; *and in case of the death of a chairman it shall be the duty of the Speaker to appoint another.*

4. The chairman shall appoint the clerk or clerks of his committee, subject to its approval, who shall be paid at the public expense, the House having first provided therefor.

5. *There shall be a Committee on Rules, elected by the House, consisting of 10 members, 6 of whom shall be members of the majority party and 4 of whom shall be members of the minority party. The Speaker shall not be a member of the committee and the committee shall elect its own chairman from its own members.* (Approved Mar. 19, 1910.)

RULE XI.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES.

(The changes in this rule from clause 1 to 60, inclusive, correspond with the changes in Rule X.)

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, viz: Subjects relating—

1. To the election of Members; to *the respective* Committees on Elections.

2. To the revenue and the bonded debt of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3. To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz: For legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District of Columbia; for pensions; and for all deficiencies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4. To judicial proceedings, civil and criminal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5. To banking and currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6. To coinage, weights, and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

7. To commerce, Life-Saving Service, and lighthouses, other than appropriations for Life-Saving Service and lighthouses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8. To the improvements of rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

9. To the merchant marine and fisheries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10. To agriculture and forestry; to the Committee on Agriculture, who shall receive the estimates and report the appropriations for the Agricultural Department.

11. To the relations of the United States with foreign nations, including appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. To the military establishment and the public defense, including the appropriations for its support and for that of the Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

13. To the Naval Establishment, including the appropriations for its support; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

14. To the post offices and post roads, including appropriations for their support; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

15. To the lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

16. To the relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes, including appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

17. To Territorial legislation, the revision thereof, and affecting Territories or the admission of States; to the Committee on the Territories.

18. *To all matters (excepting those affecting the revenue and the appropriations) pertaining to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain, and to Cuba; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.*

19. To railways and canals, other than Pacific railroads; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

20. To the manufacturing industries; to the Committee on Manufactures.

21. To the mining interests; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

22. To the public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States, other than appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

23. To the railroads and telegraphic lines between the Mississippi River and the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

24. To the levees of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

On Irrigation of Arid Lands, to consist of 13 members.
On Immigration and Naturalization, to consist of 15 members.

On Expenditures in the State Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Treasury Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the War Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Navy Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Post Office Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Interior Department, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to consist of 7 members.
On Expenditures on Public Buildings, to consist of 7 members.
On Rules, to consist of 11 members, of which the Speaker shall not be a member.
On Accounts, to consist of 11 members.
On Mileage, to consist of 5 members.
On the Census, to consist of 16 members.
On Industrial Arts and Expositions, to consist of 16 members.
Also the following joint standing committees, viz:
On the Library, to consist of 5 members.
On Printing, to consist of 3 members.
On Enrolled Bills, to consist of 7 members.
On the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, to consist of 2 members.

2. The Speaker shall appoint all select and conference committees, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

3. At the commencement of each Congress the House shall elect as chairman of each standing committee one of the members thereof; in the temporary absence of the chairman the member next in rank in the order named in the election of the committee, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, shall act as chairman; and in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

4. All vacancies in standing committees of the House shall be filled by election by the House.

5. The chairman shall appoint the clerk or clerks or other employees of his committee, subject to its approval, who shall be paid at the public expense, the House having first provided therefor.

RULE XI.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES.

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, viz: Subjects relating—

1. To the election of Members; to the respective Committees on Elections.

2. To the revenue and such measures as purport to raise revenue and the bonded debt of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3. To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz: For legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District of Columbia; for pensions; and for all deficiencies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4. To judicial proceedings, civil and criminal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5. To banking and currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6. To coinage, weights, and measures; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

7. To commerce, Life-Saving Service, and lighthouses, other than appropriations for Life-Saving Service and lighthouses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8. To the improvement of rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

9. To the merchant marine and fisheries; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

10. To agriculture and forestry; to the Committee on Agriculture, who shall receive the estimates and report the appropriations for the Agricultural Department.

11. To the relations of the United States with foreign nations, including appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. To the military establishment, the militia, and the public defense, including the appropriations for their support and for that of the Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

13. To the Naval Establishment, including the appropriations for its support; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

14. To the post offices and post roads, including appropriations for their support; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

15. To the lands of the United States and private claims to lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

16. To the relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes, including appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

17. To Territorial legislation, the revision thereof, and affecting Territories or the admission of States; to the Committee on the Territories.

18. To all matters (excepting those affecting the revenue and the appropriations) pertaining to the islands which came to the United States through the treaty of 1899 with Spain, and to Cuba; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

19. To railways and canals; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

20. To the mining interests; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

21. To the public buildings and occupied or improved grounds of the United States, other than appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

25. To education; to the Committee on Education.
26. To and affecting labor; to the Committee on Labor.
27. To the militia of the several States; to the Committee on the Militia.
28. To patents, copyrights, and trade-marks; to the Committee on Patents.
29. To the pensions of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
30. To the pensions of all the wars of the United States, other than the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.
31. To private and domestic claims and demands, other than war claims, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.
32. To claims arising from any war in which the United States has been engaged; to the Committee on War Claims.
33. To private claims to land; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.
34. To the District of Columbia, other than appropriations therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
35. To the revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.
36. To reform in the civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.
37. To the election of the President, Vice President, or Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.
38. To alcoholic liquor traffic; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.
39. To the irrigation of arid lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.
40. To immigration or naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
41. To ventilation and acoustics; to the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics.
42. The examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same; the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices; and the reduction or increase of the pay of officers shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures in the several departments, as follows:
43. In the Department of State; to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.
44. In the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.
45. In the War Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.
46. In the Navy Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.
47. In the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.
48. In the Interior Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.
49. In the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.
50. In the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.
51. *In the Department of Commerce and Labor; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.*
52. On public buildings; to the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.
53. All proposed action touching the rules, joint rules, and order of business shall be referred to the Committee on Rules.
54. Touching the expenditure of the contingent fund of the House the auditing and settling of all accounts which may be charged therein by order of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.
55. The ascertaining of the travel of Members of the House shall be made by the Committee on Mileage and reported to the Sergeant at Arms.
56. Touching the Library of Congress, statuary, and pictures; to the Joint Committee on the Library.
57. All proposed legislation or orders touching printing shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.
58. The enrollment of engrossed bills; to the Joint Committee on Enrolled Bills.
59. *All proposed legislation concerning the census and the apportionment of Representatives; to the Committee on the Census.*
60. *All matters (excepting those relating to the revenue and appropriations) referring to the centennial of the Louisiana Purchase and to proposed expositions; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.*
61. The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, viz: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business; the Committee on Elections, on the right of a Member to his seat; the Committee on Ways and Means, on bills raising revenue; the committees having jurisdiction of appropriations, the general appropriation bills; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors; the Committee on the Public Lands, bills for the forfeiture of land grants to railroad and other corporations, bills preventing speculation in the public lands, and bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers; *the Committee on the Territories, bills for the admission of new States;* the Committee on Enrolled Bills, enrolled bills; *the Committee on Invalid Pensions, general pension bills;* the Committee on Printing, on all matters referred to them of printing for the use of the House or two Houses; and the Committee on Accounts, on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.

It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of. *The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which shall provide that business under paragraph 4 of Rule XXVI shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it*

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

22. To education; to the Committee on Education.
23. To and affecting labor; to the Committee on Labor.
24. To patents, copyrights, and trade-marks; to the Committee on Patents.
25. To the pensions of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
26. To the pensions of all the wars of the United States, other than the Civil War; to the Committee on Pensions.
27. To private and domestic claims and demands, other than war claims, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.
28. To claims arising from any war in which the United States has been engaged; to the Committee on War Claims.
29. To the District of Columbia, other than appropriations therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.
30. To the revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.
31. To reform in the civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.
32. To the election of the President, Vice President, or Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.
33. To alcoholic liquor traffic; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.
34. To the irrigation of arid lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.
35. To immigration or naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.
36. The examination of the accounts and expenditures of the several departments of the Government and the manner of keeping the same; the economy, justness, and correctness of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices; the reduction or increase of the pay of officers, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the nine standing committees on the public expenditures in the several departments, as follows:
37. In the Department of State; to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.
38. In the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.
39. In the War Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.
40. In the Navy Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.
41. In the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.
42. In the Interior Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.
43. In the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.
44. In the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.
45. In the Department of Commerce and Labor; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.
46. On public buildings; to the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.
47. All proposed action touching the rules, joint rules, and order of business shall be referred to the Committee on Rules.
48. Touching the expenditure of the contingent fund of the House, the auditing and settling of all accounts which may be charged therein by order of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.
49. The ascertaining of the travel of Members of the House shall be made by the Committee on Mileage and reported to the Sergeant at Arms.
50. Touching the Library of Congress, statuary, and pictures; to the Joint Committee on the Library.
51. All proposed legislation or orders touching printing shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.
52. The enrollment of engrossed bills; to the Joint Committee on Enrolled Bills.
53. All proposed legislation concerning the disposition of useless executive papers; to the Joint Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.
54. All proposed legislation concerning the census and the apportionment of Representatives; to the Committee on the Census.
55. All matters (excepting those relating to the revenue and appropriations) referring to proposed expositions; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.
56. The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, viz: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business; the Committees on Elections, on the right of a Member to his seat; the Committee on Ways and Means, on bills raising revenue; the committees having jurisdiction of appropriations, the general appropriation bills; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors; the Committee on the Public Lands, bills for the forfeiture of land grants to railroad and other corporations, bills preventing speculation in the public lands, and bills for the reservation of the public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers; the Committee on the Territories, bills for the admission of new States; the Committee on Enrolled Bills, enrolled bills; the Committee on Invalid Pensions, general pension bills; the Committee on Printing, on all matters referred to them of printing for the use of the House or two Houses; and the Committee on Accounts, on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House.

It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of. The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which shall provide that business under paragraph 7 of Rule XXIV shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of Rule XVI.

62. No committee, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit during the sitting of the House, without special leave.

[The last clause of this rule in the Fifty-third Congress, which requires appropriation bills to be reported within a certain time, is omitted here.]

RULE XII.

DELEGATES.

1. The Speaker shall appoint from among the Delegates one additional member on each of the following committees, viz: Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Agriculture; Military Affairs; Post Office and Post Roads; Public Lands; Indian Affairs; Private Land Claims; and Mines and Mining; and two on Territories; and they shall possess in their respective committees the same powers and privileges as in the House, and may make any motion except to reconsider.

2. *The Resident Commissioner to the United States from Porto Rico shall possess the same powers and privileges as to committee service and in the House as are possessed by Delegates; and shall be competent to serve on the Committee on Insular Affairs as an additional member.*

RULE XIII.

CALENDARS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

1. There shall be three calendars of business reported from committees, viz:

First. A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to which shall be referred bills raising revenue, general appropriation bills, and bills of a public character directly or indirectly appropriating money or property.

Second. A House Calendar, to which shall be referred all bills of a public character not raising revenue nor directly or indirectly appropriating money or property.

Third. A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House, to which shall be referred all bills of a private character.

2. All reports of committees (in the rule of the Fifty-third Congress this mode of making reports was limited to private bills, public bills being reported in the "morning hour" for the call of committees, as per clause 2 of Rule XXIV), *except as provided in clause 61 of Rule XI*, together with the views of the minority, shall be delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar under the direction of the Speaker, in accordance with the foregoing clause, and the titles or subject thereof shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD (this proviso takes place of clause 3 of the Rules of the Fifty-third Congress): *Provided, That* bills reported adversely shall be laid on the table, unless the committee reporting a bill at the time, or any Member within three days thereafter, shall request its reference to the calendar, when it shall be referred, as provided in clause 1 of this rule.

3. *After a bill which has been favorably reported shall have been upon either the House or the Union Calendar for three days any Member may file with the Clerk a notice that he desires such a bill placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Calendar for Unanimous Consent." On days when it shall be in order to move to suspend the rules the Speaker shall, immediately after the approval of the Journal, direct the Clerk to call the bills upon the "Calendar for Unanimous Consent." Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called, it shall immediately be stricken from the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, and it shall not thereafter be placed thereon.*

RULE XIV.

OF DECORUM AND DEBATE.

1. When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk, and shall confine himself to the question under debate, avoiding personality.

2. When two or more Members rise at once, the Speaker shall name the Member who is first to speak; and no Member shall occupy more than one hour in debate on any question in the House or in committee, except as further provided in this rule.

3. The Member reporting the measure under consideration from a committee may open and close, where general debate has been had thereon; and if it shall extend beyond one day, he shall be entitled to one hour to close, notwithstanding he may have used an hour in opening.

4. If any Member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any Member may, call him to order; in which case he shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another Member, to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate; if the decision is in favor of the Member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise; and, if the case require it, he shall be liable to censure or such punishment as the House may deem proper.

5. If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

6. No Member shall speak more than once to the same question without leave of the House, unless he be the mover, proposer, or introducer of the matter pending, in which case he shall be permitted to speak in reply, but not until every Member choosing to speak shall have spoken.

7. While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no Member shall wear his hat, or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots, or smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. *Neither shall* ANY *person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.* (This prohibition applies to Members as well as others.)

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

report any rule or order which shall operate to prevent the motion to recommit being made as provided in paragraph 4 of Rule XVI.

57. No committee, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit during the sitting of the House, without special leave.

RULE XII.

DELEGATES.

1. The House shall elect from among the Delegates one additional member on each of the following committees, viz: Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Agriculture; Military Affairs; the Post Office and Post Roads; Public Lands; Indian Affairs; and Mines and Mining; and two on Territories; and they shall possess in their respective committees the same powers and privileges as in the House, and may make any motion except to reconsider.

2. The Resident Commissioner to the United States from Porto Rico shall possess the same powers and privileges as to committee service and in the House as are possessed by Delegates; and shall be competent to serve on the Committee on Insular Affairs as an additional member.

RULE XIII.

CALENDARS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

1. There shall be three calendars to which all business reported from committees shall be referred, viz:

First. A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to which shall be referred bills raising revenue, general appropriation bills, and bills of a public character directly or indirectly appropriating money or property.

Second. A House Calendar, to which shall be referred all bills of a public character not raising revenue nor directly or indirectly appropriating money or property.

Third. A Calendar of the Committee of the Whole House, to which shall be referred all bills of a private character.

2. All reports of committees, except as provided in clause 56 of Rule XI, together with the views of the minority, shall be delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar under the direction of the Speaker, in accordance with the foregoing clause, and the titles or subject thereof shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD: *Provided,* That bills reported adversely shall be laid on the table, unless the committee reporting a bill, at the time, or any Member within three days thereafter, shall request its reference to the calendar, when it shall be referred, as provided in clause 1 of this rule.

3. After a bill which has been favorably reported shall be upon either the House or the Union Calendar, any Member may file with the Clerk a notice that he desires such a bill placed upon a special calendar to be known as the "Calendar for Unanimous Consent." On days when it shall be in order to move to suspend the rules the Speaker shall, immediately after the approval of the Journal, direct the Clerk to call the bills which have been for three days upon the "Calendar for Unanimous Consent." Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called, it shall immediately be stricken from such calendar; but such bill may be restored to the calendar at the instance of the Member, and if again objected to, it shall be immediately stricken from such calendar, and shall not thereafter be placed thereon: *Provided,* That the same bill shall not be called twice on the same legislative day.

4. There shall also be a Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees, as provided in clause 4 of Rule XXVII.

5. Calendars shall be printed daily.

RULE XIV.

OF DECORUM AND DEBATE.

1. When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk, and shall confine himself to the question under debate, avoiding personality.

2. When two or more Members rise at once, the Speaker shall name the Member who is first to speak; and no Member shall occupy more than one hour in debate on any question in the House or in committee, except as further provided in this rule.

3. The Member reporting the measure under consideration from a committee may open and close, where general debate has been had thereon; and if it shall extend beyond one day, he shall be entitled to one hour to close, notwithstanding he may have used an hour in opening.

4. If any Member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any Member may, call him to order; in which case he shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another Member, to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate; if the decision is in favor of the Member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise; and, if the case require it, he shall be liable to censure or such punishment as to the House may deem proper.

5. If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer, nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

6. No Member shall speak more than once to the same question without leave of the House, unless he be the mover, proposer, or introducer of the matter pending, in which case he shall be permitted to speak in reply, but not until every Member choosing to speak shall have spoken.

7. While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no Member shall wear his hat, or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots, or smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

RULE XV.

ON CALLS OF THE ROLL AND HOUSE.

1. Upon every roll call the names of the Members shall be called alphabetically, by surname, except when two or more have the same surname, in which case the name of the State shall be added; and if there be two such Members from the same State, the whole name shall be called, and after the roll has been once called, the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting; and thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote *[or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule]*. (This did not apply in the rule of the Fifty-third Congress.)

2. In the absence of a quorum, 15 members, including the Speaker, if there is one, shall be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, and in all calls of the House (clause 2 takes the place of clause 3 in Rule XV of Fifty-third Congress, with which compare) *the doors shall be closed, the names of the Members shall be called by the Clerk, and the absentees noted* (transposed in the rule of the Fifty-third Congress); and those for whom no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of a majority of those present, be sent for and arrested, wherever they may be found, by officers to be appointed by the Sergeant at Arms for that purpose, and their attendance secured *and retained;* and the House shall determine upon what condition they shall be discharged. Members who voluntarily appear shall, unless the House otherwise direct, be immediately admitted to the Hall of the House, and they shall report their names to the Clerk to be entered upon the Journal as present.

3. *On the demand of any Member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of Members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the Members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.* (This clause supersedes in part clause 2 of Rule XV, Fifty-third Congress.)

4. *Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause, unless the House shall adjourn there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant at Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent Members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each Member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each Member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant at Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote, and his vote shall be recorded. If those voting on the question and those who are present and decline to vote shall together make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted, and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear. And thereupon further proceedings under the call shall be considered as dispensed with. At any time after the roll call has been completed, the Speaker may entertain a motion to adjourn, if seconded by a majority of those present, to be ascertained by actual count by the Speaker; and if the House adjourns, all proceedings under this section shall be vacated. But this section of the rule shall not apply to the sessions of Friday night until further order of the House.* (This clause is a complete innovation from the rule in the Fifty-third Congress.)

RULE XVI.

ON MOTIONS, THEIR PRECEDENCE, ETC.

1. Every motion made to the House and entertained by the Speaker shall be reduced to writing on the demand of any Member, and shall be entered on the Journal with the name of the Member making it, unless it is withdrawn the same day.

2. When a motion has been made, the Speaker shall state it or (if it be in writing) cause it to be read aloud by the Clerk before being debated, and it shall then be in possession of the House, but may be withdrawn at any time before a decision or amendment.

3. When any motion or proposition is made, the question, Will the House now consider it? shall not be put unless demanded by a Member.

4. When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but (the words "to fix the day to which the House shall adjourn" and "to take a recess" in clause 4 of the rule of the Fifty-third Congress are omitted here) to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order; and no motion to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to postpone indefinitely, being decided, shall be again allowed on the same day at the same stage of the question. *After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution one motion to recommit shall be in order,* and the Speaker shall give preference in recognition for such purpose to a Member who is opposed to the bill or joint resolution. (See clause 1, Rule XVII, of the Fifty-third Congress for motion to recommit.)

5. The hour at which the House adjourns shall be entered on the Journal. (The motion to fix day, for a recess, etc., contained in this clause of the rule of the Fifty-third Congress is here omitted.)

6. On the demand of any Member, before the question is put, a question shall be divided if it include propositions so distinct in substance that one being taken away a substantive proposition shall remain.

7. A motion to strike out and insert is indivisible, but a motion to strike out being lost shall neither preclude amendment nor motion to strike out and insert; and no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

8. Pending a motion to suspend the rules, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result thereon is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion till the vote is taken on suspension.

9. At any time *after the reading of the Journal,* it shall be in order, *by direction of the appropriate committees* ("after the expiration of the morning hour" was the rule in the Fifty-third Congress), to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue, or general appropriation bills.

10. No dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Speaker. (This clause of the rule is not contained in the rules of the Fifty-third Congress.)

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

RULE XV.

ON CALLS OF THE ROLL AND HOUSE.

1. Upon every roll call the names of the Members shall be called alphabetically, by surname, except when two or more have the same surname, in which case the name of the State shall be added; and if there be two such Members from the same State, the whole name shall be called; and after the roll has been once called, the Clerk shall call in their alphabetical order the names of those not voting; and thereafter the Speaker shall not entertain a request to record a vote or announce a pair unless the Member's name has been noted under clause 3 of this rule.

2. In the absence of a quorum, 15 Members, including the Speaker, if there is one, shall be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, and in all calls of the House the doors shall be closed, the names of the Members shall be called by the Clerk, and the absentees noted; and those for whom no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of a majority of those present, be sent for and arrested, wherever they may be found, by officers to be appointed by the Sergeant at Arms for that purpose, and their attendance secured and retained; and the House shall determine upon what condition they shall be discharged. Members who voluntarily appear shall, unless the House otherwise direct, be immediately admitted to the Hall of the House, and they shall report their names to the Clerk to be entered upon the Journal as present.

3. On the demand of any Member, or at the suggestion of the Speaker, the names of Members sufficient to make a quorum in the Hall of the House who do not vote shall be noted by the Clerk and recorded in the Journal, and reported to the Speaker with the names of the Members voting, and be counted and announced in determining the presence of a quorum to do business.

4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause, unless the House shall adjourn there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant at Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent Members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each Member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each Member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant at Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote, and his vote shall be recorded. If those voting on the question and those who are present and decline to vote shall together make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted, and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear. And thereupon further proceedings under the call shall be considered as dispensed with. At any time after the roll call has been completed, the Speaker may entertain a motion to adjourn, if seconded by a majority of those present, to be ascertained by actual count by the Speaker; and if the House adjourns, all proceedings under this section shall be vacated.

RULE XVI.

ON MOTIONS, THEIR PRECEDENCE, ETC.

1. Every motion made to the House and entertained by the Speaker shall be reduced to writing on the demand of any Member, and shall be entered on the Journal with the name of the Member making it, unless it is withdrawn the same day.

2. When a motion has been made, the Speaker shall state it or (if it be in writing) cause it to be read aloud by the Clerk before being debated, and it shall then be in possession of the House, but may be withdrawn at any time before a decision or amendment.

3. When any motion or proposition is made, the question, Will the House now consider it? shall not be put unless demanded by a Member.

4. When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order; and no motion to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to postpone indefinitely, being decided, shall be again allowed on the same day at the same stage of the question. After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution one motion to recommit shall be in order, and the Speaker shall give preference in recognition for such purpose to a Member who is opposed to the bill or joint resolution.

5. The hour at which the House adjourns shall be entered on the Journal.

6. On the demand of any Member, before the question is put, a question shall be divided if it include propositions so distinct in substance that one being taken away a substantive proposition shall remain.

7. A motion to strike out and insert is indivisible, but a motion to strike out being lost shall neither preclude amendment nor motion to strike out and insert; and no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

8. Pending a motion to suspend the rules, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result thereon is announced he shall not entertain any other motion till the vote is taken on suspension.

9. At any time after the reading of the Journal, it shall be in order, by direction of the appropriate committees, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue, or general appropriation bills.

10. No dilatory motion shall be entertained by the Speaker.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

RULE XVII.

PREVIOUS QUESTION.

1. There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of Members *voting, if a quorum be present*, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. (Provision of the Fifty-third Congress for 30 minutes' debate on the question is omitted here, but is transferred to Rule XXVIII, "suspension of the rules," and changed to 40 minutes.) The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments, and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion, for or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee. (Motion to lay on table on second and third reading, as in rule of the Fifty-third Congress, omitted here.)

2. A call of the House shall not be in order after the previous question is ordered, unless it shall appear upon an actual count by the Speaker that a quorum is not present.

3. All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.

RULE XVIII.

RECONSIDERATION.

1. When a motion has been made and carried or lost, it shall be in order for any member of the majority, on the same or succeeding day, to move for the reconsideration thereof, and such motion shall take precedence of all other questions except the consideration of a conference report or a motion to adjourn, and shall not be withdrawn after the said succeeding day without the consent of the House, and thereafter any Member may call it up for consideration: *Provided*, That such motion, if made during the last six days of a session, shall be disposed of when made.

2. No bill, petition, memorial, or resolution referred to a committee, or reported therefrom for printing and recommitment, shall be brought back into the House on a motion to reconsider; and all bills, petitions, memorials, or resolutions reported from a committee shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed.

RULE XIX.

OF AMENDMENTS.

When a motion or proposition is under consideration a motion to amend and a motion to amend that amendment shall be in order, and it shall also be in order to offer a further amendment by way of substitute, to which one amendment may be offered, but which shall not be voted on until the original matter is perfected, but either may be withdrawn before amendment or decision is had thereon. Amendments to the title of a bill or resolution shall not be in order until after its passage, and shall be decided without debate.

RULE XX.

OF AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE.

Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point.

RULE XXI.

ON BILLS.

1. Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time? and, if decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, unless the reading in full is demanded by a Member, and the question shall then be put upon its passage.

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order *in any general appropriation bill* or *in any amendment* thereto. (The exception from the inhibition against changing existing law, where the change effects reduction or retrenchment of expenditures, contained in the rule of the Fifty-third Congress, is here omitted in the rule of the Sixty-first Congress.)

3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following-named committees, viz: To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Pensions, to the Committee on Claims, to the Committee on War Claims, to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and to the Committee on Accounts. (The provision for the introduction and reference of river and harbor bills, private bills, etc., as contained in clause 3 of this rule in the Fifty-third Congress is here omitted.)

RULE XXII.

OF PETITIONS, MEMORIALS, BILLS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

1. Members having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Clerk, indorsing their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof; and said petitions and memorials and bills of a private nature, except such as, in the judgment of the Speaker, are of an obscene or insulting character, shall be entered on the Journal, with the names of the Members presenting them, and the Clerk shall furnish a transcript of such entry to the official reporters of debates for publication in the RECORD.

2. Any petition or memorial or private bill excluded under this rule shall be returned to the Member from whom it was received; and peti-

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

RULE XVII.

PREVIOUS QUESTION.

1. There shall be a motion for the previous question, which, being ordered by a majority of Members voting, if a quorum be present, shall have the effect to cut off all debate and bring the House to a direct vote upon the immediate question or questions on which it has been asked and ordered. The previous question may be asked and ordered upon a single motion, a series of motions allowable under the rules, or an amendment or amendments, or may be made to embrace all authorized motions or amendments, and include the bill to its passage or rejection. It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

2. A call of the House shall not be in order after the previous question is ordered, unless it shall appear upon an actual count by the Speaker that a quorum is not present.

3. All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.

RULE XVIII.

RECONSIDERATION.

1. When a motion has been made and carried or lost, it shall be in order for any member of the majority, on the same or succeeding day, to move for the reconsideration thereof, and such motion shall take precedence of all other questions except the consideration of a conference report or a motion to adjourn, and shall not be withdrawn after the said succeeding day without the consent of the House, and thereafter any Member may call it up for consideration: *Provided*, That such motion, if made during the last six days of a session, shall be disposed of when made.

2. No bill, petition, memorial, or resolution referred to a committee, or reported therefrom for printing and recommitment, shall be brought back into the House on a motion to reconsider; and all bills, petitions, memorials, or resolutions reported from a committee shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed.

RULE XIX.

OF AMENDMENTS.

When a motion or proposition is under consideration a motion to amend and a motion to amend that amendment shall be in order, and it shall also be in order to offer a further amendment by way of substitute, to which one amendment may be offered, but which shall not be voted on until the original matter is perfected, but either may be withdrawn before amendment or decision is had thereon. Amendments to the title of a bill or resolution shall not be in order until after its passage, and shall be decided without debate.

RULE XX.

OF AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE.

Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill shall be subject to the point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point.

RULE XXI.

ON BILLS.

1. Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time? and, if decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, unless the reading in full is demanded by a Member, and the question shall then be put upon its passage.

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

3. No amendment shall be in order to any bill affecting revenue which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill; nor shall any amendment to any item of such bill be in order which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed.

4. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following-named committees, viz: To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Pensions, to the Committee on Claims, to the Committee on War Claims, to the Committee on Public Lands, and to the Committee on Accounts.

RULE XXII.

OF PETITIONS, MEMORIALS, BILLS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

1. Members having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Clerk, indorsing their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof; and said petitions and memorials and bills of a private nature, except such as, in the judgment of the Speaker, are of an obscene or insulting character, shall be entered on the Journal, with the names of the Members presenting them, and the Clerk shall furnish a transcript of such entry to the official reporters of debates for publication in the RECORD.

2. Any petition or memorial or private bill excluded under this rule shall be returned to the Member from whom it was received; and peti-

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

tions and private bills which have been inappropriately referred may, by the direction of the committee having possession of the same, be properly referred in the manner originally presented; and an erroneous reference of a petition or private bill under this clause shall not confer jurisdiction upon the committee to consider or report the same.

3. All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, indorsed with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with Rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

4. When a bill, resolution, or memorial is introduced "by request," these words shall be entered upon the Journal and printed in the RECORD.

5. All resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of executive departments shall be reported to the House within one week after presentation.

RULE XXIII.

OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

1. In all cases, in forming a Committee of the Whole House, the Speaker shall leave his chair after appointing a Chairman to preside, who shall, in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries or lobby have power to cause the same to be cleared.

2. Whenever a Committee of the Whole House or of the Whole House on the state of the Union finds itself without a quorum, [*which shall consist of one hundred Members,*] (a quorum of the committee was formerly the same as that of the House) the Chairman shall cause the roll to be called, and thereupon the committee shall rise, and the Chairman shall report the names of the absentees to the House, which shall be entered on the Journal; but if on such call a quorum shall appear, the committee shall thereupon resume its sitting without further order of the House.

3. All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriation to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, [*or referring any claim to the Court of Claims,*] (not contained in rule of Fifty-third Congress) shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

4. In Committees of the Whole House business on their calendars may be taken up in regular order (order of consideration changed from the rule of the Fifty-third Congress, being determined by the committee, instead of by the House, as formerly), *or in such order as the committee may determine, unless the bill to be considered was determined by the House at the time of going into committee,* but bills for raising revenue, general appropriation bills, and bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors shall have precedence.

5. When general debate is closed by order of the House, any Member shall be allowed five minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the Member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak five minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon, but the same privilege of debate shall be allowed in favor of and against any amendment that may be offered to an amendment; and neither an amendment nor an amendment to an amendment shall be withdrawn by the mover thereof unless by the unanimous consent of the committee.

6. The committee may, by the vote of a majority of the members present, at any time after the five-minute debate has begun upon proposed amendments to any section or paragraph of a bill, close all debate upon such section or paragraph, or, at its election, upon the pending amendments only (which motion shall be decided without debate); but this shall not preclude further amendment, to be decided without debate. (Compare with clause 6 of this rule in the Fifty-third Congress.)

7. A motion to strike out the enacting words of a bill shall have precedence of a motion to amend, and if carried shall be considered equivalent to its rejection. Whenever a bill is reported from a Committee of the Whole with an adverse recommendation and such recommendation is disagreed to by the House, the bill shall stand recommitted to the said committee without further action by the House, but before the question of concurrence is submitted it is in order to entertain a motion to refer the bill to any committee, with or without instructions, and when the same is again reported to the House it shall be referred to the Committee of the Whole without debate.

8. The rules of proceeding in the House shall be observed in Committees of the Whole House so far as they may be applicable.

RULE XXIV.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

1. The daily order of business shall be as follows:
First. Prayer by the Chaplain.
Second. Reading and approval of the Journal.
Third. Correction of reference of public bills.
Fourth. Disposal of business on the Speaker's table.
Fifth. Unfinished business.
Sixth. The morning hour for the consideration of bills called up by committees.
Seventh. Motions to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.
Eighth. Orders of the day. (This clause supersedes in part clauses 1, 2, and 5 of Rule XXIV of the Fifty-third Congress.)

2. Business on the Speaker's table shall be disposed of as follows:

Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate. Reports and communications from heads of departments, and other communications addressed to the House, and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate may be referred to the appropriate committees in the same manner and with the same right of correction as public bills presented by Members; but House bills with Senate amendments which do not require consideration in a Committee of the Whole may be at once disposed of as the House may determine, as may also Senate bills substantially the same as House bills already favorably reported by a Committee of the Whole, be disposed of in the same manner on motion directed to be made by such committee. (This clause supersedes in part clause 1, Rule XXIV, Fifty-third Congress.)

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

tions and private bills which have been inappropriately referred may, by the direction of the committee having possession of the same, be properly referred in the manner originally presented; and an erroneous reference of a petition or private bill under this clause shall not confer jurisdiction upon the committee to consider or report the same.

3. All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, indorsed with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the RECORD of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with Rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

4. When a bill, resolution, or memorial is introduced "by request," these words shall be entered upon the Journal and printed in the RECORD.

5. All resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of executive departments shall be reported to the House within one week after presentation.

RULE XXIII.

OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

1. In all cases, in forming a Committee of the Whole House, the Speaker shall leave his chair after appointing a Chairman to preside, who shall, in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries or lobby, have power to cause the same to be cleared.

2. Whenever a Committee of the Whole House or of the Whole House on the state of the Union finds itself without a quorum, which shall consist of one hundred Members, the Chairman shall cause the roll to be called, and thereupon the committee shall rise, and the Chairman shall report the names of the absentees to the House, which shall be entered on the Journal; but if on such call a quorum shall appear, the committee shall thereupon resume its sitting without further order of the House.

3. All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriation to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, or referring any claim to the Court of Claims, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

4. In Committees of the Whole House business on their calendars may be taken up in regular order, or in such order as the committee may determine, unless the bill to be considered was determined by the House at the time of going into committee, but bills for raising revenue, general appropriation bills, and bills for the improvement of rivers and harbors shall have precedence.

5. When general debate is closed by order of the House, any Member shall be allowed five minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the Member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak five minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon, but the same privilege of debate shall be allowed in favor of and against any amendment that may be offered to an amendment; and neither an amendment nor an amendment to an amendment shall be withdrawn by the mover thereof unless by the unanimous consent of the committee.

6. The committee may, by the vote of a majority of the members present, at any time after the five-minute debate has begun upon proposed amendments to any section or paragraph of a bill, close all debate upon such section or paragraph, or, at its election, upon the pending amendments only (which motion shall be decided without debate); but this shall not preclude further amendment, to be decided without debate.

7. A motion to strike out the enacting words of a bill shall have precedence of a motion to amend, and if carried shall be considered equivalent to its rejection. Whenever a bill is reported from a Committee of the Whole with an adverse recommendation and such recommendation is disagreed to by the House, the bill shall stand recommitted to the said committee without further action by the House, but before the question of concurrence is submitted it is in order to entertain a motion to refer the bill to any committee, with or without instructions, and when the same is again reported to the House it shall be referred to the Committee of the Whole without debate.

8. The rules of proceeding in the House shall be observed in Committees of the Whole House so far as they may be applicable.

RULE XXIV.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

1. The daily order of business shall be as follows:
First. Prayer by the Chaplain.
Second. Reading and approval of the Journal.
Third. Correction of reference of public bills.
Fourth. Disposal of business on the Speaker's table.
Fifth. Unfinished business.
Sixth. The morning hour for the consideration of bills called up by committees.
Seventh. Motions to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.
Eighth. Orders of the day.

2. Business on the Speaker's table shall be disposed of as follows:

Messages from the President shall be referred to the appropriate committees without debate. Reports and communications from heads of departments, and other communications addressed to the House, and bills, resolutions, and messages from the Senate may be referred to the appropriate committees in the same manner and with the same right of correction as public bills presented by Members; but House bills with Senate amendments which do not require consideration in a Committee of the Whole may be at once disposed of as the House may determine, as may also Senate bills substantially the same as House bills already favorably reported by a committee of the House, and not required to be considered in Committee of the Whole, be disposed of in the same manner on motion directed to be made by such committee.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

2. The consideration of the unfinished business in which the House may be engaged at an adjournment, except business in the morning hour, shall be resumed as soon as the business on the Speaker's table is finished, and at the same time each day thereafter until disposed of, and the consideration of all other unfinished business shall be resumed whenever the class of business to which it belongs shall be in order under the rules. (This clause supersedes in part clause 5 of this rule in the Fifty-third Congress.)

4. After the unfinished business has been disposed of, the Speaker shall call each standing committee in regular order, and then select committees, and each committee when named may call up for consideration any bill reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar, and if the Speaker shall not complete the call of the committees before the House passes to other business, he shall resume the next call where he left off, giving preference to the last bill under consideration: Provided, That whenever any committee shall have occupied the morning hour on two days, it shall not be in order to call up any other bill until the other committees have been called in their turn. (This clause supersedes and takes the place of clause 4 of this rule in the Fifty-third Congress.)

5. After one hour shall have been devoted to the consideration of bills called up by committees, it shall be in order, pending consideration or discussion thereof, to entertain a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; or, when authorized by a committee, to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider a particular bill, to which motion one amendment only, designating another bill, may be made; and if either motion be determined in the negative, it shall not be in order to make either motion again until the disposal of the matter under consideration or discussion. (This clause supersedes in part clause 6 of the rule in the Fifty-third Congress.)

6. On Friday of each week, after the *unfinished business* (substituted for "morning hour") *has been disposed of*, it shall be in order to entertain a motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar; and if this motion fails, then public business shall be in order as on other days. (Supersedes third paragraph of clause 6 of this rule in the Fifty-third Congress.)

RULE XXV.

PRIORITY OF BUSINESS.

All questions relating to the priority of business shall be decided by a majority without debate.

RULE XXVI.

PRIVATE AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS.

1. Friday in every week shall be set apart for the consideration of private business, unless otherwise determined by the House.

2. The House shall on each Friday at 5 o'clock p. m. take a recess until 8 o'clock, at which evening session private *pension bills*, bills for the removal of political disabilities, and bills removing charges of desertion only shall be considered; said evening session not to extend beyond 10 o'clock and 30 minutes. (Substituted for clause 3 in this rule of the Fifty-third Congress.)

3. The second and fourth Mondays in each month, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, shall, when claimed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by said committee.

4. On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of Rule XXIV unless the House by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith shall otherwise determine. On such a motion there may be debate not to exceed five minutes for and against. On a call of committees under this rule bills may be called up from either the House or the Union Calendar, excepting bills which are privileged under the rules; but bills called up from the Union Calendar shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. This rule shall not apply during the last two weeks of the session. It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion for a recess on any Wednesday except during the last two weeks of the session. (This clause was first adopted March 1, 1909, and has no analogy with any rule of preceding Congresses.)

RULE XXVII.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

All business before committees of the House at the end of one session shall be resumed at the commencement of the next session of the same Congress in the same manner as if no adjournment had taken place.

RULE XXVIII.

CHANGE OR SUSPENSION OF RULES.

1. No rule shall be suspended except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present; nor shall the Speaker entertain a motion to suspend the rules except on the first and third Mondays of each month, preference being given on the first Monday to individuals and on the third Monday to committees, and during the last six days of a session.

2. All motions to suspend the rules shall, before being submitted to the House, be seconded by a majority of tellers, if demanded.

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

3. The consideration of the unfinished business in which the House may be engaged at an adjournment, except business in the morning hour, shall be resumed as soon as the business on the Speaker's table is finished, and at the same time each day thereafter until disposed of, and the consideration of all other unfinished business shall be resumed whenever the class of business to which it belongs shall be in order under the rules.

4. After the unfinished business has been disposed of, the Speaker shall call each standing committee in regular order, and then select committees, and each committee when named may call up for consideration any bill reported by it on a previous day and on the House Calendar, and if the Speaker shall not complete the call of the committees before the House passes to other business, he shall resume the next call where he left off, giving preference to the last bill under consideration: *Provided*, That whenever any committee shall have occupied the morning hour on two days, it shall not be in order to call up any other bill until the other committees have been called in their turn.

5. After one hour shall have been devoted to the consideration of bills called up by committees, it shall be in order, pending consideration or discussion thereof, to entertain a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; or, when authorized by a committee, to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider a particular bill, to which motion one amendment only, designating another bill, may be made; and if either motion be determined in the negative, it shall not be in order to make either motion again until the disposal of the matter under consideration or discussion.

6. On Friday of each week, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar in the following order: On the second and fourth Fridays of each month preference shall be given to the consideration of private pension claims and bills removing political disabilities and bills removing the charge of desertion. On every Friday except the second and fourth Fridays the House shall give preference to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, alternating between the two committees.

7. On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule, unless the House by a two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith shall otherwise determine. On such a motion there may be debate not to exceed five minutes for and against. On a call of committees under this rule bills may be called up from either the House or the Union Calendar, excepting bills which are privileged under the rules; but bills called up from the Union Calendar shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. This rule shall not apply during the last two weeks of the session. It shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion for a recess on any Wednesday except during the last two weeks of the session.

8. The second and fourth Mondays in each month, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, shall, when claimed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by said committee.

RULE XXV.

PRIORITY OF BUSINESS.

All questions relating to the priority of business shall be decided by a majority without debate.

RULE XXVI.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

All business before committees of the House at the end of one session shall be resumed at the commencement of the next session of the same Congress in the same manner as if no adjournment had taken place.

RULE XXVII.

CHANGE OR SUSPENSION OF RULES.

1. No rule shall be suspended except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present; nor shall the Speaker entertain a motion to suspend the rules except on the first and third Mondays of each month, preference being given on the first Monday to individuals and on the third Monday to committees, and during the last six days of a session.

2. All motions to suspend the rules shall, before being submitted to the House, be seconded by a majority by tellers, if demanded.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

3. When a motion to suspend the rules has been seconded, it shall be in order, before the final vote is taken thereon, to debate the proposition to be voted upon for *forty* (changed from 30 minutes. Compare this clause with clause 1, Rule XVII, "Previous question." Fifty-third Congress) minutes, one-half of such time to be given to debate in favor of and one-half to debate in opposition to such proposition; *and the same right of debate shall be allowed whenever the previous question has been ordered on any proposition on which there has been no debate.*

4. *Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on the calendar under an appropriate heading. Immediately after the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday, it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least seven days prior thereto. Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. Such motions before being submitted to the House shall be seconded by a majority by tellers. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to twenty minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall have precedence over motions to suspend the rules and shall require for adoption an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which any bill has been so taken it may be called for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee.* (This clause, adopted June 17, 1910, has no analogy with any previous rule.)

RULE XXIX.

CONFERENCE REPORTS.

1. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read, while the roll is being called, or the House is dividing on any proposition. And there shall accompany every such report a detailed statement sufficiently explicit to inform the House what effect such amendments or propositions will have upon the measures to which they relate.

2. *It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the Record, except on either of the six days preceding the end of a session.* (This clause was adopted in 1902.)

RULE XXX.

SECRET SESSION.

Whenever confidential communications are received from the President of the United States, or whenever the Speaker or any Member shall inform the House that he has communications which he believes ought to be kept secret for the present, the House shall be cleared of all persons except the Members and officers thereof, and so continue during the reading of such communications, the debates and proceedings thereon, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

RULE XXXI.

READING OF PAPERS.

When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.

RULE XXXII.

DRAWING OF SEATS.

1. At the commencement of each Congress, immediately after the Members and Delegates are sworn in, the Clerk shall place in a box, prepared for that purpose, a number of small balls, of marble or other material, equal to the number of Members and Delegates, which balls shall be consecutively numbered and thoroughly intermingled, and at such hour as shall be fixed by the House for that purpose, by the hands of a page, draw said balls one by one from the box and announce the number as it is drawn, upon which announcement the Member or Delegate whose name on a numbered alphabetical list shall correspond with the number on the ball shall advance and choose his seat for the term for which he is elected.

2. Before said drawing shall commence each seat shall be vacated and so remain until selected under this rule, and any seat having been selected shall be deemed forfeited if left unoccupied before the call of the roll is finished; and whenever the seats of Members and Delegates shall have been drawn, no proposition for a second drawing shall be in order during that Congress.

RULE XXXIII.

HALL OF THE HOUSE.

The Hall of the House shall be used only for the legislative business of the House and for the caucus meetings of its Members, except upon occasions where the House by resolution agree to take part in any ceremonies to be observed therein; and the Speaker shall not entertain a motion for the suspension of this rule.

RULE XXXIV.

OF ADMISSION TO THE FLOOR.

1. The persons hereinafter named, and none other, shall be admitted to the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto, viz: The President and Vice President of the United States and their private secretaries, judges of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress and Members-elect, contestants in election cases during the pendency of their cases in the House, the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, heads of departments, foreign ministers, governors of States, *the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds*, the Librarian of Congress and his assistant in charge of the Law Library, *the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Porto Rico*, such persons as have, by name, received the thanks of Congress, ex-Members of the House of Representatives who are not interested in any claim or directly in any bill pending before Congress, and clerks of committees when business from

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

3. When a motion to suspend the rules has been seconded, it shall be in order, before the final vote is taken thereon, to debate the proposition to be voted upon for 40 minutes, one-half of such time to be given to debate in favor of and one-half to debate in opposition to such proposition; and the same right of debate shall be allowed whenever the previous question has been ordered on any proposition on which there has been no debate.

4. Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee 15 days prior thereto. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on a calendar to be known as a "Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees." Immediately after the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday, it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least 7 days prior thereto. Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. When such motion shall be called up, the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers, and no such motion shall be entertained as to a bill or joint resolution the title of which contains more than 100 words; after the reading of the bill by title the motion shall not be submitted to the House unless seconded by a majority by tellers; if such motion fails of a second, it shall be immediately stricken from the calendar and shall not be thereafter placed thereon. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to 20 minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall have precedence over motions to suspend the rules, and shall require for adoption an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail, the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which any bill has been so taken it may be called up for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee: *Provided*, No Member shall have upon such calendar more than two motions at the same time.

RULE XXVIII.

CONFERENCE REPORTS.

1. The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read, while the roll is being called, or the House is dividing on any proposition. And there shall accompany every such report a detailed statement sufficiently explicit to inform the House what effect such amendments or propositions will have upon the measures to which they relate.

2. It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the RECORD, except on either of the six days preceding the end of a session.

RULE XXIX.

SECRET SESSION.

Whenever confidential communications are received from the President of the United States, or whenever the Speaker or any Member shall inform the House that he has communications which he believes ought to be kept secret for the present, the House shall be cleared of all persons except the Members and officers thereof, and so continue during the reading of such communications, the debates and proceedings thereon, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

RULE XXX.

READING OF PAPERS.

When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.

RULE XXXI.

DRAWING OF SEATS.

1. At the commencement of each Congress, immediately after the Members and Delegates are sworn in, the Clerk shall place in a box, prepared for that purpose, a number of small balls, of marble or other material, equal to the number of Members and Delegates, which balls shall be consecutively numbered and thoroughly intermingled, and at such hour as shall be fixed by the House for that purpose, by the hands of a page, draw said balls one by one from the box and announce the number as it is drawn, upon which announcement the Member or Delegate whose name on a numbered alphabetical list shall correspond with the number on the ball shall advance and choose his seat for the term for which he is elected.

2. Before said drawing shall commence each seat shall be vacated and so remain until selected under this rule, and any seat having been selected shall be deemed forfeited if left unoccupied before the call of the roll is finished; and whenever the seats of Members and Delegates shall have been drawn, no proposition for a second drawing shall be in order during that Congress.

RULE XXXII.

HALL OF THE HOUSE.

The Hall of the House shall be used only for the legislative business of the House and for the caucus meetings of its Members, except upon occasions where the House by resolution agree to take part in any ceremonies to be observed therein; and the Speaker shall not entertain a motion for the suspension of this rule.

RULE XXXIII.

OF ADMISSION TO THE FLOOR.

1. The persons hereinafter named, and none other, shall be admitted to the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto, viz: The President and Vice President of the United States and their private secretaries, judges of the Supreme Court, Members of Congress and Members elect, contestants in election cases during the pendency of their cases in the House, the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, heads of departments, foreign ministers, governors of States, the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, the Librarian of Congress and his assistant in charge of the Law Library, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Porto Rico, the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands, such persons as have, by name, received the thanks of Congress, ex-Members of the House of Representatives who are not interested in any claim or directly in any bill pending before

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

their committee is under consideration; and it shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a request for the suspension of this rule or to present from the chair the request of any Member for unanimous consent.

2. *There shall be excluded at all times from the Hall of the House of Representatives and the cloakrooms all persons not entitled to the privilege of the floor during the session, except that until 15 minutes of the hour of the meeting of the House persons employed in its service, accredited members of the press entitled to admission to the press gallery, and other persons on request of Members, by card or in writing, may be admitted.* (This clause adopted in 1902.)

RULE XXXV.

OF ADMISSION TO THE GALLERIES.

The Speaker shall set aside a portion of the west gallery for the use of the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet, justices of the Supreme Court, foreign ministers and suites, and the members of their respective families, and shall also set aside another portion of the same gallery for the accommodation of persons to be admitted on the card of Members. The southerly half of the east gallery shall be assigned exclusively for the use of the families of Members of Congress, in which the Speaker shall control one bench, and on request of a Member the Speaker shall issue a card of admission to his family, which shall include their visitors, and no other person shall be admitted to this section.

RULE XXXVI.

OFFICIAL AND OTHER REPORTERS.

1. The appointment and removal, for cause, of the official reporters of the House, including stenographers of committees, and the manner of the execution of their duties, shall be vested in the Speaker.

2. Stenographers and reporters, other than the official reporters of the House, wishing to take down the debates and proceedings may be admitted by the Speaker to the reporters' gallery over the Speaker's chair, under such regulations as he may, from time to time, prescribe; (the remainder of this clause consists of amendments made from time to time down to February, 1909) *and he may assign one seat on the floor to Associated Press reporters, one to the Sun Press Association, one to the United Press Association, one to the New York Herald Syndicate, and one to the Hearst News Service, and regulate the occupation of the same. And the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one additional representative of each press association.*

RULE XXXVII.

PAY OF WITNESSES.

The rule for paying witnesses subpœnaed to appear before the House or either of its committees shall be as follows: For each day a witness shall attend, the sum of $2; for each mile he shall travel in coming to and going from the place of examination, the sum of 5 cents each way; but nothing shall be paid for traveling when the witness has been summoned at the place of trial.

RULE XXXVIII.

PAPERS.

The clerks of the several committees of the House shall, within three days after the final adjournment of a Congress, deliver to the Clerk of the House all bills, joint resolutions, petitions, and other papers referred to the committee, together with all evidence taken by such committee under the order of the House during the said Congress and not reported to the House; and in the event of the failure or neglect of any clerk of a committee to comply with this rule the Clerk of the House shall, within three days thereafter, take into his keeping all such papers and testimony.

RULE XXXIX.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

No memorial or other paper presented to the House shall be withdrawn from its files without its leave, and if withdrawn therefrom certified copies thereof shall be left in the office of the Clerk; but when an act may pass for the settlement of a claim the Clerk is authorized to transmit to the officer charged with the settlement thereof the papers on file in his office relating to such claim, or may loan temporarily to an officer or bureau of the executive departments any papers on file in his office relating to any matter pending before such officer or bureau, taking proper receipt therefor.

RULE XL.

BALLOT.

In all other cases of ballot than for committees a majority of the votes given shall be necessary to an election, and where there shall not be such a majority on the first ballot the ballots shall be repeated until a majority be obtained; and in all balloting blanks shall be rejected and not taken into the count in enumeration of votes or reported by the tellers.

RULE XLI.

MESSAGES.

Messages received from the Senate and the President of the United States giving notice of bills passed or approved shall be entered in the Journal and published in the RECORD of that day's proceedings.

RULE XLII.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Estimates of appropriations and all other communications from the executive departments intended for the consideration of any committees of the House shall be addressed to the Speaker and by him *referred as provided by clause 2 of Rule XXIV.*

RULE XLIII.

QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

No person shall be an officer of the House, or continue in its employment, who shall be an agent for the prosecution of any claim against the Government, or be interested in such claim otherwise than as an original claimant; and it shall be the duty of the Committee on Accounts to inquire into and report to the House any violation of this rule.

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

Congress, and clerks of committees when business from their committee is under consideration; and it shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain a request for the suspension of this rule or to present from the chair the request of any Member for unanimous consent.

2. There shall be excluded at all times from the Hall of the House of Representatives and the cloakrooms all persons not entitled to the privilege of the floor during the session, except that until 15 minutes of the hour of the meeting of the House persons employed in its service, accredited members of the press entitled to admission to the press gallery, and other persons on request of Members, by card or in writing, may be admitted.

RULE XXXIV.

OF ADMISSION TO THE GALLERIES.

The Speaker shall set aside a portion of the west gallery for the use of the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet, justices of the Supreme Court, foreign ministers and suites, and the members of their respective families, and shall also set aside another portion of the same gallery for the accommodation of persons to be admitted on the card of Members. The southerly half of the east gallery shall be assigned exclusively for the use of the families of Members of Congress, in which the Speaker shall control one bench, and on request of a Member the Speaker shall issue a card of admission to his family, which shall include their visitors, and no other person shall be admitted to this section.

RULE XXXV.

OFFICIAL AND OTHER REPORTERS.

1. The appointment and removal, for cause, of the official reporters of the House, including stenographers of committees, and the manner of the execution of their duties, shall be vested in the Speaker.

2. Such portion of the gallery over the Speaker's chair as may be necessary to accommodate representatives of the press wishing to report the debates and proceedings shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters and correspondents shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and he may assign one seat on the floor to Associated Press reporters, one to the Sun Press Association, one to the United Press Associations, one to the National News Association, and one to the New York Herald Syndicate, and regulate the occupation of the same. And the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one additional representative of each press association.

RULE XXXVI.

PAY OF WITNESSES.

The rule for paying witnesses subpœnaed to appear before the House or either of its committees shall be as follows: For each day a witness shall attend, the sum of $2; for each mile he shall travel in coming to and going from the place of examination, the sum of 5 cents each way; but nothing shall be paid for traveling when the witness has been summoned at the place of trial.

RULE XXXVII.

PAPERS.

The clerks of the several committees of the House, shall, within three days after the final adjournment of a Congress, deliver to the Clerk of the House all bills, joint resolutions, petitions, and other papers referred to the committee, together with all evidence taken by such committee under the order of the House during the said Congress and not reported to the House; and in the event of the failure or neglect of any clerk of a committee to comply with this rule the Clerk of the House shall, within three days thereafter, take into his keeping all such papers and testimony.

RULE XXXVIII.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

No memorial or other paper presented to the House shall be withdrawn from its files without its leave, and if withdrawn therefrom certified copies thereof shall be left in the office of the Clerk; but when an act may pass for the settlement of a claim the Clerk is authorized to transmit to the officer charged with the settlement thereof the papers on file in his office relating to such claim, or may loan temporarily to an officer or bureau of the executive departments any papers on file in his office relating to any matter pending before such officer or bureau, taking proper receipt therefor.

RULE XXXIX.

BALLOT.

In all cases of ballot a majority of the votes given shall be necessary to an election, and where there shall not be such a majority on the first ballot the ballots shall be repeated until a majority be obtained; and in all balloting blanks shall be rejected and not taken into the count in enumeration of votes or reported by the tellers.

RULE XL.

MESSAGES.

Messages received from the Senate and the President of the United States giving notice of bills passed or approved shall be entered in the Journal and published in the RECORD of that day's proceedings.

RULE XLI.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Estimates of appropriations and all other communications from the executive departments intended for the consideration of any committees of the House shall be addressed to the Speaker and by him referred as provided by clause 2 of Rule XXIV.

RULE XLII.

QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES.

No person shall be an officer of the House, or continue in its employment, who shall be an agent for the prosecution of any claim against the Government, or be interested in such claim otherwise than as an original claimant; and it shall be the duty of the Committee on Accounts to inquire into and report to the House any violation of this rule.

RULES OF THE SIXTY-FIRST CONGRESS—continued.

RULE XLIV.

JEFFERSON'S MANUAL.

The rules of parliamentary practice comprised in Jefferson's Manual shall govern the House in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the standing rules and orders of the House and joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives.

RULE XLV.

PRINTING.

(The rule as to printing is now regulated by the statute law.)

1. All documents referred to committees or otherwise disposed of shall be printed unless otherwise specially ordered.

2. Motions to print additional numbers of any bill, report, resolution, or other public document shall be referred to the Committee on Printing; and the report of the committee thereon shall be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost thereof. Unless ordered by the House, no bill, resolution, or other proposition reported by a committee shall be reprinted unless the same be placed upon the calendar. Of bills which have passed the Senate, and of House bills as amended by the Senate, when referred in the House, there shall be printed 400 copies.

PROPOSED RULES OF THE SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS—continued.

RULE XLIII.

JEFFERSON'S MANUAL.

The rules of parliamentary practice comprised in Jefferson's Manual shall govern the House in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the standing rules and orders of the House and joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. ALEXANDER MCDOWELL,
Clerk of the House, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I desire to inform you that I have this day mailed to the governor of Iowa my resignation as a Member of the Sixty-second Congress, to take effect on the 15th day of March, 1911.

Respectfully, WALTER I. SMITH.

ASSIGNMENT OF ROOMS.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 24.

Resolved, That the committee rooms in the House Office Building now assigned to and occupied by the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and the same are hereby, assigned to the Committee on Military Affairs; and the committee rooms now assigned to and occupied by the Committee on Military Affairs in the Capitol Building be, and the same are hereby, assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved, That the rooms 152 and 154 in the House Office Building, formerly occupied by the Ship Subsidy Committee, be, and they are hereby, assigned to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman that these rooms were reserved to enable special committees created from time to time to have some proper place with facilities to conduct their work, and if these rooms are assigned there will be no place in the House Office Building to accommodate such committees. I suggest that the entire question of the reassignment of rooms go over until some time when a committee can take the whole matter up.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky to let his resolution go over.

Mr. HELM. Very well. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold the resolution.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—SAMUEL CUSTER.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. STERLING to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the case of Samuel Custer, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 5, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Doorkeeper of the House, transmitting a list of public property in his charge in committee rooms of the House (H. Doc. No. 1), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Coshocton, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 3) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 4) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5) to provide revenue for the Government by levying a special excise tax with respect to doing business by persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 6) to repeal paragraph 355 of section 1 of the tariff act of 1909 and to provide for the importation of cotton bagging free of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7) to repeal paragraph 125 of section 1 of the tariff act of 1909, approved August 5, 1909, and provide for the importation of cotton ties of iron or steel for the baling of cotton free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8) to repeal paragraph 285 of section 1 of the tariff act of 1909 and to provide for the importation of fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, venison, and other game, free of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9) to regulate the trial of contempts of courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 10) repealing the tax on oleomargarine and other dairy products as fixed by the act of May 9, 1902, and substituting in lieu of said tax an annual license for manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 13) to establish a department of labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14) to reduce postal rates, to improve the postal service, and to increase postal revenues; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 15) to extend the penny-postage rate on local delivery first-class mail matter to post offices where the system of free delivery is established; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16) for the establishment of a mail-delivery system at post offices of the second and third classes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17) authorizing the Postmaster General to employ certain fourth-class postmasters for the performance of mail-messenger service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18) granting pensions to Army teamsters of the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19) to provide for the erection of a memorial to Robert Fulton; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20) to declare Lincoln's birthday a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21) to establish a uniform rate of tax on oleomargarine, to change the rate of tax on renovated butter, to protect the consumers, dealers, and manufacturers of all kinds of butter and oleomargarine against fraud, and to afford the Bureau of Internal Revenue more efficient means for the detection of fraud and the collection of the revenue; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 22) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 23) for reduction of customs duties on pharmaceutical and bacteriological products, surgical instruments, and such instruments and apparatus as are used by eleemosynary institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 24) creating Fort Wayne, Ind., in the district of Indianapolis, a subport of entry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 25) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Valparaiso, in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26) authorizing a judicial review of law and facts in fraud-order cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Decennial Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 28) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to lot No. 20, square No. 253, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 29) for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States," approved February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 31) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to determine the amount due certain individual Sioux Indians of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at Dell Rapids, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 33) to establish mining experiment stations, to aid in the development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 34) for the relief of certain white men on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 35) to regulate corporations engaging in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 36) to protect migratory game birds of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 37) making appropriation to pay certain Indian claims investigated, found due, and reported to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 38) to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 39) for the relief of the survivors of McLean's Pennsylvania regiment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 40) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 41) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 42) to prevent payment of special tax on retail liquor dealers under assumed or fictitious name, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 43) to increase the tax on beer and playing cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 44) to remove the charge of desertion on the rolls against officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 45) affecting the town sites of Timber Lake and Dupree, in South Dakota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 46) to amend section 2 of an act approved March 2, 1907, entitled "An act providing for the allotment and distribution of Indian tribal funds" (34 Stat. L., pp. 1221, 1222); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 47) for the erection of a public building at Madison, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 48) to provide for the erection of a public building at Redfield, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 49) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to classify and appraise unallotted Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 50) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue unrestricted patents for certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 51) to provide for the forfeiture of rights of way granted to railway companies across Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 52) to authorize the payment of certain claims for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 53) to extend the privileges of the transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisement to the city of Dallas, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 54) to provide for the investigation of controversies affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 55) limiting the power of circuit and district courts of the United States and the judges thereof to issue injunctions and restraining orders against State laws and State officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 56) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 57) to provide for the survey of the Schuylkill River, Pa.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 58) to regulate the storage of food supplies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 59) to provide for payment of interest on judgments rendered against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 60) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 61) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 62) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 63) to create a commission to prepare a code of laws for the regulation and control of insurance companies doing business within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 64) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States building at Staunton, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 65) to provide for the improvement of Willis River, in Virginia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 66) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 67) providing for the erection of a public building in the town of Waynesboro, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 68) to provide for the improvement of Appomattox River, in Virginia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 69) to repair a portion of the roadway to the national cemetery at Staunton, Va., and to keep said portion of said road in repair; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 70) to constitute a commission to investigate the purchase of American-grown tobacco by the Governments of foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 71) to construct a highway from the station in the town of Appomattox, Va., to the battle field of Appomattox and other points of interest near said battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 702) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Jellico, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 703) to prohibit interstate carriers from transporting products of any factory or mine in which convicts are worked; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 704) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Maryville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 705) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of widows, minor children, etc., of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 706) to regulate the hours of work of post-office clerks employed in first and second class post offices and to grant 30 days' annual leave for clerks and carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 707) requiring the United States Government to own its own post-office building in every county seat in the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 708) to provide for the reduction of mileage to actual expenses of Representatives and Senators; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 709) declaring such persons as were engaged in the operation and construction of the United States military railroads during the War of the Rebellion to have been a part of the Army of the United States and having a pensionable status in accordance therewith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 710) to authorize the Secretary of War to commence and complete the locking and damming of the Clinch River in Tennessee above Kingston and to Walkers Ford, and in accordance with the plan heretofore adopted; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 711) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Clinch River at or near Kingston, Tenn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 712) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers and granting them 30 days' leave per annum; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 713) to establish a fresh-water mussel hatchery on the banks of the Clinch River in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 714) to establish a mining experiment station at Knoxville, Tenn., to aid in the development of the resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 715) requiring the flag of the United States to be displayed at educational institutions to which officers of Army or Navy are assigned, at agricultural colleges or experiment stations receiving Government aid, and at ambassadors', ministers', consuls', and consular agents' offices; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 716) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 717) to authorize the Postmaster General to establish a station, substation, or branch post office in certain communities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 718) to provide for the erection of a statue or monument to the memory of Gen. John Sevier; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 719) to extend the franking privilege to the officers of the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 720) to create a board to correct military records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 721) for the improvement and maintenance of Powell River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 722) for the improvement and maintenance of the Little Tennessee River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 723) for the maintenance and improvement of the Holston River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 724) for the maintenance and improvement of the French Broad River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 725) to grant an honorable discharge to the members of Capt. William Bingham's company, National Guard of Tennessee, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to grant pensions to the members and widows and minor children of the members of said company; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 726) to provide for the erection of an Army and Navy hospital at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 727) authorizing and empowering rural free delivery carriers to administer oaths to pensioners as required to complete pension vouchers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 728) to prevent the pollution of navigable rivers or other bodies of water under the control of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 729) for increasing the salaries and for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 730) to authorize the location of a branch home for the widows of volunteer and regular soldiers and sailors at or near Knoxville, in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 731) to create in the War and Navy Departments, respectively, a roll to be known as the "Civil War officers' annuity honor roll," to authorize placing thereon with pay certain surviving officers who served in the Volunteer or Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and who are not now on the retired list of the Regular Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 732) to do justice to the Home Guards of Scott County, Tenn., and to grant honorable discharges and pensions under existing pension laws; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 733) to grant an honorable discharge to the members of the late Union County company, National Guard of Tennessee, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to grant pensions to the members and widows and minor children of the members of said company; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 734) to provide for the erection of a building for the Supervising Architect of the Treasury; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 735) to make certain funds applicable in the payment of expenses of encampments of the Organized Militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 736) to amend the act of Congress approved February 6, 1907, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 737) to amend the immigration laws of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 738) for the improvement and maintenance of the French Broad and Pigeon Rivers, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 739) to provide for the erection of a public building at Jellico, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 740) to provide for the erection of a public building at Maryville, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 741) extending the benefits of the acts of June 27, 1890; May 9, 1900; and February 6, 1907, to the offi-

cers and enlisted men of Capt. David Beaty's company of independent scouts, Civil War, and to their widows and minor children; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 742) for the relief of the survivors of the shipwreck of the steamboat *Sultana;* to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 743) for the benefit of Federal soldiers and State militiamen who were confined in Confederate military prisons during the Civil War of 1861 to 1865; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of soldiers of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 745) to pension the National Guards of East Tennessee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 746) to establish a fresh-water mussel hatchery on the banks of the Clinch River, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 747) to fix the compensation of the surveyor of customs at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, a bill (H. R. 748) to increase the pensions of certain persons now on the pension roll under the general laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 749) for the relief of certain officers on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 750) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 751) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to rights of way through certain parks, reservations, and other public lands," approved February 15, 1901; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 752) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Thief River Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 753) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Detroit, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 754) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Bemidji, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 755) to compensate the Delaware Indians for services rendered by them to the United States in various wars; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 756) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned bronze or brass cannon to Porter Military Academy, Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 757) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Linton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 758) to provide suitable medals for officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps who participated in certain engagements of the Civil War; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 759) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment, who were the first fully equipped soldiers to arrive, on April 19, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 760) for the relief of the widows of Union soldiers, sailors, or marines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 761) to authorize the appointment of dental surgeons in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 762) providing for the equipment of Army transports with life launches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 763) for the erection of a post-office building in the town of Wakefield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 764) providing that the statute of limitations shall not be interposed in any suit brought by any laborer, workman, or mechanic in the Court of Claims against the United States to recover wages claimed to be due him under the national eight-hour law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 765) to amend the records on file at the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 766) for the recognition of services of a military nature rendered by certain civilians in the late War with Spain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 767) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico, and amending the act of April 19, 1908, relative to widows of soldiers, etc., of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 768) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, sailors, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 769) to create a Tariff Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 770) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 771) to incorporate the Commandery in Chief of the Sons of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 772) providing for the physical valuation of the properties of railroad companies engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 773) fixing the price of gas in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 774) to provide for the appointment and compensation of professors and instructors at the Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 775) to provide for the erection of a post office and courthouse at Rutland, Vt.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 776) providing for the cession of a portion of the unoccupied public lands in the State of Colorado by the Government to the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 777) providing for the cession by the Government to the States of all unappropriated public land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 778) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 779) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men (or their widows) who served in the Indian wars of the western frontiers of the several States and Territories from the year 1865 to the year 1890, inclusive; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 1207) to indemnify the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred by it in defense of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1208) granting 30 working days' leave of absence in each year, without forfeiture of pay during such leave, to certain employees at United States arsenals, proving grounds, and supply stations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1209) authorizing the appointment of an additional assistant appraiser at the port of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 1210) to confer upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the powers of a public-service commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1211) to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, pawnbrokers, and real-estate brokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1212) to amend an act entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances," approved March 23, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1213) to establish and disburse a public-school teachers' retirement fund in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1214) to enable the Telepost Co. to construct its plant, operate the same, and transact its business in

the District of Columbia, and to make necessary connections with other parts of its system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1215) to provide for a report upon and a comprehensive map or maps showing the land necessary to be acquired for parks and park ways within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1216) to provide for the payment of the debt of the District of Columbia, and to provide for permanent improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1217) to incorporate the East Washington Suburban Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1218) to require all transportation companies within the District of Columbia to provide separate accommodations for the white and negro races and to prescribe punishments and penalties for violating its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1219) to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by the acts of Congress approved, respectively, July 1, 1862; March 7, 1864; July 13, 1866, and March 2, 1867; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 1220) to amend sections 1791 and 1792 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1221) to increase the pension of certain pensioned soldiers and sailors who lost the sight of one eye or the sight of both eyes in the service of the United States, and to provide a rate of pension for those who have lost the sight of one eye and partial loss of sight of the other eye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1222) to amend an act approved February 6, 1907, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1223) to amend section 860 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1224) providing for the erection of a monument to Gen. Anthony Wayne at Defiance, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1225) to place lumber on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1226) for the distribution of the cotton-tax fund collected in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1227) for a survey for a canal between Toledo, Ohio, and Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1228) to furnish bronze medals of honor to surviving soldiers who responded to President Lincoln's first call for troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1229) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Napoleon, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1230) providing for the erection of a public building at Van Wert, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1231) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bryan, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 1232) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure suitable memorial tablets to commemorate the valor and patriotism of the Worth Infantry and York Rifles, who were the first fully armed and equipped soldiers to do active service in response to President Lincoln's call for 75,000 volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 1233) to fix the compensation of watchmen, messengers, and laborers in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1234) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the commissioned grades of chief boatswain, chief gunner, and chief carpenter in the Navy of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1235) providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy or Marine Corps, and for the efficiency of the enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 1236) for the erection of an equestrian statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1237) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 1238) to authorize the appointment of boards of investigation and arbitration, and to define their powers and duties; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1239) to prevent the Government or any officer, employee, or agent of the Government, the Territories, and the District of Columbia from contracting for products of convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1240) to limit the effect of a regulation of interstate commerce between the several States in goods, wares, and merchandise, wholly or in part manufactured by convict labor, or in any prison or reformatory; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1241) to establish fish-cultural stations in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1242) providing for the appointment of a chaplain in the Life-Saving Service of the United States in the district including the coast of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1243) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mount Holly, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1244) to grant pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, and to grant pensions to certain widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1245) to extend to the port of Thompsons Point, in the district of Bridgeton, N. J., the privilege of immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1246) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Vineland, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 1247) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 1248) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain frame building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1249) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station within the second congressional district, State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1250) allowing a second homestead entry in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1251) authorizing two persons to unite in making a homestead entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1252) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1253) for the relief of homestead entrymen; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1254) granting homestead entryman six months within which to begin improvements and establish residence, and authorizing registers and receivers to grant additional time; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1255) to prohibit the issuing of special-tax stamps for the sale of intoxicating liquors in certain States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1256) to incorporate the Webster National Birthplace Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1257) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by patent a certain lot in the city of Alva, Okla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1258) to amend paragraph No. 233, section 1, of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other

purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1259) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 1260) providing for the establishing of a Weather Bureau station at Laredo, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1261) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1262) to repeal sections 1104 and 1108, Revised Statutes, edition of 1878; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 1263) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes," approved September 30, 1890 (26 Stat., p. 502); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1264) to authorize cities and incorporated towns to purchase coal lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1265) granting to various States public lands to be sold under certain restrictions and the proceeds thereof used for the construction and improving of public highways; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1266) providing for appeals from decisions of the Secretary of the Interior to the Federal district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1267) granting public land to the city of Boulder, Colo., for public park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1268) granting public land to the city of Canon City, Colo., for public park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1269) to change the name of Pennsylvania Avenue, in the city of Washington, D. C., to Lincoln Avenue; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1270) to grant certain lands to the city of Colorado Springs, the town of Manitou, and the town of Cascade, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1271) to amend section 2320 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1272) to establish an agricultural experiment station on the western slope of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1273) to establish a botanical laboratory at Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1274) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in Garfield County, State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1275) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in La Plata County, Colo.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1276) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1277) to acquire a site for a public building at Salida, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1278) to acquire a site for a public building at Cripple Creek, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1279) to acquire a site for a public building at Golden, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1280) to acquire a site for a public building at Idaho Springs, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1281) to acquire a site for a public building at Delta, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1282) to acquire a site for a public building at Montrose, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1283) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Glenwood Springs, State of Colorado; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1284) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Durango, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 1285) to provide for the taxation of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1286) prescribing annual registration fees for corporations operating in the District of Columbia and providing for enforcing payment thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1287) requiring corporations organized outside of the District of Columbia and desiring permits to operate within the same to show that 10 per cent of authorized capital has been paid in, and to file with the recorder of deeds certified copies of their charters before such permit shall be issued; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1288) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia regarding corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1289) to establish 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 1290) to protect American trade and American shipping from foreign monopolies; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 1291) to create a commission to develop sources of revenue outside of taxation through the utilization of the natural resources of the public domain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1292) to establish in the Department of Agriculture the Office of Public Roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1293) prohibiting the issuance and operation of Federal liquor licenses in communities where State or local laws forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1294) to create a committee on interstate and foreign quarantine and public health; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1295) for an investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture to promote the more general use of cotton goods and materials manufactured of raw cotton in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1296) to consolidate the Bureau of Manufactures and the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor into one bureau to be called the "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1297) for the regulation and control of fraternal benefit societies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 1298) to amend section 167 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1299) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected"; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 1300) to amend sections 1 and 2 of an act entitled "An act to determine the jurisdiction of circuit courts of the United States and to regulate the removal of causes from State courts, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 1301) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories of the United States, to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 1302) to reenact section 12 of the act of August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1303) to import wild and domestic animals into the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 1304) to provide American registers for the steamers *San Jose, Limon, Esparta, Cartago, Parismina, Heredia, Abangarez, Turrialba, Atenas, Almirante, Santa Marta, Metapan, Zacapa, Greenbrier, Peralta, La Senora, and Sixaola;* to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 1305) to lower the rates of customs duties on imports into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1306) to incorporate the Elementary Education Foundation; to the Committee on Education.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1307) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1308) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors on board vessels and in navy yards and naval stations owned by the United States Government; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1309) to establish a council of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1310) to encourage the development of the American merchant marine and to promote commerce and the national defense; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1311) to provide for auxiliary vessels for the Navy; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 1312) for establishing a Bureau of Domestic Science; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1313) to establish a fish-cultural station near Chicago, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 1314) to incorporate the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 1315) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma, being a portion of Platt National Park, for a soldiers' home; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1316) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1317) to encourage and promote commerce between the United States and foreign countries as relates to the wood-pulp and printing-paper industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1318) to repeal the duty on cotton ties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1319) to repeal the duty on cotton bagging; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1320) to repeal the duty on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1321) providing for the allotment of land to the Apache Indians now under the charge of the War Department at Fort Sill, Okla., as prisoners of war; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1322) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations and report to Congress where a suitable reservation can be secured on which to allot certain Apache Indian prisoners of war now under the charge of the War Department at Fort Sill, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1323) to increase salaries of rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1324) to prevent gambling in cotton and grain futures, and providing penalties for the violation thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1325) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Decennial Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 1326) authorizing the Secretary of War to have constructed a direct road leading from the southern end of the New Highway Bridge across the Potomac River to the national cemetery at Arlington and Fort Myer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1327) to provide for the erection of a monument to the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1328) for the construction of a public building at Warrenton, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1329) providing for the coinage of certain memorial half dollars for the benefit of the Washington Monument Association of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1330) to protect the monuments already erected on the battlefields of Bull Run, Va., and other monuments that may be there erected; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 1331) regulating the payment of money to Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1332) regulating Indian allotments disposed of by will; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 1333) to regulate the compensation of skilled machinists in the Naval Gun Factory of the Washington Navy Yard, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1334) amending section 2 of the invalid pension act of June 27, 1890; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1335) amending the pension act approved March 2, 1903 (Public act No. 134); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1336) providing an old-age pension for honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, Regulars or Volunteers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 1337) to extend the provisions of the pension laws to officers and enlisted men of State military organizations who rendered military service to the Union during the War of the Rebellion, and to their widows, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1338) for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1339) to increase the pension of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States during the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 1340) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1341) providing for an experimental parcel-post system to be confined entirely to rural delivery routes operating from post offices located in not to exceed four counties in the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1342) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 1343) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved February 20, 1907; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEEKS: Resolution (H. Res. 7) continuing John T. Chancey in his present position; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Resolution (H. Res. 8) to name the House Office Building Henry Clay Hall; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Resolution (H. Res. 9) authorizing increase of salaries of superintendent of press gallery and messenger; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 10) authorizing the printing and binding of the history of the United States navy yard at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 12) providing for appointment of a special committee to investigate the Government Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Resolution (H. Res. 13) for investigation of expenditures in the State Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 14) for investigation of expenditures in the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 15) for investigation of expenditures in the War Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 16) for investigation of expenditures in the Navy Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 17) for investigation of expenditures in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 18) for investigation of expenditures in the Interior Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 19) for investigation of expenditures in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 20) for the investigation of expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 21) for the investigation of expenditures in Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 22) for investigation of expenditures on public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 23) expressing the opinion of the House of Representatives as to the propriety of a

joint agreement between the various Governments of America for the mutual guaranty of their sovereignty and territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 3) making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 4) approving the constitution formed by the constitutional convention of the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York and Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 5) providing for the termination of the treaty between the United States of America and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg December 18, 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 6) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SULZER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CLINE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 9) to declare the purpose of the United States to relinquish control over the Philippines, establish an independent government for them, and protect the same by a general treaty of neutrality; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 10) designating a commission to examine buildings now leased by the Government in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 11) making an appropriation for a Government exhibit at the Appalachian Exposition at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 12) to enable Senators, Representatives, or Delegates to obtain certain information; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 13) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to arrange an international conference to fix the maximum depth of rivers, harbors, and the approaches thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 15) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the commencement and termination of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 16) to regulate and control the use of wireless telegraphy and wireless telephony; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 17) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) authorizing the appointment of a commission to consider the restoration to the District of Columbia of a portion of Alexandria County, Va.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 19) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the congressional medal of honor to Peter B. Cupp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CALDER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 21) providing for the termination of the treaty between the United States of America and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg, December 18, 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 23) to increase and popularize the use of cotton materials in the United States by directing the executive departments to purchase same in preference to foreign materials and by requesting companies, firms, and individuals to make purchases with the same object in view; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. STERLING: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 26) approving the constitution formed by the constitutional convention of the Territory of Arizona; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FERRIS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the levy and collection of an income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 28) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) arranging for improvement in the American tobacco trade conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 2) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Eleventh Special Report of the Commissioner of Labor; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HANNA: Memorial of the Legislature of North Dakota, concerning Railway Mail Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 72) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Pitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 73) granting an increase of pension to Leon Schuhmacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 74) granting an increase of pension to Harman A. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 75) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Gilts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 76) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Simcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 77) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin J. Switzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 78) granting an increase of pension to James C. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 79) granting an increase of pension to George J. Solly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 80) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Saul; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 81) granting an increase of pension to Michael S. Ashton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 82) granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Sapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 83) granting an increase of pension to Michael Carew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 84) granting an increase of pension to Loren G. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 85) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Boland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 86) granting an increase of pension to Moses M. Haver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 87) granting an increase of pension to William Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 88) granting an increase of pension to Malissa Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 89) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Babel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 90) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Tennison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 91) granting an increase of pension to Perry A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 92) granting an increase of pension to Willis Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 93) granting an increase of pension to John A. Baughman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 94) granting an increase of pension to Leven Corkwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 95) granting an increase of pension to David Wineland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 96) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Lybold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 97) granting an increase of pension to Gregory Dolt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 98) granting an increase of pension to Lay W. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 99) granting an increase of pension to James Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 100) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Kistner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 101) granting an increase of pension to William M. Saer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 102) granting an increase of pension to John Stickle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 103) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Warden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 104) granting an increase of pension to William A. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 105) granting an increase of pension to James K. Nedry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 106) granting an increase of pension to James Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 107) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Boroff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 108) granting an increase of pension to John Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 109) granting an increase of pension to Zephaniah Kinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 110) granting a pension to Angeline Doane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 111) granting a pension to Emma L. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 112) granting a pension to Frank Newman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 113) granting a pension to Lena Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 114) granting a pension to Mary C. Eckenrhoad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 115) granting a pension to Amanda S. Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 116) granting a pension to Fred F. Travis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 117) granting a pension to Ellen E. Wilson (now Webster); to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 118) granting a pension to Moses G. Coates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 119) granting a pension to Harriet M. Slough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 120) granting a pension to Jonathan Budd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 121) granting a pension to Catharine Crockett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 122) granting a pension to Mary Gary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 123) granting a pension to Ida L. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 124) granting a pension to Rachel Lobaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 125) granting a pension to Sarah A. Long (now Christy); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 126) granting a pension to Mary A. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 127) granting a pension to Harman F. Schultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 128) granting a pension to Minerva B. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 129) granting a pension to Sallie E. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 130) for the relief of Charles Dahling; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 131) for the relief of Thaddeus Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 132) to remove charge of desertion from the record of William L. Wiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 133) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Burdett J. Lamson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 134) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Allen Keffer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 135) granting an increase of pension to Julius Bongner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 136) granting a pension to Anton Oppermann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 137) granting a pension to Charles A. Benham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 138) for the relief of the Lewis Publishing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 139) granting an increase of pension to Alban G. Knode; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 140) granting an increase of pension to Phillipine Steins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 141) granting an increase of pension to Edward French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 142) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Moulthop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 143) granting an increase of pension to Ulrich Schlaudecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 144) granting an increase of pension to Roswell T. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 145) granting an increase of pension to Horace M. Marquet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 146) granting an increase of pension to Amaziah Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 147) granting an increase of pension to Woodley C. Winsor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 148) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bauchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 149) granting an increase of pension to George W. Eckert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 150) granting an increase of pension to Edgar A. Sheldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 151) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 152) granting an increase of pension to Adam Bible; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 153) granting an increase of pension to William J. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 154) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 155) granting an increase of pension to James A. Dumars; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 156) granting an increase of pension to George P. Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 157) granting an increase of pension to Horace Greeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 158) granting an increase of pension to Ammi Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 159) granting a pension to Serena Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 160) granting a pension to Wilhelmine Neubert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 161) granting a pension to Justis W. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 162) granting a pension to Julius W. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 163) granting a pension to William F. Disbrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 164) granting a pension to Eva Kern; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 165) for the relief of Robert M. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 166) for the relief of John M. Devereaux; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 167) to reimburse A. J. Caufman, of Girard, Erie County, Pa., in the sum of $300, together with interest thereon from October 16, 1862, for soldier furnished United States, being the amount paid by him to one Charles Morton as a substitute; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 168) granting a pension to John Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 169) granting a pension to Stocton Sponseller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 170) granting a pension to George Sorrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 171) granting a pension to Bridget McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 172) granting a pension to Flora O. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 173) granting a pension to John A. McCauley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 174) granting a pension to Frances Haring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 175) granting a pension to A. H. Dolly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 176) granting a pension to Sabina O. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 177) granting a pension to A. J. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 178) granting an increase of pension to Eleam Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 179) granting an increase of pension to John W. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 180) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Tattersall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 181) granting an increase of pension to John J. Spiker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 182) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Shuttlesworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 183) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Penrod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 184) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth R. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 185) granting an increase of pension to James H. Michael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 186) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 187) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 188) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Fortney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 189) granting an increase of pension to Reuben H. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 190) granting an increase of pension to John W. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 191) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus Albright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 192) granting an increase of pension to Kenrick B. Combs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 193) granting an increase of pension to Pryor G. Guseman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 194) granting a pension to Andrew N. Shuttleworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 195) granting a pension to Henrietta Stuart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 196) to correct the military record of Urias Bolyard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 197) for the relief of Willis B. Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 198) for the relief of John Edwards, alias John D. Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 199) for the relief of William D. Garner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 200) for the relief of James Irwin, alias James Williamson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 201) for the relief of Jacob Kesner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 202) for the relief of John Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 203) for the relief of Lieut. Benjamin S. McDonald; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 204) for the relief of Jacob Mallow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 205) for the relief of Louis F. Upwright, alias Ludwig F. Rupprecht; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 206) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Mary E. Buckey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 207) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William W. Myers, executor of James W. Myers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 208) for the relief of the estate of John Burns, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 209) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Custer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 210) for the relief of the estate of Henry Gannon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 211) for the relief of Santford Bruce; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 212) for the relief of Joseph R. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 213) for the relief of the employees of and the contractors who furnished castings to the United States armory at Harpers Ferry, Va., from January 1, 1861, to April 19, 1861, inclusive; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 214) for the relief of the county court of Berkeley County, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 215) for the relief of Mrs. Frances Arbogast, widow of Allen Arbogast, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 216) for the relief of Gideon C. Corley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 217) for the relief of William D. Graham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 218) for the relief of the board of education of the Harpers Ferry school district, of Jefferson County, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 219) for the relief of Dennis A. Litzinger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 220) for the relief of Edward Tearney, administrator of Samuel Ridenour, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 221) for the relief of Margaret A. Timberlake, administratrix of Richard Timberlake, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 222) for the relief of Andrew J. Weese; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 223) for the relief of John Whittington; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 224) for the relief of the heirs of Archeles Stanley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 225) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Smith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 226) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Ryan, of Monongalia County, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 227) for the relief of the heirs of George Lamon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 228) for the relief of the heirs of Lydia A. Hockensmith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 229) for the relief of the heirs of James L. Geaslen, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 230) for the relief of the heirs of Charles A. Dinkle, heir of John F. Dinkle and J. Daniel Dinkle; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 231) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Chenoweth; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 232) for relief of the heirs of Isaac Clifford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 233) for the relief of John Hood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 234) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin P. Scovill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 235) granting an increase of pension to John L. Danburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 236) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 237) granting an increase of pension to John Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 238) granting an increase of pension to Job Trenholm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 239) granting an increase of pension to John O'Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 240) granting an increase of pension to John Eastman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 241) granting an increase of pension to John Mulligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 242) granting an increase of pension to Leicester B. Goodell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 243) granting an increase of pension to William Murdock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 244) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Desmuke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 245) granting a pension to George Sword; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 246) for the relief of F. W. Schultz; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 247) for the relief of Allen Edward O'Toole and others, who sustained damage by reason of accident at Rock Island Arsenal; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Rathbun, Beachy & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 249) for the relief of the Turner Produce Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 250) to correct the military record of Levi Conright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 251) to correct the military record of Thomas E. Philips; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 252) authorizing the cancellation of the allotment of Peter Rousseau; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 253) to correct the military record of Herman Radeck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 254) to complete the military record of Andrew H. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 255) to complete the military record of Elijah M. Berand; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 256) for the relief of Lieut. Commander Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 257) to authorize and direct the President of the United States to place upon the retired list of the United States Navy Surg. I. W. Kite with the rank of medical inspector; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 258) for the relief of Thomas W. Best; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 259) to pay Lewis J. Blair, late lieutenant colonel Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, amount found due him by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 260) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 261) granting a pension to Julius S. Velle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 262) granting a pension to Agnes W. Culley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 263) granting a pension to Lorinda S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 264) for the relief of Hans Peter Guttormsen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 265) for the relief of James Easson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 266) to correct the military record of William A. Persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 267) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 268) granting an increase of pension to Carlton Routzahn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 269) granting an increase of pension to Daniel R. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 270) granting an increase of pension to Asahel F. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 271) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Cruea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 272) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 273) granting an increase of pension to Robert Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 274) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim A. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 275) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Ackerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 276) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 277) granting an increase of pension to Homer C. Tyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 278) granting an increase of pension to James W. Thorp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 279) granting an increase of pension to George L. Catlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 280) granting an increase of pension to Oliver S. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 281) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 282) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 283) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 284) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 285) granting an increase of pension to Christ Westphal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 286) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 287) granting an increase of pension to Green Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 288) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. Verrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 289) granting an increase of pension to James W. Van Deman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 290) granting an increase of pension to Hattie A. Towle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 291) granting an increase of pension to John H. Tilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 292) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Tanner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 293) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Strumphford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 294) granting an increase of pension to William W. Storks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 295) granting an increase of pension to John Spies; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 296) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Sovern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 297) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 298) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Seigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 299) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Schnepp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 300) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Reilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 301) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus A. G. Rayhouser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 302) granting an increase of pension to William H. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 303) granting an increase of pension to Othmiel L. Moffitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 304) granting an increase of pension to James Mobley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 305) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Meehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 306) granting an increase of pension to John O. McNabb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 307) granting an increase of pension to William H. Loghry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 308) granting an increase of pension to Whitsel Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 309) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Leon, alias Samuel T. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 310) granting an increase of pension to Richard Kolb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 311) granting an increase of pension to Francis Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 312) granting an increase of pension to John A. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 313) granting an increase of pension to John M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 314) granting an increase of pension to John E. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 315) granting an increase of pension to William D. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 316) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 317) granting an increase of pension to Allen S. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 318) granting an increase of pension to John N. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 319) granting an increase of pension to Philip Hawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 320) granting an increase of pension to Noah Huggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 321) granting an increase of pension to Peter Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 322) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 323) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 324) granting an increase of pension to William J. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 325) granting an increase of pension to Leslie Gragg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 326) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Gonyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 327) granting an increase of pension to John Ginder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 328) granting an increase of pension to William Gillespie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 329) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 330) granting an increase of pension to Josiah J. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 331) granting an increase of pension to John Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 332) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 333) granting an increase of pension to Jacobs L. Etnire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 334) granting an increase of pension to John W. Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 335) granting an increase of pension to David S. Durbin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 336) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 337) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Dickens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 338) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Deaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 339) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 340) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Conley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 341) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 342) granting an increase of pension to Elias Corns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 343) granting an increase of pension to Richard Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 344) granting an increase of pension to Warren Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 345) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 346) granting an increase of pension to N. A. Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 347) granting an increase of pension to John M. Castle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 348) granting an increase of pension to John Cain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 349) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim M. Bryson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 350) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 351) granting an increase of pension to John Brugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 352) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 353) granting an increase of pension to James Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 354) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Allman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 355) granting an increase of pension to Wellington Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 356) granting a pension to Robert C. McCulloch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 357) granting a pension to Edward West; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 358) granting a pension to Ida B. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 359) granting a pension to Laura Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 360) granting a pension to Fannie Conn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 361) granting a pension to Henry Willis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 362) granting a pension to Edward A. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 363) granting a pension to Horace Stambaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 364) granting a pension to Phoebe J. Sawdey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 365) granting a pension to Elizabeth Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 366) granting a pension to Edward McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 367) granting a pension to Sarah Keys; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 368) granting a pension to Isaac Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 369) granting a pension to Emma M. Heimlich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 370) granting a pension to Hoyt Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 371) granting a pension to Harriett M. Glazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 372) granting a pension to Mary L. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 373) granting a pension to Mary A. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 374) granting a pension to Patrick Feeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 375) granting a pension to John E. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 376) granting a pension to Anna Christie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 377) granting a pension to Hiram W. Bays; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 378) to correct the military record of Joseph H. Rogers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 379) to correct the military record of Louis Laddauer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 380) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sewell Coulson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 381) for the relief of Edward S. Carr; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 382) for the relief of Claude M. Waite; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 383) granting a pension to Walter English; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 384) granting a pension to Luthur M. Southall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 385) granting a pension to Myers Fertig; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 386) granting a pension to Emma L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 387) granting an increase of pension to Frank H. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 388) for the relief of the estate of Robert J. Hope, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 389) for the relief of the estate of John Anderson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 390) to reimburse the trustees of the Presbyterian Church at McDowell, State of Virginia; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 391) to reimburse William Van Derveer, of Millboro, Va., for excess revenue taxes assessed against and collected from him; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 392) granting an increase of pension to Fayette Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 393) granting a pension to Mary R. C. Blanchard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 394) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Woodward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 395) granting an increase of pension to Adam Weaber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 396) granting an increase of pension to J. Howard Willets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 397) granting an increase of pension to George L. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 398) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Vannote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 399) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 400) granting an increase of pension to James M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 401) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton M. Roney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 402) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Ranigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 403) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Penn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 404) granting an increase of pension to Michael O'Neill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 405) granting an increase of pension to George Onens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 406) granting an increase of pension to Susan G. Maken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 407) granting an increase of pension to William Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 408) granting an increase of pension to George Laws; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 409) granting an increase of pension to James J. Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 410) granting an increase of pension to David B. Husted; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 411) granting an increase of pension to William H. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 412) granting an increase of pension to Richard Gennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 413) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Forbis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 414) granting an increase of pension to Stephen H. Chew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 415) granting an increase of pension to Martin Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 416) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Coles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 417) granting an increase of pension to Berdsall Cornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 418) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Brewster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 419) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 420) granting a pension to Jacob N. Wunder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 421) granting a pension to Thomas S. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 422) granting a pension to Rebecca Pedrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 423) granting a pension to David A. Nelligan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 424) granting a pension to Mary J. Merwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 425) granting a pension to Providence S. Ludlam; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 426) granting a pension to George W. Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 427) granting a pension to Margaretta B. Hodson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 428) granting a pension to Edward G. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 429) for the relief of Adolphus Yuncker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 430) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *T. P. Leined*, or their legal representatives; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 431) for the relief of the heirs of Marianne Sainte Ana Schrepper; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 432) for the relief of Anna M. Mershon, administratrix of Daniel S. Mershon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 433) to correct the military record of William S. Schenck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 434) to correct the military record of Robert T. Short; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 435) to correct the military record of Bernard Rodgers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 436) to correct the military record of Daniel O'Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 437) to correct the military record of George Davidson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 438) to correct the military record of William H. Cornell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 439) referring the claim of the legal representatives of William T. Duvall, deceased, against the United States to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 440) to permit Eugene Boehm to prosecute an action against the United States Government in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 441) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 442) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 443) granting an increase of pension to Caleb A. Lott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 444) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Vaught; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 445) granting an increase of pension to James Boner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 446) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Sponsler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 447) granting an increase of pension to George Hostler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 448) granting an increase of pension to Jacob D. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 449) granting an increase of pension to David W. Crider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 450) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Platts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 451) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Unger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 452) granting an increase of pension to Philip T. Cashman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 453) granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 454) granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 455) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Swartz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 456) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Flory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 457) to correct the military record of Peter Gouker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 458) to correct the military record of Robert Herr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 459) to correct the military record of Henry Bubb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 460) to correct the military record of Edward T. Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 461) to correct the military record of T. Abram Hetrick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 462) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Rader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 463) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 464) granting an increase of pension to John Cooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 465) granting an increase of pension to Henry Cable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 466) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Van Wye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 467) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus P. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 468) granting an increase of pension to Rufus M. Boring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 469) granting an increase of pension to John R. Massengail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 470) granting an increase of pension to James Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 471) granting an increase of pension to Herman E. Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 472) granting an increase of pension to George B. Stoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 473) granting an increase of pension to William A. Crum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 474) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Tatlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 475) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah R. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 476) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 477) granting an increase of pension to James C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 478) granting an increase of pension to Richard Strother; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 479) granting an increase of pension to Louis Remiatte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 480) granting an increase of pension to General L. Rackley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 481) granting an increase of pension to James W. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 482) granting an increase of pension to William D. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 483) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Mecham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 484) granting an increase of pension to Patrick H. McBride; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 485) granting an increase of pension to Benet Messer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 486) granting an increase of pension to John M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 487) granting an increase of pension to John P. McClarey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 488) granting a pension to John Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 489) granting an increase of pension to Noah Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 490) granting an increase of pension to David McClain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 491) granting an increase of pension to William Misner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 492) granting an increase of pension to Newton J. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 493) granting an increase of pension to James M. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 494) granting an increase of pension to William Waldo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 495) granting an increase of pension to Peter G. Wynegar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 496) granting an increase of pension to John G. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 497) granting an increase of pension to William Swalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 498) granting an increase of pension to John Swem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 499) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Ralls; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 500) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Grant Jervey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 501) granting an increase of pension to William Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 502) granting an increase of pension to John W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 503) granting an increase of pension to James R. Hooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 504) granting an increase of pension to William Hix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 505) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 506) granting an increase of pension to Willshier S. Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 507) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Hubbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 508) granting an increase of pension to Henry Gable; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 509) granting an increase of pension to John Fulgront; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 510) granting an increase of pension to Elbert Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 511) granting an increase of pension to Joel Cokely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 512) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 513) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah C. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 514) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Enochs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 515) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Dugal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 516) granting an increase of pension to William H. Castleberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 517) granting an increase of pension to James Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 518) granting an increase of pension to Buell G. Alford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 519) granting an increase of pension to Herman H. Bockhorst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 520) granting an increase of pension to Wyatt Botts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 521) granting an increase of pension to Elias E. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 522) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Baysinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 523) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Brunsteter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 524) granting an increase of pension to Catherine F. Edsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 525) granting an increase of pension to David Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 526) granting an increase of pension to Columbus W. Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 527) granting an increase of pension to John B. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 528) granting an increase of pension to Perry C. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 529) granting an increase of pension to James L. Saling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 530) granting an increase of pension to Preston Woodmansee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 531) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Sherer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 532) granting an increase of pension to Orange Scott Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 533) granting an increase of pension to Shadrach Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 534) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 535) granting an increase of pension to John W. Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 536) granting an increase of pension to James M. Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 537) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 538) granting a pension to Hugh McKane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 539) granting a pension to Priscilla McCarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 540) granting a pension to Angeline G. Kee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 541) granting a pension to James H. German; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 542) granting a pension to Louisa M. Fee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 543) granting a pension to Edward A. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 544) granting a pension to Eden N. Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 545) granting a pension to Mary E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 546) granting a pension to Claude Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 547) granting a pension to Ann Bontrayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 548) granting a pension to Frances C. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 549) granting a pension to Homer C. Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 550) granting a pension to Myrtle Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 551) granting a pension to Samuel T. Pribble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 552) granting a pension to John Schneider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 553) granting a pension to Robert Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 554) granting a pension to Maggie E. Middlecoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 555) granting a pension to Hester A. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 556) granting a pension to Mary D. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 557) granting a pension to Louis Seeberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 558) granting a pension to James M. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 559) granting a pension to Martin L. Van Buren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 560) granting a pension to Andrew Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 561) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 562) granting a pension to William Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 563) granting a pension to Charles Glyckherr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 564) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Ernst and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 565) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alonzo Northrup and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 566) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Asa Morgan, alias William H. Francis, and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 567) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles H. Mattoon, alias Charles H. Waters, and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 568) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Richard Dove and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 569) to remove the charge of desertion against William J. Morris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 570) to remove the charge of desertion against Jacob Mull; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 571) to remove the charge of desertion against Cyrus McCue; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 572) to remove the charge of desertion against James M. Neal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 573) for the relief of the estate of Israel Folsom; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 574) for the relief of the Mary E. Phillips; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 575) for the relief of James A. Nickell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 576) for the relief of Fanny Donnelly; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 577) for the relief of Benjamin F. Eads; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 578) for the relief of William Redder; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 579) for the relief of Howard V. Hinckley, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 580) to grant an honorable discharge to Richard Corner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 581) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land to the city of Alva, State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 582) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 583) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Eastman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 584) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Goss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 585) granting an increase of pension to John P. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 586) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 587) granting an increase of pension to Ebeneezer S. Bigelow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 588) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 589) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 590) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 591) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 592) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 593) granting an increase of pension to James F. Mears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 594) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 595) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 596) granting an increase of pension to James E. Cushing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 597) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 598) granting a pension to Sara M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 599) granting a pension to Catherine B. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 600) granting a pension to Mary J. Sager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 601) granting a pension to Mary J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 602) to correct the military record of Henry W. Dunbrack; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 603) to correct the military record of Albert S. Austin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 604) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Coombs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 605) for the relief of Eudora Sherman Kelly, administratrix of the estate of James R. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 606) for the relief of John Treffeisen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 607) granting a pension to Walter Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 608) granting an increase of pension to John Halstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 609) granting an increase of pension to James Agnew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 610) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Preuitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 611) granting an increase of pension to John Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 612) granting an increase of pension to William H. Allanson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 613) granting an increase of pension to James J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 614) granting pensions to Missouri Home Guards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 615) granting pensions to members of the Enrolled Missouri Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 616) granting an increase of pension to Case J. Wentworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 617) granting an increase of pension to Charles White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 618) granting an increase of pension to John B. Welcome, alias John Gendron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 619) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Tewksbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 620) granting an increase of pension to John C. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 621) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 622) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Pearl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 623) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 624) granting an increase of pension to John M. Gile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 625) granting an increase of pension to Harvey D. Gamsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 626) granting an increase of pension to Israel Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 627) granting an increase of pension to A. Wesley Eastman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 628) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 629) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Caswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 630) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 631) granting an increase of pension to Elbridge G. Brackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 632) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Bassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 633) for the relief of George A. Tarbox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 634) granting a pension to Ella Fall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 635) granting a pension to Rose B. Dares; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 636) granting a pension to S. Elizabeth Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 637) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Daniels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 638) granting an increase of pension to John R. Bouldry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 639) granting a pension to Anna S. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 640) granting a pension to Ethel K. Guerin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 641) granting a pension to David K. Arrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 642) for the relief of David Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 643) for the relief of Patrick Rattigan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Mary E. Quinn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Elizabeth L. W. Bailey, administratrix of the estate of Davis W. Bailey, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 647) for the correction of the military record of Maj. Horace P. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 648) for the relief of the city of Quincy, the towns of Weymouth and Hingham, and the Old Colony Street Railway Co., all of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 649) to authorize the appointment of a professor of mathematics of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 650) to provide for the appointment and retirement of late Ensign John Tracey Edson as lieutenant in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 651) authorizing the payment to the administrator of the late Ephraim Perkins, captain, of the value of his three-fourths of brigantine Eliza and cargo, illegally captured by the French, as ascertained by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 652) to correct the military record of Charles Bowen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 653) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 654) granting an increase of pension to John Dover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 655) granting an increase of pension to John Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 656) granting an increase of pension to William J. Teed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 657) granting an increase of pension to James Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 658) granting an increase of pension to Alice J. Rank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 659) granting an increase of pension to Amos Diemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 660) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Beardsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 661) granting an increase of pension to William M. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 662) granting an increase of pension to John Mertes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 663) granting an increase of pension to John G. Sauers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 664) granting an increase of pension to Clark E. Calligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 665) granting an increase of pension to George P. Clayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Martin Fischback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 667) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Ranney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 668) granting an increase of pension to Francis R. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 669) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Lakin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 670) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 671) granting an increase of pension to Columbus Ballard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 672) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Kinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 673) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth B. Thomason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 674) granting an increase of pension to James C. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 675) granting a pension to Elnora J. Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 676) granting a pension to Adrienne T. Church; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 677) granting a pension to John K. Jamieson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 678) granting a pension to Louis J. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 679) granting a pension to Mary O. Daum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 680) granting a pension to Edgar C. Sturges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 681) granting a pension to Melinda J. Perham Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 682) to appoint Edgar C. Sturges a captain in the Army and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 683) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Timothy Crowley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 684) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 685) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Frosch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 686) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael J. Doyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 687) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Inglis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 688) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George S. Green and to allow his widow, Minnie E. Green, a pension; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 689) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Melville N. Goodrich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 690) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John A. Curry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 691) to correct the military record of Joseph C. Burkhardt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 692) to authorize the President to reappoint Egil T. Olsen assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 693) for the relief of Clement, Curtis & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 694) for the relief of E. C. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 695) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hyam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 696) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Stackpole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 697) granting a pension to Elizabeth Northway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 698) granting a pension to Roxanna N. Wilford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 699) granting a pension to Sarah C. Colquhoun; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 700) granting a pension to Sarah J. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 701) for the relief of James Henry Payne; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to Thomas Cheatham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 781) granting a pension to Isaac Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 782) granting a pension to Mary A. Bronson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 783) granting a pension to M. Belle Houk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 784) granting a pension to Addie Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 785) granting a pension to J. S. Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 786) granting a pension to Sarah J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 787) granting a pension to Nancy Lay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 788) granting a pension to Martha Smithers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 789) granting a pension to J. T. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 790) granting a pension to Elihu Wilburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 791) granting a pension to Zack Amis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 792) granting a pension to Frank Medlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 793) granting a pension to Cleopatra Henshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 794) granting a pension to Nancy A. Robbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 795) granting a pension to Daniel Best; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 796) granting a pension to Martha C. Rayfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 797) granting a pension to Lucy Artis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 798) granting a pension to Sallie Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 799) granting a pension to John McGhee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 800) granting a pension to George Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 801) granting pensions to the minor heirs of Elisha Darity; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 802) granting a pension to Rachel Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 803) granting a pension to Isaac B. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 804) granting a pension to James Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 805) granting a pension to Loyd Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 806) granting a pension to Alonzo Shootman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 807) granting a pension to Malissa C. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 808) granting a pension to Sarah Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Sampson McGee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 810) granting a pension to John Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 811) granting a pension to James C. Claxton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 812) granting a pension to John W. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to Swanzy N. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 814) granting a pension to Helen Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 815) granting a pension to Jesse L. Riggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 816) granting a pension to Mary E. Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 817) granting a pension to Martha Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 818) granting a pension to William H. Shillings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 819) granting a pension to James W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 820) granting a pension to Rachel M. McNeilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 821) granting a pension to Sabra Shootman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 822) granting a pension to Thomas Kehoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 823) granting a pension to Daniel R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 824) granting a pension to D. W. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H R. 825) granting a pension to James M. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 826) granting a pension to Pearl Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 827) granting a pension to Anna Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 828) granting a pension to Mollie Carmichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 829) granting a pension to James M. Keeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 830) granting a pension to Masina Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 831) granting a pension to Mary Meltabarger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 832) granting a pension to George W. Hatcher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 833) granting a pension to Mitchell Fritts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 834) granting a pension to Benjamin Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 835) granting a pension to Julia A. Rouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 836) granting a pension to Thomas Swallow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 837) granting a pension to John R. Kerley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 838) granting a pension to David M. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 839) granting a pension to Lawson J. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 840) granting a pension to James F. Pryor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 841) granting a pension to Flem B. Duncan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 842) granting a pension to John T. Mockabee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 843) granting a pension to Frank Romines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 844) granting a pension to Benjamin Wardell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 845) granting a pension to Elizabeth Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 846) granting a pension to Polly Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 847) granting a pension to Daniel Burkett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 848) granting a pension to William G. Blanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 849) granting a pension to Serelda Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 850) granting a pension to Jane Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 851) granting a pension to William Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 852) granting a pension to Othello T. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 853) granting a pension to Francis M. Oglesby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 854) granting a pension to Robert G. Tindle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 855) granting a pension to Alice Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 856) granting a pension to Nancy Ann Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 857) granting a pension to Andrew Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 858) granting a pension to William R. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 859) granting a pension to George A. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 860) granting a pension to Catherine Hartly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 861) granting a pension to E. L. Watkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 862) granting a pension to Thomas E. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 863) granting a pension to Jennie M. Dye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 864) granting a pension to Delilah J. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 865) granting a pension to Lewis Adkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 866) granting a pension to Jane Gentry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 867) granting a pension to Daniel Cahill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 868) granting a pension to Frank C. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 869) granting a pension to Henrietta E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 870) granting a pension to George Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 871) granting a pension to Alfred McCarter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 872) granting a pension to Matilda Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 873) granting a pension to Ada G. Northern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 874) granting a pension to Edward Goings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 875) granting a pension to Lucy Artis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 876) granting a pension to George W. Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 877) granting a pension to Samuel Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 878) granting a pension to Sue C. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 879) granting a pension to Wilson W. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 880) granting a pension to Magaret A. Cate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 881) granting a pension to Samuel H. Thacker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 882) granting a pension to John L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 883) granting a pension to William C. Blevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 884) granting a pension to Jane Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 885) granting a pension to William M. Freels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 886) granting a pension to Margaret Jane Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 887) granting a pension to John H. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 888) granting a pension to Albert S. Kearney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 889) granting a pension to Mike Cattarine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 890) granting a pension to Jane Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Annie Roseboro; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 892) granting a pension to Victoria Blanton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 893) granting a pension to Sarah Brimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 894) granting a pension to Harriet J. Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 895) granting a pension to George W. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 896) granting a pension to Joseph A. Bray; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 897) granting a pension to George A. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 898) granting a pension to Nancy J. Saint Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 899) granting a pension to James C. Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 900) granting a pension to James Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 901) granting a pension to R. H. Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 902) granting a pension to Mattie R. Willoughby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 903) granting a pension to Tirza E. B. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 904) granting a pension to Sarah J. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 905) granting a pension to Lou E. Grill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 906) granting a pension to Polly A. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 907) granting a pension to William Jasper McGhee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 908) granting a pension to Burrell F. Badget; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 909) granting a pension to Henry Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 910) granting a pension to William Hutcheson, alias William King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 911) granting a pension to Henry Dillard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 912) granting a pension to Samuel Thomas Smith, alias Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 913) granting a pension to William May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 914) granting a pension to John Metler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 915) granting a pension to Harrison Henny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 916) granting a pension to Katherine Vines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 917) granting a pension to Thomas Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 918) granting a pension to David M. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 919) granting a pension to Mary A. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 920) granting a pension to Martha Talley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 921) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 922) granting an increase of pension to Benjman Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 923) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. Lynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 924) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 925) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Bumgardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 926) granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 927) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 928) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Edens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 929) granting an increase of pension to A. Kilen Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 930) granting an increase of pension to John Dunahoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 931) granting an increase of pension to Howell E. Freeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 932) granting an increase of pension to James Finley Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 933) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 934) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 935) granting an increase of pension to George C. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 936) granting an increase of pension to Andrew G. Kitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 937) granting an increase of pension to George W. Aldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 938) granting an increase of pension to Julian Barger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 939) granting an increase of pension to John M. Letsinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 940) granting an increase of pension to Luther Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 941) granting an increase of pension to William McLane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 942) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 943) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Spangle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 944) granting an increase of pension to Adam T. Cottrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 945) granting an increase of pension to James C. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 946) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 947) granting an increase of pension to William R. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 948) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Hubbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 949) granting an increase of pension to George W. Qualls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 950) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fielden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 951) granting an increase of pension to John H. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 952) granting an increase of pension to James Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 953) granting an increase of pension to John T. Chiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 954) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 955) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 956) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Devaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 957) granting an increase of pension to Levi Summay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 958) granting an increase of pension to John A. Prosise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 959) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Squibb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 960) granting an increase of pension to William G. Selvidge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 961) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Goddard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 962) granting an increase of pension to John A. McKelvey, alias Jackson Burk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 963) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Covington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 964) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Hendricks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 965) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 966) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cheatham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 967) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 968) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 969) granting an increase of pension to Richard Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 970) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 971) granting an increase of pension to Louise Meyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 972) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fielden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 973) granting an increase of pension to Joel Dotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 974) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 975) granting an increase of pension to John Coppock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 976) granting an increase of pension to Barnard J. Irwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 977) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 978) granting an increase of pension to Alford Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 979) granting an increase of pension to Bruce Clifton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 980) granting an increase of pension to Morgan C. Hackworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 981) granting an increase of pension to Andrew L. Cassady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 982) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Bales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 983) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Blakley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 984) granting an increase of pension to Abner D. Rutherford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 985) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 986) granting an increase of pension to John A. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 987) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 988) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 989) granting an increase of pension to Jesse J. Riggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 990) granting an increase of pension to Delos Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 991) granting an increase of pension to Theodore S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 992) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 993) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel T. Gourley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 994) granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 995) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 996) granting an increase of pension to Annie Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 997) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Eckel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 998) granting an increase of pension to Robert Crudgington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 999) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1000) granting an increase of pension to James Madison Rolain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1001) granting an increase of pension to Richard Luttrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1002) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1003) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1004) granting an increase of pension to Lewis H. Whitson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1005) granting an increase of pension to William A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1006) granting an increase of pension to John Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1007) granting a pension to Louisa C. Chesney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1008) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Hooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Lewis T. Custer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1010) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Washam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1011) granting an increase of pension to James Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1013) granting an increase of pension to Walter Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1014) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1015) granting an increase of pension to John F. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1016) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Liggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1017) granting an increase of pension to William W. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1018) granting an increase of pension to Alva O. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1019) granting an increase of pension to Godfrey D. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Hurtt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1021) granting an increase of pension to Richard Porterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1022) granting an increase of pension to Moses R. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1023) granting an increase of pension to Calloway Roddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1024) granting an increase of pension to William L. Northern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1025) granting an increase of pension to Christian Shores; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1026) granting an increase of pension to John Ridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1027) granting an increase of pension to Robert Orr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1028) granting an increase of pension to Thurman H. Rodeheaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1029) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1030) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Beals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1032) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1033) granting an increase of pension to Celina Wilhite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1034) granting an increase of pension to Hazlewood A. C. Bradfute; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1035) granting an increase of pension to Eli B. Miner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1036) granting an increase of pension to John B. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1037) granting an increase of pension to William M. Murrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1038) granting an increase of pension to Linsey H. Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1039) granting an increase of pension to James Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1040) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rigsby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1041) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Medlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1042) granting an increase of pension to William A. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1043) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1044) granting an increase of pension to John J. Duff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1045) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1046) granting an increase of pension to George H. S. Messer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1047) granting an increase of pension to Richard Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1048) granting an increase of pension to Charles Gentry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1049) granting an increase of pension to Peter O. Benham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1050) granting an increase of pension to William N. Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1051) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1052) granting an increase of pension to William H. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1053) granting an increase of pension to Prior P. Baird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1054) granting an increase of pension to William Roach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1055) granting an increase of pension to James Vandergriff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1056) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte J. Triplett Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1057) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Moses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1058) granting an increase of pension to William Mooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1059) granting an increase of pension to James F. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1060) granting an increase of pension to William W. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1061) granting an increase of pension to John N. Fagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1062) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1063) granting an increase of pension to John C. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1064) granting an increase of pension to James W. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1065) granting an increase of pension to John Hayden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1066) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1067) granting an increase of pension to John M. Letsinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1068) granting an increase of pension to David U. Weagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1069) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1070) granting an increase of pension to Spencer H. Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1071) granting an increase of pension to William G. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1072) granting an increase of pension to William G. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1073) granting an increase of pension to Henry McMahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1074) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. W. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1075) granting an increase of pension to Alga S. Roach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1076) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1077) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Main; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1078) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1079) granting an increase of pension to William Lanallen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1080) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1081) granting an increase of pension to William C. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1082) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1083) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1084) granting an increase of pension to Peter Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1085) granting an increase of pension to John A. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1086) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1087) granting an increase of pension to Silas Arthur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1088) granting an increase of pension to William M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1089) granting an increase of pension to Adam Leak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1090) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1091) granting an increase of pension to George W. Arms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1092) granting an increase of pension to J. R. Doty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1093) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Blevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1094) granting an increase of pension to James McCulley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1095) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Bright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1096) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Conway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1097) granting an increase of pension to Henry Finger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1098) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Squibb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1099) granting an increase of pension to James Key; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1100) granting an increase of pension to Lycurgus Peltier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1101) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1102) granting an increase of pension to Lewis M. Wester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1103) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1104) granting an increase of pension to John Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1105) granting an increase of pension to John W. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1106) granting an increase of pension to James Smiddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1107) granting an increase of pension to Orlin L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1108) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1109) granting an increase of pension to Theodore S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1110) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1111) granting an increase of pension to Bruce Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1112) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1113) granting an increase of pension to Alex B. Tadlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1114) granting an increase of pension to William M. Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1115) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1116) granting an increase of pension to Ferguson Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1117) granting an increase of pension to George Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1118) granting an increase of pension to Charles Davis, alias Charles Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Risden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1120) granting an increase of pension to James Shelby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1121) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1122) granting an increase of pension to Richard N. Salomon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1123) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1124) granting an increase of pension to Christian Schaick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1125) granting an increase of pension to William J. Byerley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1126) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1127) granting an increase of pension to William M. Freels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1128) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Disney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1129) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1130) granting an increase of pension to William A. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1131) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Galbreath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1132) granting an increase of pension to John V. Mays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1133) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1134) granting an increase of pension to Luvernia Newport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1135) granting an increase of pension to Carrie J. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1136) granting an increase of pension to George Hutchinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1137) granting an increase of pension to Joel Thomason; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1138) granting an increase of pension to James D. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1139) granting an increase of pension to Maggie E. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1140) granting an increase of pension to Johniker L. Mynatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1141) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Wyrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1142) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pearsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1143) granting an increase of pension to James M. Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1144) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Angel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1145) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Dupes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1146) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1147) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Cates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1148) granting an increase of pension to William Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1149) granting an increase of pension to George R. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1150) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hutcheson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1151) granting an increase of pension to James M. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1152) granting an increase of pension to Josiah D. Mater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1153) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1154) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Livsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1155) granting an increase of pension to John Lobach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1156) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Netherway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1157) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Blevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1158) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1159) granting an increase of pension to John Daugherty, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1160) granting an increase of pension to James S. Yarnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1161) granting an increase of pension to Absalom P. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1162) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Saint Clair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1163) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Edington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1164) granting an increase of pension to Cyrena M. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1165) granting an increase of pension to George W. Carney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1166) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Pardue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1167) granting an increase of pension to James M. Lawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1168) granting an increase of pension to William T. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1169) granting an increase of pension to Albert Varnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1170) granting an increase of pension to William P. Tutterow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1171) granting an increase of pension to Caswell Seamore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1172) granting an increase of pension to David C. Sparks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1173) granting an increase of pension to John Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1174) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hughett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1175) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hubble; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1176) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert Zachary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1177) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1178) granting an increase of pension to John A. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1179) granting an increase of pension to John Marney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1180) granting an increase of pension to William N. Mabry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1181) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Keeble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1182) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1183) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1184) granting an increase of pension to Robert Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1185) granting an increase of pension to Malinda C. Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1186) granting an increase of pension to Barzilla T. Monday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1187) granting an increase of pension to John Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1188) granting an increase of pension to Jennie P. Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1189) granting an increase of pension to Alexander McNabb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1190) granting an increase of pension to James Ivy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1191) granting an increase of pension to Benjman Cannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1192) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Roddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1193) granting an increase of pension to W. A. Herrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1194) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1195) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Leinart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1196) granting an increase of pension to Hilery Humphery, alias Umphus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1197) granting an increase of pension to Martin Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1198) granting an increase of pension to Robert Brashears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1199) granting an increase of pension to Abner Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1200) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1201) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1202) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Pedigo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1203) granting an increase of pension to James Smiddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1204) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Keeble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1205) granting an increase of pension to James Richey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1206) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 1344) granting an increase of pension to Pennell M. Keepers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1345) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Harter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1346) granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Boland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1347) granting an increase of pension to James H. Werking; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1348) granting an increase of pension to Cicero C. Wait; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1349) granting an increase of pension to James M. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1350) granting an increase of pension to Ward L. Roach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1351) granting an increase of pension to William Hazelbaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1352) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Klugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1353) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1354) granting an increase of pension to Mathias House; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1355) granting an increase of pension to Eli H. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1356) granting an increase of pension to James Carmine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1357) granting an increase of pension to Burris M. Noland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1358) granting an increase of pension to Gustav A. Janke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1360) granting an increase of pension to George S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1361) granting a pension to William Canaday; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1362) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Sells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 1363) for the relief of George Marion Gaut; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1364) for the relief of Jeremiah Campbell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1365) for the relief of Robert Allcorn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1366) for the relief of Henry Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1367) for the relief of Wilson L. Lowery; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1368) for the relief of Frank B. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1369) for the relief of Lucy Mynatt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1370) for the relief of the personal representatives of Mitchell J. Childress, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1371) for the relief of J. J. Starnes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1372) for the relief of John M. Dailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1373) for the relief of G. A. Turner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1374) for the relief of Henry B. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1375) for the relief of John T. Burchfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1376) for the relief of W. L. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1377) for the relief of Susan J. Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1378) for the relief of Martha V. Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1379) for the relief of Carrick W. Crozier; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1380) for the relief of Walter Lee Christenberry; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1381) for the relief of James W. Holt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1382) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1383) for the relief of Reverend William Jasper McGhee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1384) for the relief of Lewis Turner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1385) for the relief of Isaac A. Duncan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1386) for the relief of Charles Baum; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1387) for the relief of George T. Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1388) for the relief of Sarah E. Cox; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1389) for the relief of Calvin L. Childress; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1390) for the relief of Eli Sharp; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1391) for the relief of David J. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1392) for the relief of Mrs. Amanda M. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of Mary A. Mynatt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1394) for the relief of James J. Sellers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1395) for the relief of George Marion Gaut; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1396) for the relief of W. J. McGhee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1397) for the relief of R. M. Magill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1398) for the relief of F. A. R. Scott; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1399) for the relief of Clarrissa H. Tipton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1400) for the relief of Joe S. Shipe; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1401) for the relief of David H. Marney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1402) for the relief of William P. Douglass; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1403) for the relief of Annie Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1404) for the relief of Harry A. Claiborne; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1405) for the relief of William Spears; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1406) for the relief of Samuel Lewis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1407) for the relief of Mrs. James Kennedy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of Charles J. Harvey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1409) for the relief of James H. Galbraith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1410) for the relief of Lee T. Kitts; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of M. E. Hall and the estate of James B. Hall, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Margaret Emma Brown, Kate D. Jarnagin, John Jacob Hubbard, and Georgia B. Teague, heirs of Mary Jane Hubbard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1413) to remove the charge of desertion standing against John W. Bennett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1414) to remove the charge of desertion against William Lawson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1415) to remove the charge of desertion against George W. Chambers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1416) to remove the charge of desertion standing against William A. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1417) to remove the charge of desertion against Alkanah Ballinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1418) to remove the charge of desertion against Creed F. Casteel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1419) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Derious O. Bibee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1420) to remove the charge of desertion against David J. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1421) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Jerry Fritts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1422) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Hugh Washam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1423) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Henry Wallace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1424) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Gideon Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1425) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Ranson Fritts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1426) to remove the charge of desertion standing against H. B. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1427) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Thomas Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1428) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Samuel McKamey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1429) to remove the charge of desertion standing against William A. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1430) to remove the charge of desertion against Pleasant M. Chapman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1431) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Gilbert C. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1432) to remove the charge of desertion against Sampson Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1433) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Alexander English; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1434) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Samuel S. Caldwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1435) to remove the charge of desertion standing against George W. Mabry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1436) to remove the charge of desertion standing against Mark Seiber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1437) to remove the charge of desertion against Samuel Robbins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1438) to remove the charge of desertion against Ben Graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1439) to remove the charge of desertion against George Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1440) to remove the charge of desertion against John C. White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1441) for the relief of the estate of William Kennedy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1442) for the relief of the estate of John Chesney, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1443) for the relief of the estate of William M. Goforth; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1444) for the relief of the estate of John North, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1445) for the relief of the estate of Noah C. Wenger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1446) for the relief of the estate of William F. Sharp; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1447) for the relief of estate of Henry Sessler, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1448) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Galbraith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1449) for the relief of the estate of David Pangle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1450) for the relief of the estate of Nelson Mynatt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of the estate of Lemuel Cox, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1452) for the relief of the estate of Dr. Thomas J. Coward; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1453) for the relief of estate of William H. Dawson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jacob G. Carmichael, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1455) for the relief of the legal representatives of Jacob S. Fritts, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1456) for the relief of the legal representatives of William C. Blalock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1457) for the relief of the personal representatives of Horace L. Bradley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1458) for the relief of the estate or heirs of William H. Turley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1459) for the relief of the heirs of Bryant Wheeler, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1460) for the relief of heirs or estates of William Kennedy and Mrs. Jane H. Kennedy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of heirs of John Gates, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1462) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Prater; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of the heirs of Ross Talbott, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Harle; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1465) for the relief of the heirs of Charles Frances; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1466) for the relief of the heirs of George Turner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1467) to correct the military record of William H. Shillings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1468) to correct the record of Roadman V. Burleson, Company H, Third Tennessee Mounted Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1469) to correct the war record of Samuel Braden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1470) to correct the military record of George A. Tillett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1471) to correct the war record of G. W. Swanay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1472) to correct the war record of George Washington Pevyhouse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1473) to correct the war record of Calvin Fielden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1474) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Isaac Tipton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1475) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Warham Easley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1476) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of John G. Henson, guardian of Catherine J. Gilson (insane) and administrator of estate of Samuel L. Gilson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1477) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Warham Easley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1478) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Clarissa H. Tipton, administratrix of Isaac Tipton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1479) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Henry J. Kinzel; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1480) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of John G. Henson, administrator, etc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1481) to grant an honorable discharge to T. J. Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1482) to grant a discharge to Benjamin F. Cheatham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1483) to furnish ex-soldiers medals of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1484) to muster in and muster out Wilson W. Duncan, late of the Volunteer Army, Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1485) to muster John Curtis as captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1486) to muster out and grant an honorable discharge to Sampson McGhee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1487) to reimburse depositors of the late Freedman's Savings & Trust Co.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1488) for the allowance of certain claims under the Tucker and Bowman acts; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1489) granting a pension to Charles W. Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 1490) granting an increase of pension to Miriam P. Yates; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1491) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1492) granting a pension to John A. Cherry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1493) granting a pension to Charles E. Holcomb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1494) granting a pension to John G. Kimbrough; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1495) granting a pension to Ed Schlueter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1496) granting a pension to Douglas M. Weems; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1497) granting a pension to James R. Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1498) granting a pension to William Stephan, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1499) granting a pension to Charles Lavender; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1500) granting a pension to Byron J. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1501) granting a pension to Mrs. Idus Chambers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Orin J. Lucas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1503) for the relief of Thomas F. Hastings; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1504) for the relief of J. M. King; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1505) to correct the military record of Jerome S. Long; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1506) for the relief of the estate of John C. Green, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1507) for the relief of the estate of Calvin W. Battle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Alberti Operti; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1509) for the relief of P. A. Wingate; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1510) for the relief of Pinkney Persons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1511) for the relief of Mrs. S. A. Dunn, formerly Mrs. S. A. Mitchell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1512) for the relief of Mrs. J. M. Thomas, Lula Lawson, E. L. Lawson, and F. M. Lawson, heirs and legal representatives of Robert Lawson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of Mrs. J. M. Thomas, Lula Lawson, E. L. Lawson, and F. M. Lawson, heirs and legal representatives of Nancy Lawson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of Philip Epstein, Mordecai David, Henry Stein, Julius Louis, and Herman Somers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1515) for the relief of Sarah E. Rankin, sole heir at law and next of kin of Emily R. Hathorn, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of the heirs of R. W. Jemison; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1517) for the relief of the heirs of James Roberts, late of Jasper County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1518) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of William N. Dickson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1519) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of John P. Lamar, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1520) for the relief of the heirs of L. G. Brantley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1521) for the relief of the heirs of Lawrence Smith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1522) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Martha McLeroy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1523) for the relief of the heirs of Jordon Lyons, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1524) for the relief of the heirs of David R. Cook, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 1525) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claims of Jones and Laughlin and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 1526) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1527) granting an increase of pension to Greenberry V. Miles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1528) granting an increase of pension to Isaih Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1529) granting an increase of pension to Frank Boone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1530) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Parrish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1531) granting a pension to Denny H. Vocke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1532) granting an increase of pension to William Waggoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 1533) to reimburse the estate of Gen. George Washington for certain lands of his in the State of Ohio, lost by conflicting grants made under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 1534) for the relief of Thomas H. Brown and B. H. Stickney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 1535) granting a pension to William A. Dew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1536) granting a pension to William Heuslick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1537) granting a pension to William C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1538) granting a pension to John Levingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1539) granting a pension to Jacob C. Bloodworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1540) granting a pension to Luther McRill and Rena McRill, helpless and imbecile children of Newton McRill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1541) granting a pension to James Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1542) granting a pension to Jeremiah C. Wooten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1543) granting a pension to G. W. Piland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 1544) granting a pension to Maude S. Sherry and minor children; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 1545) granting an increase of pension to Barney Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1546) granting an increase of pension to Edward Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1547) granting an increase of pension to John J. Gorman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1548) granting an increase of pension to Amelie Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1549) granting an increase of pension to Christian Teubner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1550) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shute; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 1551) for the relief of Wesley S. Crane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 1552) for the relief of William H. Schriver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1553) for the relief of Francis H. Connelly; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1554) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1555) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1556) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1557) granting an increase of pension to John Dougan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1558) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1559) granting an increase of pension to William A. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1560) granting a pension to Annie H. Schuler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 1561) granting an increase of pension to James McElroy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1562) to establish a military status for William B. Okeson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1563) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William H. Gibson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1564) for the relief of John C. De Lany; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1565) for the relief of the North American Transportation & Trading Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1566) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Birk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1567) for the relief of Maria McMurdie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1568) to correct the naval record of Ezekiel Downey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1569) to correct the military record of George F. Dewey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1570) for the relief of the North American Transportation & Trading Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1571) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of C. G. S. Mills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1572) for the relief of Mary C. Mayers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1573) for the relief of the North American Transportation & Trading Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1574) for the relief of the North American Transportation & Trading Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1575) to correct the military record of James E. C. Covel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1576) to correct the military record of Marcus A. Root; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1577) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. William W. Sherman, née Alice Park; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1578) granting an increase of pension to Seward S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1579) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Lord; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1580) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Edwin Crossan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1581) granting an increase of pension to Charles Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1582) granting an increase of pension to Charles Walster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1583) granting a pension to John Finucane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1584) to correct the military record of Joseph Rosenbaum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 1585) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Remington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1586) granting an increase of pension to John C. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1587) granting an increase of pension to Corydon M. Turnbull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1588) granting an increase of pension to Robert Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1589) granting an increase of pension to Theodore H. Doescher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1590) granting an increase of pension to Obadiah C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1591) granting an increase of pension to James L. McWilliams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1592) granting an increase of pension to James S. Daugherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1593) granting a pension to Frank Sutterfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1594) granting a pension to Israel Bower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1595) granting a pension to Fred Olson, alias William Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1596) for the relief of Isaac Bettelyoun; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1597) for the relief of John H. Janssen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1598) for the relief of Patrick Dewire, alias Patrick O'Donnell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1599) for the relief of Mary Russell, Jesus Gallegos, William H. Babby, Sophia Gallegos, Richard C. Stirk, Manuel Martinez, Louisa Bianis, and Seberiano Sierra, of Pine Ridge, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 1600) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the National Lincoln Douglas Sanatorium & Consumptives' Hospital Association (a corporation), of Denver, Colo., for a certain described tract of land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 1601) granting an increase of pension to William Koons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 1602) granting an increase of pension to Eli H. Kimberley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1603) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1604) for the relief of Welcome M. Brackett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1605) for the relief of William Neal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 1606) for the relief of Charley Clark, a homestead settler on certain lands therein described; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 1607) to remove the record of dishonorable discharge from the record of James Parsons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 1608) for the relief of the heirs of General John A. Quitman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 1609) granting a pension to John F. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions adopted by the Centennial Grange, No. 1682, Vanatta, Ohio, in opposition to the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; also, resolutions adopted by the congress of the Knights of Labor in opposition to the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty, especially with reference to wood pulp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, asking Congress to pass a general pension law at the first session of the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Defiance County Pomona Grange, of Defiance, Ohio, with reference to Canadian reciprocity and other legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Oakland Auxiliary of Oakland Methodist Episcopal Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., urging passage of Miller-Curtis bill to protect "dry" territory by excluding liquors from interstate commerce protection; also, the Curtis bill to prohibit saloons in Hawaii, and the McCumber-Terrell bill to forbid liquor selling in ships and buildings used by the United States Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of P. Rosenburg, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Dekalb, Ill., for legislation to create a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of Illinois Farmers' Institute, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Brooklyn Township, Williams County, N. Dak., urging a bill for parcels post, either similar to the one recommended by ex-President Roosevelt or the one recommended by President Taft; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of farmers of North Dakota, protesting against Canadian free trade on farm products, with protection on what farmers buy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Resolutions of New Canaan Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, New Canaan, Conn., in reference to reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of New Canaan Grange, No. 158, New Canaan, Conn., and of North Cornwall Grange, North Cornwall, Conn., with regard to parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Evidence to accompany bills granting increase of pension to Benjamin W. Unger, David W. Crider, and Augustus Sponsler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of Rock Island Chapter, No. 140, American Woman's League, Rock Island, Ill., asking for an investigation of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, petition of residents of Illinois, for a national bureau of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Resolution of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade in executive council, protesting against any attempt at tariff revision during the extra session of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Massachusetts, for establishment of a national board of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. SULZER: Memorial of committee of wholesale grocers of New York, relative to the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., in favor of the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *April 5, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

JOHN H. BANKHEAD, a Senator from the State of Alabama, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. BACON, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared, and,

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Senate and the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and to inform him that the two Houses of Congress had assembled and were ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make, have attended to their duty, and in behalf of the Senate we beg leave to report that the President will communicate to Congress in writing at once.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

M. C. Latta, assistant secretary to the President of the United States, appeared, and said: Mr. President, I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver to the Senate a message in writing.

The message was received by the Secretary and handed to the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Assistant Secretary [Henry M. Rose] read the message, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmitted to the Sixty-first Congress on January 26 last the text of the reciprocal trade agreement which had been negotiated, under my direction, by the Secretary of State with the representatives of the Dominion of Canada. This agreement was the consummation of earnest efforts, extending over a period of nearly a year, on the part of both Governments to effect a trade arrangement which, supplementing as it did the amicable settlement of various questions of a diplomatic and political character that had been reached, would mutually promote commerce and would strengthen the friendly relations now existing.

The agreement in its intent and in its terms was purely economic and commercial. While the general subject was under discussion by the commissioners, I felt assured that the sentiment of the people of the United States was such that they would welcome a measure which would result in the increase of trade on both sides of the boundary line, would open up the reserve productive resources of Canada to the great mass of our own consumers on advantageous conditions, and at the same time offer a broader outlet for the excess products of our farms and many of our industries. Details regarding a negotiation of this kind necessarily could not be made public while the conferences were pending. When, however, the full text of the agreement, with the accompanying correspondence and data explaining both its purpose and its scope, became known to the people through the message transmitted to Congress, it was immediately apparent that the ripened fruits of the careful labors of the commissioners met with widespread approval. This approval has been strengthened by further consideration of the terms of the agreement in all their particulars. The volume of support which has developed shows that its broadly national scope is fully appreciated and is responsive to the popular will.

The House of Representatives of the Sixty-first Congress, after the full text of the arrangement with all the details in regard to the different provisions had been before it, as they were before the American people, passed a bill confirming the agreement as negotiated and as transmitted to Congress. This measure failed of action in the Senate.

In my transmitting message of the 26th of January I fully set forth the character of the agreement and emphasized its appropriateness and necessity as a response to the mutual needs of the people of the two countries as well as its common advantages. I now lay that message, and the reciprocal trade agreement as integrally part of the present message, before the Sixty-second Congress and again invite earnest attention to the considerations therein expressed.

I am constrained, in deference to popular sentiment and with a realizing sense of my duty to the great masses of our people whose welfare is involved, to urge upon your consideration early action on this agreement. In concluding the negotiations, the representatives of the two countries bound themselves to use their utmost efforts to bring about the tariff changes provided for in the agreement by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa. I have felt it my duty, therefore, not to acquiesce in relegation of action until the opening of the Congress in December, but to use my constitutional prerogative and convoke the Sixty-second Congress in extra session in order that there shall be no break of continuity in considering and acting upon this most important subject.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1911.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message and accompanying paper (H. Doc. No. 2) will be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BATTLESHIPS FOR ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 3), which was read and, on motion of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith the answer of the Secretary of State to the resolution passed by the Senate of the United States on February 27, 1911, relating to the construction and armament in this country of two battleships for the Argentine Republic.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1911.*

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned has the honor to make to the President the following report as responsive, in so far as compatible with the public interests, to the resolution passed by the Senate of the United States on February 27, 1911, which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, copies of any written communications and report upon any verbal communications which may have passed between the State Department and any other department of the Government of the United States, or between the State Department and any department or representative of the Argentine Republic, and any other communications, written or verbal, which may have been issued or received by the State Department pertaining to the construction and armament in this country of two battleships for the Argentine Republic."

As to communications between the Department of State and any other department of the Government, such communication was practically confined to that with the Navy Department. Its object and effect was to obtain from the Navy Department, in furtherance of the placing of the Argentine orders for naval construction in the United States, all such facilities as might be found wholly compatible with the naval interests and policy of the United States, the Navy Department being the responsible and expert judge of this question. The purport and essence of such communication is entirely clear from this department's letter of April 13, 1909, which is included, with other papers, in the report submitted to the President under this date by the Secretary of the Navy.

Beyond its letter of April 13, 1909, just referred to, and some oral communications between officials of the two departments upon precisely the same lines, such communications were confined to the transmission to the Navy Department of confidential requests for information made by the Argentine Government or of questions touching upon naval technique which came before this department confidentially through the legation at Buenos Aires.

As to communications between the Department of State and the Government of the Argentine Republic, such communication, except as already referred to, consisted in the oral or written expression of the Department of State, chiefly through its legation at Buenos Aires, of everything that could properly be said with the view to furthering the placing of these orders in the United States, together with such replies as were received from the Argentine Government.

Such other communications as were made or received by the Department of State pertaining to the construction and armament in this country of two battleships for the Argentine Government consisted of a great volume of correspondence, chiefly with the legation at Buenos Aires and the embassy in London, and a correspondence with all American shipbuilders who were known to be interested or who it was thought might be interested in these contracts, this last correspondence having been carried on with a list of manufacturers supplied by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

At the beginning of the present administration, on August 5, 1909, the Congress appropriated $100,000 principally for the purpose of "defraying the necessary expenses incurred in connection with foreign trade relations which come within the jurisdiction of the Department of State under tariff legislation and otherwise." Thereupon the Department of State was promptly reorganized, the very purpose of this reorganization being to make it possible, among other things, for the Government of the United States to lend vital, cordial, and efficient support to all legitimate and beneficial American enterprises in foreign countries.

In the autumn of 1908 the Congress of the Argentine Republic appropriated for armaments the sum of £11,000,000, a part of which was to be expended in the construction of two battleships. The Department of State, upon receipt of a communication during the month

of September, 1908, pointing out that American firms were keenly desirous of submitting bids for this naval construction, telegraphed instructions to the legation at Buenos Aires to use its friendly good offices to the end that such American firms might secure the same opportunity in the competition about to ensue as that accorded to firms of other nationalities. On February 10, 1909, the president of the Fore River Shipbuilding Co., on the eve of his departure for England, wrote to the Department of State that the Fore River company, among three other American firms, had been invited to submit designs and prices for the proposed Argentine warships and requested that this department cable the embassy at London regarding the good standing of the company for use before the Argentine naval commission, then sitting in London.

The call for tenders for the construction, for the Argentine Government, of the two largest battleships afloat, and the prompt coming forward of American manufacturers and shipbuilders, prepared to compete, afforded an immediate opportunity to test the ability of the department, as reorganized, to secure in a concrete case real equality of opportunity for American manufacturers in a foreign country.

It should be borne in mind that this was the first time that American shipbuilders and ordnance manufacturers had ventured into competition for a contract of this importance with the naval constructors of the world, who were favored in many cases by the prestige of long-established international commercial relations and experience. The representatives of American industry labored under the added disadvantage of isolation by the necessities of negotiation at London and in Buenos Aires, while their competitors enjoyed all the powerful aid incident to the presence of large colonies and great masses of invested capital of their respective nationalities in the foreign country concerned. To overcome these enormous advantages and to give the American builders a favorable opportunity to demonstrate their competency to meet all requirements in free competition entailed, naturally, an amount of discussion commensurate with the great innovation it was sought to bring about. Hence the telegraphic and written correspondence is voluminous.

The efforts of the Department of State were the more earnest by reason of the feeling that it was peculiarly appropriate that between American republics American manufacturers should have at least as favorable an opportunity as those of any other country.

The undersigned had the honor to report to the President, with peculiar gratification, the conclusion of the Argentine Republic to order these great battleships in the United States. The advantages to American labor, industry, and commerce are self-evident. The national advanage of naval construction within the United States, as vastly strengthening the efficiency of the manufacturers upon whom this Government would have to depend if ever requiring great supplies of war material, has been set forth by the Secretary of the Navy. The prestige of American industry is greatly benefited. This transaction has shown not only the high quality of an important branch of American manufacture but has proved the ability of American manufacturers to enter the lists against foreign competitors when given a fair opportunity, and when receiving from their own Government such support as it has been for years past the invariable practice of the governments of all really great commercial nations to give most energetically to their reputable producers. The Department of State has regarded the placing of these orders in the United States as a good augury for the commercial expansion of the future.

The commercial, industrial, and even political importance of such an international transaction is so great that the undersigned has thought it his duty to scrutinize with special care the question as to how far it is compatible with the national interests to make public the very extended correspondence involved, much of which possesses an inherent quality of reserve. The undersigned has sought to give what, with the report of the Secretary of the Navy, constitutes a clear indication of all that is essential in the trend of the correspondence in question. To go beyond this he does not deem to be compatible with the public interest. To publish correspondence affecting the Argentine Republic would do violence to that delicacy and to that courteous consideration called for by the amenities of international intercourse. To publish the ancillary correspondence with American manufacturers would be scarcely fair, serving merely, as to matters of their foreign business, to compel them to disclose details which might in some respects tend to paralyze their future efforts and to impose upon them relative disadvantages by making known facts unknown to their competitors in the foreign market. In reaching this conclusion and in submitting this report the undersigned has, however, the honor to assure the President that, beyond the necessary reserves imposed by the national interests upon the text of correspondence of the character in question, it is his conviction that the present report will be found to serve the purpose contemplated by the resolution of the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

P. C. KNOX.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1911.

EXPENDITURES OF TARIFF BOARD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (H. Doc. No. 3), which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with the provision of the act approved August 5, 1909, making appropriation "to enable the President to secure information and to assist the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, as provided in section 2 of the tariff bill, relating to the maximum and minimum rates," I transmit herewith a detailed statement of all expenditures under this provision for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1911.*

BATTLESHIPS FOR ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of February 27, 1911, certain information relative to the construction in this country of battleships for the Argentine Republic (S. Doc. No. 2), which, on motion of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 30, 1911.

SIR: By direction of the President and in accordance with the Senate resolution of February 27, 1911, of which a copy is hereto attached, relative to the subject of information furnished by this department to American shipbuilders, which brought to this country a contract amounting to about $23,000,000 for the construction and armament of two battleships of 28,000 tons each for the Argentine Republic, and with particular reference to the various clauses thereof, I have the honor respectfully to submit the following:

"First. Copies of any and all orders which may have been issued by the Secretary of the Navy or his subordinates and of all communications received or sent by the Navy Department pertaining to the construction in private shipyards of two battleships for the account of the Argentine Republic."

There are transmitted herewith copies of the following:

(1) Letter of the State Department, dated April 13, 1909, asking the assistance of the Navy Department in carrying out the policy of the administration in regard to encouraging the building of battleships for foreign governments in this country.

(2) Confidential memorandum of March 11, 1910, inaugurating the department's policy with reference to giving assistance to private contractors in this country.

(3) Correspondence relative to the construction of torpedo tubes at the Washington Navy Yard.

(4) Letter to Admiral Garcia of April 5, 1910, informing him that the Argentine Naval Commission would be given all possible assistance in having their battleships constructed in this country, and that all information would be regarded as of a confidential nature.

(5) List showing information given to our contractors or to the Argentine Naval Commission.

(6) Instructions of April 4, 1910, relative to exchange of information in regard to the construction of the Argentine ships.

The correspondence to which this clause of the resolution refers is very voluminous, dating back several years. It is believed, however, that the above papers will furnish all necessary information.

"Second. What, if any, plans of guns, gun mounts, and other appliances pertaining to the armament of battleships the property of the Government of the United States in the custody of the Navy Department have been loaned, transmitted, or communicated to either the representatives of the Argentine Republic or to representatives of any shipbuilding company?"

The correspondence described in the foregoing paragraphs includes a list which gives the plans of guns, gun mounts, and other appliances pertaining to the armament of battleships that have been communicated to either the representatives of the Argentine Republic or the shipbuilding company. This list contains three of the general plans of battleships Nos. 34 and 35. The plan of the fire-control system has not yet been furnished, but it is the intention of the department to supply the necessary information for use in the installation of fire-control systems in these ships at the proper time. The question of the torpedo tubes and their construction at the Washington Navy Yard will be referred to later on. The list of books and specifications furnished the representatives of the Argentine Republic is submitted with the correspondence referred to above.

"Third. What, if any, of such plans cover devices which hitherto, through patents or secrecy, have been the exclusive property of the United States Government?"

No devices contained in the plans furnished are covered by patents the exclusive property of the United States. The question of holding certain plans or devices as secret is purely one of expediency, to be determined in view of all the circumstances of each particular case and depending much upon what military value may be assigned to their use. It is the usual practice for naval authorities of different countries to exchange information of this kind. It has therefore been deemed advisable to pursue this course in regard to the particular devices to which the Senate resolution refers.

"Fourth. What, if any, work has been done in the navy yard at Washington or elsewhere by any officials or employees of the Navy Department, civilian or otherwise, to aid in the construction of the two battleships being built in this country for the Argentine Republic?"

There is transmitted herewith correspondence relative to the manufacture of two torpedo tubes at the Washington Navy Yard. The plans of these were developed by the Bureau of Ordnance, and it has not been deemed advisable to make these plans public by giving out a contract for their construction by private manufacturers. These tubes could not be purchased from any private firm or contractor in this country without Government supervision, drawings, etc., and for this reason it was decided to permit their manufacture at the Washington Navy Yard. This procedure, furthermore, is in complete harmony with numerous precedents in this country and abroad where the facilities of the Government docks and shops are often available for the use of foreign men-of-war and for commercial firms and merchant vessels when Government business is not interfered with and when the Government is not brought into competition with private concerns.

"Fifth. If any such plans have been so divulged or if any such work has been performed by employees of the Navy Department, by whose authority has such action been taken and such work performed?"

The action above referred to in placing at the disposition of the contractors for the Argentine ships plans and technical devices of the department has been taken upon careful consideration and by authority of the Secretary of the Navy, in pursuance of the policy of the administration to endeavor in every proper way by seconding the efforts of American firms to procure for American shipyards and labor a participation in the construction of these vessels, as is outlined in the letter of the State Department dated April 13, 1909.

The American firms in competition for the Argentine contract soon learned that the quality of the material they were able to furnish was regarded as most excellent by the technical commission of the Argentine Government. Nevertheless, it was apparent that if the American competitors were to offer bids upon a footing of equality with their foreign rivals it was essential that they receive from their Government

the same assistance and support as that which the great ordnance manufacturers of Europe obtained from their governments.

The correspondence shows the restrictions placed upon the furnishing of plans and information as to naval matters, and the arrangements made to secure such advantages as would naturally be derived from an access to the new features of naval construction which would be certain to be incorporated in the specifications of these new war vessels of a larger tonnage than had been heretofore placed in American shipyards.

It should be borne in mind that these ships represent the very latest advances at home and abroad in naval construction and equipment. The Argentine commission, previous to the awarding of the contract for the construction of the vessels in this country, had traveled extensively abroad inspecting many plans and devices submitted by European contractors. The result of this personal study has undoubtedly gone into the preparation and development of plans and devices for the vessels laid down in the United States and will now become available to the American Navy. Indeed, it is reasonable to assume that there is no modern improvement in naval warfare that will not be embodied in these ships. The value, therefore, that the interest of this Government must attach to the exchange of information of this character can not be too strongly emphasized.

Another consideration of the first importance which has had great weight with the department is that the construction and armament of foreign war vessels in the United States is of undoubted benefit to the country at large in view of the fact that a high development of the shipyards and ordnance factories of the United States constitutes an asset of military strength of inestimable value in time of war.

Respectfully, yours,

G. V. L. MEYER,
Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

—

[Inclosure No. 1.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 13, 1909.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose a translation of a note from the minister of the Argentine Republic, transmitting a list of publications desired by his Government, for use in comparing the bids of American shipbuilders for work for the Argentine Navy with other bids.

This department has already made efforts, through the legation at Buenos Aires, to get as large a portion of this work as possible for American shipyards, and will be very happy if you will facilitate a reply to the present request of the Argentine Government, in so far as such compliance is likely to increase the American shipbuilders' chances of success, and to such an extent and in such manner as may be deemed entirely consistent with the policy of your department. I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

HUNTINGTON WILSON,
Acting Secretary.

—

[Inclosure No. 2.—Confidential memorandum.]

MARCH 11, 1910.

The following correspondence explains the inauguration of a policy which the department desires to follow concerning the cooperative assistance that may be rendered by officers to private contractors in this country in their contracts with foreign Governments:

BETHLEHEM STEEL WORKS,
South Bethlehem, Pa., May 12, 1909.

CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have recently returned from a visit of some weeks to London, where I went to endeavor to procure the order for the ordnance material of two battleships of the first class for the Argentine Government and some smaller vessels. I am satisfied that the Argentine Government believes that the material we are offering them is of excellent quality, and that the prices are below those current in Europe; but we carry a great load in the fact that European Governments interest themselves very actively in their makers of war material, and, so to speak, put the authority of the Governments behind these makers.

There were several American shipbuilding firms represented, but for the ordnance—the completed guns, ammunition, and armor—the Bethlehem Co. alone made a proposition. If the Bethlehem Co. had not been able to furnish designs for the ordnance material, the American firms could have made no proposition.

We made complete propositions for the ordnance material, with the important exceptions only that we offered no under water discharge tube for torpedoes and no completed design for the arrangements of fire control. We would like to have the bureau's assurance that we can obtain its designs for these two features of ordnance equipment. This would make us in all respects complete. The bureau will please understand that we have not as yet been specifically asked for these things; but we believe that we shall be in time, if the work comes to this country, and desire to be prepared beforehand. The specific thing that we would like to do at the present time is to write to our agent in London and tell him to wait upon the Argentine commission and inform them that the bureau will give us its design of these two features. I may add that it will be of assistance to us if the bureau will say that it will aid us so far as it can; but, as already stated, these two features referred to are the only ones in which our designs are defective and which we may be called upon to deliver. All the other designs and specifications are filed with the commission complete and have been gone over at great length and fully explained by our agents.

If the bureau should determine that our request can not be granted, we trust that some way can be devised whereby we can obtain some aid and warrant in the same nature as the great ordnance manufacturers of Europe obtain from their Governments. It goes without saying that any indorsement from our Government will be most valuable, and the advantage to our Government in helping us is also obvious. It will help to build up manufactories in which ordnance material can be procured rapidly when required.

Very respectfully,

BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.,
JOHN F. MEIGS.

[First indorsement.]

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE, *May 14, 1909.*

Respectfully referred to the department.

The following recommendations are made with the approval of the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, who has discussed the subject of this letter at the bureau in the presence of the author:

(*a*) It is believed to be in the best interests of the Government to encourage the private establishments of the country as far as practicable in obtaining foreign orders for the building of ships and the manufacture of war material, especially from those countries affected by the Monroe doctrine. It is thought that it would result in increasing our available resources in time of war or of threatened war, while adding material to our commercial prestige and prosperity.

(*b*) The specific designs requested are strictly confidential, and the bureau takes especial care to keep them from becoming public property. The bureau, however, recommends that this request be granted, provided an assurance be obtained that adequate precautions will be taken to insure that they will be used and treated as confidential by all those concerned in their use.

With respect to "Fire control," the Bureau of Ordnance has cognizance of the instruments only, the Bureau of Equipment plans and supplies the connections, and the Bureau of Construction and Repair makes the installations. Representatives of these bureaus confer in advance concerning the complete system, and constant experimentation and improvement is in progress.

(*c*) The bureau recommends, if permission be granted for the use of any of its designs, that the information be not furnished until after the signing of the contracts and after suitable agreements have been made that the confidential nature of the information will be preserved.

(*d*) The bureau respectfully suggests that if such transactions are approved by the department, it be distinctly understood that no firm is to be favored over any other with an established reputation in good standing.

(*e*) The bureau also respectfully recommends that proper safeguards be established to assure an understanding that this action will not favor one nation more than another.

(*f*) The bureau further recommends that all contracts for the building of warships in this country for a foreign government, in which assurances are given by the department for the use of its confidential information, require the contracting parties to agree that the United States will be given the first refusal in case of a contemplated sale and that the United States will have the right to purchase such vessels at any time before delivery in event of any emergency in which the purchase would be to its best interests.

There would be more likelihood of successful results and increased foreign orders to the private establishments if it were understood that the aid of the Navy Department would be given by consultation, advice, and recommendation concerning the plans; and the suitability of such ships for the purposes of the United States, in event of purchase, would be increased, if the bureau's ideas concerning standard dimensions of ordnance material and the plans of gun mounts were consulted. With these ends in view, the bureau would be pleased to lend its assistance to any extent considered by the department for the best interests of the Government. It is not thought that cooperation in his matter would be difficult, provided the remote possibility of sale to the United States were considered as the price of cooperation.

W. IRVING CHAMBERS,
Acting Chief of Bureau of Ordnance.

—

[Second indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *May 21, 1909.*

Returned to the Bureau of Ordnance.

The department desires the written assent of the Bethlehem Steel Co. to all of the Bureau of Ordnance recommendations, as set forth in the first indorsement herein, before making a final decision in the matter.

G. V. L. MEYER, *Secretary.*

—

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1909.

SIR: Referring to Bethlehem Steel Co.'s letter of May 12, 1909, to the Bureau of Ordnance, signed by Mr. John F. Meigs, requesting designs of ordnance material for submission to the Argentine Government, etc.:

The bureau forwards herewith copy of its first indorsement of May 14, 1909, referring said letter to the Navy Department, making certain specific recommendations.

The Secretary of the Navy has just informed the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance that in case the Bethlehem Steel Co. assent to all of the recommendations of the bureau, as set forth in the above-mentioned indorsement, and will agree to carry them out in case contracts are made with the Argentine Government, that in all probability the Navy Department would be willing to assist the company in the way they desire.

It is therefore requested that the company forward its assent to the Bureau of Ordnance at its early convenience.

Respectfully,

N. E. MASON,
Chief of Bureau of Ordnance.

The BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.,
South Bethlehem, Pa.

—

BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.,
South Bethlehem, Pa., May 22, 1909.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We have received the bureau's 22745/4 (A) of May 21, referring to a request by this company under date of May 12 for certain designs of ordnance material, and beg to thank the bureau and the Secretary of the Navy very warmly for the decisions in this matter, which we are confident will give us great assistance in our representations to the Argentine Government in reference to the ships for which we are proposing to them.

We assent to all the engagements which the Bureau of Ordnance requires that we shall make in the premises, and will take every precaution that the designs and other information shall be strictly confidential, as respects people in our employ and all others to whom it may be necessary in any way to indicate any part of the information furnished us. We will also attend to the wishes of the bureau in re-

spect to clauses e and f of paragraph 2 of the bureau's indorsement of May 14, which appear, together with the requirement of keeping the information confidential, to be the only undertakings that the bureau at this time suggests that we should enter into.

Respectfully,

A. JOHNSTON,
First Vice President.

—

[First indorsement.]

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE, *May 25, 1909.*

Respectfully referred to the honorable Secretary of the Navy, together with a copy of Bureau of Ordnance letter of May 21, 1909, to the Bethlehem Steel Co.

This correspondence is to be considered in connection with bureau's first indorsement of May 14, 1909, on letter from the Bethlehem Steel Co., dated May 12, 1909, to the Bureau of Ordnance, requesting designs of ordnance material for submission to the Argentine Government, etc.

As will be seen within, the Bethlehem Steel Co. assents to all of the recommendations of the bureau, as set forth in the above-mentioned indorsement, and will agree to carry them out in case contracts are made with the Argentine Government.

N. E. MASON,
Chief of Bureau of Ordnance.

—

[Second indorsement.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *May 29, 1909.*

Returned to the Bureau of Ordnance.

The department accepts the assent of the Bethlehem Steel Co. to all the engagements which the Bureau of Ordnance requires, as set forth in the copy of Bureau of Ordnance first indorsement of May 14, 1909, herein, and is willing to assist the company in the way they desire, as far as lies within its power.

G. v. L. MEYER, *Secretary.*

—

[Inclosure No. 3.]

FORE RIVER SHIPBUILDING CO.,
Quincy, Mass., March 30, 1910.

SIR: We shall be obliged if you would inform us if you could undertake to manufacture on our account, and under what conditions, the submerged torpedo apparatus, in whole or in part, for the battleship, our hull No. 187, building for the Argentine Government at these works.

We are inclosing for your information the preliminary specifications for the torpedoes, torpedo tubes, air compressors, and accumulators, and would prefer, if you can undertake it, that you should supply the whole apparatus complete. An early reply will greatly oblige,

Yours, respectfully,

FORE RIVER SHIPBUILDING CO.,
By F. T. BOWLES, *President.*

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

—

[First indorsement.]

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE, *April 4, 1910.*

Respectfully forwarded to the Navy Department.

This bureau can, with the approval of the Navy Department, undertake the manufacture, at the navy yard, Washington, D. C., of two broadside, under-water, side-loading torpedo tubes, one port and one starboard, after the drawings and plans of the type of tube now used in the United States naval service, the commandant certifying, in accordance with article 926, paragraph 3, United States Navy Regulations, that these articles can not be purchased from private firms or contractors.

Air compressors, air separators, air accumulators, torpedoes, and gyroscope testing tables are procured by this bureau by contract with private firms, but this bureau can, with the approval of the department, furnish the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. with the specifications under which these articles are furnished.

N. E. MASON,
Chief of Bureau of Ordnance.

—

[Second indorsement.]

APRIL 6, 1910.

Respectfully returned to the Bureau of Ordnance.

The department approves the recommendation contained in the preceding indorsement that the two submerged torpedo tubes be manufactured at the Washington Navy Yard, and that the specifications for such articles of the torpedo outfit as are procured from private firms be also furnished the Fore River company to assist that company in placing orders with private firms for the rest of the outfit.

WINTHROP,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

—

[Third indorsement.]

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
April 8, 1910.

Respectfully forwarded to the commandant, navy yard, Washington, D. C., and Superintendent Naval Gun Factory, calling attention to previous indorsements.

The bureau, if possible, desires to undertake the manufacture of the submerged-tube outfit and such parts connected therewith as can not ordinarily be purchased from private firms or contractors.

Comments and suggestions are requested concerning "under what conditions these submerged tubes can be manufactured for the Fore River Shipbuilding Co.," the probable limit of cost, the times of delivery, and the method of payment for the work desired by the navy yard.

The torpedoes, air compressors, accumulators, and other parts of the outfit ordinarily contracted for by the bureau will not be furnished by the Government.

Please return as soon as possible.

N. E. MASON,
Chief of Bureau of Ordnance.

[Fourth indorsement.]

UNITED STATES NAVY YARD,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1910.

Respectfully returned to the Bureau of Ordnance.

The following is an estimate of the cost for two 5m x 21", submerged torpedo tubes, Mark 1:

	Labor.	Material.
2 tubes	$12,110.42	$9,021.58
Jigs, tools, etc	4,289.59	18.42
2 Mark VIII, model 2, firing locks, to be taken from store	.....	341.70
2 solenoids for Mark VIII, model 2, firing locks	60.00	6.00
Spare parts and tools as per sketches No. 3351 and No. 3352 (copies of which are forwarded herewith)	260.52	176.40
Total	16,720.53	9,564.10
Shop expense	5,434.17	2,090.06
Total	22,154.70	11,654.16
		22,154.70
Total	.....	33,808.86
Add 12 per cent of whole labor for leave and holiday	.....	2,658.56
Grand total	.....	36,467.42

To build these two tubes and the two tubes referred to in Naval Gun Factory second indorsement of this date, in reply to bureau's first indorsement of April 12, 1910, it will require about nine months after receipt of order. The first two tubes would be completed in six months after receipt of order.

It is considered advisable to change the design of mouthpiece of these tubes to allow more clearance for the tail of the torpedoes when torpedoes are fired at speeds greater than 18 knots, so that the Argentine battleships will not be subjected to the same serious defects at high speeds as recently encountered by the U. S. S. *Chester*.

The method of payment for this work should be in accordance with the existing regulations and deposit for the amount involved to be made with the paymaster of the yard through the commandant. As the whole amount is rather large and the expenditures will run over a considerable period of time, it would seem equitable to allow several deposits on account to be made. One-third of the amount should be deposited before work is begun and the balance in suitable installments promptly to meet the requirements of our pay rolls, when request is made by the commandant or paymaster of the yard.

It will be noted in the above estimates that there is no charge provided for the use of the Government drawings, patterns, etc., thus far completed and used for its own manufactures. The privilege of the use of these is of considerable value, as they cost the Government much time and money to develop. I would, however, leave this to the bureau to estimate how much, if any, charge shall be made.

These torpedo tubes can not be purchased from private firms or contractors, nor could they be built by such without Government supervision, drawings, etc.

F. C. BEATTY,
Captain, United States Navy,
Commandant and Superintendent Naval Gun Factory.

—

[Inclosure No. 4.—Confidential.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *April 5, 1910.*

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 2, 1910, in regard to the assistance to be rendered by the Navy Department in the construction of the battleships to be built in this country for the Republic of Argentine, and note your assurance that information furnished you will be regarded as of a confidential nature, which assurance, as set forth by you, is quite satisfactory to the department.

Instructions have been sent by the department to its inspectors at the shipyards where these ships are to be built to furnish all necessary information in their power, and where such information must come from one of the bureaus of the department, it will be furnished through the appropriate inspector. This will render it unnecessary for the officers of your commission to visit the bureaus of the department.

The department would prefer not to issue any general authorization for your officers to visit the latest ships of the United States Navy, whether in commission or under construction, with a view to inspection of details, but in any special case would be glad to consider a special request from you, and to decide such case in accordance with the circumstances attending it.

The plans, specifications, etc., referred to in the department's letter of March 25 will also be furnished through the local inspectors.

The department would be pleased to receive from you a list of the members of your commission, showing the special duty of each, together with a permanent address to which your mail can be sent.

Very respectfully,

G. v. L. MEYER,
Secretary of the Navy.

Rear Admiral M. DOMECQ GARCIA, Argentine Navy,
President Argentine Naval Commission,
Argentine Legation, Washington, D. C.

—

[Inclosure No. 5.]

INFORMATION FURNISHED TO NAVAL CONTRACTORS IN THIS COUNTRY AND TO THE ARGENTINE MINISTER TO AID IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO BATTLESHIPS.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington.*

Specifications for twin-screw Curtis turbine propelling engines with boilers and auxiliary machinery for U. S. battleship *No. 29*. 1907.

Specifications for Curtis turbine for shaft-propelling engines with oil-burning boilers and auxiliary machinery for U. S. torpedo-boat destroyers *No. 26* and *No. 27*. 1908.

Specifications for building twin-screw armored battleship *No. 29* for the United States Navy. 1907.

Specifications for building torpedo-boat destroyer *No. 27* for the United States Navy. 1908.
Specifications for inspection of steel and iron material for hulls and hull fittings of vessels of the United States Navy. 1908.
Specifications for inspection of copper, brass, and bronze for use in construction of auxiliaries and fittings. 1908.
General instructions for painting and cementing vessels of the United States Navy. 1908.
Instructions for riveting vessels. 1906.
Instructions for making joints and for obtaining water-tightness and oil-tightness through bulkheads, decks, etc., of vessels of the United States Navy. October, 1908.
Specifications for plumbing fixtures. 1908.
General specifications for electrical appliances on shipboard. 1908.
Specifications for electric fixtures and lanterns, including their globes and shades, for ships of the United States Navy. Issued April, 1906.
Specifications for illuminating outfits for ships of the United States Navy. Issued September 18, 1906.
Specifications for standard electrical conductors. Issued February 20, 1909.
Specifications for accessories and instruments issued in connection with electrical plants and interior communications for ships of the United States Navy. January, 1902.
Specifications for installing electrical plants and electrical means of interior communication on board ships of the United States Navy. January, 1902.
Specifications for the manufacture of turret electrical appliances under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance. May 1, 1905.
Ordnance Pamphlet No. 311: Specifications for the manufacture of turret electrical appliances under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance; U. S. S. *Delaware* and *North Carolina*. March, 1908.
Specifications for the manufacture of 7-inch mounts. September 17, 1903.
Specifications for the manufacture of 3-inch, 4-inch, and 5-inch rapid-fire guns and mounts complete with sights, spare parts, and accessories. February 21, 1905.
Specifications for the manufacture of 6-inch, Mark VII, Model 1; 7-inch, Mark II; 8-inch, Mark VI; 12-inch, Mark V, guns. January, 1905.
Specifications for the manufacture of sights and sight mountings. September 16, 1904.
Circular and specifications of the Navy Department concerning armor plate and appurtenances of the United States Navy. March 21, 1906.
Circular and specifications of the Navy Department concerning armor plate and appurtenances of the United States Navy. September 3, 1908.
Specifications for steel castings. March 1, 1906.
Specifications for steel and nickel gun forgings of the United States Navy. 1907.
Ordnance Pamphlet No. 15: Specifications for forged steel common shell of the United States Navy. November, 1906.
Ordnance Pamphlet No. 11: Specifications for target projectile for the United States Navy. January, 1909.
January 25, 1910: To Argentine minister, copy "Detail specifications for building battleships for the United States Navy, including specifications for equipment under the cognizance of the Bureau of Equipment and specifications for installation of ordnance and ordnance outfit."
March 28, 1910: Various plans and specifications furnished by Construction and Repair for Fore River Shipbuilding Co.
April 7, 1910: Various specifications furnished by Bureau of Ordnance for Fore River Shipbuilding Co.
May 19: Bureau of Ordnance circulars, specifications of armor plates Nos. 9, 11, 12, 25, 27, and 29.
April 11, 1910: Letter of Bureau of Equipment relative to various specifications furnished.
April 20, 1910: Various specifications furnished by Steam Engineering for Fore River Shipbuilding Co.
October 20: Information regarding the manufacture of 4-inch, 6-inch, and 12-inch guns, with special references to clearances, shrinkage, etc.
October 8: The following drawings were furnished: 14-inch gun, Mark I, .45 caliber; 14-inch, A/P projectile; 14-inch mount, Mark I, general arrangements; mounts, 14-inch slide, Mark I; 14-inch slide, Mark I, recoil cylinder; 14-inch deck lug, Mark I, trunnion bearings, general arrangement; 14-inch deck lug, Mark I. All the above were ordnance drawings. Also the following drawings from Construction and Repair: Contract plan No. 3, U. S. battleships *No. 34* and *No. 35*; part of contract plan No. 4, U. S. battleships *No. 34* and *No. 35*; contract plan No. 7, U. S. battleships *No. 34* and *No. 35*. Also there was furnished by Ordnance the ballistics of the 14-inch, Mark I, Navy gun.
October 26: Drawings of ignition fuses, copy of Instructions Governing the Care of Ammunition Details and the Preparation of Ammunition at Naval Magazines on Shore, Ordnance Pamphlet No. 367, Register No. 58, and one copy of Ordnance Pamphlet No. 368, Instructions for Marking and Painting Ammunition for the Naval Service.
October 20: Statement that distance pieces between rollers of 12-inch turrets are made of cast steel, class B.
October 31: Information concerning use of oil fuel on board ship.
November 1, 1910: Information respecting promotions, retirements, etc., in the United States Navy.
November 18: One Vandyke print and two prints of the rifling for 12-inch and 5-inch guns.
December 22, 1910: Reports of Chief of Bureau of Ordnance, 1905 to 1910, inclusive.
December 19, 1910: Twenty-five ship record books to be used in recording measurements of guns.
December 31, 1910: Furnish Fore River Shipbuilding Co. hull specifications of battleships *Arkansas* and *Texas*.
January 6, 1911: Information concerning storage of oil fuel on shore.
January 7, 1911: Furnish Fore River Shipbuilding Co. information regarding dimensions of 14-inch turret.
January 31, 1911: Furnish Fore River Shipbuilding Co. electrical specifications battleships *No. 34* and *No. 35*.
January 19, 1911: Information regarding contracts for fuel oil for use afloat.
January 21, 1911: Information regarding rifling of latest 12-inch guns.
February 16, 1911: Cost of subcaliber attachments.
February 4, 1911: Collision mats and coaling booms.
January 18, 1911: Plan of battle towing target.
January 31, 1911: Approximate cost of battle towing target.
February 23, 1911: Information regarding elevators in engine and boiler rooms.

[Inclosure No. 6.—Confidential.]

[Memorandum for the Bureau of Ordnance, the Bureau of Construction and Repair, the Bureau of Steam Engineering, and the Bureau of Equipment.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 4, 1910.

Referring to the confidential memorandum dated March 24, 1910, concerning certain information to be furnished to the Fore River company, for delivery in confidence to the Argentine commission, you will please furnish to the department a list of all such information forwarded, if you have not already done so.

You will also inform the local inspectors of the cooperative policy of the department with respect to the assistance it is disposed to render to private firms in the execution of this contract with the Argentine Government, and you will issue instructions to the local inspectors to keep in touch with the work and furnish the bureau, confidentially, with details of any work involving innovations or departures from United States practice that may be made, and the bureau will furnish copies of these details as they are received to the department for the information of all bureaus concerned and for file with the Office of Naval Intelligence.

The memorandum dated March 24 was ordered to avoid delay in the commencement of the work, but hereafter, when the contractor or a subcontractor desires to use a plan, method, or detail originated or developed as part of the special work of the Navy Department or its bureaus, he should notify, by letter, the local inspector, under whose cognizance the work would come, of the plans or methods he intends to use. The inspector should immediately forward the correspondence, with any comment necessary by him, to the bureau for transmission to the department for action.

G. v. L. MEYER, *Secretary of the Navy.*

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. ROOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of State be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, at a salary of $1,800 per annum.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 6, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 5, 1911.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Maurice Maschke, of Ohio, to be collector of customs for the district of Cuyahoga, in the State of Ohio, in place of Charles F. Leach, removed.

Russell H. Dunn, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Sabine, in the State of Texas. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. Cecil Maunsell Gabbett to be first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from November 10, 1910, in place of First Lieut. Aaron Lichtenberg Gamble, promoted.

Third Lieut. Roy Percival Munro to be second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from November 10, 1910, in place of Cecil Maunsell Gabbett, promoted.

SPECIAL EXAMINER OF DRUGS, ETC.

Frederick W. Heyl, of Pennsylvania, to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, in place of Benjamin P. Ashmead, removed.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surg. Leland E. Cofer to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 15, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Passed Asst. Surg. Hugh S. Cumming to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to rank as such from March 15, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

George Parcher, of Maine, to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to fill an existing vacancy.

Louis Schwartz, of Pennsylvania, to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, to fill an existing vacancy.

REGISTER OF THE TREASURY.

James C. Napier, of Tennessee, to be Register of the Treasury, in place of William T. Vernon, resigned.

AUDITOR FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Charles A. Kram, of Pennsylvania, to be Auditor for the Post Office Department in place of Merritt O. Chance, resigned.

DEPUTY ASSISTANT TREASURER.

George Fort, of Georgia, to be deputy assistant treasurer of the United States in place of William H. Gibson, appointed assistant treasurer of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Francis W. Bird, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York, in place of George W. Wanmaker, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Fremont Leidy, of Kansas, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kansas in place of James M. Simpson, resigned.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

William H. Lewis, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Attorney General (charged with the defense of Indian depredation claims), who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice John G. Thompson, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Charles F. Clemons, of Hawaii, to be United States district judge of the Territory of Hawaii, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice A. G. M. Robertson, appointed chief justice, supreme court, Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Guy D. Goff, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Henry K. Butterfield, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Elmer B. Colwell, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon. Mr. Colwell was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Charles J. Reed, term expired.

William Lindsay, of Montana, to be United States marshal for the district of Montana, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Arthur W. Merrifield, term expired.

Hyman D. Davis, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio. Mr. Davis was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Frank M. Chandler, term expired.

CHIEF JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Alexander G. M. Robertson, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Hawaii, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Alfred S. Hartwell, resigned.

MEMBER OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Col. Curtis McD. Townsend, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the Mississippi River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a 'Mississippi River Commission' for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Col. Walter L. Fisk, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, relieved.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Charles J. Badger to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 8th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Charles C. Marsh to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Thomas W. Kinkaid, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, with the officer next below him.

Commander Louis S. Van Duzer to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Wilson W. Buchanan to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander William J. Maxwell to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander William S. Smith, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, with the officer next below him.

Commander John A. Hoogewerff to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Edward E. Capehart to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Henry B. Wilson to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Kenneth McAlpine, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, with the officer next below him.

Commander Emil Theiss, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, with the officer next below him.

Commander Spencer S. Wood to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Urban T. Holmes to be a commander in the Navy from the 15th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Matt H. Signor to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Charles B. McVay, jr., to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Lucius A. Bostwick to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Julian L. Latimer to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander De Witt Blamer to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander John K. Robison to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Arthur L. Willard to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Henry C. Kuenzli to be a commander in the Navy from the 8th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Charles P. Nelson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 9th day of January, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Allen Buchanan to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 15th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Edward B. Fenner to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 18th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Sylvester H. Lawton, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 29th day of January, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Ensign John E. Pond to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1910, upon the completion of three years' service as an ensign.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1911, upon the completion of three years' service as ensigns:

William C. Barker, jr.,
Robert L. Ghormley,
William L. Calhoun,
Walter W. Lorsbough,
William A. Glassford, jr.,
Herbert B. Riebe,
Thomas Withers, jr.,
Leo F. Welch,
Harry L. Pence,
Ferdinand L. Reichmuth,
Wolcott E. Hall,
Fred M. Perkins,
Frank H. Roberts,
Lewis D. Causey,
Francis M. Robinson,
Randolph P. Scudder,
Charles C. Hartigan,
George A. Alexander,
Edwin B. Woodworth,
Wilson E. Madden,
James P. Olding,
Sherwoode A. Taffinder,
John S. McCain,
Ronan C. Grady,
Harold Jones,
Albert S. Rees,
Frank N. Eklund,
Claude A. Bonvillian,
William B. Howe, and
Jefferson B. Goldman.

Midshipmen Francis J. Comerford and Paul E. Speicher to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1910, to fill vacancies.

Surg. Albert M. D. McCormick to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 8th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Passed Asst. Surg. Ulys R. Webb to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 7th day of January, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Passed Asst. Surg. Charles M. Oman to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 8th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Passed Asst. Surg. Robert A. Bachmann to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 27th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Asst. Surg. Dallas G. Sutton to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 29th day of November, 1910, upon the completion of three years' service as an assistant surgeon.

Naval Constructor Henry M. Gleason, with rank of lieutenant, to be a naval constructor in the Navy, with rank of lieutenant commander, from the 4th day of March, 1911.

The following-named assistant naval constructors, with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy with rank of lieutenant from the 4th day of March, 1911:

Allan J. Chantry, jr.,
Whitford Drake, and
Harry G. Knox.

First Lieut. Arthur B. Owens to be a captain in the United States Marine Corps from the 6th day of November, 1910, to fill a vacancy.

First Lieut. Gerard M. Kincade to be a captain in the United States Marine Corps, to fill a vacancy occurring March 25, 1911, and to take rank from February 10, 1911.

Tracy G. Hunter, jr., a citizen of Georgia, to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps from the 3d day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Capt. Norman G. Burton, assistant quartermaster, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of major from the 11th day of February, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

First Lieut. Jeter R. Horton to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of captain from the 29th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

First Lieut. Bennet Puryear, jr., to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of captain from the 1st day of April, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Boatswain Frank Miller to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 16th day of May, 1910, upon the completion of six years' service as a boatswain.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy from the 4th day of February, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as boatswains:

John Danner,
Harry Williams,
James F. Hopkins,
Charles Schonborg,
Alexander Stuart,
William Derrington, and
Frank D. Blakely.

Gunners Richard H. Cheney and Constantine Clay to be chief gunners in the Navy from the 4th day of February, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as gunners.

Gunner Roderick M. O'Connor to be a chief gunner in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as a gunner.

Machinists George Growney and John R. Burkhart to be chief machinists in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1910, upon the completion of six years' service as machinists.

Machinist Louis R. Ford to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as a machinist.

Midshipman William H. Walsh to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 3d day of March, 1911, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved on that date.

Passed Asst. Paymaster Edwin M. Hacker to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with rank of lieutenant, from the 23d day of October, 1907, to rank next after Passed Assistant Paymaster Thom Williamson, jr., United States Navy, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Asst. Engineer Michael H. Plunkett, with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), on the retired list, to be a passed assistant engineer, with rank of lieutenant, on the retired list, from the 4th day of March, 1911, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved on that date.

Chief Gunner Charles B. Magruder, ranking with, but after, ensign, on the active list, to be a chief gunner, ranking with, but after, lieutenant (junior grade), on the retired list, from the 28th day of April, 1911, the date upon which he will be transferred to the retired list, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 29, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

G. R. Vaught to be postmaster at Monroeville, Ala. Office became presidential July 1, 1910.

ALASKA.

Daniel W. Figgins to be postmaster at Ketchikan, Alaska, in place of A. Z. Hopkins, resigned.

ARIZONA.

Joe V. Prochaska to be postmaster at Miami, Ariz. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

Esther A. Snider to be postmaster at Winkelman, Ariz. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

CALIFORNIA.

Lizzie McGann to be postmaster at Richmond, Cal., in place of Lizzie McGann. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1910.

Winifred C. Sheldon to be postmaster at Fairfield, Cal., in place of Rose M. Roberts, resigned.

COLORADO.

Frank E. Griffith to be postmaster at Blanca, Colo. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Carrie James to be postmaster at Loveland, Colo., in place of Carrie James. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1911.

F. M. Smith to be postmaster at Holyoke, Colo., in place of George W. Shuler. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1911.

William M. Thorne to be postmaster at Lyons, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

CONNECTICUT.

Lewis B. Sutton to be postmaster at New Canaan, Conn., in place of William J. McKendrick. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

FLORIDA.

Horace M. Bradley to be postmaster at Green Cove Springs, Fla., in place of Edwin N. Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1911.

Henry O. Brown to be postmaster at Lake Butler, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

GEORGIA.

Pet L. Cooke to be postmaster at Doerun, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

ILLINOIS.

Thomas C. Grotevant to be postmaster at Forrest, Ill., in place of Arthur F. Duckett, resigned.

J. Stewart Lamont to be postmaster at Apple River, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

William F. Temple to be postmaster at Fairmount, Ill., in place of Howard E. White, resigned.

INDIANA.

Seward S. Watson to be postmaster at Winchester, Ind., in place of Seward S. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1911.

IOWA.

James L. Brown to be postmaster at Clarinda, Iowa, in place of James H. Dunlap, deceased.

J. C. Davenport to be postmaster at Clear Lake, Iowa, in place of William Gray, deceased.

Henry S. Ferris to be postmaster at Lorimor, Iowa, in place of George R. Lochrie, resigned.

John J. Heverly to be postmaster at Center Point, Iowa, in place of John J. Heverly. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

Hiram Lamb to be postmaster at Murray, Iowa, in place of Hiram Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1910.

Clarence A. Muehe to be postmaster at Dyersville, Iowa, in place of Henry D. Muehe. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

John Stevenson to be postmaster at Jefferson, Iowa, in place of Gardner S. Turrill. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1910.

KENTUCKY.

George M. Crider to be postmaster at Marion, Ky., in place of George M. Crider. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1910.

Rebecca Green to be postmaster at Barbourville, Ky., in place of Jesse D. Tuggle. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1911.

W. Sherman Ball to be postmaster at Hardinsburg, Ky., in place of Marcus L. Kincheloe. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

Jesse C. Speight to be postmaster at Mayfield, Ky., in place of Jerry B. Mason, resigned.

MAINE.

Jarvis C. Billings to be postmaster at Bethel, Me., in place of Jarvis C. Billings. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1911.

Luther W. Stanley to be postmaster at Springvale, Me., in place of George H. Roberts, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Elmer W. Hallett to be postmaster at Yarmouth Port, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

MICHIGAN.

Samuel Fuller to be postmaster at Lewiston, Mich., in place of Charles B. Drake, resigned.

Benjamin F. Oakes to be postmaster at East Tawas, Mich., in place of Benjamin F. Oakes. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

MINNESOTA.

J. D. Haradon to be postmaster at Park Rapids, Minn., in place of Leonard W. Bills. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

L. O. Haugen to be postmaster at Harmony, Minn., in place of Samuel Aaberg. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

George M. Kaupp to be postmaster at Blue Earth, Minn., in place of George M. Kaupp. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

Oscar Krook to be postmaster at Marshall, Minn., in place of Oscar Krook. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1911.

Oscar E. Linquist to be postmaster at Dassel, Minn., in place of Oscar E. Linquist. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1910.

Martin L. Murphy to be postmaster at Browerville, Minn., in place of Benjamin Borgert. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1910.

N. C. Nelson to be postmaster at Two Harbors, Minn., in place of Frank M. Woodfill, removed.

Emma C. Taylor to be postmaster at Chaska, Minn., in place of Emma C. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

MISSISSIPPI.

Robert L. Bradshaw to be postmaster at Moss Point, Miss., in place of Mellicent R. McInnis. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1911.

Annette Simpson to be postmaster at Pass Christian, Miss., in place of Annette Simpson. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1910.

MONTANA.

William Cowgill to be postmaster at Chouteau, Mont., in place of Clarence H. Drake, resigned.

John J. McDonald to be postmaster at Townsend, Mont., in place of William L. Cronk, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Timothy C. Cronin to be postmaster at Spalding, Nebr., in place of Timothy C. Cronin. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1911.

E. S. Davis to be postmaster at North Platte, Nebr., in place of Robert D. Thomson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1910.

Charles S. Hughes to be postmaster at Pender, Nebr., in place of John G. Gannon, resigned.

James H. Logan to be postmaster at Ponca, Nebr., in place of James H. Logan. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

Aaron W. Loucks to be postmaster at Falls City, Nebr., in place of Glenwin J. Crook, removed.

William W. McGaw to be postmaster at Wilsonville, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

John H. McGuire to be postmaster at Benson, Nebr., in place of John H. McGuire. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

Lewis H. McLaughlin to be postmaster at Emerson, Nebr., in place of Stephen E. Cobb. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1911.

William B. Swindell to be postmaster at Minatare, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

Otto Zuelow to be postmaster at Schuyler, Nebr., in place of Donald McLeod. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1911.

NEW JERSEY.

James F. Sherman to be postmaster at Frenchtown, N. J., in place of James F. Sherman. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

NEW MEXICO.

William H. Parker to be postmaster at Fort Sumner, N. Mex. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

NEW YORK.

Joseph A. Crane to be postmaster at Rochester, N. Y., in place of William S. Whittlesey. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1911.

John G. Cole to be postmaster at Waterford, N. Y., in place of Hiram W. Vedder. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1911.

William L. Connor to be postmaster at New Dorp, N. Y., in place of Max Geldner, removed.

James K. Cowan to be postmaster at White Plains, N. Y., in place of Freeman H. Merritt. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1911.

Harrold R. Every to be postmaster at Athens, N. Y., in place of Harrold R. Every. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1911.

Bruce F. Martin to be postmaster at Watertown, N. Y., in place of Robert J. Buck, resigned.

Owen B. Mulholland to be postmaster at Dunkirk, N. Y., in place of Frank B. Barnard. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1910.

John H. Scofield to be postmaster at Scottsville, N. Y., in place of William Purcell, deceased.

Seneca D. Zek to be postmaster at Hillsdale, N. Y., in place of Seneca D. Zek. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John G. Brown to be postmaster at Red Springs, N. C., in place of John G. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 15, 1909.

Moses L. Buchanan to be postmaster at Concord, N. C., in place of Moses L. Buchanan. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1910.

John M. Burrows to be postmaster at Ashboro, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1908.

Frank D. Dickey to be postmaster at Murphy, N. C., in place of Drury W. Deweese. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1909.

Warren V. Hall to be postmaster at North Charlotte, N. C. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

OHIO.

John W. Beckett to be postmaster at North Baltimore, Ohio, in place of George W. Wilkinson. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

Leroy C. Benedict to be postmaster at Mansfield, Ohio, in place of William S. Capeller. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1910.

Joel P. De Wolfe to be postmaster at Fostoria, Ohio, in place of Joel P. De Wolfe. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1911.

Elmer C. Jesse to be postmaster at Mineral City, Ohio, in place of Elmer C. Jesse. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1907.

Homer S. Kent to be postmaster at Chagrin Falls, Ohio, in place of Homer S. Kent. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

Earl W. Mauck to be postmaster at Gallipolis, Ohio, in place of Sherman H. Eagle. Incumbent's commission expired June 29, 1910.

William A. Moxley to be postmaster at St. Marys, Ohio, in place of John A. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1908.

George W. Rich to be postmaster at Loveland, Ohio, in place of Minor T. Vandervort. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1909.

Lester A. Smith to be postmaster at Jamestown, Ohio, in place of William O. Custis. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1909.

OKLAHOMA.

John A. Banker to be postmaster at Kingfisher, Okla., in place of Wallace R. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

Bert B. McCall to be postmaster at Walter, Okla., in place of Elliott F. Hook. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Benjamin Apple to be postmaster at Sunbury, Pa., in place of Ferdinand K. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1911.

Mary J. Ensign to be postmaster at Ardmore, Pa., in place of Benjamin F. Hevener. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1911.

Charles L. Ferrebee to be postmaster at St. Clair, Pa., in place of Joseph H. Denning, deceased.

Daniel J. Gensemer to be postmaster at Pine Grove, Pa., in place of George W. Schmeltzer. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1910.

Isaac N. Lightner to be postmaster at Ephrata, Pa., in place of Isaac N. Lightner. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1911.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

M. B. Cross to be postmaster at Ferguson, S. C., in place of Alton H. Felder, resigned.

M. J. Spears to be postmaster at Lamar, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Julia E. D. Tolbert to be postmaster at Ninety Six, S. C., in place of Julia E. De Loach, name changed by marriage.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles S. Harter to be postmaster at Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of John F. Reid. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

Hiram A. Mason to be postmaster at Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of Evan J. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1911.

William A. Schwichtenberg to be postmaster at Kadoka, S. Dak., in place of Leonore Green, resigned.

May A. Knappen to be postmaster at Sisseton, S. Dak., in place of Charles C. Knappen, deceased.

TENNESSEE.

Willis F. Arnold to be postmaster at Jackson, Tenn., in place of Joseph J. Losier, removed.

James S. Byrd to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Tenn., in place of Frank E. Britton, removed.

Edward E. Hathaway to be postmaster at Elizabethton, Tenn., in place of Edwin C. Alexander, removed.

Wayne J. Johnson to be postmaster at Oakdale, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

W. S. Latta to be postmaster at Somerville Tenn., in place of John D. McCarley. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1907.

Alvin J. Roller to be postmaster at Bristol, Tenn., in place of Eli A. Warren, removed.

TEXAS.

Malvina M. Anderson to be postmaster at Roby, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Clara A. Boynton to be postmaster at Anson, Tex., in place of J. W. Boynton, resigned.

E. N. Browning to be postmaster at Center, Tex., in place of Henry Liem. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1909.

E. G. Crabbe to be postmaster at Corpus Christi, Tex., in place of Thomas D. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1910.

R. E. Dorsey to be postmaster at McLean, Tex., in place of H. W. Mullis, resigned.

John A. Hooker to be postmaster at New Boston, Tex., in place of Richard B. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1910.

A. D. Hollingshead to be postmaster at Ganado, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

Leander Hopkins to be postmaster at Ferris, Tex., in place of Leander Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1911.

Benjamin F. Robey to be postmaster at Coleman, Tex., in place of James O. Brown, resigned.

George W. L. Smith to be postmaster at Henderson, Tex., in place of Ellie V. Flanagen, removed.

VIRGINIA.

Waverly S. Barrett to be postmaster at Dendron, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Joel W. Hortenstine to be postmaster at Abingdon, Va., in place of Oscar L. James. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

Howard T. Jenkins to be postmaster at East Radford, Va., in place of T. B. Einstein. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1910.

Annie E. Martin to be postmaster at Waverly, Va., in place of Annie E. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1911.

James T. Waddill to be postmaster at Victoria, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

WEST VIRGINIA.

E. E. Wells to be postmaster at Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of William H. Lantz. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1910.

Albert S. Winter to be postmaster at Moundsville, W. Va., in place of Alonzo E. Linch. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1910.

WISCONSIN.

Robert V. Baker to be postmaster at Kenosha, Wis., in place of John B. Maloney, resigned.

W. A. Jones to be postmaster at Oconomowoc, Wis., in place of John G. Gorth, removed.

Henry G. Kress to be postmaster at Manitowoc, Wis., in place of Henry G. Kress. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1910.

Clayton G. Morgan to be postmaster at Oakfield, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1910.

John F. Shaw to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Wis., in place of Eldon D. Woodworth. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

George W. Smith to be postmaster at Amherst, Wis., in place of Andrew Moberg, resigned.

James D. Strickland to be postmaster at New Lisbon, Wis., in place of James D. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1911.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *April 5, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we invoke Thy blessing upon the new Congress now convened. Impress, we beseech Thee, each Member of this House with the great responsibility resting upon him, that with high ideals of statesmanship he may give the best that is in him to his country. Let Thy blessing descend upon the Speaker, that with clear perceptions, noble endeavors, and lofty purposes he may preside over the deliberations of this House with justice and equity and lead on to the highest results. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed under a resolution of the House to wait upon the President reports that in conjunction with a similar committee of the Senate it has performed its duty, that the President desires it to present his friendly greetings to Congress and to say that he will without delay communicate further in writing.

THE RULES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 30.

Resolved, That the House shall proceed to consider the pending House resolution providing rules for the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress under the following terms, to wit:

First. At the conclusion of the first reading of the resolution it shall be in order to offer one substitue for the resolution of the gentleman from Texas.

Second. There shall be four hours' general debate, the time to be equally divided between the friends and opponents of the resolution, the time to be controlled on one side by Mr. HENRY of Texas and on the other by Mr. MANN, of Illinois.

Third. At the conclusion of the general debate as herein provided, a vote shall be taken without delay or intervening motion—first, on the question of adopting the substitute, if any, and then on the question of adopting the resolution of the gentleman from Texas or the substitute resolution, as the case may be.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman if he will not consent to permit amendments to be offered by any Member? It seems hardly fair that it should be confined to one motion to offer a substitute. There are many Members here,

who in the best of faith desire to offer some amendments, who would like the privilege of doing so.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will understand that I am presenting this as a party measure, as a caucus action, and there is an opportunity for a substitute. The gentleman can embody his amendments in any substitute that may be proper. These rules are being presented as a party measure, as I say. There will be four hours of general debate. There is an opportunity given to offer a substitute, and the gentleman's party can offer a substitute with any modifications of the rules as heretofore obtained as they see proper, and there will be ample opportunity to present their side of the question just as we are presenting ours.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will yield for a question or for a suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. It is in the nature of a suggestion. I could not confine it to a question. There are a good many of us who believe that the adoption of rules is not a party question, and who desire to take no party advantage whatever on the question of rules, but who would like an opportunity of presenting amendments that would perhaps not be contained in the substitute which would be offered. I will say, frankly, to the gentleman that I do not know what the substitute is going to be. If it were the old rules of the House, I would prefer the rules that the gentleman has reported, but still I would like an opportunity, and there are many others like me here, to offer some amendments even to those rules. It would be of little advantage to us if we had a right to debate it and have no right to vote on any of the amendments that might be offered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Let me suggest to the gentleman that all these questions of which he speaks can be considered later in the House and by the Committee on Rules. The gentleman's party will undoubtedly offer a substitute and possibly may embrace the propositions suggested by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, I think not; I am satisfied from past experience it will not embrace some propositions that I want to offer. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Is not the gentleman willing first to concede some debate on the adoption of the rule?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. You mean on this resolution?

Mr. MANN. On the adoption of this rule.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Certainly I am.

Mr. MANN. So that the gentleman will withhold his motion for the previous question and possibly agree upon some time for debate.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. Now, may——

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Let me say to the gentleman I am perfectly willing to have 20 minutes on a side on this question, and that at the end the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. MANN. Now, let me make this further inquiry in the way of a suggestion, and that is whether the gentlemen on that side of the House would not be willing to proceed to-day to general debate on the resolution in reference to the rules and then to-morrow give opportunity to offer amendments to the rules? I suggest to the gentleman I do not understand that the caucus on that side of the House has decided that there might be no amendments offered. I understand that the caucus, naturally, on that side of the House would resist any amendments unless we can present some amendments which I think will appeal to the gentleman himself.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Well, if the gentleman can do that, suppose we go ahead with the adoption of this resolution and later, then, perhaps you might persuade us.

Mr. NORRIS. But the adoption of this resolution, let me suggest to the gentleman, would preclude that.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We can adopt this, and then we will come to the other——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has authority at any time to move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. Why would not the gentleman be willing to proceed——

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I only yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. And I was trying to ask a question.

Mr. McCALL. I simply wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry, and that was if it was not in order to read the message of the President, which has just been received?

The SPEAKER. Why, the Chair thought that would be done.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. As soon as we settle this question I am perfectly willing to yield.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentlemen on that side of the House be willing to proceed with general debate for the four hours first, as they will have the right to move the previous question, so that they will not now foreclose any opportunity for amendments if amendments be presented to which they might agree?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will state to the gentleman candidly I would rather proceed in this way and allow 20 minutes of debate on each side on this resolution, and then we can come to the other question.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CUSTOMS LAWS.

The SPEAKER. Without prejudice to the position of the gentleman from Texas, the Chair lays before the House the following message (H. Doc. No. 3) from the President of the United States, which the Clerk will read.

The message was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 5, 1909, making appropriation "to enable the President to secure information and to assist the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, as provided in section 2 of the tariff bill, relating to the maximum and minimum rates," I transmit herewith a detailed statement of all expenditures under this provision for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1911.*

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also lays before the House the following message (H. Doc. No. 2) from the President of the United States.

The message was read, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

[For message see proceedings of the Senate for this day.]

THE RULES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for the suggestion he was about to make.

Mr. MANN. The inquiry I made of the gentleman was whether he would not be willing on that side to proceed with the general debate on the rules for four hours, and at the end of that time determine whether that side of the House would not give to this side of the House opportunity to offer amendments?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Let us first get this resolution out of the way.

Mr. MANN. That gets the whole thing out of the way.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And if the gentleman desires 20 minutes on this resolution I am perfectly willing to concede it.

Mr. KENDALL rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENDALL]?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman for a question; yes.

Mr. KENDALL. What I want to know is this: Is it the purpose of the gentleman from Texas to submit these rules as printed to the House, with no alternative to amend except by a substitute en bloc?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It is.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to make an inquiry.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman for the inquiry.

Mr. WEEKS. At the convening of the Fifty-ninth Congress the leader of the minority made an eloquent appeal supporting a motion which he made that the rules of the last Congress be

adopted tentatively for 30 days and then have them taken up for consideration——

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I desire to say that is hardly an inquiry. It seems to be a speech.

Mr. WEEKS. It is not a speech. He made a motion to that effect, and based that motion on the fact largely that the new Members——

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I decline to yield further. That seems to be a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] declines to yield.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman, however, for a question.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman stated this resolution was a party measure, and therefore thought it proper. I wish to ask if the gentleman's position is that, upon party measures, reasonable opportunity to offer amendments on the floor shall be denied to Members?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I desire to say to the gentleman that he limits my words too strictly. It is hardly a party measure, but a caucus action, and these rules have been made so good that I think the gentleman will find no difficulty in voting for them as proposed by this side of the House.

I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman was going to yield some time first.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will agree that we shall have 20 minutes on a side for debate, by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] moves the previous question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas have permission, without yielding the floor, to yield to me 20 minutes. That gives him the authority.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, by permission of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] I make this suggestion, namely, that by unanimous consent we agree to 20 minutes' debate on a side on the resolution of the gentleman from Texas, and at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and the vote taken.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. That was my proposition to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] again state his request?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The request is that the House have 40 minutes' debate, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], and that at the end of the 40 minutes, without intervening motion, the House shall proceed to vote on the resolution of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the House have 40 minutes' debate, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and then that the previous question shall be considered ordered without intervening motion.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, does that mean, then, that there is to be no further debate on the question of the adoption of these rules?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all. The resolution provides for the rules.

The SPEAKER. Unless there is objection——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object, because I think there ought to be a roll call on the motion for the previous question in this instance.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. You can have it when we get to that, if you desire it.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question. Those in favor of it will say "aye;" those opposed will say "no." The ayes seem to have it——

Mr. MANN. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 138, answered "present" 1, not voting 44, as follows:

YEAS—205.

Adair	Barnhart	Buchanan	Carlin
Adamson	Bartlett	Bulkley	Carter
Aiken, S. C.	Bathrick	Burke, Wis.	Clark, Fla.
Akin, N. Y.	Beall, Tex.	Burleson	Claypool
Alexander	Blackmon	Burnett	Clayton
Allen	Boehne	Byrnes, S. C.	Cline
Anderson, Ohio	Booher	Byrns, Tenn.	Collier
Ansberry	Borland	Callaway	Connell
Ashbrook	Brantley	Candler	Conry
Ayers	Brown	Cantrill	Covington
Cox, Ind.	Graham	Linthicum	Shackleford
Cox, Ohio	Gray	Littlepage	Sharp
Cravens	Gregg, Pa.	Littleton	Sheppard
Cullop	Gregg, Tex.	Lloyd	Sherley
Curley	Gudger	Lobeck	Sherwood
Daugherty	Hamilton, W. Va.	McCoy	Sims
Davis, W. Va.	Hamlin	McGillicuddy	Sisson
Dent	Hammond	Macon	Slayden
Denver	Hardwick	Maguire, Nebr.	Small
Dickinson	Hardy	Martin, Colo.	Smith, N. Y.
Dickson, Miss.	Harrison, Miss.	Mays	Smith, Tex.
Dies	Harrison, N. Y.	Moore, Tex.	Sparkman
Difenderfer	Hay	Morrison	Stanley
Dixon, Ind.	Heflin	Moss, Ind.	Stedman
Donohoe	Helm	Murray	Stephens, Miss.
Doremus	Henry, Tex.	Oldfield	Stephens, Tex.
Doughton	Hensley	O'Shaunessy	Stone
Driscoll, D. A.	Hobson	Padgett	Sulzer
Dupre	Holland	Page	Sweet
Edwards	Houston	Palmer	Talcott, N. Y.
Ellerbe	Hughes, Ga.	Patten, N. Y.	Taylor, Ala.
Estopinal	Hull	Pepper	Taylor, Colo.
Evans	Humphreys, Miss.	Peters	Thayer
Faison	Jacoway	Post	Thomas
Ferris	James	Pou	Townsend
Fields	Johnson, Ky.	Pujo	Tribble
Finley	Johnson, S. C.	Rainey	Turnbull
Fitzgerald	Jones	Raker	Tuttle
Flood, Va.	Kent	Randell, Tex.	Underhill
Floyd, Ark.	Kindred	Ransdell, La.	Underwood
Fornes	Kipp	Rauch	Watkins
Foster, Ill.	Kitchin	Richardson	Webb
Francis	Konop	Riordan	Whitacre
Garner	Korbly	Robinson	White
Garrett	Lafferty	Roddenbery	Wickliffe
George	Lamb	Rothermel	Wilson, N. Y.
Glass	Latta	Rouse	Wilson, Pa.
Goeke	Lee, Ga.	Rubey	Witherspoon
Goldfogle	Lee, Pa.	Rucker, Colo.	Young, Tex.
Goodwin, Ark.	Legare	Rucker, Mo.	
Gordon	Lever	Russell	
Gould	Lewis	Scully	

NAYS—138.

Anderson, Minn.	Foss	Langley	Pray
Andrus	Foster, Vt.	Lawrence	Prince
Anthony	French	Lenroot	Rees
Austin	Fuller	Lindbergh	Roberts, Mass.
Barchfeld	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Roberts, Nev.
Bartholdt	Gardner, N. J.	McCall	Rodenberg
Berger	Gillett	McCreary	Sells
Bowman	Good	McKinley	Simmons
Bradley	Greene	McKinney	Slemp
Burke, S. Dak.	Griest	McLaughlin	Sloan
Butler	Guernsey	McMorran	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Hamilton, Mich.	Madden	Smith, Saml. W.
Campbell	Hanna	Madison	Speer
Cannon	Harris	Malby	Steenerson
Catlin	Hartman	Mann	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper	Hawley	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Copley	Hayes	Matthews	Stevens, Minn.
Crago	Heald	Miller	Sulloway
Crumpacker	Helgesen	Mitchell	Switzer
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Mondell	Thistlewood
Dalzell	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Danforth	Hill	Morgan	Towner
Davidson	Hinds	Morse, Wis.	Utter
Davis, Minn.	Howland	Mott	Volstead
De Forest	Hubbard	Murdock	Warburton
Dodds	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Wedemeyer
Draper	Jackson	Nelson	Weeks
Driscoll, M. E.	Kendall	Norris	Wilder
Dwight	Kennedy	Nye	Willis
Dyer	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Olmsted	Wilson, Ill.
Esch	Knowland	Parran	Wood, N. J.
Fairchild	Kopp	Patton, Pa.	Woods, Iowa
Farr	Lafean	Payne	Young, Kans.
Focht	La Follette	Porter	
Fordney	Langham	Powers	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Kinkead, N. J.

NOT VOTING—44.

Ames	Godwin, N. C.	Loud	Prouty
Bates	Hamill	Loudenslager	Redfield
Bell, Ga.	Haugen	McDermott	Reilly
Bingham	Howard	McGuire, Okla.	Sabath
Broussard	Howell	McHenry	Saunders
Burgess	Hughes, N. J.	McKenzie	Smith, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Hughes, W. Va.	Maher	Stack
Cary	Kahn	Moon, Pa.	Talbott, Md.
Davenport	Konig	Moon, Tenn.	Taylor, Ohio
Fowler	Levy	Pickett	Vreeland
Gallagher	Lindsay	Plumley	Young, Mich.

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. AMES.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. BATES.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. MCHENRY with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey, Mr. WICKLIFFE, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland appeared before the Speaker's desk and asked to be recorded.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that these gentlemen do not bring themselves within the rules and practice of the House of Representatives, in that they are generally required to state that they were present and listening and did not hear their names called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will attend to that.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I just came in when my name was called and had no opportunity to answer.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman hear his name called?

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. No; but a gentleman told me it was called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not entitled to vote.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as voting "yea" on this proposition. I was paired with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER]. I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. MANN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, pending that, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I understood that 20 minutes on a side for debate was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. That was offered to our friends on that side, but was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Then I was in error.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] objected.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It was only offered on condition that the previous question be agreed to without a roll call.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 135, answered "present" 1, not voting 52, as follows:

YEAS—200.

Adair	Dixon, Ind.	Humphreys, Miss.	Richardson
Adamson	Donohoe	Jacoway	Riordan
Aiken, S. C.	Doremus	James	Robinson
Akin, N. Y.	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Roddenbery
Alexander	Dupre	Jones	Rothermel
Allen	Edwards	Kent	Rouse
Anderson, Ohio	Ellerbe	Kipp	Rubey
Ansberry	Estopinal	Kitchin	Rucker, Colo.
Ashbrook	Evans	Konig	Rucker, Mo.
Ayers	Faison	Konop	Russell
Barnhart	Ferris	Lafferty	Saunders
Bartlett	Fields	Lamb	Scully
Bathrick	Finley	Latta	Shackleford
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Sharp
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Lee, Pa.	Sheppard
Blackmon	Floyd, Ark.	Lever	Sherley
Boehne	Fornes	Levy	Sherwood
Booher	Foster, Ill.	Linthicum	Sims
Borland	Francis	Littlepage	Sisson
Brown	Garner	Littleton	Slayden
Buchanan	Garrett	Lloyd	Small
Bulkley	George	Lobeck	Smith, Tex.
Burke, Wis.	Glass	McCoy	Stanley
Burleson	Goeke	McGillicuddy	Stedman
Burnett	Goldfogle	Macon	Stephens, Miss.
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	Maher	Stone
Callaway	Gould	Martin, Colo.	Sulzer
Candler	Graham	Mays	Sweet
Cantrill	Gray	Moore, Tex.	Talbott, Md.
Carter	Gregg, Pa.	Morrison	Talcott, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Gregg, Tex.	Moss, Ind.	Taylor, Ala.
Claypool	Gudger	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Clayton	Hamilton, W. Va.	Oldfield	Thayer
Cline	Hamlin	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Collier	Hammond	Padgett	Townsend
Connell	Hardwick	Page	Tribble
Conry	Hardy	Palmer	Turnbull
Cox, Ind.	Harrison, Miss.	Patten, N. Y.	Tuttle
Cox, Ohio	Harrison, N. Y.	Pepper	Underhill
Cravens	Hay	Peters	Underwood
Cullop	Heflin	Post	Watkins
Daugherty	Helm	Pou	Webb
Davis, W. Va.	Henry, Tex.	Pujo	Whitacre
Dent	Hensley	Rainey	White
Denver	Hobson	Raker	Wickliffe
Dickinson	Holland	Randell, Tex.	Wilson, N. Y.
Dickson, Miss.	Houston	Ransdell, La.	Wilson, Pa.
Dies	Hughes, Ga.	Rauch	Witherspoon
Difenderfer	Hull	Reilly	Young, Tex.

NAYS—135.

Ames	Bradley	Crago	Driscoll, M. E.
Anderson, Minn.	Burke, S. Dak.	Crumpacker	Dwight
Andrus	Butler	Currier	Dyer
Anthony	Calder	Dalzell	Esch
Austin	Campbell	Danforth	Fairchild
Barchfeld	Cannon	Davidson	Farr
Bartholdt	Catlin	De Forest	Focht
Bates	Cooper	Dodds	Fordney
Bowman	Copley	Draper	Foster, Vt.
French	Kendall	Miller	Rodenberg
Fuller	Kennedy	Mitchell	Simmons
Gardner, Mass.	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Mondell	Slemp
Gardner, N. J.	Knowland	Moon, Pa.	Sloan
Gillett	Kopp	Moore, Pa.	Smith, J. M. C.
Good	Lafean	Morgan	Smith, Saml. W.
Greene	La Follette	Morse, Wis.	Speer
Griest	Langham	Mott	Stephens, Cal.
Guernsey	Langley	Murdock	Sterling
Hamilton, Mich.	Lawrence	Needham	Stevens, Minn.
Hanna	Lenroot	Nelson	Sulloway
Harris	Lindbergh	Norris	Switzer
Hawley	Longworth	Nye	Tilson
Hayes	McCall	Olmsted	Towner
Heald	McCreary	Parran	Utter
Helgesen	McGuire, Okla.	Patton, Pa.	Volstead
Henry, Conn.	McKinney	Payne	Warburton
Higgins	McLaughlin	Porter	Wedemeyer
Hill	McMorran	Powers	Weeks
Hinds	Madden	Pray	Wilder
Howell	Madison	Prince	Willis
Howland	Malby	Prouty	Wilson, Ill.
Hubbard	Mann	Rees	Wood, N. J.
Humphrey, Wash.	Martin, S. Dak.	Roberts, Mass.	Young, Kans.
Jackson	Matthews	Roberts, Nev.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Kinkead, N. J.

NOT VOTING—52.

Berger	Foss	Korbly	Redfield
Bingham	Fowler	Legare	Sabath
Brantley	Gallagher	Lewis	Sells
Broussard	Godwin, N. C.	Lindsay	Smith, Cal.
Burgess	Hamill	Loud	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Hartman	Loudenslager	Sparkman
Carlin	Haugen	McDermott	Stack
Cary	Howard	McHenry	Steenerson
Covington	Hughes, N. J.	McKenzie	Taylor, Ohio
Curley	Hughes, W. Va.	McKinley	Thistlewood
Davenport	Johnson, S. C.	Moon, Tenn.	Vreeland
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Pickett	Woods, Iowa
Driscoll, D. A.	Kindred	Plumley	Young, Mich.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. HARTMAN.

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.

Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. KORBLY with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded as voting no.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to change his vote?

Mr. SELLS. No; I want to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House listening for his name?

Mr. SELLS. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago a distinguished gentleman, several times Speaker, said on the floor of the House of Representatives:

> I have been 15 years in Congress and I never saw a Speaker's decision overruled, and you will never live to see it, either.

That language was uttered by Thomas B. Reed, of Maine. His prophetic vision, in the light of recent history, does not seem to have been entirely correct. Since that time the country has seen the decisions of Speakers overruled on several occasions. It is but fair to say that perhaps some of the reasons which impelled the House to thus act did not come entirely from a defect in the rules themselves, but from the abusive administration of their provisions.

The country inquired the reason for these things. They considered it and have entered their decree, and the Democratic Party is here to-day for the purpose of keeping its plighted faith and restoring this body to its ancient functions as the representative body of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I assume that the gentlemen do not intend to offer a substitute under the provisions of the special order. But I pause to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois whether he proposes to offer a substitute under the terms of the special order just adopted?

Mr. MANN. What are the terms of the special order?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the order again.

The Clerk again read the special order.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to yield the floor now for me to offer the substitute?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not desire to yield right here unless the reading of the resolution is to be waived, as agreed by us yesterday, having already been printed in the RECORD in parallel columns for the information of Members.

Mr. MANN. There is no objection to waiving the first reading of the resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then there is no objection to the gentleman from Illinois offering his substitute at the present time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives for the first or extra session only of the Sixty-second Congress, including the standing orders of March 8 and March 14, 1900 (relating to consideration of pension and claims bills on Friday), which are continued in force during said first session, with the following amendments to said rules of said Sixty-first Congress:

First. That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint the following standing committees and no others (unless he is hereafter specially authorized to appoint other committees by resolution of the House), viz:

The Committee on Ways and Means, on Printing, on Accounts, on Mileage, and on Enrolled Bills.

Second. That section 4 of Rule X be amended to read as follows:

"There shall be a Committee on Rules, to consist of 15 members, who shall be elected by the Members of the House, said committee to elect its own chairman, which committee, when so elected, shall have all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon the Committee on Rules by the rules of the House, and in addition to the powers so conferred upon it, it is hereby authorized and directed to revise, amend, simplify, and codify the rules of procedure of the House and report its conclusions to the House of Representatives on the first Monday in December, 1911, which report shall be of the highest privilege and remain so until disposed of by the House. Said committee shall have authority to sit during the session of Congress and in recess, to send for persons and papers, and to take testimony either before the full committee or any subcommittee thereof; that the necessary and actual expenses incurred in carrying out the purpose of this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House: *Provided*, That said Committee on Rules shall continue to act until said report shall be acted upon by the House."

Mr. MANN. Now, if the gentleman from Texas will pardon the interruption——

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The resolution that I have offered as a substitute is the same resolution that was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] two years ago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And which the gentleman from Illinois voted against at the time.

Mr. MANN. And I may do so again; I do not know.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I felt sure that the gentleman from Illinois would make that statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Chair to notify me when I have proceeded 15 minutes. How much time have I already occupied?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has occupied four minutes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. When I have occupied 20 minutes in all I will ask the Chair to notify me. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to proceed, I will state in a brief way the changes made in the rules and undertake to explain what is proposed in the present code presented by the Committee on Rules.

The first amendment is to Rule X. We here provide for the election of all standing committees. Heretofore those standing committees have been appointed by the Speaker, until otherwise ordered; but we are now meeting the expectations of the American people and conforming to our own judgment, taking that power away from the Speaker of this House, as we promised to do. Therefore, no longer is the Speaker of the House authorized to appoint standing committees, but hereafter during this Congress, and as long as subsequent Congresses may prefer to follow the precedent, you have the right to elect your committees.

We have abolished six of the useless committees, to wit: The Committees on Manufactures, Militia, Private Land Claims, Pacific Railroads, Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, and Ventilation and Acoustics. We also provide for the election of the chairmen of all standing committees and filling vacancies therein by election in this House. We have changed the clause of the old rules in reference to the Committee on Rules and provided that hereafter such committee shall consist of 11 members, of which the Speaker shall not be a member.

The next change is in Rule XI. We have made the necessary changes in order to harmonize it with the amendments of Rule X.

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I must decline to yield at this time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is for a very brief question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I must decline to yield until the completion of my statement, and then if I have time will endeavor to answer the question.

The next change is in Rule XIII. There we have provided for the requisite number of calendars of business, and placed under the appropriate heads in this rule the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees, and also provide for the daily printing of calendars. We have also perfected the unanimous-consent rule in order that a Member may have a second opportunity to place his request upon the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and then if that request is denied by objection, after placing it there at his own pleasure, it must go off the calendar and not be again placed thereon.

To Rule XXI we have added what is known as the retrenchment amendment. Some call it the Holman amendment. Mr. Speaker, let me say in passing that if there is any one subject needing attention in this country it is the one appropriating the people's money. Extravagance with the money of the people in the Treasury of the United States is eating into the very vitals of this Republic! Hence we have so amended this rule as to make it possible to cut down appropriations and save millions of public money every year. [Applause.]

We have added an entirely new provision to Rule XXI in reference to revenue bills, and it is perhaps fair that I call attention to the exact verbiage of that provision at this time. That new clause reads:

No amendment shall be in order to any bill affecting revenue which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill; nor shall any amendment to any item of such bill be in order which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I can not yield now. If I have time after concluding my statement, it will give me pleasure to do so.

Rule XXIV, clause 6, adds an entirely new proposition. It takes the standing orders in regard to pension bills and claim bills and incorporates them in one rule. They will hereafter be known as a part of Rule XXIV. This rule is also changed and rearranges the order of business, and puts it in such form that there is logical sequence.

Rule XXVII, known as the "Calendar of Motion to Discharge," has been materially changed. It is one of the new rules forced from the Republican majority last Congress against their will, and we have largely improved it. It is so important to the House and the country that I may be pardoned for giving a brief analysis of that rule as formulated by its present wording. First, the Calendar of Motion to Discharge is established. It provides that a bill must have been in the appropriate committee for 15 days before the discharge motion can be filed. Next, the calendar is named and called specifically a "Calendar of Motion to Discharge Committees." Again, the motion to discharge must have been entered for 7 days on the motion calendar prior to its being called up. Recognitions must be in the order in which they are filed. Again, a very important change is that a bill shall be read by title only when called up, and the title must contain not over 100 words.

After reading the title, the bill can not be submitted to the House unless a majority, by tellers, so determines. If a second, by tellers, fails, then the motion must go off the calendar and can not be restored. If a second is ordered, debate is limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to each side. The motion has precedence over motions to suspend the rules, and must be ordered at this juncture by a majority vote of the House membership. If it prevails, then the bill must be taken from the consideration of the committee and placed upon the proper calendar to which it belongs. And upon the calling of such committee the bill may be called up prior to any bill reported from the same committee subsequent to the discharge of the same. No Member can have on such calendar exceeding two bills at any one time. This is an entirely new provision of the rule. We found it convenient to drop Rule XXVI in rearranging and renumbering certain rules, and that has been done. Whatever was deemed necessary for retention in the rule has been preserved. We changed Rule XXXIII by allowing the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands the privileges of the floor. We slightly changed the verbiage of Rule XXXIV in regard to the Press Gallery, and by specific language have set apart a certain portion thereof for the benefit of the reporters and correspondents. The committee saw proper to abrogate the rule in regard to printing, because that matter is covered by general law.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman perfectly confident about that? That is not a partisan matter in any sense. I have not been able to discover myself any provision of law which provides for the printing as a document of matter referred by a Speaker to a committee. I think there is no such provision.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Texas will permit.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that a lot of printing formerly done under orders and rules was done under authority of acts which have been adopted from time to time. The only part of the rule there might be any question about is the first clause, providing that all documents disposed of by reference to committees and otherwise shall be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House except to make this suggestion so gentlemen may look into this. I went over the matter myself, and then I requested the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] to go over the matter, and neither of us were able to find or did find—I will not say we were not able to find—any provision which would authorize the printing of documents referred from the Speaker's table to a committee, and there may be some question as to whether there would be any authority to print a bill which had been reported or passed.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We can arrange all that by a standing order, and I will say to the House that we conferred with those in charge of the document room and those connected with the Committee on Accounts and others dealing with public printing and they all informed us that the rule is practically obsolete and unnecessary, and therefore we struck it from the provisions of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other amendments not necessary to discuss at this time and these have been laid before the House in this brief statement, the chief changes, the material alterations, and we are ready to submit the rules to the judgment of the House and country. The minor changes can be taken up and considered as we proceed.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. How much time have I occupied?

The SPEAKER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if there is any amendment to the old rules or a provision in the proposed rules that will prevent the use of calendar Wednesday by one committee for more than two days? Is there any change of that kind made in the rules?

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. GARRETT. There is not, and it is not necessary, because it is always within the power of the House to prevent that by the question of consideration being raised.

Mr. MADISON. The gentleman remembers that while we had that same power during the last session of Congress, yet every calendar Wednesday was taken up by one bill.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will answer the gentleman by saying that we have preserved calendar Wednesday, and are sure the Speaker of the House will see that it is wisely administered. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question on that particular proposition?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there is no provision, as I read it, in the proposed new rule that will permit the Committee of the Whole, on calendar Wednesday, to limit debate or to prevent anyone speaking in general debate on a bill in the Committee of the Whole on calendar Wednesday about things ulterior and having no connection with the bill under discussion. I want to ask the gentlemen if they considered the proposition of changing that so that calendar Wednesday could not be frittered away as it has been several times before?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We did, and we considered that we could proceed with perfect order and utilize calendar Wednesday as it is in the rule. We think that is covered by the general rules of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. Several times there was general debate on some unimportant bill on calendar Wednesday taking place and consuming the entire day on subjects entirely different and not connected with the bill under debate. I think that has occurred.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We think we went as far as we should have gone at this time.

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman the purpose of the amendment to paragraph 2 of Rule XI, with regard to the reference of bills to the Committee on Ways and Means. There is the additional language:

Such measures as purport to raise revenue.

What is the purpose of that?

Mr. GARRETT. May I be permitted to say to the gentleman that there are some who hold to the belief that protective tariff bills, laid purely for protection, are not revenue bills and are not constitutional bills. This is the restoration of the language of an old Democratic rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it desired to limit the functions of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. GARRETT. Not in the least, nor will this do it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. This will liberalize their functions when they are legislating in behalf of the people.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota and Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. As to Rule XXIV, paragraph 6, I would like the gentleman to tell the House how a bill on the Private Calendar, reported from some committee other than the committees named in the paragraph, can be considered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We will discuss that when we get to it seriatim. I can not yield any further.

Permit me to say, in conclusion, that we have so amended these rules as to confer on every Member his privileges under the Constitution of the United States to legislate in behalf of his constituents, and if this body is not a deliberative forum, as intended by its founders, the Committee on Rules, in so far as they are concerned, will be willing and prompt to hear suggestions and write the rules as they should be, in accordance with principles of wisdom and right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to paragraph 2 in Rule XXI, which is known as the Holman rule. Has the gentleman got the paragraph before him?

Mr. MANN. He has it in his head.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We are going to get to that and discuss it presently.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Now, that rule states what classes of amendments and what classes of provisions shall be in order on general appropriation bills. The rule states that new legislation shall be in order, provided it retrenches expenditures and is germane.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend until I can make an inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois? Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts from his time?

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman desires more time, I will yield to him two minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It will take several minutes to discuss this question.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] just stated that he would consider these various items seriatim when he reached them. May I ask the gentleman from Texas when that will be? Will it be to-day, or will it be after the rules are adopted?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. No. I meant to say that there would be Members of the House who would take up the various features of the rules and discuss them.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I would like three minutes in which to raise this question now.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman prefer to wait until the gentlemen who are to discuss that rule have discussed it?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I think it would be well to discuss it now, because I think it is a matter which ought to be looked into.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman from Massachusetts proceeds, I would like to suggest to Members that they will aid the Chair very much in keeping order if they will observe the rule that they address the Chair first when they want to interrupt a Member who has the floor. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Texas will find that on line 6, paragraph 2, Rule XXI, page 22, there is a provision quoted verbatim from the old Holman rule—

Nor shall any such provision in any such bill or amendment thereto be in order—

unless certain requirements are met. Now, does that word "provision" qualify the word "bill" and the word "amendment," both, or does it only qualify the word "bill"? It is a very important question.

Mr. MANN. There being no answer forthcoming——

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I am willing to give an answer. Giving my individual judgment, I think it would qualify the bill and amendment, both. The Speaker can place his construction on it. I have not the right to construe the language for him, but the language can speak for itself.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The reason I raise this question is because in the past this provision caused very much confusion. The House before voting ought to know what it means.

If the gentlemen will look up Crutchfield's Digest, which was prepared by order of the Congress that adopted these rules, he will find that in the first session of the Fifty-first Congress a situation arose in which Mr. Buchanan, of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, held an amendment in order in direct opposition to the views just expressed by the gentleman from Texas. The Post Office bill appropriated $450,000 for rural free delivery. An amendment was offered reducing that amount to $449,000, and providing likewise that no rural routes should be established except under specified methods. Now, it is true that that amendment reduced the appropriation, but the all-important part of the amendment introduced changes in existing law which had nothing to do with retrenchment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole held that under the reading of that rule, although the amendment might produce changes in the existing law not contemplated by the spirit of the Holman rule, yet merely because one part of the amendment nominally reduced the appropriation, therefore the whole must be held in order, even though the important clause in no way related to retrenchment. Mr. Crutchfield, the Democratic parliamentarian, suggests possible modifications, so that the rule may be made clearer. Mr. Buchanan's decision and later decisions of like tenor have given this rule just the opposite construction to that which the gentleman from Texas has just given us.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] says that the Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole will decide this matter. I will try to point out that any Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, unless guided by the interpretation which the gentleman from Texas has just given, would be constrained to construe the rule according to the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Buchanan, of Virginia, and the similar rulings of his successors. But inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has given us his interpretation——

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I regret that I can not yield. I say, inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has given to the House his present interpretation of that clause, this fact would seem to be worthy of weight as an opinion overruling the decision rendered by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. MANN. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, at the commencement of our business to-day the Speaker said that no more important business was ever presented to a House than the consideration and adoption of its rules. I venture to say that never in the history of the American Congress has any House heretofore attempted to adopt a code of rules without giving to every Member of the House an opportunity to offer an amendment to those rules.

This is not the adoption of a code of rules by a party that has been in power for a number of years, as the Republican Party has, but it is the adoption of a new code of rules by a party new to power. It is substantially, in all respects, a revision of the House rules.

Heretofore on several occasions there have been important revisions of the rules. The rules were revised in 1880 upon a report from the Committee on Rules, which at that time consisted of several very distinguished men, Mr. Randall of Pennsylvania, Mr. Stephens of Georgia, Mr. Blackburn of Kentucky, Mr. Garfield of Ohio, and Mr. FRYE of Maine. Those rules were carefully considered by that committee of distinguished men, who represented both the majority and minority parties, and when presented to the House were accompanied by a written report. There is no written report accompanying this code of rules. Week after week was spent in deliberating upon those rules in 1880, and opportunity was afforded to every Member of that House to present such amendments as he saw fit to present, to any and every one of those rules.

The rules were revised again in 1890, and the Committee on Rules at that time was made up of men whose names are distinguished in our history. It consisted of Thomas B. Reed, William McKinley, JOSEPH G. CANNON, John G. Carlisle, and Roger Q. Mills. Those rules were carefully deliberated upon, and after long consideration by the committee were presented to the House, accompanied by a written report. Then they were debated day in and day out, and every Member of the House of Representatives at that time was afforded an opportunity to offer amendments to the rules. It was recognized then that every man on either side of the House, whatever might be his political faith, had an interest in the establishment of wise rules for the government of the House of Representatives.

There was another revision of the rules in the Fifty-second Congress, when the Democratic Party came into power. The chairman of the Committee on Rules at that time was the Speaker, Mr. Crisp. Mr. Outhwaite, of Ohio, was on the committee; Mr. Catchings, of Mississippi, was on the committee, all distinguished men in our parliamentary history; and on that occasion the rules were considered and deliberated upon over a great length of time by the committee and presented to the House, accompanied by a written report. A resolution was adopted that the rules should be read seriatim and due opportunity given to every Member of the House to consider the rules and to offer amendments.

So that on every occasion heretofore when there has been a revision of the rules an opportunity has been afforded to Members of the House to offer amendments, to debate, and consider and come to a conclusion as to what should be proper rules for the government of the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman recall what was done in the Fifty-fourth Congress with reference to the adoption of the rules? I think we had three days of consideration then.

Mr. DALZELL. I recall very distinctly what was done in the Fifty-fourth Congress. I happened to be a member of the Committee on Rules, with Mr. Henderson, subsequently Speaker, and on that occasion, as to every single rule in the code of rules, an opportunity was offered for amendment. I do not recall whether we had any lengthy general debate, but general debate on the rules amounts to nothing. Why should you have general debate if you can not offer an amendment? Why theorize about what might be if we know that it can not be?

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. POU. I would like the gentleman to tell us when it was from that day down to this that the minority have had an opportunity to offer amendments to the various paragraphs of the rules of the House, or even so much as an opportunity to offer a substitute? We have had the gag put on us every time at the opening of every Congress.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, you gentlemen seem to have learned how to do it pretty well. [Laughter.] I have drawn a distinction between the adoption of the rules by a party that has been continuously in power and has been acting under rules that it originally adopted after consideration by both sides of the House and a party that has just come into power and proposes to introduce a new code of rules.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman explain why that distinction is of any value to the minority or to the new Members of the House? Why in the Fifty-eighth Congress, when I was a new Member, was not I just as much entitled to the privilege of amending the rules as if there had been a change of parties?

Mr. DALZELL. The rules that were then adopted had been discussed originally by the members of the gentleman's party and had been in force for many years. There is no analogy between that case and this at all. Here is a proposition——

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not wish to yield further, I will not annoy him.

Mr. DALZELL. I thought I had pointed out the distinction that exists in my mind.

Mr. SHERLEY. If that is the gentleman's full answer, then I am content.

Mr. DALZELL. The proposition under which we are acting to-day is that after the reading of the resolution—and, by the way, the rules are offered as a single proposition en bloc—after

the reading of the proposition the minority is entitled to offer a substitute, and then after four hours of general debate, which means nothing, because in general debate we can do nothing more than theorize, the gentlemen on the other side defending their position and we on our side defending our position, but no amendment can be offered, and then at the close of that useless general debate a vote is to be taken. How? "Without delay or intervening motion."

Now, there is adopted in this order one of the most drastic phrases of any of the rules that have heretofore been adopted in this House by either the Republican or the Democratic Party, and which is in violation of one of the provisions of the majority's own code of rule, to the effect that even the Committee on Rules can report no proposition that shall exclude a motion to recommit.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What would be the use of a motion to recommit if there is no committee to send it to, no committee of the House?

Mr. MANN. We might recommit it to the Democratic caucus.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That might not have been bad if you had done it previously.

Mr. MANN. It could not have made it any worse.

Mr. DALZELL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to engage in general debate on this proposition. I do not care to discuss Republican theories or Democratic theories with respect to the rules, nor do I care to go into in detail the various amendments that have been made, that are proposed to be made, to the rules of the Sixty-first Congress by the code of rules now offered. Every material thing in the code of rules now offered that is of any advantage or of any value has been copied into those rules from the rules of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is not a single new thing in the code of rules now offered——

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. What about Rule X? Did the Republicans put that in? And now, if they are so good, why are you not all willing to vote for them?

Mr. DALZELL. I think, except in some particulars, they are a pretty good code of rules.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then I hope the gentleman's side will vote for them.

Mr. DALZELL. I think the gentleman will be disappointed in his hope; not that I would not like to be in his company, but at this time I am afraid I can not be.

Now, the fundamental change in the rules is embodied in Rule X and Rule XI—that is to say, in taking away from the House the opportunity to have the appointment of committees through the medium of the Speaker. Under the Republican rules—because the rules of the Sixty-first Congress were Republican rules—the language was "unless especially ordered by the House the Speaker should appoint the committees." The language of these proposed rules is that there "shall be elected by the House at the commencement of each Congress the following standing committees," and so forth.

So far as the question of electing committees, instead of selecting committees by the Speaker is concerned. I do not propose now to discuss that question. Assuming that the gentlemen on the other side of the House were justified in selecting their committees in the manner in which they have selected them, there is no possible justification for their having added Members to the majority side of these committees without adding any to the minority side of the committees.

I shall leave the discussion of that question to some of the gentlemen who shall follow me.

I think, so far as the provision of these rules is concerned with respect to the appointment of select committees, that it is an improvement on the rules of the Sixty-first Congress. That provision restores a clause that was in the rules of the House from the beginning of the Government up until 1880, which for some reason or other was omitted when the rules were then revised. It reserves to the House, in other words, the right to do as it pleases with respect to select committees and to conference committees, but I see no reason why there should have been taken away from the Members of the committees the right to select their chairman.

In this respect this rule is in one particular in direct violation of the rule adopted at the last Congress, when a Committee on Rules was provided for, because the provision there was that that committee should elect its own chairman. The language is:

> And in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

That is, as I say, in direct violation of the terms of the rule adopted at the last Congress when the Committee on Rules was created and power given to it to elect its own chairman.

Mr. GARRETT. That is, of course, a change as to the Committee on Rules; but does not the gentleman think it is a consistent change, that it is consistent with the general principle that the committee was seeking to lay down?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, well, perhaps it is. I have no criticism to make on the ground of consistency.

In the provision for preferential reports, reports of committees which have a preference in the right to report, the present code of rules follows the rules of the Sixty-first Congress in striking out what was in the rules of the Fifty-third Congress, namely, the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and also follows the rules of the Sixty-first Congress in providing a preference for the Committee on Territories and for the Committee on Pensions.

Now, if I would make any criticism on that, it would be that, while good reason existed for striking out the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, because they were made preferential committees in the first place, during the free silver period, I think the same logic that justified that action would justify the restoration of the Committee on Banking and Currency at this time, in view of the fact that we have an existing Monetary Commission and that the probabilities are, if not in the immediate, at least within the near future, Congress will have to deal with questions of currency.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is that upon the theory that the Monetary Commission is likely to report proposed legislation?

Mr. DALZELL. I said, if not in the immediate, within the near future.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman seriously propose that a Democratic Congress should make privileged bills coming from a Republican Monetary Commission?

Mr. DALZELL. I was not undertaking to judge the action of the Democrats at all, either charitably or uncharitably.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has that impression, it is no doubt based on the recent action of the minority with reference to the reciprocity treaty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman, I understand, is facetious and not serious in that suggestion.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, aside from the question of selecting committees, the only material change, in my judgment—the only serious change, in my judgment—made in the rules of the Sixty-first Congress is in Rule XXI, section 2, by the adoption of what is known as the Holman amendment. I can not, in view of the parliamentary history of this country, do otherwise than regard that as a most dangerous innovation in the rules of the House. In order that the House may thoroughly understand what that is, let me take the time to read it. As that clause appears in the rules of the Sixty-first Congress it is as follows:

> No appropriation shall be recorded in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

Now, that is the existing rule. That has been the rule ever since the Forty-ninth Congress, with an exception. It was the rule in the Forty-ninth Congress, which was Democratic, and the rule in the Fiftieth, which was Democratic, both presided over by Speaker Carlisle, but not the rule, as I recollect now, in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third, which adopted the Holman amendment. Now, the Holman amendment is this:

> Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

Now, that is a provision for legislation on appropriation bills. That is a provision for legislating by the Appropriations Committee. That is a provision which renders useless and unnecessary any other committee of the House. That is a provision which turns over to the Committee on Appropriations all the powers of all the other committees of the House of Representatives. It is wrong in theory, because, in the first place, the Committee on Appropriations ought not to legislate, for the reason that the other branch of Congress is entitled to have an appropriation bill not containing legislation which they have not considered; and, secondly, because the President of the United States is entitled to have an appropriation bill that does not require consideration at his hands of legislation. It is wrong in theory, furthermore, because it is a usurpation of

the rights of every other committee and of the jurisdiction of every other committee in the House of Representatives. Now let me call your attention to this rule, or rather to this amendment to the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule, without the Holman amendment, was in operation until 1876, when the Holman amendment was adopted, and it remained in operation from 1876 until 1880, until the adoption of the rules in the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress. I want to show you what kind of legislation resulted from the operation of that rule. On February 5, 1879, an extensive scheme of legislation for the reorganization of the Army was admitted as an amendment to the Army appropriation bill on the discovery by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that the general effect would be to reduce appropriations.

Think of that. A reorganization of the Army put on an appropriation bill upon proof being made to the satisfaction of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that on the whole it would reduce expenditures. Why, my friends, you take the sundry civil appropriation bill that deals with every single department of the Government, that touches the Government in every vital spot, and under this rule the Committee on Appropriations can legislate for every department, for every bureau, for every question that the Government may be directly interested in. Again, on February 19, 1879, an amendment to repeal a portion of the Federal election law was admitted upon discovery by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that it would be a retrenchment of expenditures. On May 18, 1880, an amendment providing for free seed distribution was admitted to the agricultural appropriation bill without a question of order, the wording being so arranged as to reduce the appropriation $80,000 to $79,000. The extent to which legislation was placed on appropriation bills at that time was illustrated on July 27, 1882, the naval appropriation bill being before the Senate, when Mr. John Sherman, of Ohio, deplored the change which the bill had made in its rule to prevent legislation on appropriation bills, and said of the pending bill:

> Here is a bill 40 pages long passed at the heel of the session. It is sent to us. I will say that three-fourths of this bill contains matter either of a mere recitative character or is general legislation affecting the whole organization of the Navy from beginning to end.

Now, then, in the revision of 1880 the Committee on Rules, with John G. Carlisle, Samuel J. Randall, Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, Thomas B. Reed, Mr. Hiscock, of New York, not only reported against the readoption of that rule, but they denounced it in the most strenuous terms, and on the floor of this House——

Mr. BUTLER. What Congress was that?

Mr. DALZELL. That was the Forty-ninth Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. Democratic?

Mr. DALZELL. A Democratic Congress.

On the floor of the House it was denounced by Roger Q. Mills, of Texas; by Mr. Dockery, of Missouri; by Mr. Sayres, of Texas; by Mr. Springer, of Illinois; by Mr. Bland, of Missouri, all distinguished Democrats, and by every prominent Democrat whose name is historical in the life of that Congress. And yet you gentlemen come here to-day and, in view of the legislative history of that bill, and in view of its denunciations by these great Democrats, undertake to force upon the minority a rule which, instead of reducing expenditures, which, instead of being in the interests of economy, is likely to increase the expenditures and to put upon the statute books legislation that otherwise could not get there. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Then, of course, I can not yield.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a strange and an unusual note from that side of the Chamber to-day. Our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] complains that the Republican side of this Chamber has not the privilege to offer amendments to these rules, paragraph by paragraph. The rule provides that a substitute may be offered, but he complains that that is not enough. He wants opportunity to amend these rules section by section. This is rather an unusual demand from that side of the Chamber, in the light of the history of the past 10 years. For five successive Congresses, and even longer, I and other Members have sat in our seats here and had a code of rules offered to us, with no other privilege than that of voting for or against the entire code offered by the Republican side of this Chamber. We were not only not allowed to offer amendments in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but, so far as I now recollect, we were not even accorded the privilege of offering a substitute, and often you adopted your rules almost without debate, and now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] makes this novel argument. Because in 1894 the rules of the House were considered for some 6 or 8 weeks, and because there was ample opportunity for debate 17 years ago, and because the rules were then amended as the Fifty-fourth Congress deemed proper, there has been no necessity for amending the rules in the same manner at any time since then until the opposite party came into power. The gentleman from Pennsylvania complains now that the minority, of which he is a member, is not permitted under the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas to amend the code of rules offered by this side of the Chamber, rule by rule, paragraph by paragraph.

Now, let us consider for a moment how the Democratic majority in this Chamber is proposing to consider the rules offered for the government of the House. In the first place, let it not be forgotten that ample time is allowed for general debate. If that side of the Chamber had insisted upon even longer time for general debate, you could have gotten it. You were allowed to offer any substitute upon which you can agree among yourselves.

How did you treat us when you were in power? Usually you adopted the rules of the preceding Congress, with little or no opportunity for debate, with no opportunity for amendment in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and, so far as I now recollect, without the privilege of offering a substitute. We simply had to vote "aye" or "no" on the adoption of the Reed rules. That was the treatment accorded to the minority for years by the Republican majority in this Chamber. For 17 years we have been told over and over again that the Reed rules were about as near perfect as any code of rules could be made. You on that side of the Chamber considered them so nearly perfect that you felt justified in presenting them time and again to this House and forcing Members to vote "aye" or "no," without opportunity at any time to offer amendments or even a substitute. What is the matter with that side of the Chamber to-day? If your Reed rules have been perfect for 17 years, are they not perfect to-day? Are they any less perfect now than they have been during all the years when you forced their adoption, often without debate and never with privilege to amend?

In the rules offered to-day we have taken away from the Speaker the power to name the committees of the House.

Will you gentlemen vote to give that power back to the Speaker? We have written in our rules a provision that the Speaker shall not be a member of the Committee on Rules. Do you gentlemen desire to change that? Do you want to vote for the old rule allowing the Speaker to make up a Rules Committee of five with himself as chairman? Why do you not stand by these perfect rules under which you have been running the House? Are you ready to restore to the Speaker that power which so long made it necessary for the individual Member to go to him privately, get on his knees, and beg for the privilege of being recognized on the floor in order to ask for unanimous consent? Why do you not offer your perfect code of rules as a substitute for the rules offered by the gentleman from Texas? Are those rules so bad that no one can be found on that side of the Chamber who is willing to offer them as a substitute for the rules now under consideration? Has it come to pass that the rules which governed the House for nearly two decades are without a single friend on this floor? Every change which has been made, Mr. Speaker, is in the direction of limiting the power of the Speaker and restoring to the individual membership of this House rights and privileges which never should have been taken away.

You gentlemen pursued your policy of centralization of power until you made the American House of Representatives well-nigh the laughingstock in the eyes of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POU. For a brief question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Are the rules in respect to centralization in the Sixty-first Congress any different from the rules of the Fifty-third Congress which the gentleman has used as a model? I mean the Democratic rules.

Mr. POU. I do not know exactly to what the gentleman refers.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I mean with reference to a Member going to the Speaker on his knees for unanimous consent, and the Speaker having the power to grant it.

Mr. POU. Nobody now has to go to the Speaker begging for unanimous consent unless he wants to do so.

Mr. MANN. Both of these gentlemen voted against the rules.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POU. For a question.

Mr. MADISON. Is it not true that under the rules as now proposed, that upon the matter of the suspension of the rules, if any Member here under the rules, as you propose them, desires to make a motion to suspend the rules, he has to go to the Speaker in his chamber and ask for recognition?

Mr. POU. You have a perfect right to ask it right here on the floor.

Mr. MADISON. I will ask the gentleman if there is any modification whatever in the rules of the Sixty-first Congress as to that matter, and if it is not true that under those rules and the rulings made by a Democratic Speaker that you have still got to go to the Speaker's chamber and make arrangements in advance for recognition for a suspension of the rules?

Mr. POU. Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is done out in the open under a Democratic Speaker and administration of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. POU. And, Mr. Speaker, a Democratic Speaker would not abuse that privilege, anyway. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not care to yield further. I submit again the proposition stated in the beginning, that every change recommended—and you gentlemen know it to be so—has been toward limiting the power of the Speaker and enlarging the power of the individual Members of this House.

Now, there has been a good deal said with respect to Rule XXI and with respect to Rule XXVIII, which provides for the discharge of committees of the House. We do not contend that these rules are perfect. We do contend, though, that they both are better than the old rules. If a fair trial shall prove that these rules do not work well, they can and will no doubt be amended. Now, I want to say this: If gentlemen propose deliberately to go about it to make Rule XXVIII a farce, when it was intended to confer upon individual Members larger powers, possibly they can to some extent succeed. If gentlemen deliberately plan and scheme to nullify the laudable purpose of this rule, it is possible, I say, they may partially succeed; and that can be said of other rules as well. Any man who sets out to obstruct legislation can do a great deal along that line. We all know that, but we have improved Rule XXVIII in several respects, we think, and if necessity shall develop, it can be still further amended.

The same may be said with respect to the criticism of Rule XXI, which is among the most important changes we have made. The rule provides two things—first, that a proposition which changes existing law shall be germane; second, that its effect shall be to retrench and economize. Those two requirements must be met, but if revolutionary measures are offered under cover of this rule, if it shall be found that there are real dangers of abuse, the Committee on Rules will, I am sure, take such action as may be deemed wise and necessary; but I do not believe there is basis for the criticism of this rule.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield a minute there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POU. I do.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I understand a ruling was made on this provision in the Fifty-second Congress and at various other times. An amendment was offered to the post-office appropriation bill which nominally reduced the amount of the gross appropriations. With that same amendment there was incorporated a totally different provision, totally changing existing law in a way not contemplated by the spirit of the Holman rule. Yet, as that rule was then interpreted by Mr. Buchanan, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, and as it was subsequently held on other occasions, such amendments were held in order merely because they reduced the gross amount of an appropriation, irrespective of what else they might do.

Mr. POU. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can not yield further. The gentleman is making a speech in my time. I do not believe there is basis for fears expressed as to the abuse of this rule, but if experience shall show that the purpose of the rule can be perverted in the manner suggested we will simply have to amend that rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. POU. Just a word more, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that so much of my time has been taken up by interruptions.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute more to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. POU. The Committee on Rules, Mr. Speaker, has made an honest effort to revise these rules in a way that will, in a proper manner, enlarge the powers of the individual membership of this House. If it shall develop that further amendments are necessary, the committee will not stand for the policy of stifling legislation demanded by the people, and in so far as it has the power, it will aid in restoring to each Member every right he is entitled to exercise and enjoy in this Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say this: No code of rules which ever will be adopted by this House will be perfect. We claim that the rules offered by the gentleman from Texas, who will be chairman of the Committee on Rules, are better by far than the code of rules under which the House has been working for years.

Reforms begun have not been abandoned. There has been no step backward. The right of the Member to request unanimous consent for the present consideration of any measure in which he is interested is enlarged by the provision allowing him to reinstate his measure a second time. Several useless committees have been abolished and other changes made which will result in a saving of many thousands of dollars; and I want to repeat, if other changes shall become necessary to restore to every Member every right to which he ought to be entitled under the Constitution, the committee will not turn a deaf ear to any reasonable suggestion. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. [Applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of those who have always believed that the question of rules for the government of the House was not a partisan proposition. I have always thought we ought to adopt rules for the government of this body without taking into consideration which political party was in control of it. I ought to demand the same rules for my government and my control as a Member of this House when my political opponents are in the majority that I insist upon for myself when my own political party is in control.

I want to discuss briefly the proposed rules, now before the House, and to suggest to the House some amendments that I believe will appeal to every man, regardless of his political affiliations, if he believes in fair play and good legislation, and likewise believes in remedying the defects that have been developed in the past under our rules.

I regret that we are placed in such a parliamentary situation here that while we can talk and talk and talk we are not allowed to offer amendments and to vote. One of the greatest prerogatives of Members of this House is to be permitted to vote upon propositions material to our people and upon propositions material to the control of our own body.

Now, to begin with, I want to say that some of the amendments to the old rules that are proposed in this schedule of rules now before us are, in my judgment, good ones and amendments that I would gladly support. At the same time the first one that I am going to mention, I believe, does not give, in place of the old rule, as good a remedy for what I believe to be the acknowledged defects of the old rule as we could get if no man's hands were tied by a caucus and every man voted as he felt and not as he feared.

These rules provide that the committees of the House of Representatives shall be selected by the House. It takes away from the Speaker the power of appointing the standing committees. That particular principle of taking from the Speaker the power to appoint the standing committees of the House is something that a good many of us over here on this side have stood for, worked for, and almost died for for the last two or three years. As far as you go in taking that power away from the Speaker you have done well and are entitled to praise, but you put down the gag rule then and say that the method that you provide in its place shall not be amended. You tie every man's hands and refuse to allow any amendments to be offered. You let us talk, but deprive us of the right to offer or vote upon amendments.

If I had had the opportunity, I would have offered an amendment that in substance is the same as the original amendment that was offered here on the 17th day of March a year ago last month, and for which many of us over here stand. I realize that this particular amendment could not prevail, because you are tied up by caucus action, and I believe that all the amend-

ments that I am going to suggest would prevail if every man here was free. I believe that there is a majority of Members here who believe in it, and that it would bring the proper relief, so that we ought to have had the right to offer it and to vote upon it. The right to vote is much more precious than the right to discuss. On page 6 of the pamphlet containing these rules I would offer an amendment as follows:

Strike out the first paragraph of Rule X and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The standing committees of the House shall be selected by the Committee on Rules, which committee shall consist of 15 members, 9 of whom shall be members of the majority party and 6 of whom shall be members of the minority party or parties, to be selected as follows: The States of the Union shall be divided by a committee of three, appointed by the Speaker for that purpose, into nine groups, each group containing as near as may be an equal number of members belonging to the majority party. The States of the Union shall likewise be divided into six groups, each group containing as near as may be an equal number of members belonging to the minority party or parties. At 10 o'clock a. m. of the day following the adoption of the report of said committee each of the said groups shall meet and select one of its number a member of the Committee on Rules. The place of meeting for each of said groups shall be designated by said committee of three in its report. Each of said groups shall report to the House the name of the member selected for membership on the Committee on Rules. Each standing committee shall elect its own chairman. The Speaker shall not be eligible to membership on any standing committee. The following shall be the standing committees of the House, namely."

Mr. GARRETT and Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman think it would be very bad policy to put into the rules and continue in the rules a proposition of majority and minority parties?

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the gentleman, as I have already said, that I firmly believe, and there are a good many others that think with me, that that particular change in the rules would bring the greatest possible relief and provide a very good way for the selection of committees. As I said before, I do not expect this to carry, but we ought to have had the right to go on record for what we believe, and conscientiously believe, to be the best remedy for this situation. Having said that much about it, unless I can be afforded further time I hope gentlemen will not take my time on this amendment, because I have others that I want to discuss.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for one question right there?

Mr. NORRIS. If I had the time, I would be glad to. The objection to the method of selecting committees provided in this schedule of rules is, as I look at it, that it results in caucus selection of committees. I believe the amendment I have suggested would obviate that. I believe we ought to get away from the caucus just as much and just as often and just as far as we can. I believe the time is not far distant when the progressive, patriotic sentiment of the American people will drive the caucus and the political boss and the political machine out of business.

Now, I want to suggest another amendment on page 9 of this pamphlet, and I would like to have the membership follow me, because I am satisfied these amendments will meet with the approval of a vast majority here if they will consider them. At the end of clause 4, Rule X, add a new paragraph, as follows:

No Member shall be eligible to serve at the same time on more than one of the following standing committees: Appropriations, the Judiciary, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rivers and Harbors, Agriculture, the Post Office and Post Roads, and Ways and Means.

Now, I have no objection to adding other committees to this list, if there would be an opportunity here to offer an amendment. I would not confine it myself to those particular committees, but, as far as these committees are concerned, it ought to appeal to every man who has been in the House of Representatives for any length of time that there are two reasons why no Member should serve at the same time on two of these committees. First, it is not just to the other Members who are deprived of the privilege and who are not allowed to serve on any of those important committees; and, second, it is not fair to the House and the country, because a Member can not perform the duties properly as a Representative if he is liable to be called, for instance, by the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on very important matters for consideration at the same hour.

Members will realize that I will not be able to discuss in detail all of the benefits that would come from that rule and some others that I will offer, because my time is too limited.

On page 5 of this pamphlet I would like to offer an amendment as follows:

After section 5, Rule X, add a new section, as follows:
"SEC. 6. The Speaker shall not be eligible to serve on any standing committee."

I am not going to discuss that, because I want to go on with some other amendments that I would like to propose; but I think the justice of that will appeal to every Member of the House.

If I were not prevented by this caucus gag I would offer the following amendment:

On page 13, after paragraph 57, Rule XI, add a new paragraph, as follows:
"Unless otherwise ordered by the committee, the business and records of all committees shall be public, and the record of a vote to go into executive session shall be public."

I am satisfied that much of the criticism that has come—some of it justly and some of it unjustly—against the House of Representatives has been because there have been too many executive sessions of committees. We ought to open the door and give the light of publicity full sway in the committee room as we do here on the floor of the House. Every man knows that it is out of order on the floor of the House for a Member to state what took place behind closed doors in the committee. The public—the press—are not able to get the information, and naturally there is a suspicion, in many cases, perhaps, a wrong impression goes out. It may be in many instances that it is necessary to have a secret meeting. I can imagine such conditions might arise, but we ought to at least reverse the present rule, and instead of making the presumption true that all the business must be secret unless otherwise ordered, we ought to make it public unless the members of the committee are ready to go on record and say that it is of such nature that it ought to be private. Publicity will not injure any honest attempt at legislation, and we all know many meritorious bills are secretly killed in the committee room, and the country is not able to locate the responsibility.

Now, I would like to offer on page 28 of this pamphlet the following amendment, and this refers to calendar Wednesday, a subject that was called up just a while ago in debate by my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON]. After the word "Union," in line 11, paragraph 7 of Rule XXIV, insert the following:

And in considering any such bill before the Committee of the Whole House all general debate shall be confined to the bill under consideration, and the said committee shall have the power to limit and to close such general debate.

Under the rule as brought in here and as it existed in the last Congress, the Committee of the Whole House can not close general debate, and we all know, those of us who were here in the last Congress, that there were instances when men got the floor under general debate on calendar Wednesday and consumed the entire time discussing something that was not before the committee, and the committee was helpless to limit general debate or to close it. To do that, it was compelled to go back into the House and get action by the House. No man would vote against this amendment if King Caucus would only unfasten the fetters.

I would like to have offered on page 30 of this code of rules the following amendment:

At the end of paragraph 1, Rule XXVII, add the following:
"The Speaker shall not entertain any motion to suspend the rules unless such motion or the substance or notice thereof shall be printed on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent on the day when such motion is entertained."

Now, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] said that the object of these proposed rules was to lessen the power of the Speaker and increase the power of the Member. Under the rule, the same as it existed before and as you have repeated it in the proposed code, the Speaker is absolutely in control on suspension day. He is absolutely supreme. He can recognize or not recognize as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Speaker need not recognize a Member, and no Member is entitled to recognition under this rule unless the Speaker desires to give it to him. Now, I do not seek to take that power away. If I had my way about it, I would take it away altogether; but I wanted to make this change moderate, so it would have no doubt in passing, and therefore I only provided that notice must be given to the House so that it will be published on the calendar and the Members of the House may know what is coming up under suspension. There is no way now, under this Democratic caucus proposed rule, of finding out what it is. The Speaker and the man he is going to recognize carry it in their breasts. We will sit here all day and never know what the next motion to suspend the rules is going to be unless one of these men tells us. Why would it not be reasonable and fair to put on the calendar a notice of this motion, the same as must be done with all bills reported from

committees. If this wonderful power on suspension day is to be vested in the Speaker, why not require that notice to the membership shall be given as to what bills the Speaker is going to have taken up?

I want to refer briefly now, in conclusion, because I have not the time to discuss these questions as I would like to, to the parliamentary situation as it exists at the present time. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] said he wanted to enlarge the power of the individual, and yet this very rule you have brought in here and have adopted by a party vote cuts off the right of every individual Member here to offer amendments to these rules, something I must serve under, something you must serve under, and the country must live under for the next two years. I want to say that you are not practicing what you preach. [Applause on Republican side.] You ought to have permitted amendments to be offered here. I do not care whether in the past some Republican majority has been that tyrannical or not. I never have stood for it. I never believed in a gag rule from my own party, and I want to say that it does not taste any better when it comes from the other party. [Applause on Republican side.] It seems to me you have given us an exhibition here of just what you have claimed you were going to avoid. We ought to have had the right to offer amendments here in good faith. These rules must govern me just the same as they must govern you, and I want to say that you can not justify yourself by saying that Republicans did the same thing some other time.

I have heard that argument and excuse made many times on both sides of this House. I have heard Republicans justify their application of the gag by referring to equally drastic gags applied by the Democrats, and to-day we find the Democrats citing Republican precedent. In neither case is the argument either good or logical. Democratic sin will not justify Republican wickedness and Republican tyranny will not excuse Democratic coercion. Instead of seeing if we can not be as bad as our opponents have been we should bend our energies and ambitions toward improvement. The people will not be satisfied when we tell them we were no worse than someone else has been. Instead of imitating what is wrong we should try to improve and stand for what is right. I have refused, when my party was in control of the House, to surrender my convictions at the behest of King Caucus, and I decline to-day to submit my hands to his shackles when he comes in the guise of a Democrat. There ought to be no caucuses on matters of legislation. You know these amendments I have proposed to-day would be adopted if your hands were not shackled and every man was allowed to follow the dictates of his own conscience. Many of you men on the Democratic side, and nearly all of your newspapers, condemned Republican Party machine methods. There are some of us over here who came out in the open, and at the expense of political punishment and the surrender of political patronage, fought those same methods and that same machine. That machine to-day seems to be on the Democratic side of the aisle. King Caucus seems to be there in control, and if you surrender your consciences to him you will be in as great a political slavery as though you were ruled by a czar on the Speaker's throne. When my party was in power I stood here in my place and denounced rules that came in from this side and said then that we could not afford to back up our action by saying that Democrats had done the same thing some time before; and that applies to you to-day. It ought to be nonpartisan. We ought not to tie ourselves up here with a gag rule and by a caucus. You are not elected here to serve a caucus. A caucus nine times out of ten means only that 51 men shall compel 50 men to do what they do not want to do and do not believe in. It means that a majority of a majority will control the House, which often will be a minority of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. He talks well and intelligently, as he always does, and yet, when you sum it up, he has arraigned not the tentative rules of this House, but the caucus. Now, I would say to the gentleman from Nebraska, there are caucuses and caucuses. A caucus can be a dog and cat fight and a caucus can be a friendly conference of conceding brethren. It depends upon whether it was held on last Saturday or the Monday following. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This caucus action is nothing more or less than a unanimous statement of the Democratic membership of this House to the country of the concurrent views of men willing to concede to their brothers. The rules of this House will find in their last analysis no more perfect defense than the fact that when for the first time in eight long years, to my knowledge, an opportunity was given to the minority party to offer a substitute, which substitute could have cured all the ills of which you complain, no such substitute was offered.

These gentlemen have arraigned against particular flaws against this or that or the other provision of these new rules. Is it true, gentlemen, that your objections are captious, ill-considered, extemporized on the spur of the moment simply for the purpose of finding fault? If these objections have weight with your own party, if these objections have not behind them a majority of your membership, or if they were worthy of consideration, why were not they incorporated in the substitute which is offered to the rules of the House? I know of nothing which more commends the Democratic Party to the House than these rules as offered, unless it be the captious and almost frivolous objections made by the gentlemen upon the other side. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] concedes that in their essentials they are admirable rules. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] makes objection not to the substance, but to the form of the rules. It is a matter of comparative little importance whether the committees of this House are named by caucus and made in harmony, as far as Democrats and Republicans are concerned, or made by particular sections. The only thing which the country demanded, and the thing which these rules have provided, is the right that the House should name its committees, and the manner in which the House acted, so it acted untrammeled and intelligently, is of infinitely small importance. It is a mere matter of detail.

Every other objection that has been offered to these rules has been of a like character. The truth is that the rules as a whole stand unassailed and are unassailable. When they are reviewed it will be found that there is not a single popular demand, there is not a single rational reform demanded by the people that is not conceded by the rules. It has been suggested, sir, that committees of this House were formerly created, some for the purpose of reporting legislation that was acceptable to a coterie, some for the purpose of becoming a mausoleum of legislation that was foredoomed to eternal death. Under the rules of this House no man can hereafter name, organize, and control these committees. They provide further, even after a committee has been organized, a rational and efficient method by which committees can be discharged from further consideration of a bill if the people demand consideration of that bill. In all other details we present the rules of this House to this House, believing that they contain all the provisions, believing that they are a system by which a harmonious party can operate with facility and with efficiency in carrying out the great, the wise, and the beneficent legislation which it will soon be our pleasing duty to crystallize into the statutes of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] use some of his time now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in my legislative life I have always tried to be candid and direct. I believe in a government by the people acting through majorities. That is the way we got here as individual Representatives, and I believe that the majority in the House of Representatives, responsible only to the people of the United States, could not avoid the responsibility if they would—and I dare say they would not if they could—and must be the sole judge, with plenary power, as to what rules they will adopt and as to what legislation they will enact.

And I want to say here and now that substantially the rules proposed by this resolution are an indorsement of nearly all that is good in the rules that have evoluted since the adoption of the Constitution, and, therefore, I am not going to criticize the rules where they do or where they do not sin merely because the majority of the House proposes to adopt them. Sometimes majorities and minorities tear passion to tatters and appeal—and I do not say it offensively—sometimes from the standpoint of demagoguery and claptrap to people that would not know a rule or a code of rules if they would meet in the middle of a street.

I have had a good deal to do with rules during my legislative life. I reported, as a member of the Committee on Rules in the Fifty-first Congress, what were then denounced by an almost unanimous press and by a violent minority as the "infamous Reed rules." I examined again this morning to see how that code was considered. It was thrown open to amendment, with two days' general debate, and, in addition, one day under the five-

minute rule, and with the most perfect freedom of amendment, and the previous question ordered at 5 o'clock on the third day upon the rule and all pending amendments. [Applause on the Republican side.] And at that time the Republicans had a majority of 5. You now have a majority of 63. I submit to you, as you are now flopping your wings together on that side and have complete harmony and solidarity, that perchance you might, from the standpoint of propriety, give the minority a chance to offer amendments to the rules for consideration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, after all, you are the best judges. You have full power. I say that you are the best judges, because you are responsible, as majorities are always responsible, and, therefore, if you are mistaken in judgment, and it leads to bad consequences, the responsibility will prove uncomfortable to you.

I say again that, substantially, I agree that this is a valuable code of rules as proposed by your resolution. I recollect very well that at the close of the Fifty-first Congress there was no leader upon the other side, there was no member of the minority, that would observe the usual courtesies and offer a resolution thanking Speaker Reed for his courtesy and fairness.

I offered the resolution, and had to move the previous question upon it, and on a roll call, without any exception, every member of the minority voted "no." It was a great revolution. And yet in the two Congresses that were presided over so ably by the late Speaker Crisp, you absolutely took all the reforms, counting a quorum, and others, and adopted them; and you propose to do it to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] Well, for 16 years the Republican majority have lived and enacted legislation under these rules, and in that time—and I measure my words—proved by the legislation that has been written upon the statute books that it is wiser legislation, better legislation, and more far-reaching and important legislation than was ever written upon the statute books in all the history of the American Congress for over 120 years. So much for that.

But you say you have come in and that you are here. That is true. In my time of nearly 40 years of service I served in the minority 14 years. So you have come in 7 times before coming in now. I trust that your legislation will be such and that your legislative action will be such that you may not go out on account of the conditions to which the country will come under your jurisdiction and action. That remains to be seen.

Now, it is wonderful how, as the pendulum swings back and forth, men change in their opinions and in their votes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], in my absence from the floor, I having his remarks now before me, referred evidently to the late Speaker of the House, and I just got in in time to hear the applause that followed his remarks. Gentlemen, the late Speaker of the House has no apology to offer to the majority, to the minority, to the country for the manner in which he administered that great office under the rules of the House for eight years. [Applause on the Republican side.] But the gentleman from North Carolina referred to a saying of Speaker Reed that in 15 years no Speaker had been overruled and, in his opinion, would not be. There was further great applause. But the former Speaker of this House in the last Congress, after a two days' contest, was overruled by a majority. Majorities are all powerful. For the time being they may disregard the fixed law of the land. For the time being they may run over and spit upon and trample upon the rules of the House. They have full and plenary power, including the power to remove a Speaker. I could rise in my place, Mr. Speaker, now, under the highest constitutional privilege, and move, sir, to remove you, and you would be compelled to entertain the motion, and you would be removed, provided the majority said so. [Laughter.] But, in any event, it would force consideration.

Now, one further matter. One year ago and a little over the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] arose in his place, as he stated, to a constitutionally privileged question. He had to be recognized. For what? He proposed to change the rules. It was debated. The Chair ruled that the rules could not be amended in that way and cited all the precedents that had ever been made by Speakers of all parties that had preceded him.

The gentleman from Nebraska appealed, and then there was a majority that overruled the Speaker. How? By a solid Democratic minority, plus enough voting with them on the Republican side to constitute a majority; and there was a new majority, and the Speaker's decision was overruled.

At the late session of Congress the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] arose to a question of constitutional privilege and proposed to amend the rules, offering his resolution. It was debated. The gentleman from Missouri, the present Speaker, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and other gentlemen debated the point of order, and held inside of 12 short months that that motion was not in order. And when the Chair sustained the point of order, saying that one decision made by a majority of the House would not in his opinion constitute such a precedent as to overrule all former decisions, an appeal was had, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who arraigned the ex-Speaker to-day by inference, and the gentleman from Alabama, the leader of the majority now, but of the minority then, and the gentleman who is the present Speaker of the House, fell over themselves to sustain the Chair on precisely the same question upon which they had previously voted to overrule the Chair. [Applause on the Republican side.] I submit to the criticizing gentleman from North Carolina—no, I am told that it was the gentleman from Texas, and I will apologize to North Carolina——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. It was the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CANNON. I did not hear him, and I have had to depend on the notes. I submit to him that the criticism that the former Speaker was overruled is fully answered by the statement that he voted along with all his party colleagues to sustain the Speaker. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And now it is said that we have a Unanimous Consent Calendar. I am glad that we have. Along with that is the saying, in the language of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] and the universal representation of the uplift magazines [laughter], that it is no longer necessary to crawl upon your knees, hat in hand, to ask the Speaker for recognition for unanimous consent.

No, no. The Speaker is a Member of the House. I am a Member of the House, and I never felt less like dying than I do now. [Laughter and applause.] When the Unanimous Consent Calendar is called, if my judgment prompts me to object to the consideration of a bill, no doubt the man in charge of that bill will, figuratively, come on his hands and knees, with hat in hand, even the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], trying to convince his co-Member on the floor that the consideration of the bill ought not to be objected to.

I said I was glad there was a Unanimous Consent Calendar. You will not pass so many bills by unanimous consent; but I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, as I congratulated myself upon the creation of the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Before that time I made it an absolute rule, as one Member of the House, not to submit any bill under a request for unanimous consent that I would have objected to from the floor; because the Speaker is a Member of the House, and when he refuses to submit a matter for unanimous consent he does not refuse as Speaker, but as a Member, for the Speaker always can object as a Member.

The old practice entailed upon the Speaker the absolute duty to examine every bill submitted for unanimous consent, and he did not submit a bill unless, in his judgment, it had that merit and that want of importance, if you choose, that entitled it to be considered with safety in the way in which we consider unanimous-consent bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. How much more time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CANNON. Very brief time.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I think I can finish in that time. I say you will not pass so many unanimous-consent bills as you did under the old practice, but I shall vote against any amendment, now or in the future, to dispense with that calendar, because I know how it relieves the Speaker to have it.

Ah, but, Mr. Speaker, you are not a member of the Committee on Rules, and that is a great thing that has been established, because otherwise you would have been a czar. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Let me tell you about the rules. Under the uniform practice, up to the last session of Congress, the Speaker was a member of a committee of five, of which he was chairman. Proposed amendments to the rules and proposed special orders were sent to that committee. No report was ever made from any Committee on Rules until there had been a thorough canvass of the majority side of the House, and it was practically certain that it was the will of the majority that the temporary rule or special order should be made, because the business could not be properly done under the ordinary rules of the House in the presence of 30,000 other bills, and that the proposed special order would secure a majority vote. So, how the czar fades out!

To the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] I have this to say: I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Rules, or

will be chairman of that committee, consisting of 11 men. I venture the prophecy here that no report will come from that committee until a caucus of the other side of the House have instructed the gentleman to make it, or there has been the equivalent of a caucus by canvassing his side of the House to assure him that he has a majority. Czar HENRY, are you any more or less a czar than was the Speaker?

Mr. ELLERBE. Hurrah for HENRY! [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; hurrah for HENRY! He has done pretty good work on these rules [applause on the Democratic side] with the exception of two things. There is the want of one amendment and the presence of another that are subjects of legitimate criticism. If you will read the amendments touching the discharge of committees, you will find that there is no provision that enables the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER] constituting one party and the only member of it, or any other gentleman who has perchance a wild-eyed or sensible proposition, to obtain a discharge of the Committee on Rules. The gentleman drops a resolution into the box to go to the Committee on Rules providing that they shall report a rule for the consideration of his bill. Every other committee in the House may be discharged, but under this resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a bill and bring it before the House a motion will not be in order, and no amendment can be offered here to amend this resolution. Why did you do it? My dear friend and colleague, the honorable gentleman from Texas, why, oh, why did you do it?

Was there any danger of interfering with your czar-like power if you were subject to the same rule that the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee and every other committee is subjected? Nay, nay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Now there is one vicious amendment to these proposed rules and that is known as the Holman amendment. It proposes to make in order legislation upon an appropriation bill provided it decreases the appropriation—by way of a salary to officers and various other provisions.

I undertake to say as practiced by the House heretofore that a man might move to amend an appropriation for a million of dollars by striking off one dollar and then loading on enough iniquitous legislation to be dragged through on an appropriation bill to wreck a party. You tried it, and after you tried it your own people amended it, and now you bring it back with a flapping of wings and a crowing, and say that you are going to work out great economies. Gentlemen, I should be apprehensive of your power had I not in my lifetime in Congress and out of Congress heard people thunder in the index. We will wait and see, and if, perchance you should be clothed with power again in 1912 [applause on the Democratic side] I said "if perchance" [laughter and applause on the Republican side], you will modify or repeal that provision.

Now, I think that is about all I care to say. I thank you for allowing me to consume more time than perhaps I ought to have taken. I yield back to the gentleman from Illinois the remainder of my time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, we have listened with interest and with profit to the very entertaining and illuminating discussion, both of political conditions and of the rules to which we have just been treated by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Whatever may be the state of our feelings politically toward that gentleman, most of the Members on this side entertain for him the kindest personal feelings, and however much we rejoice and the country rejoices at the downfall of the political system of which he so long stood out as the most conspicuous example, yet we not only entertain toward the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] the kindly personal feelings already alluded to, but also have for him that respect we feel for the warrior who can endure defeat but rebels at surrender; and when we meet him in joint discussion we feel for him that "stern joy that warriors feel for foemen worthy of their steel." The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] have undertaken to complain bitterly of this side of the House, because they say that the majority has gagged the minority. While I am not an old man either in years or point of service on this floor, yet I must say that I have had enough experience here to be utterly astonished that these gentlemen should advance such a contention. For four successive Congresses I have seen the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] rise in his place on the majority side and move that the rules of the last House be adopted and upon that motion demand the previous question, after allowing 20 minutes' debate to each side, and without offering the slightest opportunity for amendment. And yet to-day, because the Democratic Party, in power in this House for the first time in 16 years, insists that after a general discussion of 4 hours and after the minority has been afforded an ample opportunity to offer a complete substitute for each and every rule of the code of rules we offer, these gentleman, with amazing inconsistency, in view of their past performances, cry out to the country against the "gag" that the Democratic Party has applied to them and to the minority.

When the gentlemen have fully collaborated with each other and have completed their new treatise on "gagging," it will be a most interesting as well as amusing production.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] asserts that the code of rules we present to-day is "substantially, in all respects, a revision of the House rules." Against this statement of his we shall put the contention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who asserts that "substantially the rules proposed by this resolution are an indorsement of nearly all that is good in the rules that we have evoluted since the adoption of the Constitution." The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] criticizes the majority for not throwing open the rules to individual amendment, because, as he contends, they are substantially different from the rules of the last Congress, and yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asserts that the new rules are practically the same as those of the last House, and has congratulated the majority upon them. The truth is, in my judgment, neither gentleman is right. The rules we propose are in many respects identical with the similar rules of the last Congress and of many preceding Congresses, and yet in some respects they are vitally and fundamentally different from those of any previous Congress. The complaint of the American people against the last and the three immediately preceding Congresses was that under the rules and under the practice the power of the Speaker had been built up until he had become a literal boss, able to control legislation in the House, to stifle it when it suited his purpose, and to pass it when he favored it. This was accomplished, or was at least capable of accomplishment, by the two powers that rested in the Speaker: First, the power to appoint all committees, and, second, the power of recognition.

The American people do not believe in bosses, either in city, in State, or in Nation. Least of all will they tolerate a system of bossism in the House of Representatives. They have determined that no such system shall be possible here in this House, composed of their direct and chosen Representatives, and when the Republican Party turned a deaf ear to their demand that the system which had fastened its iron grip upon the House be destroyed, they commissioned the Democratic Party to work their will. In the last Congress enough Republican Representatives joined the solid Democratic minority to work a great reform by providing that the Committee on Rules should not be appointed by the Speaker and that the Speaker should not be a member thereof. They did not go far enough, in that they failed to also provide that the House itself, instead of the Speaker, select all of the great committees to consider and report proposed legislation. To-day we execute the will of the American people and bow to their mandate when we provide that the House itself shall elect every standing committee. This change in itself is fundamental, sweeping, and far-reaching. If no other change than this was made, the fight for popular rights in this House would not have been made in vain, and the Democratic Party would have fulfilled its pledges and served the people well.

So far as the power of recognition is concerned we frankly concede that the Speaker's right of selection among several Members who seek recognition at the same time on questions of equal privilege can not and ought not to be impaired. This power is discretionary and must, in the very nature of things, be lodged somewhere. Where, then, except in the duly chosen Speaker? So far as the Speaker's power of recognition for legislative purposes, strictly speaking, is concerned, we have very much curtailed it and rendered the individual membership of this House freer and more independent. We think we have very much improved both the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, calendar Wednesday, and the Calendar of Motions to Discharge the Committees. We believe that under the practical operation of the rules that we propose the individual Member will have a larger opportunity if he is only diligent and active. When it is asserted that some of these last-named reforms came during the Sixty-first Congress, we reply that such of them as did come were literally forced down the throats of an unwilling and protesting majority by the solid Democratic

vote aided by a few independent Republicans. To-day the Democratic Party preserves these reforms, has improved them, and hopes to still further improve them in the future.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I quite agree with the gentleman on the proposition that the rule as to discharging committees is improved. Does not the gentleman think that rule ought to be further amended, so that there will be a way left in the rules themselves for their own amendment? In other words, so that a resolution introduced for the purpose of amending a rule and being referred to the Committee on Rules, if not acted upon by that committee, might be gotten before the House?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the gentleman with perfect candor on that proposition. In theory he may be right; but the Rules Committee is the one important political committee in this House controlling general procedure in the transaction of its business, and we do not think the Rules Committee should be discharged by any procedure until the majority can fully consider it and fully manifest its will. Until this happens, it should not be done.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is it not true that under the rules as now proposed there is no way left for amending a rule unless the Committee on Rules shall see fit to recommend it?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; there is no way to get consideration of such a proposition.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There is no way to get consideration of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will also say to the gentleman that the objection he makes could also be applied to all propositions on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. Then, if you put a bill on its appropriate calendar, you would not get immediate consideration for it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is true; but you will get it on the way.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will tell the gentleman again candidly that we do not think that the political party in power should make the concession he suggests.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and several of his associates on that side of the Chamber who sympathized with him in his fight in the last House on this rules question complained that we did not allow each and every Member of the minority full opportunity of amending each and every rule we present.

In reply, we say that we realize that this Government of ours is practically operated and conducted through the agency of political parties, and we submit that on so important a question as the adoption of rules for the transaction of public business and for the execution of the will of the people the party in power must adopt such rules as it thinks best suited to meet the responsibility resting upon it and to enable it to execute the popular will. Of course if it should adopt rules that are unfair to the minority, unjust and oppressive to the people, and subversive of their rights, then the party in power must pay the penalty for such exercise of its power, as the Republican Party did in the last election; but the Democratic Party in this House, conscious of its responsibility and anxious to meet it, presents to the House and to the country, as a result of party action, a code of rules upon which it is willing to stand, as fair and just to the minority and to the country, and thinks it has the perfect right to require of its great political opponent in this body that it shall present its proposition on this great subject as a matter of party policy, if at all. If we are able to agree on this side of the Chamber unanimously and harmoniously on our proposition about this much-vexed and much-discussed question of rules, and it shall develop that the minority is unable to present any definite proposition in lieu of what we offer to the House and to the country, or any policy on this question on which they can agree upon among themselves, then we say it but serves to emphasize and drive home the fact that the Democratic Party is united and harmonious, able to transact the public business, and able to meet its responsibilities, while the Republican Party on this floor is divided and discordant, unable to agree on anything, even when in a minority. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, just one more word in reference to the criticism made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The gentleman objects to the provision of the rules reenacting what is known as the Holman amendment, which provides in effect that a provision of or an amendment to an appropriation bill shall not be subject to the point of order that it changes existing law, provided the amendment retrenches expenditure. I am not surprised that the gentlemen on the other side object to any rule that renders it impossible to reduce expenditure. Their present performances are quite consistent with their past record. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] particularly objects to this Holman provision, because he says that it confers on the House the power to legislate in connection with general appropriation bills.

The reason that he gives for objecting is one of the strongest reasons I have for supporting this great change in the rules, which, in my opinion, will do so much to enhance both the dignity and importance of this body.

It is my deliberate judgment that when the House surrendered some years ago the right to legislate on appropriation bills it immeasurably lowered both its dignity in the eyes of the public and its power as a legislative factor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Certainly I shall favor, and I think I voice the sentiment on this side when I say we shall favor, the employment of all reasonable and proper means to increase the dignity and importance of this House; that comes direct every two years from the American people and is responsive to the popular will. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The rules we have presented to-day are, of course, not perfect; the work of man never is. We do not believe, however, that the minority can offer as a substitute any definite proposition that is better; nor do we think that the trifling and unimportant changes that have been suggested during the progress of this discussion are of enough value to justify the House in halting now at the adoption of the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY]. We believe we have met the popular demand upon us and have executed the popular will in the preparation and presentation of this code of rules, and we have endeavored to make our general rules as fair and just as possible, and we do not think that special rules should be forced out of the Committee on Rules except in response to the definite will and declared policy of the party in power. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I trust the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will use some of his time now.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED]. [Applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, under the special rule just adopted under the previous question, without any opportunity for debate, the time allowed is of course too short to discuss this proposed body of rules, but of what use is discussion when we are not permitted to amend them? Under that special rule thus arbitrarily and unfairly adopted we are not permitted even to offer amendments. I deem it worth while, however, to call the attention of the House and of the country to one or two points. There never was before submitted to this House, from the foundation of the Government to the present moment, any considerable revision of the rules which had not first been considered by a committee of the House and then submitted with a printed report of that committee—and usually, also, with a minority report—setting forth in each instance the old rule, the alleged mischief, and the proposed remedy.

Here we have thrust upon us, without any such report or explanation and without even any opportunity to read them, a body of rules which most of us have been permitted to see for the first time this morning, and which we must, under the special rule, take up at once for passage. We are graciously permitted two hours for discussion, not time enough even to read these rules, and then we must vote for or against them as a whole, being denied the privilege of offering a single amendment. Is this "the free and untrammeled expression of the representatives of the people" which the country has been taught to believe the Democrats would permit when they got control of this House? I call attention to the proposed Rule XXI. It is our rule plus what is styled the Holman amendment. Away back in the early days there obtained in this body the practice of "log rolling" and passing all kinds of legislation by riders upon appropriation bills. It was found to be absolutely destructive of good order, good government, and economy, and it was abolished. The rule finally adopted, in force in the last Congress and many previous Congresses, made it out of order for the committee to report or for anybody to suggest as an amendment any provision changing existing law or providing for an appropriation without previous authority of law.

That rule, which has saved the Government so many millions of dollars, was contained in Rule XXI of the Rules of the Sixty-first Congress in this language:

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order.

That was the result of the wisdom and experience of both parties for more than a century. Our Democratic friends now propose to readopt that language, with the following addition:

Except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

That addition, known as the Holman amendment, has been tried heretofore and found to work so badly that it was eliminated and rejected in a Democratic House presided over by Speaker Carlisle. Now you propose to reenact it.

It has been found to be absolutely essential to good and economical government that appropriation bills shall be stripped of all provisions except appropriations, and that the Appropriations Committee shall be stripped of all power except the power to report appropriations. This amendment to the rules will place that committee in charge of pretty near all the legislation of this House. It will enable appropriations to be made without previous authority of law for their expenditure, and it will permit existing law to be changed upon appropriation bills.

It is urged that appropriation bills will be subject only to such amendments as are germane. Well, in these great appropriation bills, containing, some of them, a hundred different subjects, almost anything is germane that anybody may choose to offer. That is to say, an amendment upon almost any subject may be so skillfully drawn as to be germane to a general appropriation bill.

Let me give you a few illustrations of the operation of this Holman amendment when it was heretofore in force.

Speaker Kerr, of Indiana, a Democratic Speaker, presiding over a Democratic House, ruled that a proposition to transfer the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Department of the Interior to the War Department was germane to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. William L. Wilson, that distinguished Democrat from West Virginia, presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, ruled that a proposition to transfer the Pension Office from the Interior Department to the War Department was germane to a general appropriation bill.

On another occasion—and I wish particularly to call attention to this—when in the Post Office appropriation bill an item was reached appropriating $9,500,000 for the transportation of the mails, an amendment was offered reducing it to $9,400,000, but adding "of which sum $150,000 may be used by the Postmaster General to maintain and secure from railroads necessary and special facilities for the postal service." Here is an illustration of economy which may be expected under the operation of this Holman amendment. There was upon the face of the amendment a reduction of $10,000 in the amount of the appropriation. Speaker Carlisle ruled that the amendment was germane and was in order, although there was no previous authority for the expenditure of the $150,000. Under that amendment, adopted by a Democratic Congress, under the operation of the Holman rule, there was fastened upon this Government a system of mail subsidies to certain railroads which we did not get rid of for nearly thirty years, and under the operation of it two or three railroad companies drew out of the Federal Treasury nearly five millions of dollars, not one cent of which they ever could have secured except for the operation of the so-called Holman amendment, and for not one cent of which did the Government or the people ever derive the slightest benefit.

The authority of law for the railroad mail subsidy having thus been secured, appropriations for subsequent years could be made without any reduction in the total appropriation. The amount of the mail subsidy was simply added to what would otherwise have been the total of the general appropriation, and the Government was out of pocket just that much money. This Holman rule can be made to operate in that way in a thousand different directions when it has been adopted as one of the rules of the present House. That is the way it will work, and yet it has been heralded to the four corners of the country as a great instrumentality in bringing about the economies which our Democratic brethren say they are about to enforce.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the dismissal of certain employees whose salaries aggregate about $182,000. Their places, we are told, are to be left vacant. No resolution or bill has been offered abolishing those places. They are still authorized by law, but the Republicans who held them have been or will be promptly dismissed. The offices, however, remain, and it is a safe prediction that in less than 90 days from this date every one of them will be filled by a lusty Democratic political worker. So much for the insincerity of that pretended economy.

This Holman rule, skillfully worked, can be made to cover almost any kind of extravagance and permit appropriations for a thousand objects for which there is now no authority of law and which could not now be made without the previous enactment of a separate measure authorizing such expenditure. Its operation will not be in the interest of economy at all. Any amendment reducing an appropriation is now and always has been in order without any Holman rule. The object of it is to accomplish some other purpose upon an appropriation bill. It is the height of insincerity to hold out to the public that its adoption is in the interest of economy. Adopt it, and after less than one year of its operation the people of this country may well exclaim, "Oh, economy, what wrongs have been done in thy name." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The object and the effect of this Holman rule will be to lessen the importance of the other committees and vastly enlarge the importance of the Appropriations Committee by putting all kinds of general legislation within its authority. "Upon the report of the committee" any germane amendment is to be in order. What committee? Why, the Appropriations Committee. It may report as an amendment a matter that might properly come from the Judiciary Committee, or the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or any other of the great committees, and yet it will be in order upon a general appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee appropriates nearly a billion of dollars every year. This power of appropriation gives it a wonderful command in the House. Add to that the power of general legislation, and instead of bowing to the Speaker for favors everybody will have to kow tow to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. With the power to give or withhold appropriations used as a big stick Members may be clubbed into the support of any matter of general legislation which that committee may choose to report.

In the last House, the Republicans being in control, the Speaker appointed 11 Republicans upon that committee. In this Congress, the Democrats being in control, propose to take 14 places on that committee.

Upon the whole, so far as I have had time to read this set of rules which is to be forced upon us without the power of even offering an amendment, I wish to be perfectly frank and candid and say that, with the exception of this Holman amendment and one or two other changes, it is not a bad set of rules. It is practically a reenactment of the same rules which we adopted in the recent Republican House. Such changes as have been made in this set of Democratic rules have been either unnecessary or unwise. As a sample of the unnecessary I point to Rule X. In its new form it reads there, "shall be elected by the House" the standing committees. The old rule provided that they were to be appointed by the Speaker "unless otherwise authorized by the House." It was not necessary to change that rule. It has always been permissible under Republican rules for the House to make the committee assignments if a majority so desired. All you had to do was to adopt a motion to that effect. Many years ago, when committee places were assigned otherwise than by the Speaker, the result was unsatisfactory. Whether it will work better now remains to be seen. Whether a better adjustment of committee assignments can be made by a Democratic caucus than by yourself, Mr. Speaker CLARK, with your long service, your familiarity with the work required of the respective committees, and of the qualifications of Members for such work, may well be doubted. Personally, I should be more than willing to leave the selection in your hands.

One of the first results of the new plan appears to be that in order to effect a sort of compromise and satisfy the Democratic aspirants it has been found necessary to make 35 new committee places; and it has been found necessary to so far depart from the "square-deal" principle that you allow only one of those 35 places to be filled by a Republican. I am not unwilling that you shall try the experiment of having the committees appointed otherwise than by the Speaker, although I believe that the making of the appointments by him would tend to wiser selection and better results in legislation. There are, however, a good many gentlemen upon this floor who not only believe that the Speaker ought not to have the power of appointment, but they also believe that these appointments ought not to be determined in a party caucus. They think that there ought to be appointed or elected by the House a committee on committees, to consist of Members of both parties, the majority party, of course, having a majority of the committee. Such a

committee, after meeting in conference, these gentlemen think, would bring about the most satisfactory results of all. But you do not give them a chance to offer such an amendment and have it voted upon.

I heard a Democratic Member of this House, when discussing the Republican rules, say:

> Give these Representatives their rights upon this floor. Let every man have the privilege to rise in his place to present what he chooses for the consideration of this House, and then let that matter be disposed of by a free and untrammeled expression of the representatives of the people.

That same honorable gentleman is one of the men assigned for duty on the Ways and Means Committee, delegated to prepare and submit to the Democratic caucus the assignments to places on all the other committees. That same gentleman has just voted for the previous question, which deprived us of an opportunity for "a free and untrammeled expression" or any expression at all upon the adoption of the special rule under which we are now proceeding, which rule requires us to vote for or against the adoption of this body of 43 rules without the poor privilege of any Member to rise in his place and present even the smallest amendment, or any amendment whatever, "to be disposed of by a free and untrammeled expression of the representatives of the people."

The platform adopted by the Democratic national convention at Denver demanded a change in the rules and regulations of this House. Through the press, by means of campaign literature, and upon the stump, the people were led to believe that there was something terribly wrong about the rules of this House, which made it impossible for every Member to get every bill passed that he or his people wanted. They were led to believe that if your party got in power you would bring about some great reforms. Now, what do you propose to do? Why, simply to reenact the Republican rules, with a few unwise changes, the worst of which is the readoption of the Holman amendment. Indeed, if that were omitted, and you had allowed opportunity for discussion and amendment, I should not be complaining. I do not now so much complain of what you propose to do as of the manner in which you are doing it. You have held out to the people through all these years that Republican rules and Republican majorities were arbitrary and despotic, that free debate was not allowed, and that Members were given no freedom of action. Now let us make a little comparison. The so-called Reed rules wrought only about four important changes in the rules as they had previously existed.

The revision made at that time was first considered by the Committee on Rules. It was then submitted to the House with two reports from that committee, a majority report and a minority report, each of which discussed minutely each proposed change, and the two reports together gave every argument that could possibly be made either for or against the changes. Then the proposed new rules were read in the House and were debated for three days. They were then read again, paragraph by paragraph, under the five-minute rule, and any Member on either side of the House who desired to offer an amendment had an opportunity to do so. It was only at the end of the third day that the final vote was taken. What have you done? You have brought in a set of 43 rules. They have not even been read from the Clerk's desk. This side is allowed two hours to discuss them. No one on either side is permitted to offer or will have an opportunity to vote upon any amendment. It is no answer to say that in other cases in matters of legislation Republican majorities may have been arbitrary and drastic. You have condemned those things. You have preached to the people about them. You have told what you would do when you got in power. I wish merely to expose the insincerity of your promises and to contrast them with this present performance. I wish merely to call the attention of the country to the fact that in the matter of stifling debate, in the matter of depriving the people's representatives of an opportunity to present by way of amendment matters in which they or their constituents may be interested, in short, in all those things of which you have heretofore so loudly complained you have within the first 24 hours after your accession to power made the Democratic little finger thicker than the Republican thigh ever was. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Would the gentleman from Illinois prefer to go on with another speech on his side now?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that we have occupied nearly twice as much time as the gentleman has.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have never agreed to the political heresy of the poet that—

> For forms of government let fools contest;
> That which is best administered is best.

but I have been impressed with the fact that it contains something of truth by the criticisms offered here to-day to the rules proposed by the majority.

The American people are a practical people, and as a practical people they will judge this side of the House as they have judged that side of the House—not by the intricacies of parliamentary law, but by the results that follow from the administration of the power given to us as a party.

This is still a country that is governed by and through parties. The day may come when the speech of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] may be logical and proper, but that day has not yet come.

Having then party government, it is to my mind entirely logical and proper that the party here charged with responsibility should present as a party the rules that it considers necessary to enable it to properly discharge that responsibility. And equally should the minority party present its proposition touching procedure. In presenting its rules, the majority must pay proper heed to the rights of the minority and to the rights of the individual Member, and if it fails to do so, to that extent it abuses its power and is censurable. It is the province of the minority to make clear such abuse by criticism and to prevent it, if possible, by offering a substitute proposition remedying such evils. But that the majority in assuming control is properly subject to criticism in not affording each Member of the House opportunity to express his individual views and to offer individual amendments embodying them I do not admit.

I have never stood in this House as the advocate of extreme rule on the part of the majority. I believe civilization is measured by the rights that are secured to a minority, no matter how small. But I believe that in a legislative body like this, when we of the majority present to you of the minority the opportunity to present a code of rules that you consider should be adopted as against ours, we have done all that can be asked of us in fairness.

Much is said about this being the adoption of a new code of rules, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] undertakes to draw a fanciful distinction, so far as the rights of the minority are concerned, between Congresses that represent a change of party control from the prior Congress and those that do not—a distinction that I am quite sure exists only in the gentleman's mind. We present here not an entirely new set of rules, but we present a set of rules that undertakes in two major particulars to change the rules that have been known as Republican rules, and which until recently have controlled the House. One change has been in taking away from the Speaker the power of appointing committees. Another rule, and to my mind a very much more far-reaching rule, is that which takes away from committees the power to stifle legislation. The complaints that we have had, as I have pointed out heretofore, have not been so much as to the personnel of committees as they have been to the power of committees, and you do not change personnel necessarily, though you do sometimes, by changing method of selection, but you do afford a great relief by changing the power of committees. We have provided here a rule whereby a committee may be discharged from the consideration of legislation when, in the opinion of the House, it is not considering that legislation in good faith or desirous of reporting it.

Personally, I should have liked a rule not only discharging committees but one enabling the majority using it to make preferential the bill taken from the committee. I embodied my view in the proposed rule introduced by me in the last Congress and which served as a basis for the rule now offered. It is believed by many that this rule is all that is necessary, and until experience shall prove to the contrary, I am willing to abide by it. If this rule works as it is intended, we will have given real liberty to the House. If it does not work as intended, I for one shall favor an enlargement of it so that it will work that way.

Much criticism has been made of the Holman amendment because it gives to the House the power to legislate on appropriation bills. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] that when the House surrendered its power, under proper circumstances, to put legislation upon appropriation bills, it surrendered what has been the greatest instrument in favor of the liberties of the English-speaking people since the time that parliamentary government was established. It was in England that the House of Commons, by putting conditions upon the supply bills of the King, gained for

the people their greatest liberties and rights; and a Democratic Congress, confronted with a Republican President, confronted with the other branch of the National Legislature in control of the opposite party, can well afford to give to itself such power as will enable it to enforce those demands which it believes to be in the interest of the people, whose mandate it so recently bears. [Applause.] It may be that a party having control of every branch of the Government need not have this rule; but speaking for myself, I am glad that the majority of this House will be in a position to make its voice actually felt by those other branches whose cooperation is essential to legislation in this Government.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. CULLOP. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if the criticism made on the adoption of these rules by the opposite side of the House is not all remedied in the opportunity they have under the rule to offer a substitute to liberalize or amend the rules as they may desire?

Mr. SHERLEY. As I have said, in my judgment ample right is given to the minority in that particular.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I desire to ask whether I correctly infer from what the gentleman said that if his party had control of all branches of the Government, he would not be in favor of the so-called Holman amendment?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is drawing an inference of his own; but this I do say to him, that the fact that we have not such control is one of the warrants for the rule. If that be treason, the gentleman is welcome to make the most of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OLMSTED. It is the same thing that I inferred.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, we have had some suggestions made here as to amendments, though none of the seriously proposed amendments are embodied in the substitute offered by the minority leader, Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] complains bitterly of the condition in which he finds himself, and he suggests various rules that he thinks would improve the present proposed rules. He suggests that instead of the one master we were supposed to have when the Speaker appointed the committees we should have 15 masters, arranged by geography. If I am to have a master at all, I would rather have 1 than 15, because I could at least place responsibility. The Democrats, in arranging that the committees should not be appointed by the Speaker, did not give into the hands of 15 men the power to name those committees. They have used a committee in the preliminary arrangement of proposed committee membership in this House, but these rules provide that actual membership on committees shall be determined by the House itself. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I was surprised that the gentleman from Nebraska, who would have us view him as the embodiment of all progress and reform, is so willing to create 15 masters from whose decision there would be no appeal. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He also criticized the rules of the House because we did not provide for open meetings of all committees. In my judgment no man who has ever served upon any great committee of this House but knows that the enforcement of such a rule would benefit no one, but would result in great delay and great hindrance of the public business. Such a rule is predicated on the idea that Members of Congress are not honest men, and that unless the flood light of publicity is always turned upon every movement of theirs they will be guilty of wrongdoing.

I am not willing to admit such a contention as to myself, and I am not willing to believe it of my colleagues. I do not believe that the membership of this House is composed of cowards, and I do not believe that the people's cause has suffered because of holding our committee meetings as we have held them.

The trouble has been not in the discussion of committee members among themselves, but it has been the fact that heretofore there has been no way for the majority of the House to compel a committee to report. Such a method was imperative for the liberty of this House, and I believe we have provided for it; and having provided for it, we have answered all the just criticisms that could be brought against the rules.

In the past eight years I have not indulged in undue criticism; I have not undertaken to criticise the majority simply because they were the majority. I have always put to the test every rule—was it fair to the minority and to the majority?—without reference to which side I happened to be on. I believe that that is the only test, and I am willing here in my place to-day to say that the proposed rules of the House give at present ample liberty to the Members, and I believe that it depends largely upon the membership as to how far they will have freedom. Many restrictions have been placed upon membership here because men have not been willing to restrain themselves. If every Member will undertake to enforce these rules in the true spirit of their enactment, we will not have any just cause, in my judgment, to complain.

Now, something has been said about the failure to provide a way to discharge the Committee on Rules. There is some force in the criticism, but bear in mind that the Committee on Rules does not have referred to it propositions of legislation. They only have referred to it questions relating to procedure. Now, if you have actually and effectively provided a method whereby legislation can be brought forward before the House, any further question of procedure becomes of very much less importance. It is not near so important that the Committee on Rules should be subject to a motion to discharge as it is that the various legislative committees should be so subject.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman state how many resolutions were referred to the Rules Committee at the last Congress?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not.

Mr. MILLER. Was there not over a thousand?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know and I do not think it is material. I will tell the gentleman why I do not think it is material. I do not suppose there were anything like a thousand; but if there were a thousand it was because it was only through the agency of the Committee on Rules that you could legislate at times. But if we have remedied the major complaint we do not need to be bothered by a secondary remedy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We can go directly to the matter.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a second question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Irrespective of the number of resolutions referred to that committee in the last Congress, is it not true that at least nine-tenths of the resolutions referred to that committee related to investigations and were entirely distinct from matters of procedure?

Mr. SHERLEY. I should say not; but under the rules of the House there were many resolutions relating to departments, most of them resolutions of inquiry, privileged under the rules.

Mr. Speaker, it has been impossible in the time that was at my disposal to deal exhaustively with a subject as comprehensive and intricate as that of the rules, but I have endeavored in candor and fairness to present the major propositions here involved. Speaking for myself, and, as I believe, voicing the opinion of my party colleagues, I say that we have in good faith presented a code of rules that has proper regard for the rights of the two major parties and of the individual Members, and if defects in these rules become apparent in the actual test of experience under them, the majority will gladly and sincerely provide the changes necessary to accomplish this end. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is much that I can add to what has already been said about these rules. In my judgment some very valuable additions have been made to the rules that have been adopted by former Congresses. Especially this is so, I think, with reference to the rule which we have changed regarding the discharge of committees. Under that rule, if it works out the way we believe it will, there will be an opportunity for Members to get bills on the calendar which the country demands, and when those bills are put upon the calendars it then will be an easy matter, if the bill be demanded by the country, to have it taken up for consideration. Many rules which Members sometimes use or might use for the purpose of stifling legislation ought not to be used when the people demand certain legislation against which those rules might apply. I believe that with the adoption of these rules, and as one member of the Committee on Rules I desire to say——

Mr. MANN. There is no Committee on Rules.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Well, there will be; and when that committee is appointed, if I am a member, I desire to say that I believe a majority of the members of that committee will be willing at all times to consider any resolution that is for the good government of this House. I will say this, that the people have spoken, and they have demanded that certain legislation shall be put in effect by this Congress, and I believe that these rules which you are asked to adopt will be such as will

enable this side of the House to put into operation the laws that the people have demanded for their relief.

I think the rule, which was an old rule of the Fifty-third Congress, that will enable an amendment to be placed upon an appropriation bill when it retrenches expenditures, if the amendment be germane to the subject, making that amendment in order, is a very important rule to the House of Representatives, as it will enable the Members whenever it is necessary to cut down expenses. We have seen the time in the last Congress when a recommendation had been made to do away with a certain item in a bill, and because that item was authorized by law, although it was a ruthless expense on the Government, it was impossible to get the item out of the appropriation bill, because it sometimes affected the districts of the individual Members and was perhaps demanded by some particular part of the country. Under this rule no man can make a point of order upon that sort of an amendment to an appropriation bill.

It has also been provided by these rules that any Member who has a bill upon the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, if it is once objected to, may have an opportunity to again place that bill upon the calendar and at some future time to ask its consideration. It occurs to me that this is but fair and right to Members who desire to pass bills by unanimous consent.

The rule providing the way bills affecting the revenue shall be considered in this House is also an important one. It seems to be the settled policy of the majority party of this House to revise the tariff by amending one schedule at a time. This way of revising the tariff was advocated a good many years ago by a Representative from the State of Illinois, Hon. William M. Springer.

President Taft became a convert to this Democratic form of revision after the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and there was published in the Republican campaign textbook of 1910 a letter written by the President to Hon. Duncan E. McKinlay, of California, in which he uses the following language in reference to the passage of bills through Congress revising the tariff by schedule and the kind of rule that should be adopted. He says:

> Of course, this will be impracticable unless Congress itself shall adopt the parliamentary rule, as I hope it will, that a bill to amend one schedule of the tariff may not be subject to a motion to amend by adding changes in other schedules.

It occurs to me that the Members on the other side of this House have little cause of complaint of such a rule being passed at this time. One of the greatest reforms of the rules of the Sixty-first Congress was made when the Democrats combined with a minority of the Republicans and elected a Committee on Rules and provided that the Speaker should not be a member of that committee.

These rules which are now before the House for action go further, and provide that all standing committees of the House, together with the chairman, shall be elected by the Members of the House, thus taking away from the Speaker the power to form these committees with any reference to control legislation, and putting in the hands of the membership of this House the control of its committees and say what Members shall constitute those committees. The country has demanded that these reforms should be made in the rules, and the Democratic Party, in keeping faith with the people, have endeavored to carry out their will. These rules I have no doubt will permit the will of the people to be carried out if it is so desired by the membership of this House. It should be the object of a legislative body as constituted by representatives of the people to endeavor to enact such legislation as is demanded by a majority as near as possible. Relief from excessive taxation and an economical administration of the affairs of this Government have been demanded, and it is the duty of this House to carry out this mandate. As Representatives we would be recreant to our duty if we failed to do these things. The Democratic Party of this House proposes to give fair discussion to all matters proposed, but they do not intend that filibustering for the purpose of defeating legislation that a majority of the people have demanded shall be permitted. There have been other changes in these rules which, in our judgment, we believe will work well. I have every reason to believe that if any amendments are necessary for the proper regulation and to secure the orderly procedure in this House that the rules will be so amended as to carry out the wishes of a majority of the Members and of the country. It should be the duty of the Committee on Rules to give free and fair hearing to all matter proposed. The Rules Committee will not be a graveyard where propositions for the good government of the House can be laid away. This side of the House has offered to the minority an opportunity to propose a substitute for these rules and an opportunity to put every Member on record as to his vote on these two propositions as now proposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the proposed rules are, in the main, an improvement over the rules of the Sixty-first Congress, but they fall far short of what should be embodied in the rules governing this body. For a number of years there has been upon this side of the House a little group of Republicans called "insurgents," who have been fighting for freedom in this House—freedom of debate, freedom of amendment—and during those many contests they have had almost the unanimous support of the Democratic minority. What is the situation before us to-day? You have adopted a resolution as drastic in effect, as subversive of freedom in this House as any resolution that has ever been adopted in the House of Representatives. Were you sincere two years ago when you protested against this very kind of a proceeding? If you were, are you sincere this afternoon when you stand for the same kind of a proceeding? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] said, in the first place, that a distinction was made with reference to this resolution because it was a party measure, and, later, he said that a distinction should be made because it was a caucus measure. All of the old Members will recall that two years ago during the special session the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] stood in this aisle beside my desk and condemned caucus rule, condemned the action of the Republican majority in preventing amendments upon the tariff bill, and do you remember how he pictured so graphically the Members going into a caucus and having their hands manacled? I would like to have the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] hold up his hands this afternoon for inspection of this House, and tell us how he likes being manacled. If we had an opportunity to offer some amendments, they would be adopted by this House, and the reason that you have denied the opportunity for amendment is that you do not dare trust your own majority to stand by these rules when improvements may be offered to them from this side.

I want to speak of one or two such amendments. You all remember during the last session of Congress calendar Wednesday was entirely done away with through a defect of the rule; that a committee secured the consideration of a bill upon calendar Wednesday and held the floor during the balance of that session until the consideration of that bill was completed——

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LENROOT. I will when I finish this sentence. The gentleman from Pennsylvania secured consideration of the judicial codification bill, and every Wednesday during that session was taken up by that bill when many more important measures remained upon the calendar and failed for want of action.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Could not the House on calendar Wednesday have ended that by a majority vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois has 35 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 37 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON].

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of replying to my friend from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. I want to tell him why it was impossible to pass a motion to lay aside the codification bill, or Moon bill, as it was called. It was because there were so many men here who knew that there were other bills which would come up on calendar Wednesday that would embarrass them to vote upon them, and they did not want to face those embarrassing situations.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MADISON. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not that simply another way of saying that the majority preferred the Moon bill to something else?

Mr. MADISON. No; it is not. If this rule remains as it is proposed to have it, then, as in the past, calendar Wednesday can and will be used for the purpose of blocking legislation and affording a refuge for men who do not care to face questions that ought to come up before this House for consideration. [Applause.] I deplore the fact, as one of the few men who stood here on this side during the recent Congress for the liberation of this House, that my friends on the other side, who have now come into possession of this House, and who have the opportunity to completely revise and reform its rules, have not improved their opportunity and have not risen to the high

standard that the country expected of them in the system of rules they now propose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been agreeably surprised by hearing so little of criticism from gentlemen on the other side of the aisle of the rules that are presented. It is exceedingly gratifying to find it so, and I am constrained to believe that it may be possible, judging from the lack of criticism which has come from that side of the aisle, that the reading of the rules as presented may have been another of those disappointments that have been so frequently coming to that side of the aisle recently growing out of the fact that the Democratic Party was showing itself able to do the business of the country. It is very gratifying, Mr. Speaker, for a different reason, and that is that there is not a suggestion in such criticisms that have been offered that there is in the code of rules proposed here a single proposition unfair to the minority, whether it be the political minority or the legislative minority of this House. I assume, therefore, that the lack of criticism in that respect must indicate that they have found in these rules nothing that is unfair to the minority as a minority. It is true there has been a suggestion on the floor that there was a certain unfairness in the enlargement of committees or rather in the manner in which that enlargement was to be made, but that criticism does not go to the rules themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. In the early part of the debate the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] made an inquiry, with regard to Rule VI, page 28, as to business on the Private Calendar, and he was informed that later in the debate the matter would be discussed. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the new rule, which seems to me to be so drafted that it would not be possible, if experience of the future shall be that of the past, to reach private legislation or legislation on the Private Calendar other than legislation coming from the Committees on Claims and War Claims, and from the Committee on Military Affairs touching the removal of charges of desertion. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the Committee on Public Lands, the Committees on Military Affairs and on Naval Affairs are committees reporting a large amount of legislation that goes on the Private Calendar. In the 14 years I have been in the House there never has been a time when that class of legislation could be reached under this rule, for there never has been a time when the private bills on the Private Calendar from these other committees have all been disposed of.

Mr. GARRETT. I think the gentleman is mistaken about the bills from the other calendars not being disposed of. The effect of this rule, I will say to the gentleman, is this: That it gives to this character of business coming from those two committees the same privilege that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has heretofore had, and with that character of privilege there will be such an expedition of that business that it will be easy to reach the claims to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MONDELL. If my memory serves me right, and I have made some inquiries, in the last seven Congresses the legislation on the Private Calendar from these preferred committees has never all been disposed of, and therefore other legislation coming from the Public Lands Committee, from the Military and Naval Committees, could not have been reached under this form of rule.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty has been that this business coming from these two committees has been permitted to accumulate on the calendars in such quantities that it was not possible to deal with it in the limited time allowed under the rule to these committees. There has not been a day during the entire session of Congress, at times, that these committees have had a chance, because they have not the privilege. They have the privilege now and can deal with the business. I think the gentleman will not find practical difficulty about that; but, if that should be, it is a minor detail, which can be, of course, corrected.

Mr. DALZELL. I think there is a much more serious criticism to be made than that made by the gentleman from Wyoming. Under all the rules that have existed heretofore, both Democratic and Republican, Friday has been set apart for private business. In other words, to get rid of private business you would have to have an affirmative vote of the House. Now, in this code of rules you have omitted that rule, and you have provided, on the other hand, that private business should be entertained when you take affirmative action, when you make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of private business.

In other words, under the rule as it existed up to this time, Friday is the day set aside for private bills automatically, unless dispensed with. Under your rule you can not have a private-bill day unless you have affirmative action on the part of the House. Suppose the House resolves to go into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar and pass a number of bills, say, 10, 12, or 15, and reports to the House, and does not order the previous question, when will those bills come up again, or will they ever come up?

Mr. GARRETT. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he asks if the committee reports to the House and does not order the previous question, when would those bills come up again? Whenever the House chose to order the previous question. That is to say, when it would be in order to move the previous question.

Mr. DALZELL. They would not come up at any time devoted to other business by the rule. Under our rules now those bills would come up again on the next calendar day.

Mr. GARRETT. That does not change the rule in that respect in any way.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly it does.

Mr. GARRETT. It does this: It places those claims in precisely the same condition that the invalid-pension claims have been placed in heretofore.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman misunderstands me. He is talking about another matter. I say that under the rules that existed up to this time, in both Democratic and Republican Congresses, Friday was private-bill day and you could not get rid of it except by vote of the House. Now, you have not a private-bill day.

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; we have.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. The same rule that we had before—the special order.

Mr. GARRETT. Precisely the same rule as the special order carried.

Mr. DALZELL. What rule?

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think I have answered him. The language in regard to invalid pensions is precisely the language of the standing order, and the language in regard to the war claims and claims is precisely the language of the standing order, except it gives them the privileged character that invalid pensions has had heretofore.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to know where in your code of rules you establish a private-bill day.

Mr. GARRETT. In that section——

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I beg to congratulate the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House on the liberality of the resolution under which we are considering this code. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

To be sure, you do not throw the code open to amendment, and you do not permit it to be read, but you to provide that it shall be introduced and that it shall be voted upon. Oh, gentlemen, why do you not give an opportunity for amendment? I have not heard a single argument advanced as to why this code should not be open to amendment which would not be equally sound if it were brought forward as a reason to show that no bill of any sort should be open to amendment.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] says: "Oh, it is because this code includes every rule which the people have asked for." How does he know? I do not see anything in these rules about a committee on committees, although I know of my personal knowledge that Members on your side of the House are pledged to their constituencies to vote for a committee on committees.

I can tell you why you gentlemen do not want this bill amended. It is because your solidarity would be destroyed the moment you had to go on a record vote on that question of a committee on committees. I have never spoken on the floor of this House in behalf of that particular provision in the rules, but I know that you gentlemen do not wish to meet that question, and you are in the same position which you have accused

us of being in so often. You do not dare to trust yourselves. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, this is as drastic a rule as the old rules that used to be brought in here. * * * I have taken a good part, first and last, in general debate in this House, but every time I do so it is with increased reluctance, because I have come to the conclusion that general debate very rarely changes the situation on a bill. * * * I had rather have two hours' debate, section by section, on this bill, or any other important bill, under the five-minute rule, with the privilege of offering amendments, than have eight hours of general debate. * * *

I do not know how long I shall be here, but as long as I am here I intend to fight for the right to amend every section of every great bill which comes into this House, and I do not care a straw whether the Democrats control the House or the Republicans.

I am going to maintain that proposition as far as I am individually concerned.

The last time those words were spoken in this House I find in the RECORD these words:

Applause on the Democratic side.

But not one handclap do I hear at the present moment. [Laughter on the Republican side.] For the benefit of those of you who were not in the last Congress I inform you that I am reading from the eloquent speech made by the present Speaker of the House, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Oh, gentlemen, indeed the Speaker is no longer a czar when, after the terrific battle which he promised upon these occasions, he can not command a single vote on his own side! [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1909, when there was a bitter controversy over the rules, I stated that if certain amendments then proposed by me were adopted the rules would be perfectly satisfactory to me. At that time I proposed amendments to eliminate what I considered to be the glaring abuses in the procedure of the House. After an exhaustive and careful investigation it was apparent to me that the abuses in the House were not due to the rules so much as to the abuse of power in their application and enforcement.

One of the amendments which I proposed provided for the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. The second provided that business in order on calendar Wednesday should not be set aside excepting by a two-thirds vote. The third provided that the right to recommit after the previous question had been ordered should be retained, and that the minority, or those in opposition to the bill, should have a preferential right to recognition in making that motion. The fourth provision was that the Committee on Rules should not report any rule which would deprive the minority or opposition of the right to move to recommit after the previous question had been ordered, or permit the setting aside of business in order on calendar Wednesday by less than a two-thirds vote.

Those amendments I then believed corrected every abuse in the procedure of the House, and the experience of the last two years has fully and completely demonstrated the accuracy of my contention.

Since then two important changes have been made in the rules. One was the elimination of the Speaker from the Committee on Rules and providing for its election by the House and the other was the so-called Motion to Discharge Calendar.

I favored the latter change, because I believed it would silence all criticism of committee designations and remove the cause of the charges that the committees of the House were packed for one or another purpose. I believed then as now that if an orderly method were provided by which bills might be taken from various committees upon the demand of a majority of the House it made no difference who appointed the committees so long as the House had complete control over its committees and opportunity to record its will in an orderly way.

These proposed rules, Mr. Speaker, retain all of the amendments proposed by me on March 15, 1909. I take it that now that the heat and passion have died out and the differences which grew up from that controversy have passed away, everybody will be willing to admit the accuracy of the statement I made at that time, that those amendments, known as the "Fitzgerald amendments," did effect useful, important, and drastic reforms in the procedure of the House, beneficial to the Members, helpful to legislation, and so satisfactory in their operation that no suggestion will be made in the near future to abandon them. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one great satisfaction derived by me from this discussion is that no one has suggested that a single one of the reforms resulting from the "Fitzgerald amendments" be repudiated or that any of the amendments be changed in a fundamental respect.

Mr. Speaker, the rules now proposed dispose of the one other important matter regarding the rules about which there has been any controversy since March, 1909. That is the method of the selection of the committees by the House. I do not favor, and never have favored, the election of the committees. I am frank to say that, in my judgment, the power should be concentrated in the Speaker and the responsibility placed in him. I believe there should be no doubt as to the responsibility for the make-up of the committees.

But the Democrats in this House had a fair, open, and free discussion of that question in caucus. They determined otherwise than I believe most wise. As one who is a stanch advocate of party government, and I believe that the success and permanence of our institutions depends upon strong party government, I am perfectly willing to acquiesce in the determination of a majority of my party upon every question that does not involve such matters of principle upon which I could not conscientiously surrender my convictions to act in concert with others. This is not such a question. And so I am supporting the proposed rules with this change, providing for the election of the committees by the House, and taking the power to appoint them away from the Speaker.

These rules, however, go further. They provide that the chairman of the various committees shall be elected, so as to do away with the criticism that the Speaker's instruments or lieutenants are at the head of the committees having charge of the business upon the floor, to the injury of the rights of Members of the House. The provision is logical and demanded by the other change.

The rules contain another important provision. They provide that bills affecting the revenue shall not be open to amendments other than those germane to the subject matter contained in the bill. I suppose nobody upon the other side of the House will object to that change, since a Republican President has taken up and advocated the old Democratic proposition, first advanced by Mr. Springer, of Illinois, that the tariff should be revised by special bills affecting single schedules rather than in a general bill affecting all schedules of the tariff.

Mr. Speaker, the criticism indulged in by that side of the House has not been against the proposed rules, but it has been because opportunity has not been given Members upon that side to offer amendments to the rules. Personally, I should be willing to permit anyone to offer any amendment to any provision in the rules. I have always believed that any intelligent discussion of them would prevent very material changes. But no fundamental or important proposition has been suggested from that side of the House which should be incorporated in these rules; no really important change has been suggested, either to facilitate business or to protect individual Members; so that after all the criticism is merely of the form of procedure rather than the statement of a substantial grievance. The minority is given the right to propose and have voted upon, a code of rules in the form it would adopt if it were in the majority. It should have such opportunity. It is a privilege of much importance, and the order under which the House is proceeding gives such privilege. If not availed of, it will be because no really important change can be suggested.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON] regretted that we have not risen to the opportunity to strike the shackles from the Members of the House now that the opportunity is here. And yet the only amendment or proposition that he suggests should be adopted is one that would put a more powerful weapon in the hands of the majority than it ever has had in the past. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He wishes to give to this side of the House the right in Committee of the Whole on Calendar Wednesdays to close debate, to throttle the minority, and compel them to accept the good Democratic legislation which shall be on the calendars during this Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It gives me the greatest pleasure to learn that there are a number of gentlemen on that side of the House so convinced that this side intends to legislate for the benefit of the entire people that they are begging us to enact drastic rules to force such legislation down their throats and compel them to accept it even against their will. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] But the adoption of the proposed change would not be beneficial, but very harmful. Gentlemen either forget or do not know that one of the most important reasons for many of the proposed rules, as well as those which have been in force in the past, is to prevent the majority exercising its power in a drastic, tyrannical, and unjust manner. To adopt the suggestion of the gentleman from Kansas would be

to give the majority a power I should deplore if in the minority; and so I am unwilling to have it in the majority.

It is not true, as has been several times asserted, that the order under which the House is proceeding is the most drastic ever adopted by the House. Gentlemen on that side of the House known as insurgents joined the regulars and voted for a rule for the consideration of the postal savings bank bill which deprived the House of the right to appeal from the Speaker, whom they had denounced so viciously on so many previous occasions, merely because the bill happened to be one they favored. I have never been able to understand how the insurgent Republicans, after denouncing the Speaker of the House as a czar, as they had done so repeatedly, were willing to vote for a rule which would prevent even an insurgent Republican appealing from any decision which might be made by him during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, criticism has been made of the Holman rule, which is incorporated in the proposed rules. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] referred to the fact that under the operation of that rule provisions were inserted in an appropriation bill in 1879, if I be not mistaken, by which the entire Federal supervisory election law was repealed, and yet he failed to recall that the Federal supervisory election law was enacted and placed on the statute books in the very same way, by being incorporated in an appropriation bill on June 10, 1872. It was the necessity of the situation which compelled the Democrats to get rid of that infamous measure, and they adopted the same method as had been adopted in order to enact it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Few Democrats will be worried by such an argument against the reviving of the rule. How shall expenditures exceeding a thousand million dollars a year be curtailed unless some method be devised by which wasteful expenditures, when found, may be eliminated? Those familiar with the parliamentary history of our Government, and who have given consideration to the existing political conditions, realize the necessity of utilizing the appropriation bills as the vehicles in which imperative reforms must be carried.

The complaint that was made 30 years ago, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, was not so much as to the usefulness and the operation of the Holman rule, but because of the condition that existed in the House prior to 1885, and which does not exist at this time.

Prior to 1885 the jurisdiction over all the appropriation bills was centered in the Committee on Appropriations. Those bills were so manipulated that with the Holman rule in force other committees having general legislative jurisdiction were deprived of an opportunity to be heard in the House, because legislation beyond the scope and intention of the rules was continually incorporated in all the appropriation bills.

Conditions now are different. The Military Committee has charge of the Army appropriation bill, the Naval Committee has charge of the naval appropriation bill, the Post Office Committee has charge of the Post Office appropriation bill, the Indian Committee has charge of the Indian appropriation bill, the Foreign Affairs Committee has charge of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, the Agriculture Committee has charge of the Agriculture appropriation bill. These committees not only have control of the appropriations for those various services, but they have jurisdiction of the legislation for the departments which expend the money. They should be given an opportunity in this coming Congress to demonstrate to the country the sincerity of this side of the House to cut out all useless and wasteful expenditure of the public money, and in this way alone, considering the political complexion of other branches of the Government, can it be done. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, two years ago the Democratic Party and the insurgent or progressive Republicans stood for a change of the rules of this House. What was the change that we demanded? We demanded that the power of the Speaker to control the legislation of this House should be taken away from him. We recognized that as long as the Speaker of the House of Representatives had in his hands the power of recognition for private bills that each Member desired to put through, as long as he had the power to make up and absolutely control the Committee on Rules of this House, as long as he had the power to appoint the standing committees of this House, he had within his control as Speaker absolute power over the legislation of the American people. Against that power and against the exercise of it by the Speaker of the House of Representatives the Democratic Party made its protest. Against that power the progressive Republicans joined with us and made their protest. Now that was all there was in the fight. There was nothing else contemplated in the fight of two years ago, and to-day, in these rules that are presented by the Democratic Party for the action of this House, every pledge and every promise that was made has been carried out by the Committee on Rules. [Applause on Democratic side.] What more can you ask; what more can your constituency ask? The power to run this House is to-day placed in the hands of the Members of the House. You elect a Committee on Rules that by your votes under a privileged motion you can discharge if they drop the legislation that the majority of the House desires.

Mr. MANN. Where is that provision?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Committee on Rules will be elected, when the proper time comes, by the membership of this House. They then become the officers of this House. It has never been questioned that it is the privileged right of any Member of this House to rise and move to turn any officer of this House out of his place, and I say that the same power will exist as to every committee of this House when these rules are adopted, and we elect them from the floor of the House instead of having them appointed by the Speaker. So that I say, that when you adopt these rules the power to control legislation in the House of Representatives is absolutely placed in the majority of this House, whether it be a partisan majority or not.

I have heard some gentlemen complain to-day that the right of absolute amendment has not been given here; that we have given four hours for general debate, and only propose to allow one substitute to be offered. Why, if that objection comes from the gentlemen on that side of the House who stand behind the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and the position that he took two years ago, I have to say to them that two years ago when a real majority of this House desired to amend the rules they were not given the opportunity to offer a substitute. If it comes from the gentlemen who acted with us, the progressive or insurgent Republicans, I desire to call their attention to the fact that when we united to try and force an amendment of the rules two years ago, they recognized, and we recognized, that you could not amend a set of rules out on the floor of the House. And why? Because we did not propose, then, to bring the rules into the House for general amendment, recognizing that it required special attention to every word that you write in the rules and every paragraph that goes into the rules in order that business may be orderly conducted on the floor of the House; but they proposed, and we proposed, to elect a special Committee on Rules and give them the authority to revise the rules and report back to this House at the December session. So that every Republican who stood with us at that time recognized the impossibility of going into a general amendment of the rules on the floor. He recognized the necessity of having the changes of those rules carefully worked out by a committee.

Now, to-day we are going to do what you did not do two years ago or four years ago or six years ago, or since I have been a Member of this Congress. We are going to give you an opportunity absolutely to present to the House and to the country an entire change of rules from what we have proposed, to suit yourself. If you do not like the changes we have made in these rules, your leader can strike them out. He can present them to the House as he sees fit. He can have an absolutely fair vote and a roll call on his proposition, that we have been denied ever since I have been a Member of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have demonstrated to the country in the past two years and to-day that we wanted the representatives of the American people to control the legislation in this House. We have presented to you a set of rules by which the Speaker can no longer control the legislation of this House, where an opportunity will be given to any man that has a majority of this House behind him to write the law on the statute books that his constituency and the American people stand for. Can you ask for more than that? We do not say we will stop here. The Rules Committee is to be elected by this House. They are subject to be dethroned by this House. It is open to every Member of this House to go before them and present any proposition that he sees fit looking to a change of the rules. There is no man who has the right to assume to-day that that committee will not give him a fair hearing. There is no man who has the right to assume that that committee will not be responsive to the will of the majority of the representatives of the American people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment and congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and those behind him upon the resolution which he has presented providing for the rules of this House in this Congress. After all the cry which has resounded throughout the country for years, increasing in volume until it had affected a congressional election, after the people had been persuaded from one end of the land to the other that the old rules of the House were rules of tyranny and

not suitable for rules for a free people, the rules now proposed by the Democratic majority are substantially the rules of the last Republican House of Representatives.

There are 240 paragraphs in the rules as now proposed, and nearly all of these are identical in language with the rules which were in force while my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was the Speaker. Most of the actual changes which have been made relate to the committees.

It is proposed by these rules to abolish six of the committees of the House as they have existed for many years and to concentrate the power previously exercised by those committees in the other committees. We have had for many years a Committee on the Militia, which rendered important service and gave special study to the subjects relating to the National Guard. You propose to abolish that committee and concentrate its power in the already powerful Committee on Military Affairs.

You propose to abolish the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, which has existed for many years, and to concentrate its power in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

You propose to abolish the long-standing Committee on Pacific Railroads, which has rendered most important service in connection with Government-aided transcontinental railroads, and concentrate its power in the Committee on Railways and Canals.

With the same ruthless disregard of the manufacturing interests of the country, which leads you to oppose the American protective system, you propose to entirely abolish the Committee on Manufactures.

These changes are not in the interest of individual freedom in the House, but tend to the further concentration of power in the hands of the few. Although the committee rooms and the committee tables are now crowded with the present size of the large committees, you propose to increase the size of 15 of the leading committees of the House in order to provide additional places to satisfy the demands of your Democratic Members arising out of your new system of selecting committees through a party caucus. And in this connection, I wish to take a few moments in appealing to the Democratic side of the House to show some degree of fairness in dealing with the Republican minority as to committee assignments.

Every game must be played by fair rules, and even prize-fighters shake hands in advance and are barred from hitting below the belt. It is a rule in practice everywhere that a majority should in the preliminaries treat the minority fairly, and that has been the practice in the House, I believe, during the history of the Republic. You now propose to violate that practice.

You propose to increase the membership of 15 of the leading committees and take the increase for the majority. In the Fifty-third Congress, when the Democratic side of the House had a majority of 84, 20 more than it has in this House, although the total membership of the House was much less than it now is, you divided the great committees on the basis of 11 Democrats to 6 of the minority. With your great majority at that time you were still fair enough to give to the minority more than one-third. In this House you have a Democratic majority of 63. In the Sixtieth Congress, with a Republican majority of 58, we gave to you 7 Members to our 12 on most of these 15 committees.

In the last House, or the Sixty-first Congress, we had a majority of 47, only 16 less than you now have in this House, and we took 12 Members and gave you 7 on most of these leading committees, and on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors we took 12 and gave you 8.

You propose now to increase these 15 committees to a membership of 21 each and to take 14 and give to the Republicans only 7 on each committee. That is hitting below the belt.

Take the great Committee on Appropriations. In the Fifty-third Congress it stood 11 majority to 6 minority. That was a Democratic House. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, it stood 11 majority to 6 minority. In the Fifty-ninth Congress, with a Republican majority of 116, it stood 11 majority to 6 minority. With your majority now of 63 you propose to make it 14 Democrats to 7 Republicans.

Take the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, we took 8 places and gave to the minority 5. In the Republican Fifty-sixth Congress we took 10 places and gave to the minority 7. In the last Congress we took 12 places and gave you 7. You propose now to take 14 members and give us only 7.

Take the great Committee on Agriculture. In the Democratic Fifty-third Congress you took 11 members and gave the minority 6. In the Republican Fifty-fourth Congress, with over 130 majority, we took 11 members and gave you 7. In the last Congress we took 11 members and gave you 7. You propose now to take 14 and give us 7.

Take the important Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the Fifty-third Congress, with a Democratic majority of 84, you took 9 places and gave the minority 6. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, we took 9 places and gave to the minority 6. In the Fifty-sixth Congress, with a small Republican majority, we took 10 places and gave the minority 7. In the last Congress, with a Republican majority nearly as large as you now have, we took 12 places and gave you 7. You propose now to take 14 places and give us only 7.

Take the great Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. On each of those committees in the Democratic Fifty-third Congress, with a Democratic majority of 84, you took 9 and gave to the minority 6. In the Republican Fifty-sixth Congress we took 10 and gave to the minority 7. In the last Congress, with a Republican majority of 47, we took 12 places and gave to the Democrats 7.

In this Congress, with a Democratic majority of 63, you propose to take 14 places and give to the minority only 7.

Take the great Committee on Ways and Means. In the Fifty-third Congress, with a Democratic majority of 84, you took 11 places and gave to the minority 6. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, we took 11 places and gave to the minority 6. In the Fifty-sixth Congress, with a Republican majority, we took 10 places and gave to the minority 7. In the Sixtieth Congress, with a Republican majority of 58, we took 12 places and gave to the minority 7. In the last Congress, with a Republican majority of 47, we took 12 places and gave you 7. You now, with a Democratic majority of only 63, propose to take 14 places and give to us only 7.

Heretofore, when there has been an increase in the size of committees, that increase has usually been divided between the majority and the minority parties. You propose now to make an increase and to take the increase for yourself. I appeal to the fairness of the gentlemen on the Democratic side in the hope that you will deal fairly by the minority as to committees.

You propose to increase the membership of 15 of these leading committees to 21. Their membership is now from 17 to 20, most of them at present having a membership of 19. This increase in numbers will involve a change of the furniture of every room which is occupied by these committees. The rooms and tables are now so arranged that one member can sit at each end of the table and the others have seats along the sides, and it does not take any more room for 22 members than for 21.

You have a membership in this House of 227 and the minority has a membership of 164. If you observe the traditional spirit of fairness which has prevailed in the past, both on the Democratic and Republican sides when they have respectively been in a majority, you will be willing now to give to the minority 8 members on each of these committees to your 14.

By the rules you have proposed you have increased the membership of these 15 committees by adding 35 new members to them, and you propose to take for the majority 33 of these new places and give to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER], of the Socialist Party, one place and give to the Republican minority only one of the increased membership. You propose to take on these 15 committees 33 more places than we took when we were the majority, and give to us only one more place than we gave you when you were the minority.

You propose to abolish 6 committees which in the past have had a majority membership of 44 and a minority membership of 32. You propose to abolish, therefore, 32 minority committee places and 44 majority committee places, and add on other committees for the majority 33 new places and for the Republican minority only 1 new place. You propose to take a net loss on committee assignments of 11 places and give to the minority a net loss of 30 places.

The committees which you propose to increase in size are the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, Judiciary, Banking and Currency, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rivers and Harbors, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, the Post Office and Post Roads, Public Lands, Insular Affairs, and District of Columbia.

In the Fifty-ninth Congress there was a Republican membership of 250, and the Republicans took 179 places on these 15 committees. You now have a Democratic membership in this House of 227 and you propose to take 210 places on these 15 committees.

We all know that on most of these committees partisan questions seldom arise, and that it is just as important for the

country that the minority be well represented on the committee as for the majority to be. Nor have you anything to fear in regard to numbers. If we have been able to legislate with a majority of only 11 to 7, or 12 to 7, you certainly can carry out your plans with a committee majority of 14 to 8.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES.

Mr. Speaker, I understand why this unfair distribution of committee membership is now proposed. Under the rules which are now offered it is provided that the House shall elect its committees, and your side of the House heralds that as a great change of the rules. Why, sir, under the rules of the House for many years the House has had the power to elect its committees. There never has been a requirement in the rules that the Speaker appoint the committees if the House otherwise provided.

When your side of the House provided for the selection of committees by a Democratic caucus committee and caucus action it found what every party endeavoring to do the same thing will find, that it is necessary to increase the majority membership on the leading committees in order to pacify the demands which are made upon the individual members of the committee on committees in order to put your committee list through the caucus. And hence you generously provided to give to yourselves more places, but to deny them to us.

You say now that you have made a great change in the rules by providing for the election of committees. You propose, you say, to elect the committees in the House; but you do not propose to elect the committees by ballot; you do not propose to give to the individual membership of the House an opportunity to pass upon the qualifications of Members for committee assignments by either an open or secret ballot. What is the difference, pray, between having the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Democratic floor leader, rise in his place and offer a resolution providing for the election of the gentlemen he names in the resolution as members of committees, which you have already named in your caucus, and having the Speaker of the House, as you could have done, say that the Speaker appoints the following committees which you had selected by your caucus action?

The idea which went through the land as to the selection of committees by a Committee on Committees was to have a committee of the House, where both sides were represented in the committee, select the membership of the various committees. You have eliminated that. You have simply provided a different method of carrying out your caucus action, which you could have carried out under the old rule with equal facility.

Under the old method of selecting committees by the Speaker every Member of the House was given an equal opportunity of expressing his wishes and desires and explaining his qualifications for committee assignments. The Speaker became the clearing house of information on the subject. He could consider not only the wishes of Members, but the interests of the public and of legislation and the geographic interests in representation, both of the majority and of the minority.

The Democratic caucus has already adopted its membership on the committees, and in general has accepted the Democratic committee assignments which were made by Speaker CANNON and former Speakers, thereby showing that you approve on the Democratic side of the House the action of the Speakers in making assignments in the past. You have turned over the selection of the Democratic members of committees to a caucus committee of 14 Democratic Members, which for weeks has been engaged, not so much in considering qualifications and suitability as in trading among themselves, in order to take care of personal friends and factional adherents.

The Republican caucus has decided that the recommendations for Republican assignments on committees shall be made by myself as the selected minority leader. I shall give consideration in my selections to the interests of the public as well as the desires and capabilities of the Members, their length of service in the House and on the committees, and their experience and qualifications.

Your method of selecting committees will inevitably lead to committees of unwieldly size and packed for political purposes through the influence of the brute power of factional majorities. You have failed entirely to meet the sentiment of the country, which you largely worked up through misleading statements, that committees of the House should be selected through a House committee on committees, composed of both majority and minority Members.

REPUBLICAN RULES.

For years you have been denouncing the rules of a Republican House. The Republicans were in power in this House for 16 consecutive years. During that time more wise legislation of a reform and progressive nature was enacted than during any other equal period in our country's history. Under the rules of the House which were in force a membership of nearly 400 was enabled to reach those matters for consideration which the majority desired to consider without permitting a small minority to waste the time of the House considering legislation which the majority did not desire or propose to enact.

Rules of a large legislative body which enable the minority to fritter away the time only tend to prevent legislation, but the rules must provide some manner for protecting the right of the minority to be heard, both in opposition to measures which the majority proposes and in advocacy of measures which the minority propose and the majority do not take up. Such are the rules which have been in force in the past. You have denounced them as tyrannical, unworthy of free men, and subversive of individual freedom in the House. You made the country believe that our rules were rules of tyranny; that the Speaker was an autocrat and czar combined; that no bill could receive consideration in the House without first obtaining the consent of the Speaker. You have declaimed on the floor of the House and on the stump in the country that no Member in the House could be recognized to call up a bill without making previous arrangement with the Speaker; that no bill could receive consideration which the Speaker did not approve; that no bill could pass which did not bear the O. K. of the Speaker. You have frequently said on the Democratic side that the Speaker was the House and that the Members were merely attendants upon the Speaker, waiting to hear his will, because under the rules the power of the House and of its Members was lodged in the Speaker.

And yet, in the rules which you now propose, you have made no change which affects the power of the Speaker in giving recognition, or in affecting the consideration of measures to be brought before the House or actually brought up in the House. You acknowledge by your course that your charges and statements in the past were mere declamation; that the autocratic power of the Speaker under the former rules is a mere myth, and that the newspaper and magazine articles which have represented the Members of the House to be mere automatons, acting only when the Speaker pulled the wires, were mere fanciful stories, written by sensational writers who had never read the rules and were not familiar with the practices in the House.

CHANGES PROPOSED.

The truth is as to most of you on the Democratic side of the House that you have read and studied the rules now for the first time since you assumed responsibility as a majority. Upon reading and studying the rules you have found little to criticize and less to change.

I propose to discuss the changes which you have actually made in your proposed rules from the rules as heretofore existing. You have inserted as paragraph 3 of Rule XXI the following:

> No amendment shall be in order to any bill affecting revenue which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill; nor shall any amendment to any item of such bill be in order which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed.

Do you propose this as a new rule of parliamentary law? Why, every man who has even a rudimentary knowledge of parliamentary law knows that an amendment not germane to the subject matter of a bill was never in order under general parliamentary law, and yet you write it into your rules as a discovery. Is your knowledge of parliamentary law so lax that you do not know that an amendment not germane to the subject matter of the bill is not in order? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Then you provide that it can not be in order with respect to a particular item, unless it relates to the item. Since when did anyone think he could offer an amendment in order to any one item which did not relate to the item? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Is that a Democratic discovery of parliamentary law? You have referred to this on the Democratic side as one of the important changes you propose in the rules. While this provision in the rules will do no harm, it will not change to the extent of the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" the parliamentary law as shown in the precedents from the time of Jefferson's Manual down to the present time.

You have another important amendment or change in your rules. You provide for the election by the House of a Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Documents. Has the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] never been called to the fact that the statute law provides for that committee and provides that the Speaker shall appoint the House members of it? [Laughter on the Republican side.] That committee has certain functions to discharge which are very important. It can authorize the destruction of papers in the departments. The committee must be appointed in conformity with the law, because when they discharge the

functions of the committee and authorize the destruction of papers, they may find that unless they are legally appointed they are guilty of a penitentiary offense for authorizing the destruction of official papers which can only be destroyed by authority of the law, and the law says the members on the House side shall be appointed by the Speaker. You say they shall be elected by the House.

Another one of the changes which you have made in the rules is to consolidate the rules providing for the consideration of the Private Calendar. A consolidation of those rules was undoubtedly desirable, and in practice they have been treated as consolidated for many years. But you will find when you come to work under the rule which you have adopted, being paragraph 6 of Rule XXIV, that you have not covered the case at all. Your new rule, unless you adopt a forced construction, omits to provide any method by which a bill reported by the Committee on the Whole to the House can be acted on in the House unless it is disposed of on the same day it is reported, and very often it is not possible to do that; and you have inadvertently changed the rule so as to cut out the consideration of bills reported from other committees when calling the calendar of bills reported from the Committee on Claims or the Committee on War Claims.

One other change you have proposed is by including as paragraph 2 of Rule XXI the so-called Holman rule, which undertakes to make in order on the general appropriation bill an amendment changing the existing law, if it shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

This provision was adopted many years ago as one of the rules of a Democratic House, and after trying it and finding that it resulted not in the reduction of expenditures, but in the increase of expenses, it was left out of the rules of subsequent Democratic Houses as a dangerous rule, tending to provoke extravagance rather than economy. Under it an amendment will be in order providing for the reduction of an appropriation from $100,000 to $99,000, and requiring the department receiving the appropriation to render some service, which service may cost more than the entire appropriation, and which service, when authorized, will have to be cared for by a deficiency or subsequent appropriation.

This is authorized by the language of the rule, and, in fact, was the result of the working of the rule when in force in the past. Under this rule the Southern Railway mail subsidy, costing, I believe, $250,000 a year, was originally provided for by proposing to reduce some appropriation for the Post Office Department a nominal amount and requiring the department to render the service. It took many years to abolish that subsidy, which became intrenched behind the power of the southern Members of Congress, whose districts were claimed to receive the benefit of it.

You have now proposed this rule through your lack of information, although your predecessors in Congress on your side of the House, when they were in power, discarded it after practice and threw it on the scrap heap. If you had been aware of its history you would not have now proposed it, but you found it in the rules of some Democratic House of the past, and with the innocence of ignorance and the infatuation of a novelty you seized it as a great Democratic rule, thinking that it had been thrown aside by a Republican House and unaware of the fact that it was a Democratic House which, after years of experience with the rule, had cut it out of the rules. But you will learn, for we are here to teach you.

COMMITTEE-DISCHARGE RULE.

One of the new rules which you brag most about is the committee-discharge rule, which reads as follows:

Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee 15 days prior thereto. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on a calendar to be known as a Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. Immediately after the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least seven days prior thereto. Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. When such motion shall be called up the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers, and no such motion shall be entertained as to a bill or joint resolution the title of which contains more than 100 words; after the reading of the bill by title the motion shall not be submitted to the House unless seconded by a majority by tellers; if such motion fails of a second, it shall be immediately stricken from the calendar and shall not be thereafter placed thereon. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to 20 minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall have precedence over motions to suspend the rules and shall require for adoption an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which any bill has been so taken it may be called up for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee: *Provided*, No Member shall have upon such calendar more than two motions at the same time.

In the last campaign you, on the Democratic side, told the people—and they believed you—that, under the rules of the House, it was a practice for committees to pigeonhole important bills and refuse to bring them before the House and give the House a chance to vote upon them. Under the old rules and under these proposed rules, every bill which is introduced is referred to a committee. You said that under our rules, if the committee was adverse to the bill, there was no method by which it could be brought before the House, and while I have frequently controverted that statement and have proven in the House by actual fact that there was a way of bringing a bill before the House, although the committee to which it had been referred was opposed to reporting it, yet I propose now only to consider this rule which you offer as a complete remedy for the evils which you have charged existed under the old rules.

In every set of rules adopted by a legislative body, it is important that there shall be a method by which the majority of the Members can bring before the legislative body for consideration and action any proposition which the majority desires to have considered. A legislative body like this House, composed of nearly 400 Members, can not afford to be held up by the small number of Members constituting a majority of one of its committees, and if there be no method by which a majority in the House can bring before the House for consideration a bill, notwithstanding the opposition of less than a dozen members on some committee to which the bill has been referred, then we are, indeed, lacking in virility and power.

I do not propose to discuss the methods which have existed in the past by which the majority could act, but to simply discuss this new rule which is offered as a panacea for all the evils. What does the rule provide? It is that if a committee declines or neglects to report a bill any Member may place upon the calendar a motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill.

A somewhat similar rule was prepared in the last House by the distinguished gentleman who is now the Speaker of this House, and adopted by the House. I undertook to show the futility of that rule, and although there were placed upon the calendar in the last House in the neighborhood of 100 motions to discharge committees, the House never got past motion No. 1, which I filed. And the rule in the last House was no more a joke than the rule which is now proposed.

What does the rule propose to do? When your motion is on the calendar to discharge a committee, and you call it up, if it is ever reached, which very likely it never will be, you first have to have it seconded by a majority of all the Members present before it can be put to the House, and then when put to the House it must receive a favorable vote from a majority of the entire elected membership of the House. Considering the fact that on the Mondays when this calendar will be called there is seldom much more than a quorum of the House present, it is not likely that a majority of the membership of the House will often be found to vote for the motion, if there be sufficient opposition to a bill to have a committee refuse to report it. But suppose you have a motion, and it is reached on the call of the calendar, and the majority of the Members present second the motion and the majority of the Members-elect of the House vote for your motion, then what happens? Does the bill come before the House for consideration? Why, not at all. The bill goes on the calendar. Any bill which has been previously reported from the same committee has priority over your bill when the calendar is called. It is not likely that a House in its early days will discharge a committee from the consideration of a bill, because that might be considered unjust to the committee, and even unfair to the House, which is usually entitled to have the benefit of committee consideration first; and if the committee is not discharged until late in the Congress, the calendar will already be so full that there is scarcely any chance of the bill being reached for consideration in the House, even after the committee has been discharged.

You will note that the rule provides for the discharge of a committee from the further consideration of any "public bill or joint resolution." This does not include a simple House resolution. Suppose we should strike out the words "public" and "joint" and provide for the discharge of a committee from consideration of any bill or resolution. You could then introduce a resolution providing that on a certain day the House should

proceed to the consideration of a certain bill, whether it be in the hands of a committee, or whether it has been reported from a committee and is on the calendar. Such a resolution would be referred to the Committee on Rules. If you could move to discharge the Committee on Rules, you could bring that resolution before the House, and when adopted, if it should be, you would bring the bill itself up before the House for consideration; but the gentelman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who is to be the chairman of the Committee on Rules, in introducing these rules for adoption carefully provides that a simple House resolution referred to the Committee on Rules, his committee, shall be beyond the control of the House. You can not discharge the Committee on Rules under this new rule from the consideration of a resolution providing that the House shall proceed to consider and vote upon a pending bill or other proposition.

You can get at a bill now by going out to the document room and asking for it, and that is about as near as you can get to it under this new discharge rule. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I may undertake to demonstrate if I choose, and I make no promises that I will not choose, to show the utter absurdity, not to say idiocy, of the rule that is now proposed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You have denounced us for years, as well as the rules we adopted in Republican Houses, because we did not permit any individual Member at any time to waste the time of the House on motions to discharge committees. You have said that we were tyrants; that we were afraid; that we were unwilling to meet the issues. You made the public believe that you were sincere and in earnest; that you had a method by which any bill at any time could be brought before the House for consideration without unduly delaying the proceedings in the House. And now that you have the power you offer your remedy. It is a gold brick. It will not work to aid the majority, but you will find that even the rule that you have proposed can be used to annoy the majority. You will have the opportunity during this Congress to vote upon many motions to discharge committees from the further consideration of bills. You will have the responsibility of voting those motions up or down. You will find that the rule will not work efficaciously to produce any good results to the majority, but when we have tried the rule for some time on your majority the Democratic side of this House will be inclined to purchase a patent self-kicking machine, and furnish it to the distinguished gentleman from Texas in order that he may supply himself with what the other Democratic Members would like to give him.

The rule that you bring in on this subject, as well as the other changes in the rules, are mainly inspired through lack of experience and knowledge. With all the talk you have indulged in before the country, you have no more desire than any other majority in a legislative body has to deprive itself of the power to control legislation in the body where it is responsible. [Applause on the Republican side.] All the talk you have indulged in has been for the purpose of deluding the people and to get votes, and now that you have come into power you decline to put into effect the remedy which you have been talking about and talked for, lo, these many years.

I do not criticize you, but you have proven that you have not been sincere. Let us hope that when you come to real legislation, for which rules are only preliminary, you will be sincere.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a substitute, which is in terms and in language in effect the resolution offered two years ago by the present Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I do not intend myself to vote for it, but I want to have the pleasure of seeing the Democratic side of the House, then hailing and hurrahing for it, now voting against it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I have referred to all of the important changes which have been proposed in the rules. In the 240 paragraphs constituting the rules there is no other important change from the rules as existing in the House under Speaker CANNON.

RECOGNITION STILL REMAINS WITH THE SPEAKER.

Rule XIV still provides that "when any Member desires to speak, or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to 'Mr. Speaker,' and on being recognized may address the House." The autocratic power in the Speaker to recognize or not to recognize, which has been so ferociously denounced all over the country as a Cannon rule of tyranny, still remains in the identical language of the rule in force while Speaker CANNON presided over the House. I have heard Democrat after Democrat on this floor denounce this rule as depriving Members of their rights, and say that when the Democratic Party came into power in the House it would no longer be left to the sweet will of the Speaker to recognize or refuse to recognize a Member, but that the Speaker would be required to recognize any Member who rose and asked for recognition. I have heard Members on the Democratic side of the House, while Mr. CANNON was Speaker, indignantly exclaim against the question so often put by the Speaker when the Member was asking for recognition, "For what purpose does the gentleman rise?"

Under this rule that same question will be frequently asked by Speaker CLARK, and I listen and wait in vain for any Member on the Democratic side to now object to the provision of this rule.

One other change you have made in the rules, however, and that is in regard to correspondents having the right in the press gallery. Heretofore press correspondents have had the right to use the press gallery under regulations practically prepared and enforced by the body of correspondents themselves. I notice in the rules now that this right is confined to "reputable reporters and correspondents." Who is to determine whether the correspondent is "reputable"? The Speaker? Is this arbitrary power given to the Speaker in addition to the powers which the Speaker has had heretofore? Why is an insinuation put in this rule that newspaper correspondents who have been favorably passed upon by the committee of the correspondents may not be reputable?

Mr. Speaker, I have now gone through the changes proposed by these new rules from the old rules. They are of little importance. There will be no substantial difference in the working practice of the new rules from the old rules. The House will be conducted in the same old manner. Proceedings will be had as heretofore. The precedents of the past will guide us in the future. The legislative mill will grind in the same manner in this Democratic House as it ground under Speaker CANNON in the Republican House. I have never denounced the tyranny of the rules or the tyranny of the Speaker. I have known full well that so long as the Speaker observed the rules he could not be a tyrant and that so long as the rules were observed they were not tyrannical.

I congratulate again the Democratic side of the House in now bringing before the House, after their study and consideration of the rules, practically the same rules that the Republicans had in force. I wish I could congratulate them on having the courage and the manliness to say to the public and to the House, "We had never studied the rules, because we did not have the responsibility, but when we did obtain responsibility, we studied the rules and we find that our charges against the old rules were unjustified; that they did not permit the Speaker to be a tyrant or a czar; that they did preserve individual liberty to the Members, and power to the House; and that we have not been able, after study of the subject, to make any manifest change in the rules or any practical betterment of them, and we apologize to Speaker CANNON and the Republican House for the misleading charges we hurled for years against him and the Republicans." [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything "idiotic" and "farcical" in the rules as here proposed, it has certainly called forth from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] the most doleful speech we have ever heard him deliver. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Permit me to remind his side of the House that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which he has been the distinguished chairman, was constituted in the Sixty-first Congress of 12 Republicans and 6 Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I did not think the gentleman would make wry faces if we gave him a homeopathic dose of his own medicine by adhering to the same proportion. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Many points made by the gentleman are not tenable, although he assumes to himself all knowledge of parliamentary law. He says that the amendment in regard to revenue measures is not good and that we have acted as if we had discovered something new. Let me say to him, if the amendment is satisfactory to his side, it suits us over here. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The ex-Speaker of the House winced because I politely alluded to the fact that prior to his administration of that great office no Speaker's decision had ever been overruled. I regret these things did occur while he was the Speaker of the House, and am satisfied now he regrets that such record fell to his lot.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have not the time.

Mr. CANNON. It is only to correct a statement.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then I will yield.

Mr. CANNON. The books are full of instances where many other Speakers were repeatedly overruled.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. My remarks were only a quotation from Thomas B. Reed, the accuracy of which is left to rest with his speech and memory. Now, Mr. Speaker, the ex-Speaker also said, "You have taken the power of appointing committees away from the Speaker and vested it in the Committee on Rules," and added, "This House must drive the Committee on Rules to make it conform to its views." That is not a bad proposition. 'Tis well! It is much better than when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois carried the "bait gourd" and appointed the committees and Members were compelled to do obeisance to his will. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This is a different story. Let me say that although he has said the epithet of "czar" may be transferred from the Speaker's chair to the floor of this House and applied to my humble self, I hope no such unhappy fate may ever befall me. In so far as I am individually concerned, whenever the majority of this House, which has elected the Committee on Rules, gives their command to bring in a rule to conform to their will a ready response will be found. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Yes; the American people demanded that we should take power away from the Speaker and restore it to the membership. They decreed that we should elect the committees. That is where the power belongs, and our Speaker consented to it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman complains of the retrenchment provision placed in the new rules. They have gone back and dug up ancient history. Let me say to you gentlemen that some of the most important matters of legislation ever passed through legislative bodies have been on appropriation measures. Riders have been placed on such bills, shaking the foundation of kingdoms and republics! We have only enlarged and restored the power of appropriation to the representatives of the people, fresh from their constituents, bearing the banner of economy for the good of the whole country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And while the President of the United States is a Republican, and the Senate is controlled by the Republican Party, thanks to popular approval this House has been commissioned to retrench and economize and save the people's money. And when the final chapter of the history of this Congress has been written it will perpetuate the living truth that we have saved the American people millions of dollars. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, if there are any other amendments necessary at a later day, they will be added in behalf of the country. At present we are ready and willing to indorse this work and now invite the formal vote. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. Under the order adopted by the House the vote will first be taken on the substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HENRY of Texas, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the rules just adopted be printed (Order No. 1).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the rules just adopted be printed. Is there objection?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how they will be distributed.

Mr. MANN. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that under the law as now provided for if documents of this kind are ordered the document room will have liberty to increase the number and order as many copies as are necessary.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand that, but I wanted to be understood by Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the rules as adopted be printed. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make one more request, and that is that Members be allowed five legislative days in which to print on the subject of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is that to apply to all Members or to Members who spoke upon the rules to-day?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. To all Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days within which to print remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the rules. Is there objection?

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, would that give to a Member who has spoken the right to extend his remarks?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Oh, certainly.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire if it is the purpose of the gentleman from Texas to allow everybody to print remarks in the RECORD upon this proposition?

Mr. MANN. That is the request.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. That is the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas objects.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. OLMSTED. I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who spoke on the question of the rules shall have five legislative days in which to print on that subject. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] will give me his attention a moment, it occurs to me that there is no doubt but that a motion permitting gentlemen to print on this subject would be in order, and a majority could agree to give them the opportunity to print on the subject of the rules unless there is a demand for the regular order. We have now got rules. Such a motion of course could be cut off by a demand for the regular order. The regular order, of course, is to clear the Speaker's table.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in order to simplify the situation, I demand the regular order.

MESSENGER TO SPEAKER'S TABLE.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 31.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, compensation at the rate of $1,200 for the services of a messenger to be appointed by the Speaker to serve at the Speaker's table, said office to be in lieu of the messenger at the Speaker's table at $1,200 per annum, office of the Doorkeeper, as now authorized.

Resolved, That the Speaker shall control the appointment and removal of the messenger at the Speaker's table, the salary of which is provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, under the office of the Doorkeeper.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the resolution provide that the Speaker shall have authority to appoint an official which the law provides shall be appointed some other way?

Mr. LLOYD. The sole purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Speaker to appoint a messenger at his table.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no objection——

Mr. LLOYD. Under existing law the messenger at the Speaker's table is appointed by the Doorkeeper.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman, after all, I did not intend to say anything about it, it would be better to provide privately that the Speaker direct the Doorkeeper to discharge that clerk, because the law provides the Doorkeeper shall make that appointment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appointment by the Speaker, until the law has been changed, will not give the person designated the salary, which is the important thing.

Mr. LLOYD. This provides that the salary which is now allowed to a messenger at the Speaker's table under existing law shall be given to him when appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can not do that by resolution of the House; provide that what the law provides shall be paid to a person designated in one way shall be paid to a person designated in another way.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble about the matter, it occurs to me, if the resolution provides that until further provided for the messenger who shall be appointed by the Speaker shall be paid out of the contingent fund. I think it will meet all requirements of the law, because under the precedents, under rulings of the Comptroller of the Treasury time and time again, it has been held that the House has absolute control over its contingent fund, and if this resolution provides for the payment of a messenger to the Speaker's table, to be paid out of the contingent fund until provided for by law, and the Doorkeeper does not appoint some one to take the place of the man whom the Doorkeeper is authorized to reappoint, there will be no one to draw the salary, and it will lapse into the Treasury, so that while you can not change the law by a resolution you can provide for the payment of money out of the contingent fund for any purpose that the House sees fit to pay.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be reported again.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wish the resolution to be read in the form in which I have just modified it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the modified resolution.

Mr. MANN. The other resolution is before the House. Unless the gentleman withdraws it——

Mr. LLOYD. I wish to withdraw the other resolution, and I offer the modified one.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the modified resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, compensation at the rate of $1,200 per annum for the services of a messenger to be appointed by the Speaker to serve at the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

JOHN T. CHANCEY.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That John T. Chancey be continued in the service of the House of Representatives in his present position during the Sixty-second Congress at his present compensation.

[Applause.]

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the resolution reported again.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, that position is already provided for under the law. The resolution is not necessary.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution.

The resolution was again reported.

Mr. BARTLETT rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no desire, and do not intend, to oppose the proposition to continue this man, whom I know; but if the gentleman will examine the legislative bill he will find that this employee is carried on the rolls of the House until 1912 at his present salary, and this resolution might be a recognition of some authority somewhere to remove. He is an employee of the House, originally specified in a resolution, and has been continued for a great many years under the original resolution and carried in every appropriation bill since.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, if it is unnecessary, of course I do not care to press it. I withdraw the resolution.

JOURNAL CLERK.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, compensation at the rate of $4,000 per annum for the services of a journal clerk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent for that?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The law does provide for the compensation of a journal clerk.

Mr. LLOYD. The law provides for the payment of a journal clerk, but the law also provides that the journal clerk shall be appointed by the Clerk, and the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Speaker to appoint the journal clerk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The resolution does not provide by whom the clerk shall be appointed at all.

Mr. LLOYD. This resolution provides that the Speaker shall appoint the journal clerk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest that it go over. Provision is made for it by law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] to the fact that this resolution does not provide that the journal clerk shall be appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. MANN. Let it go over, and take time to consider it.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, for the present I withdraw the resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, April 6, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Newport News Creek, Va. (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Dabob Bay, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1610) to extend to the veterans of the several Seminole Indian wars and to the widows of veterans of the several Seminole Indian wars the benefits of the act of Congress of February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1611) to prohibit the receipt of money in payment of special taxes as dealers in intoxicating liquors by internal-revenue officials of the United States, except in certain cases, and to provide punishments for its violation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1612) granting pensions to the soldiers of the different Seminole Indian wars and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1613) to extend the provisions of the existing bounty-land laws to the officers and enlisted men and the officers and men of the boat companies of the Florida Seminole Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1614) to prescribe the terms of office of collectors of internal revenue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1615) for the relief of the State of Florida; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) to provide for the erection of a subtreasury building and the establishment of a subtreasury at Jacksonville, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 1617) to provide for a trial by jury of persons charged with contempt of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 1618) amending paragraph 6 of the act relating to the Metropolitan police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1619) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 1620) to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or of racing odds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 1621) for the refunding of the cotton tax; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PALMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 1622) granting pensions to soldiers who served 90 or more days in the Philippines and were honorably discharged for disability; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 1623) to establish the University of the United States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 1624) to erect a monument to the memory of John Summerfield Staples at Stroudsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1625) providing for the purchase of an oil painting entitled "The death of Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel Alonzo H. Cushing;" to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1626) to amend sections 5136 and 5137 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, known as the "national-bank act;" to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1627) to repeal the duty on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 1628) authorizing an increase in expenditure for the purchase of a post-office site at Fordyce, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1629) making it unlawful to falsify any memorandum, enumeration, report, or tabulation relating to the census; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1630) authorizing the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith of the United States to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the organization on lots Nos. 3 and 4, block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1631) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1632) providing for the enlargement, improvement, and repair of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1633) to authorize and provide for the investigation and survey of swamp, wet, and overflowed lands in the Mississippi Valley susceptible of drainage, and to devise plans and systems therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) authorizing the construction of a post-office building at Stuttgart, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 1635) for the construction of a memorial and mortuary chapel in the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 1636) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon at St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) authorizing an appropriation for the Interparliamentary Union for International Arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) providing for the protection of the interests of the United States in lands and waters comprising any part of the Anacostia River, or Eastern Branch, and lands adjacent thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to sublots 31, 32, and 33 of original lot 3, square No. 80, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to lots 3 and 4, square 103; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1641) authorizing the Connecticut River Co. to construct a dam or dams across the Connecticut River above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 1642) establishing a standard gauge for sheet and plate iron and steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) to give religious and charitable publications the benefit of the second-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) granting the public lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Missouri to the State of Missouri for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1645) to extend the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, respectively, to all State militia and other organizations that were organized for the defense of the Union and cooperated with the military or naval forces of the United States in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1646) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1647) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1648) for the erection of a Federal building for the post office at Navasota, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1649) to provide for a public building at Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) to provide for the selection of a site for the establishment of a navy yard, dry dock, and naval training station on or near Morgans Point, in San Jacinto Bay, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1651) to establish a subtreasury at Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1652) supplementary to and amendatory of the act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Nation of Indians in Oklahoma," approved June 28, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 1653) making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1654) to amend the law of patent designs; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1655) to acquire the manuscript of Charles Chaillé Long, containing an account of the unveiling of the McClellan statue; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 1656) providing for the extension of the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Seventy-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1657) to amend an act to authorize the employment of volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property, approved March 3, 1863; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1659) to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, in relation to pensions, etc.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1660) establishing the Wilson Creek National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1661) providing for an amendment to section governing the compensation of registers and receivers of United States land offices; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1662) to amend chapter 90, Twenty-fourth Statutes at Large, page 373, approved February 3, 1887, and fixing term of office of electors of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 1663) to correct the military record and provide for the granting of pensions to survivors of certain battalions of Kentucky Militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1664) to regulate the sale of unstemmed leaf tobacco in the hand; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1665) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) establishing the Mammoth Cave National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1667) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 1668) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by requiring the use of the block system by common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 1669) to create in the War and Navy Departments a roll to be known as the volunteer retired list, to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers of the United States Volunteer Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORNES: A bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 657 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1671) to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of the North American Indian; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 1672) to construct a Lincoln memorial highway from the White House, Washington, D. C., to the battle field of Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 1673) requiring the Washington, Spa Springs & Gretta Railroad Co. and the Washington Railway & Electric Co. to issue free transfers for passengers using their lines; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 1674) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1675) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River below mouth of Wabash River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1676) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 1677) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 1678) providing for taxation of and fixing the rate of taxation on inheritances, devises, bequests, legacies, and gifts in the District of Columbia, and providing for the manner of payment as well as the manner of enforcing payment thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 1679) to accept the cession by the State of Montana of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Glacier National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 1680) to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to apply a portion of the proceeds derived from the sale of its sewer bonds to the purchase of the sewer system of the Phoenix Sewer & Drainage Co., in said city; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 1681) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 1682) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct bridges across the San Carlos and Gila Rivers on the White Mountain or San Carlos Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1683) to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to issue its bonds for the purpose of constructing buildings for the housing of its fire department, equipping its fire department, and constructing and installing a fire-alarm system in said city; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1684) to authorize and empower the town of Glendale, Maricopa County, Ariz., to issue its bonds in the sum of $10,000, for the purpose of providing $8,000 for the improvement of its streets and $2,000 for the purchase of an apparatus for extinguishing fires; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1685) to establish a fish-culture station in the Territory of Arizona; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1686) to enable the town of Tempe, in the County of Maricopa, Territory of Arizona, to issue its municipal bonds for the purpose of acquiring an electric-light and power plant for the use of the inhabitants of said town; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1687) to enable the board of supervisors of the county of Mohave, in the Territory of Arizona, to issue the bonds of said county in the sum of $60,000 to construct and furnish a courthouse and to grade and improve the courthouse grounds; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1688) to enable the town of Tempe, in the County of Maricopa, Territory of Arizona, to issue its municipal bonds for the purpose of erecting a city hall for the use of the inhabitants of said town; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1689) providing for the sinking of experimental artesian wells in the Territory of Arizona; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1690) to provide pensions for prisoners of war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1691) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of fraud in insurrectionary districts within the United States and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 1692) in amendment of the act of June 25, 1910, providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 1693) to establish a fish-cultural station near Walterboro, Colleton County, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 1694) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish one condemned cannon to the Appleton City Academy, Appleton City, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 1695) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 1696) to decrease the expense and increase the efficiency of the staff service of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1697) to regulate the selection of lieu lands by railroads in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1698) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1699) providing that certain soldiers and sailors who served in the United States Army and Navy or Marine Corps during the Civil War, the War with Spain, or the Philippine insurrection for 90 days shall have a preference right in making entry on the public lands of the United States hereafter opened to settlement; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1700) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Oregon City, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1701) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1702) providing for the manner of making payment for water rights under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1703) to provide pensions for the officers and soldiers of the Indians wars of the United States which occurred prior to the year 1880; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1704) to further amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1705) to provide for reserving from the public lands in the State of Oregon as a public park for the benefit of the people of the United States, and for the protection and preservation of the game, fish, timber, and all other natural objects therein a tract of land herein described, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 1706) to improve the navigation in the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 1707) for an investigation by the Geological Survey of the water resources of the Red River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1708) directing the Office of Public Roads of the Agriculture Department to advise and cooperate with State and local authorities as to the best methods of maintaining roads used as rural routes in passable condition, and to inspect and report the condition of said roads with recommendations to the Post Office Department whenever requested by it to do so; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1709) for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 1710) to prevent the use of coupons and other devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1711) providing for the construction of a dredge boat to be used upon the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1712) authorizing a survey of Tradewater River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1713) for dredging and removing sand bars in Ohio River, near Hawesville and Uniontown, Ky., and near the mouth of Green River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1714) authorizing a survey of Pond River, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1715) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River below the mouth of Green River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1716) for the erection of a cold-storage warehouse in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1717) requiring a more complete record of all unmanufactured tobaccos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1718) providing for the sale of the old Federal building and site at Owensboro, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1719) for the relief of the drafted men of Henderson County, Ky., and other counties of Kentucky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1720) relating to punishment for contempt in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1721) for the relief of farmers and tobacco growers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1722) relating to punishment for contempt in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1723) to admit free of duty certain articles manufactured in the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1724) to admit free of duty certain articles manufactured in the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1725) for the erection of a public building at Hopkinsville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1726) for the relief of farmers, merchants, and other dealers in leaf tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1727) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct experiments and determine the practicability of making paper material out of cornstalks, and to erect buildings and purchase apparatus therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1728) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in Christian County, in southwestern Kentucky; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1729) to prohibit persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of railroad cars, locomotives, railroad rails, and structural steel, or in the mining and sale of coal from becoming directors or other officers or employees of railroads engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1730) for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1731) for the relief of tobacco growers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1732) to prevent the use of coupons and other devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1733) placing licorice and licorice paste, etc., on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 1734) to locate a subtreasury at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 1735) in amendment of section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1737) to amend section 1 of an act approved January 30, 1897, entitled "An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 1738) to create a Tariff Commission and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 1739) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 1740) to grant to soldiers pensioned on account of wounds received in battle the same rate of pension to which they would be entitled on account of old age under the act of February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1741) to prevent the manufacture or use of dishonest or fraudulent weighing or measuring appliances in commercial transactions; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1742) to amend sections 3536 and 3548 of the Revised Statutes in regard to the standard weight of coins; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 1743) to create a Tariff Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1744) to change the date of the regular annual session of Congress to March 4 or 5, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1745) to amend the revenue laws so as to provide for furnishing certified copies of certain records to officers and other persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 1746) amending section 2 of the act of Congress approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 1747) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Marianna, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 1748) for the relief of the Miami Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1749) directing the Secretary of War to ascertain the amount of money expended by the State of Texas between January 1, 1866, and December 31, 1876, inclusive, and report the same to Congress for its consideration; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1750) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 1751) to make October 12 of each and every year a public holiday in the District of Columbia, to be known as "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1752) for the erection of a public building at the city of Taylorville, in the State of Illinois, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1753) amending section 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 25) calling on the President of the United States for a statement of Philip-

pine expenses; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Resolution (H. Res. 26) for facilitating the distribution of public documents; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STANLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 27) requesting the President, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the House with certain information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 28) requesting the President, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the House with certain information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 29) to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) relative to the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) in reference to the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) concerning the manuscript prepared by Charles Chaillé Long, containing an account of the proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of the late Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRIEST: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) directing the Commission on Universal Peace to report upon a plan for commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the treaty of Ghent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) creating a commission to consider and report upon a plan for the promotion of universal peace among nations by commemorating the one hundredth anniversity of the signing of the treaty of Ghent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to prepare plans and specifications for docks in certain cases; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) requesting the President of the United States to renew negotiations with the Government of Russia to secure for American missionaries in Russia the same rights enjoyed by Russian missionaries in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of the Legislature of Ohio, asking Congress to make provision for the calling of a constitutional convention to amend the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of Ohio, concerning the law against polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS (by request): A bill (H. R. 1754) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1755) for the relief of the legal representative of James Doyle; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 1756) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1757) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Weese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1758) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1759) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Weldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1760) granting an increase of pension to David B. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1761) granting an increase of pension to James T. Vincent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1762) granting an increase of pension to James Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1763) granting an increase of pension to John Travis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1764) granting an increase of pension to John B. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1765) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1766) granting an increase of pension to O. A. Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1767) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Sheridan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1768) granting an increase of pension to James D. Ramey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) granting an increase of pension to George Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1770) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1771) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) granting an increase of pension to Elbert Nugent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) granting an increase of pension to John T. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Kepler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) granting an increase of pension to James A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) granting an increase of pension to William E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1778) granting an increase of pension to James Dodson; Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1779) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) granting an increase of pension to R. R. Dill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) granting an increase of pension to William P. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) granting an increase of pension to Michael Coplinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1783) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Moses Callison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bedwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1787) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon N. Boardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) granting an increase of pension to W. M. Jolly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1791) granting an increase of pension to James C. Haden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) granting an increase of pension to Logan Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1793) granting an increase of pension to John W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1794) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1795) granting an increase of pension to Solon B. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1796) granting an increase of pension to William B. Gist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1797) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Ginger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1798) granting an increase of pension to E. E. Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Enox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1800) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Blackledge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1801) granting an increase of pension to James A. Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1802) granting a pension to Tazwell T. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1803) granting a pension to B. F. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1804) granting a pension to Mary Wehrmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1805) granting a pension to W. K. Whittaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1806) granting a pension to James M. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1807) granting a pension to Fred Wakefield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1808) granting a pension to Levi Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1809) granting a pension to Mary M. Varbie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1810) granting a pension to Malissa R. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1811) granting a pension to Marion Yest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1812) granting a pension to W. E. Sharp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) granting a pension to Amanda Sexton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1814) granting a pension to Dora Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1815) granting a pension to Jesse G. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1816) granting a pension to Paris G. Strickland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1817) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1818) granting a pension to John Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1819) granting a pension to James W. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1820) granting a pension to Narcissa E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) granting a pension to Mary A. Runyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) granting a pension to Thomas F. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1823) granting a pension to Joseph L. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1824) granting a pension to I. T. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1825) granting a pension to Nicholas Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1826) granting a pension to Sophrona Pursley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) granting a pension to Sarah F. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1828) granting a pension to Thomas Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1829) granting a pension to Keziah Phlegly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1830) granting a pension to Solomon Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1831) granting a pension to William F. Neet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1832) granting a pension to A. A. McAlister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1833) granting a pension to James G. Munday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1834) granting a pension to O. A. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1835) granting a pension to James McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1836) granting a pension to Glenn A. Means; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1837) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) granting a pension to Lucy F. Melton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1839) granting a pension to Samuel Moser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) granting a pension to Henry B. Meyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) granting a pension to Fay Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1842) granting a pension to Ella Mansell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1843) granting a pension to Conrad F. Korthanke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1844) granting a pension to Jefferson Knaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1845) granting a pension to Vina Lindenbower; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1846) granting a pension to Joseph T. Kerby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1847) granting a pension to Helena Koester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) granting a pension to Louis Legnne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) granting a pension to A. N. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) granting a pension to James J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1851) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Drumwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1852) granting a pension to George W. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) granting a pension to J. G. Dollison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) granting a pension to Solomon Coan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) granting a pension to James T. Calvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) granting a pension to George W. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) granting a pension to John I. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) granting a pension to Tim Clifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1859) granting a pension to Joseph Caton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1860) granting a pension to John B. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1861) granting a pension to Samuel M Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1862) granting a pension to John R. Cropp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1863) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) granting a pension to Edwin W. Bretz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1865) granting a pension to George T Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1866) granting a pension to Mary Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1867) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1868) granting a pension to William S. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1869) granting a pension to M. C. Bixby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1870) granting a pension to J. P. Akin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1871) granting a pension to Samuel Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1872) granting a pension to James M. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) granting a pension to William David Allee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1874) granting a pension to Lemuel Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1875) granting a pension to Harriet L. Gist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1876) granting a pension to James Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1877) granting a pension to Oliver P. Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1878) granting a pension to James G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1879) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1880) granting a pension to Robert S. Hoge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1881) granting a pension to Ozias Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) granting a pension to Leonidas H. Hightshoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) granting a pension to Julia E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) granting a pension to Louisa K. Holbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1885) granting a pension to Easter Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) granting a pension to Ira Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1887) granting a pension to James Gladish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1888) granting a pension to Mordecai Gladish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1889) granting a pension to J. J. Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1890) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Goodknight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1891) granting a pension to R. C. Goswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1892) granting a pension to Jane D. Goss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1893) granting a pension to John Gerdts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) granting a pension to Mary A. Gurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) granting a pension to Eliza Faries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) granting a pension to R. H. Farrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1897) granting a pension to William England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1898) granting a pension to Mary Esser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1899) for the relief of John Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) for the relief of Dennis Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) for the relief of Omar A. Du Esler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1902) for the relief of Louis Dunham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1903) for the relief of Josiah Baugher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1904) for the relief of Henry Stufflebam; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) for the relief of Greene County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1906) for the relief of Joseph W. Hawkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Glasgow, Howard County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1908) restoring the name of Berry Weese to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1909) to correct the military record of Charles J. Lanning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1910) to correct the military record of Rudolph Kraut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) to correct the military record of Bennett Lopp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1912) to correct the military record of Oliver T. Worman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1913) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Maroney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) granting an increase of pension to Milton Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1915) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Ginty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1917) granting an increase of pension to David A. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1918) granting an increase of pension to Merit D. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1919) granting an increase of pension to William Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1920) granting an increase of pension to John H. Turpin, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1921) granting an increase of pension to William N. Ruggles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1923) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Haydon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Dollarhide; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1926) granting an increase of pension to Monroe Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1927) granting an increase of pension to George F. Blood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1928) granting an increase of pension to James Baragar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1929) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1930) granting an increase of pension to Lieuary Flatter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1931) granting an increase of pension to Faxon Hayford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1932) granting an increase of pension to John B. Shafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1933) granting a pension to Sarah C. Ryland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1934) granting a pension to Thomas L. Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1935) granting a pension to Almon Shibley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1936) granting a pension to Seely B. McCarthy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1937) granting a pension to Alonzo Epler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1938) granting a pension to George W. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1939) granting a pension to Michael Goetz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1940) granting a pension to James Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1941) granting a pension to John Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1942) granting a pension to William S. Curtis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1943) granting a pension to Charles W. Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1944) for the relief of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1945) to correct the military record of J. W. La Bare; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1946) to correct the military record of Peter Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1947) to correct the military record of Henry M. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1948) to correct the military record of Daniel D. May; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1949) to correct the military record of Paris R. Winslow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1950) to correct the record of discharge of Capt. Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1951) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sydney W. Moss; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1952) to reimburse Mary E. Myers, widow of Joseph Myers, deceased, for loss of personal property sustained in depredations of Indians on the Snake River, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 1953) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1954) granting an increase of pension to Charles Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1955) granting an increase of pension to Lester T. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1956) granting an increase of pension to W. O. Medler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1957) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Rolls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1959) granting an increase of pension to William Spangenberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) granting an increase of pension to Avilla Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1961) granting an increase of pension to Asa H. Patrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1962) granting an increase of pension to John Marley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1963) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) granting an increase of pension to James P. Chaffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) granting an increase of pension to John H. Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 1966) granting an increase of pension to Maj. C. C. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1967) granting an increase of pension to John L. Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 1968) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1969) granting a pension to Charles M. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1970) for the relief of Thomas W. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 1971) granting an increase of pension to William Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1972) granting an increase of pension to Hattie L. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 1973) granting an increase of pension to Ann Elizabeth Kitchin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1974) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 1975) granting an increase of pension to David Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1976) granting an increase of pension to James M. Higgs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) granting an increase of pension to John W. Priest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1978) granting an increase of pension to William Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1979) granting an increase of pension to Rezin F. Mumma; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) granting an increase of pension to Andrew K. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1981) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Larue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1982) granting an increase of pension to John R. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1983) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Hoeffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1984) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson R. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Pegg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1986) for the relief of William E. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1987) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Rouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1988) granting an increase of pension to John T. Slackford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) granting an increase of pension to Bateman Zoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) granting an increase of pension to John Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 1991) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1992) granting an increase of pension to John B. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1993) granting an increase of pension to Louis H. Paulick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) granting an increase of pension to George Brenizer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) granting an increase of pension to William A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1996) granting an increase of pension to Reaser W. Eberhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 1997) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1998) granting a pension to Emma McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1999) granting a pension to Harry Harwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 2000) granting an increase of pension to Marion Finley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 2001) for the relief of the J. Kennard & Sons' Carpet Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 2002) granting an increase of pension to Willard D. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2003) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Klotz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2004) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2005) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2006) granting an increase of pension to William M. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2007) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Schreiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2008) granting an increase of pension to Amanda McGillum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2009) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Westfall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2010) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to P. R. Baldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2012) granting an increase of pension to David T. Weir; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) granting an increase of pension to William H. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2014) granting an increase of pension to John H. Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2015) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2016) granting an increase of pension to William Pirkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2017) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) granting an increase of pension to James P. Noel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) granting an increase of pension to America Mears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) granting an increase of pension to John C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2021) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. McGarrah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Hales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2023) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ficklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2024) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Corn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2026) granting an increase of pension to Haydon Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) granting an increase of pension to M. M. Angleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2028) granting an increase of pension to John Beiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) granting an increase of pension to John R. Carrol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) granting an increase of pension to Amos Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) granting an increase of pension to James F. Thurman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) granting a pension to Martha J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) granting a pension to Mary Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) for the relief of Abel J. Mosby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) for the relief of Henry A. Polen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) for the relief of the legal representatives of L. H. Cook, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2038) for the relief of William Niehaus; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) for the relief of Henry G. Roetzel and Paul Chipman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) to correct and complete the military record of Anderson G. Pittman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 2041) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) granting an increase of pension to James C. Settle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Julius Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) granting an increase of pension to John L. Sumner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to James M. Steel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2048) granting an increase of pension to William P. Crayne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) granting a pension to C. E. Burkitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) granting a pension to John W. McKissick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) granting a pension to Henry E. Patee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting a pension to Thomas Glynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2053) granting a pension to Florence M. Woods; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) granting a pension to Charles R. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) for the relief of A. L. H. Crenshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) for the relief of the estate of William Morrison; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) for the relief of the estate of Robert G. Wilson, sr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) to correct the military record of George H. English; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2059) granting an honorable discharge to George D. Hooker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) to remove the disabilities of John Farrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) to remove the disability of Floyd J. Farber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Harriet L. Young, administratrix of the estate of Solomon Young, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Stephen E. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Nannie, Oscar W., John R., and Emma Cogswell, heirs of O. H. Cogswell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) to carry out findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Alexander Bradshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 2066) for the relief of A. J. Sampson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) for the relief of Dr. Warren E. Day; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 2068) granting an increase of pension to Margaret I. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 2069) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alice E. Davis, heir at law of John C. Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) for the relief of Herbert Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 2072) granting an increase of pension to Julius Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) granting an increase of pension to Enos R. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) granting an increase of pension to George A. Shephard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sansom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting an increase of pension to Claudius L. Pyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Pitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) granting an increase of pension to Lee W. Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) granting an increase of pension to Osborn Parrish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) granting an increase of pension to James W. Orvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Christian B. Old; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) granting an increase of pension to Jacob G. Lobaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) granting an increase of pension to John H. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) granting an increase of pension to Vernon L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) granting an increase of pension to George R. Ingersoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) granting an increase of pension to James Hudgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) granting an increase of pension to Fields B. Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) granting an increase of pension to William M. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Crosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) granting an increase of pension to John Bridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) granting an increase of pension to Garrick McCain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) granting an increase of pension to David Potarf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) granting an increase of pension to John W. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) granting an increase of pension to Jesse T. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) granting an increase of pension to William Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) granting an increase of pension to William Bybee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) granting an increase of pension to James F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) granting an increase of pension to John Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) granting a pension to John W. Sage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) granting a pension to Margaret Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) granting a pension to Roseannah Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) granting a pension to William L. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) granting a pension to Joel Harreford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) granting a pension to Sudie Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) granting a pension to Davis Woody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) granting a pension to Fred Yeomans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) granting a pension to Martha J. Thorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) granting a pension to Anna Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) granting a pension to Thomas G. Butner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) for the relief of Abraham Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) for the relief of W. W. Wall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of John B. Harrelson, administrator of the estate of Nathan E. Harrelson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Elijah B. Hammontree, administrator of the estate of John Hammontree, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 2118) granting an increase of pension to Jeshuron Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) granting an increase of pension to John W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) granting an increase of pension to John Landis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) granting an increase of pension to Tennis O. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) granting an increase of pension to Herbert M. Nogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) granting an increase of pension to John A. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) granting an increase of pension to William D. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) granting an increase of pension to George H. Yarrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) granting a pension to Emily A. Ballard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) granting a pension to Emma Burrows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) granting a pension to Martin Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) to authorize the Secretary of War to issue a certificate of service in the name of Charles B. Walworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) to remove charge of desertion from military record of George W. Moore, alias George W. More; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) granting a medal to Herbert N. Nogle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 2138) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 2139) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) granting a pension to Peter E. Luttrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 2141) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Lyerly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sherfy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) granting an increase of pension to Absalom P. Carlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wandling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) granting an increase of pension to William T. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) granting an increase of pension to James P. Sarver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) granting a pension to Hannah Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) granting a pension to John Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) removing the charge of desertion against William H. H. Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) to remove the charge of desertion now standing on the records against John F. Harbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) for compensation for the nursing and treatment of sick soldiers of the United States by St. John's Hospital at Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of Joseph F. Ritcherdson on the rolls of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and issue him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 2154) for the relief of Richard W. Clifford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) for the relief of Wilson B. Strong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 2156) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Soloman Brobst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) granting an increase of pension to William Sills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Spicher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) granting an increase of pension to Rose C. Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Dumont; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2162) granting an increase of pension to John Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2163) granting an increase of pension to Lucien F. Kellogg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) granting a pension to Charles Volz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) granting a pension to Otis H. Shurtliff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) granting a pension to Barney Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 2167) granting an increase of pension to John S. Rodgers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) granting an increase of pension to George R. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Henry Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 2172) granting a pension to Catherine Arnould; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Beyel and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) to remove the charge of desertion and insubordination from the record of Michael J. Quirk, alias Joseph McDonough, and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2175) granting an increase of pension to Cecilia Quinlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) granting a pension to James Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Sanford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Shearer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 2179) for the relief of Tracey Edson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2180) granting a pension to Robert L. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2181) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Westwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) granting an increase of pension to Temple Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) granting an increase of pension to W. N. Peirce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) granting an increase of pension to William Marvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Haskell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) granting an increase of pension to George F. Hodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) granting an increase of pension to Chester Greenwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) granting an increase of pension to John A. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) granting an increase of pension to Martha C. Dodge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) granting an increase of pension to John W. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) granting an increase of pension to Charles Blanchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Caroline Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) granting a pension to Isaac Baum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) granting a pension to Anna Jones Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) granting a pension to Elizabeth Becker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting a pension to Anna Jones Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) granting a pension to James Carlile; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) granting a pension to Alexander Cowan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) granting a pension to Mary C. Higbee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) granting a pension to Thomas Kenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) granting a pension to Temperance Moon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) granting a pension to James Henry Martineau; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) granting a pension to Louis Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) granting a pension to John McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) granting a pension to Marcena De Witt McKane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) granting a pension to John McLaws; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) granting a pension to Nymphus Murdock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) granting a pension to Persis M. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) granting a pension to James Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) granting a pension to William McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) granting a pension to Samuel Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) granting a pension to Matilda Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Ann Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) granting a pension to Charlotte E. Rudd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) granting a pension to Thomas D. Stevensen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) granting a pension to Margaret Ann Sperry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) granting a pension to John Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) granting a pension to John Woolley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) granting a pension to Harriet Wild; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) granting a pension to Anna L. Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) granting a pension to Nancy A. Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) for the relief of William P. Alexander; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) to correct the military record of Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 2226) granting an increase of pension to James Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) granting an increase of pension to John J. Chance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Burris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) granting an increase of pension to Victor B. Crowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) granting a pension to Neill Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of Mary J. McGlothlen; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 2234) granting an increase of pension to John Fellon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) granting an increase of pension to William S. Halladay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 2236) granting an increase of pension to L. B. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) granting an increase of pension to William H. Staples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 2239) granting a pension to Charles W. Faux, alias Charles M. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Wittenmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) granting a pension to Sarah Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) granting a pension to William K. Wertman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) granting a pension to Frederick Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) granting a pension to Oscar S. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) granting a pension to Laura C. Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) granting a pension to Francis B. Savage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) granting a pension to Jacob M. Stratiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) granting a pension to Edwin H. Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) granting a pension to Emma B. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) granting a pension to Warren W. Klinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) granting a pension to Jeremiah Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) granting a pension to Jane McNalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) granting a pension to Kate H. Lovett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) granting a pension to Jacob Kelchner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) granting a pension to Mary Alice John; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) granting a pension to Luther L. Kauffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 2257) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hackley, alias Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting a pension to Jane Heist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) granting a pension to Sophia G. Eckman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) granting a pension to William H. Eoute; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) granting a pension to Ellen Gunton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) granting a pension to Michael S. Dietrich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) granting a pension to Alfred Dressler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) granting a pension to Charles C. Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) granting a pension to Harriet Barnd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) granting a pension to Emma Bound; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) granting a pension to Emma Crewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting a pension to Mary E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting a pension to Benjamin E. Kneibler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) granting a pension to Harry W. Albeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Zerbe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) granting an increase of pension to John G. Woolley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) granting an increase of pension to William Walt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) granting an increase of pension to Joel W. Strohecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting an increase of pension to William H. Utt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) granting an increase of pension to William Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Strausser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) granting an increase of pension to William Spotts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) granting an increase of pension to John N. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) granting an increase of pension to William Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Sigmund; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting an increase of pension to James Sheap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Search; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) granting an increase of pension to David Ruckel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Riddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Raver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting an increase of pension to John Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting an increase of pension to John Nungesser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting an increase of pension to William H. Morton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting an increase of pension to J. Hunter Miles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Metz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Leib; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Knarr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kearns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Kase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) granting an increase of pension to John N. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) granting an increase of pension to Charles Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) granting an increase of pension to William H. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Frame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) granting an increase of pension to Alem B. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) granting an increase of pension to George Duke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dietrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Croft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Cragne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2308) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) granting an increase of pension to Gideon Beishline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of J. K. Beltz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) for the relief of Jeremiah Rader; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2312) for the relief of Joseph G. Swank; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) for the relief of Louisa Weaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow a medal of honor upon Lieut. Russell Karns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 2315) granting an increase of pension to Richard Harkness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) granting an increase of pension to Noah Tohill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Peddecord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) granting an increase of pension to James S. Gustin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) granting an increase of pension to George M. Bence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) granting an increase of pension to Albert Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2323) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) granting an increase of pension to William Vandeventer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2325) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Helton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2326) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Grover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) granting an increase of pension to William R. Rennels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2328) granting an increase of pension to Martin Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2329) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2330) granting an increase of pension to J. A. McCoskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) granting an increase of pension to John Helt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) granting an increase of pension to David O. Giffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) granting an increase of pension to David Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) granting an increase of pension to Clarkson Tryon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) granting an increase of pension to William Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) granting an increase of pension to John H. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2337) granting an increase of pension to Michael Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) granting a pension to Archibald Van Dereu; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) granting a pension to Anna Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to W. H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) granting a pension to Frank J. Himes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) granting a pension to John S. Kerans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) granting a pension to Lena L. Stevenson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2344) to remove the charge of desertion against John McElhiney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) to correct the military record of A. C. Burk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) to correct the military record of John Healy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) to correct the military record of Lewis Rankin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) to correct the military record of Norman B. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) for the relief of Francis M. Watrous; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 2350) granting an increase of pension to Matthew H. Jamison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 2351) granting an increase of pension to Nancy W. Coffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) granting an increase of pension to James Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) granting a pension to Olena M. Hagenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) granting a pension to Ellen Weiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) granting a pension to Kate Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) granting a pension to Thomas Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2357) granting a pension to Charles I. Heywood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) granting a pension to Edward Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2359) to refund certain tonnage taxes and light dues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 2360) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2361) granting an increase of pension to Evan Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2364) granting an increase of pension to James Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Kresge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Brecht; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) granting an increase of pension to Elmer E. Frederick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) granting an increase of pension to George W. Heim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) granting an increase of pension to Henry Zellner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) granting an increase of pension to Thompson Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) granting an increase of pension to Morris Ecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) granting an increase of pension to John Burger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) granting an increase of pension to Martin Creahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Vogel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2380) granting an increase of pension to George Starner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2381) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wildrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2382) granting an increase of pension to George King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2384) granting an increase of pension to William Peltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2385) granting an increase of pension to William J. Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 2386) granting an increase of pension to Laura Shelby Converse; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of W. J. Bilderbacker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) for the relief of Nancy M. Cockerham, heir of Cirley Fairchilds, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of the heirs of John Oliver, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) for the relief of the widow and the heirs of Daniel R. Wright, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2391) for the relief of the heirs of Rebecca James, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Riley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 2393) for the relief of the American West Indies Trading Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) granting a pension to Henrietta Sherman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Ayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Megehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2398) granting an increase of pension to Albert McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Konicka; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) granting a pension to A. G. Hamilton, alias Garland Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) granting a pension to Thomas H. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) granting a pension to Anne E. Preddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2403) granting a pension to Samuel A. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) granting a pension to B. E. De Vall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) granting a pension to Sarah L. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) granting a pension to Thomas S. Garen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2407) granting a pension to David Hubert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) granting a pension to Rhoda L. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) granting a pension to Minnie Bryant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2410) granting a pension to Misses M. E. and S. J. Gladney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) granting a pension to Nancy E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) granting a pension to William B. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2413) granting a pension to Phoebe A. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) granting a pension to Albert I. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2415) granting a pension to Julius C. Parrott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) granting a pension to John B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) granting a pension to G. A. Joyner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) granting a pension to Charles Woolston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) for the relief of Margaret Hardwick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) for the relief of Thomas J. Estes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2421) for the relief of H. C. Chase; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2422) for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Hibbard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2423) for the relief of Lizzie E. McCord, administratrix of Moses S. McCord, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of William M. West; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of Annie H. Rainey and heirs of William S. Rainey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) for the relief of the heirs of W. L. Dillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of W. J. Massey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) for the relief of the heirs of Miles Knowlton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) for the relief of the heirs of John G. Freeman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Austin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Edwards, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) for the relief of the heirs of George Sink; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) for the relief of the heirs of G. W. Morris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of the heirs of William W. Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas O. Burkhead; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) for the relief of the heirs of J. A. Patillo; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) for the relief of the heirs of Marguerite E. Dennis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) for the relief of the heirs of Eliza Ann Ashcraft; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) for the relief of the heirs of Susan McCurley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Jesse E. Lacey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) for the relief of the heirs of Azraih Mitchell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) for the relief of the heirs of Wesley W. Wallace; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) for the relief of the heirs of Levander Jenkins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) for the relief of the heirs of the late Jennie Hunter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) for the relief of the heirs of the late Hugh Rowen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) for the relief of the heirs of H. S. Young; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) for the relief of the heirs of John J. Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2448) for the relief of the heirs of David R. Lamb; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) for the relief of the heirs of John Kirk; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2451) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of the estate of James Scull; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of the estate of Moses S. McCord; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) for the relief of the estate of Amanda E. Buck, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2455) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Virginia A. Jones, administratrix of Samuel J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William A. Bethel, administrator of Martha Harrison, deceased, and Oliver P. Lister; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2457) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William E. Floyd, administrator of Asa Crow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2458) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of heirs of Thaddeus N. Ferrell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dr. W. D. Barnett, deceased, late of Cleveland County, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Pine Bluff, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2461) to provide for the repayment of the ransom of Ellen M. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2462) granting an increase of pension to James N. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Forbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Elwood Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pride; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2466) granting an increase of pension to James Crain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2467) granting a pension to A. M. Huckstep; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 2468) granting an increase of pension to Barzillar P. Irons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn W. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) granting an increase of pension to T. S. Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2471) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Rail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) granting an increase of pension to William Rech; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2473) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2474) granting an increase of pension to John Rexford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Gatton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2476) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2477) granting a pension to Frank Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2478) granting relief to Thomas E. Osborn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) to place Jonathan J. McClarren on the retired list with the rank of captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 2480) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Jacobs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2481) granting an increase of pension to S. G. Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) granting an increase of pension to John Coombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel S. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2484) granting an increase of pension to Marcus E. Cartwright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2485) granting an increase of pension to Perry Knox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2486) granting an increase of pension to William A. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2487) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Pearce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2488) granting an increase of pension to Catharine May; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2489) granting a pension to Emmett Puckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2490) granting a pension to Edwin Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2491) granting a pension to Sophia Goodman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2492) granting a pension to Mary S. Overby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2493) granting a pension to William E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2494) granting a pension to Columbus Wise; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2495) granting a pension to Stephen H. Harrel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2496) granting a pension to William H. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2497) granting a pension to Robert S. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) granting a pension to Ulysses S. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) granting a pension to George Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) for the relief of George D. Blakey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) for the relief of Francis M. Price; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) for the relief of Frank W. Clark; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) for the relief of Walter Langley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) for the relief of George W. Lackey, surviving partner of the firm of William Lackey & Sons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2505) for the relief of the estate of John M. Higgins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) for the relief of the estate of W. C. Russell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of A. W. Richards, administrator of estate of Kinchen Bell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2508) to enroll James B. Nichols and others as Choctaw Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Absolom Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Smedley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) granting an increase of pension to William T. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) granting an increase of pension to John Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Swaim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Scholck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) granting an increase of pension to James P. Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) granting an increase of pension to William Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2517) granting an increase of pension to John T. Starr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) granting an increase of pension to John Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2519) granting an increase of pension to Willet Van Winkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) granting an increase of pension to Seraphim T. Thery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2522) granting an increase of pension to William Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2523) granting an increase of pension to Preston Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Mishler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) granting an increase of pension to John H. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) granting an increase of pension to George P. McClellan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2528) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shropshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2530) granting an increase of pension to James Downey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) granting an increase of pension to James W. McMillen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2532) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) granting an increase of pension to John S. Bray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Proctor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) granting an increase of pension to Job J. Whiteman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) granting an increase of pension to George W. Horine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stauffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Z. Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2540) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) granting an increase of pension to James M. Latham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2543) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus G. Peppel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2544) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Will; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) granting an increase of pension to Russell Punteney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) granting an increase of pension to William C. Rike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) granting an increase of pension to John W. Towner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hazenwinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Justice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) granting an increase of pension to William Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2551) granting a pension to William L. Archer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2552) granting a pension to Andrew J. Bess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2553) granting a pension to Clark Conners; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2554) granting a pension to William E. Gilchrist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) granting a pension to Anna F. Haddock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) granting a pension to Maria Fix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2557) granting a pension to Francis M. Phares; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2558) granting a pension to Jean B. Kopf; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2559) granting a pension to Ema S. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) for the relief of Joseph M. Howe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2561) to correct the military record of William Schroeder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2562) to correct the military record of John B. Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2563) to remove the charge of desertion against Ephraim H. Gallion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2564) granting an increase of pension to Henry Selover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2565) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Seymour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Weymouth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) granting an increase of pension to James P. Aney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2568) granting a pension to Mary Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2569) granting a pension to Regina Ebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) granting a pension to Mary Dowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2571) for the relief of Lydia Mahoney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2572) for the relief of the McBride Electric Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) for the relief of Michael Flaherty, guardian of John Flaherty, claimant; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Weidle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) for the relief of the estate of Robert M. Cannon, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany the bill introduced for the special relief of Reason W. Eberhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of citizens of Glen Ellyn, Ill., against the establishment of a parcels post, and protest of citizens of Aurora, Ill., against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of the eleventh district of Illinois, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Union League Club of the city of New York, indorsing the action of the President in calling the extra session of Congress, and favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Socialists of La Crosse, Wis., against increased rate of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of George D. Eggleston Post, No. 133, Grand Army of the Republic, of Appleton, Wis., urging passage of H. R. 20346, of the third session of the Sixty-first Congress, commonly known as the "Sulloway bill"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Wisconsin associations of creamery owners and managers, against Hepburn bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Wisconsin citizens, favoring election of United States Senators by direct vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of the Trempealeau County Union of the American Society of Equity, in favor of retaining the present 10-cent tax on all colored oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Wisconsin citizens, against Canadian reciprocity; petition of citizens of Wisconsin, favorng retention of duty on barley and oleomargarine; and resolution of the American Protective Tariff League of New York City, opposed to the adoption of the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Streator, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of American Protection Tariff League, in opposition to Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Alvin Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Belvidere, Ill., concerning donation of public lands to Archbishop of Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of 44 citizens of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, against accepting the silver service offered by the State of Utah for the battleship *Utah*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of 150 residents of Haverhill, Mass., favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of 244 residents of Newburyport, Mass., favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: Petition of South Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Butler, Pa., favoring passage of Miller-Curtis bill, (1) to protect dry territory by excluding liquors from interstate-commerce protection; (2) the Curtis bill, to prohibit saloons in Hawaii; (3) the McCumber-Terrell bill, to forbid liquor selling in ships and buildings used by the United States Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, insisting upon the building of the battleship *New York* in compliance with the law of 1910; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Bolivar Lodge, No. 570, of Bolivar, Pa., and America's Pride Council, No. 952, of Export, Pa., Junior Order United American Mechanics, in favor of illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition signed by Mrs. H. S. Townsend, W. F. Swan, F. Dunsterberg, and other citizens of Utah, protesting against any increase in second-class rates of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition against parcels post by J. W. Bassett and others, of Lena, Wis.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Kaukauna, and Henry Jonen, of South Kaukauna, and other citizens of adjoining towns, favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition against parcels post by Thomas F. De Wave and others, of Cooperstown; G. J. Stodola, of Brageau; and R. D. Zuehlke and others, of Suring, Wis.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of 150 citizens of Oklahoma City, Okla., favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petitions from various citizens and business firms of Waynoka, Avard, Woodward, Moorland, Alva, Cherokee, Ingersoll, Carmen, Okeene, Ringwood, Oklahoma City, El Reno, Yukon, Cement, Apache, Anadarko, Luther, Geary, Taloga, Okla., protesting against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petitions of D. A. Fraser and 6 others, of Port Huron, Allen Phillips and 15 others of Port Huron, E. P. Draper and 8 others of Allenton, Mrs. Mary Russell and 26 others of Silverwood, all of Michigan, favoring the Miller-Curtis bill (S. 7528 and H. R. 23641); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Fred. W. Pohley and 24 others, of Avoca, St. Clair County, and William R. Simons and 37 others of China Township, St. Clair County, Mich., favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition adopted by the Republican caucus of Goodland Township, Lapeer County, against the passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of Theodore Munger and 55 others, of Rochester, Mich., relative to the conservation of the soil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHARP: Protest of citizens of Greenwich, Ohio, against reduction in wool schedule; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Resolutions of the Polish National Alliance, Group No. 1180, of Woonsocket, R. I., against further restriction of immigration; resolutions of Local Union No. 1831, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Arctic, R. I., favoring an illiteracy test for immigrants; resolutions of Street Sweepers' Union No. 13114, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring an illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, statement of the adjutant general of Rhode Island, in support of the so-called militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Providence Division, No. 57, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, for an investigation concerning dairy products and for the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, remonstrance of Fletcher W. Lawton, Henry K. Littlefield, and John T. Gardner, members of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, protesting, in behalf of the fishing interests in and about Newport, R. I., against ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement with Canada relative to fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring the establishment of a department of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Ann Elizabeth Kitchin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 79, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Frenchtown, N. J., urging the immediate passage of H. R. 15413, Sixty-first Congress, providing for additional legislation for checking undesirable immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Millstone Valley Grange, No. 169, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millstone, N. J., urging the passage of a bill providing for the correction of the defects in the Federal statutes governing the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, affidavits to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *April 6, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

LE ROY PERCY, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REFERENCE BUREAUS IN LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a special report relative to the legislative reference bureaus in the Library of Congress (S. Doc. No. 7), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Yedtman*, Roger Crane, master (S. Doc. No. 5), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel brig *Sally*, James Wallace, master (S. Doc. No. 4), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the

Committee on the Geological Survey and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

House joint memorial No. 6—Requesting the Congress of the United States to take steps to prohibit the changing of the old names of Montana's mountains and streams.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas the Government officials in charge of the work of making geological, topographical, and other Government surveys of Montana, both in and out of forest reserves, have seen fit to change the old names of many of our mountains and streams; and

Whereas the old names index Montana's early history and should be preserved as part of the old West: Now therefore be it

Resolved (the Senate concurring), That we, the Twelfth Legislature of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of necessary legislation forbidding the changing of names of Montana's mountains, rivers, and streams, and to make it obligatory upon those in authority to use the old names in making maps of this State; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and is hereby, instructed to transmit properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior, our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, and to the President of the United States Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives.

W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.
W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.

Approved, March 3, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, *Governor.*

Filed March 3, 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*
By DAVID PIZER, *Deputy.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 6, requesting Congress to take steps to prohibit the changing of the old names of Montana's mountains and streams, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 3d day of March, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 12—Memorializing the Congress of the United States to create a commission whose duties shall be to classify and segregate all agricultural lands in forest reserves in the United States.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Whereas large areas of agricultural lands are included in the various forest reserves of the United States that are more valuable for agriculture than for forestry; and

Whereas the same should be speedily opened to actual and bona fide settlers applying for same under the homestead laws: Now therefore be it

Resolved, the senate concurring, That we, the Twelfth Legislature of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States that a commission of three persons be appointed for each State in which forest reserves are located; said commission to consist of one resident of such State and one person connected with the Forestry Service and one person whose residence shall not be in the State. The duties of said commission shall be to enforce the laws relative to homesteads in the forest reserves in a just and liberal manner, and to immediately pass on the application of all persons applying for homesteads upon such reservations; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior, our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.
W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.

Approved, March 2, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, *Governor.*

Filed March 2, 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 12, memorializing Congress to create a commission whose duties shall be to classify and segregate all agricultural lands in forest reserves in the United States, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 2d day of March, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 4th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 10.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas under the present statutes and rulings of the Department of the Interior relating to the disposition of coal lands owned by the United States it is now possible that the price of coal lands may fluctuate or change between the date of entry and the time of payment by the entryman; and

Whereas it is the sense of the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana that such fluctuation or change of price during that period is unfair and unjust to the entryman: Now therefore be it

Resolved (the House concurring), That we, the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of necessary legislation to correct and remedy the evil herein above referred to.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and that a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senators and Representative in Congress of the State of Montana, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about a speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved, March 3, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, *Governor.*

Filed March 4, 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*
By DAVID PIZER, *Deputy.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of senate joint memorial No. 10, relating to the disposition of coal lands by the United States, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 3d day of March, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 15.

Whereas by the terms of a treaty entered into between the United States of America and the Government of Russia in the year 1832 it was provided that the inhabitants of each of the respective contracting States and all of such inhabitants should be at liberty to sojourn and reside in all parts of the territories of the other and should enjoy the same security and protection as natives of the country wherein they reside, on condition of their submitting to the laws and ordinances there prevailing; and

Whereas the said Government of Russia now claims the right, under the provisions of such treaty, to exclude from its territories American citizens of the Jewish faith, because of local laws and ordinances; and

Whereas the American people have always regarded the said treaty as guaranteeing to all our citizens the right of sojourn within the Russian Empire, without discrimination on account of either race or creed; and

Whereas the premises being recited a resolution is now pending before the National House of Representatives calling for the termination of the said treaty because of the unwarrantable construction so put upon it, after due notice to the Government of Russia; and

Whereas in the opinion of this house such exclusion of American citizens on any such ground is contrary to the spirit of the age and particularly obnoxious to the sentiment of religious toleration historically characteristic of the people of this country: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That the resolution so pending before the Congress merits the approbation of all lovers of liberty and justice, and ought to be adopted without delay.

Resolved, That the Representatives in Congress from this State be, and they hereby are, urged to use all honorable means to procure the speedy passage of the said resolution and action in accordance therewith by the Department of State.

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly attested by the secretary of state, be by him transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each House of Congress, and to the Senators and Representative in Congress from the State of Montana.

W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.
W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.

Approved, March 6, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, *Governor.*

Filed March 6, 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 15, petitioning Congress to adopt the resolution now pending to recognize the rights of American citizenship under treaty, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on March 6, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representative in Congress assembled:

Whereas a national forest reserve has been established in central western Montana known as the Snowy Mountains National Forest; and

Whereas the territory included within such Snowy Mountains National Forest is the natural home of great numbers of game animals; and

Whereas such game animals have not now in the State of Montana any place or shelter where they are safe from the destruction of hunters; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable that these game animals should be preserved and allowed to breed and grow without molestation of hunters: Now therefore be it

Resolved (the senate concurring), That we, the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States for the passage of necessary legislation to, at as early a date as practicable, authorize the President of the United States, by proclamation or executive order, to set aside and designate the territory included within the Snowy Mountains National Forest as a game preserve wherein the natural wild game will be forever protected and immune from the attacks of the hunters.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States, and a copy thereof be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C.; and

Resolved further, That a copy thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to each of the Representatives of the State of Montana in the Congress of the United States with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about a speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

W. W. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.
W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.

Approved, March 4, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, *Governor.*

Filed March 4, 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*
By DAVID PIZER, *Deputy.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 3, asking Congress to set aside and designate the territory included within the Snowy Mountains National Forest as a game preserve, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved March 4, 1911, by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 6th day of March, A. D. 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial No. 7—Asking for the construction of two steel bridges over the Kootenai River in the Kootenai National Forest Reserve by the United States Government acting in conjunction with the civil government of Lincoln County, Mont.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas vast tracts of valuable public lands of Montana have heretofore been withdrawn from settlement and set aside by the Federal Government as forest reserves thereby permanently preventing their occupation and development; and

Whereas these forest reservations in the county of Lincoln, State of Montana, particularly, cover a large portion of the area of the county and are only accessible by mere forest trails sufficient alone for footpaths, and are utterly inaccessible at present to vehicles of any character as there are but few roads and bridges in any part of these reservations over which a wagon can be driven; and

Whereas the land over which these forest trails have been built can not be made by public taxation to bear any part of the expenses of constructing roads and bridges required by the inhabitants of these regions; and

Whereas recent experiences have shown that the lack of suitable roads and bridges in these forest reserves has resulted in enormous loss by forest fires of vast quantities of very valuable timber and in a terrible sacrifice of human life: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we petition the Congress of the United States for the necessary legislation enabling and directing the construction, under supervision of the board of county commissioners of Lincoln County, Mont., of two steel highway bridges across the Kootenai River at suitable and convenient places in Lincoln County, one half of the expenses of the construction of said bridges to be paid out of the funds set aside for the maintenance and protection of the national forests and the other half of said expenses to be paid out of the public treasury of the said county of Lincoln under an agreement to be entered into between the proper Federal officers and the county commissioners of Lincoln County, Mont.

Resolved further, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Senate of the United States; and that a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Montana, to the House of Representatives of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be transmitted, by the secretary of state of the State of Montana, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Montana, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about a speedy action for the accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.
W. W. MCDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved, March 2, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, *Governor.*

Filed, March 2, 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Senate Joint Memorial No. 7, asking for the construction of two steel bridges over the Kootenai River in the Kootenai National Forest Reserve, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 2d day of March, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 3d day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (J. Res. 61 A) indorsing the action of the United States House of Representatives in selecting San Francisco as the site for the Panama Canal Exposition of 1915.

Whereas the people of California have raised seventeen and a half million dollars for the purpose of holding an international exposition at San Francisco in 1915 to celebrate the opening of the Panama Canal, and neither ask nor desire aid from Congress other than a mere invitation to foreign nations to participate in said exposition; and

Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States of America, January 31, 1911, by decisive vote, has chosen San Francisco as the city in which to hold the exposition commemorating the opening of the Panama Canal: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That we do hereby approve and indorse the said action of the House of Representatives of the United States in selecting San Francisco as the site for said exposition.

C. A. INGRAM,
Speaker of the Assembly.
THOMAS MORRIS,
President of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
F. M. WYLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 10—Relative to the establishment of a parcels post.

Whereas the establishment of a parcels post would be an inestimable benefit to the State of California and an incalculable stimulus to trade, both domestic and foreign, throughout the whole of the United States; and

Whereas it has been found possible for the American express companies to unite in giving to the British post office a flat rate of 24 cents on parcels up to 11 pounds for all distances between New York and San Francisco, thus proving the economic practicability of such desired parcels post: Be it

Resolved, That the Senate and Assembly of the State of California hereby join in requesting our Representatives in the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington to do their utmost to forward such legislation as may insure the establishment of a parcels post at rates not to exceed those accorded by American express companies to the foreigner, viz, 24 cents for packages up to 11 pounds; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and a copy hereof to each Member of Congress from the State of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 7.

Whereas it appears from investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States and otherwise that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now therefore

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the application be made, and hereby is made, to Congress under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited, and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved, That the legislature of all other States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.
W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.

Approved, March 1, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, *Governor.*

Filed March 1, 1911.

A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Montana, ss:*

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 7, relating to the practice of polygamy, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 1st day of March, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 1st day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] A. N. YODER, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Brotherhood of the First Presbyterian Church of Parkersburg, Pa., praying for the ratification of the proposed arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Pennsylvania, of sundry members of the Sunday school of the Church of the Brethren of East McPherson, Kans., and of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren of McPherson, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Lincoln Park Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia praying for the passage of the so-called Judson bill to systematize the finances of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the Congress of the Knights of Labor remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch National German-American Alliance of America of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying that an investigation be made into the conditions existing at the Bureau of Immigration, Ellis Island, N. Y., which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Federation of Jewish Organizations of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of Jewish chaplains in the United States Army and Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Laymen's Missionary Movement of Hendersonville, N. C., and a petition of the Woman's Board of Missions of the Interior of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Sammamish Valley Grange, No. 286, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bothwell, Wash., and the memorial of B. F. Anderson and sundry other citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Salem, Oreg., and Union, La., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BROWN. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution by House and Senate of Nebraska Legislature, thirty-second session—Antipolygamy resolution.

Whereas it appears from investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States, and otherwise, that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now therefore

Resolved, That the application be made and hereby is made to Congress under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited, and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved, That the legislatures of all other States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

JOHN KUHL,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
M. R. HOPEWELL,
President of Senate.

Approved, March 14, 1911.

CHESTER H. ALDRICH, *Governor.*

Filed March 14, 1911.

ADDISON WAIT, *Secretary of State.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Nebraska, ss:*

I, Addison Wait, secretary of the State of Nebraska, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a joint resolution relating to the practice of polygamy, adopted by the thirty-second session of the Legislature of Nebraska and approved by Chester H. Aldrich, governor of said State, March 14, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State.

Done at the city of Lincoln, this, the 14th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] ADDISON WAIT, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. BROWN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Clay Center, Nebr., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the city council of Rock Island, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation relative to the condition of the employees at the Rock Island Arsenal, Ill., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Illinois, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a memorial from 28 of the leading furniture manufacturers of Grand Rapids, Mich. I should like to have the memorial read for the information of the Senate, and the signatures may be printed with the consent of the Senate.

There being no objection, the memorial was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *March 15, 1911.*

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

We commend the statesmanship of President William H. Taft for his negotiation of the Canadian reciprocity treaty as a step to larger commercial activity and freer trade with the countries of North America.

We believe, however, that amendments should be made to the treaty lowering or abolishing the duties on some classes of manufactured goods that will be mutually beneficial: Therefore

We the undersigned manufacturers respectfully request that our Senators and Representatives favor the removal of all duties between the two countries on manufactured furniture and refrigerators.

Sligh Furniture Co., C. R. Sligh, president; Grand Rapids Refrigerator Co., C. H. Leonard, president; Imperial Furniture Co., F. Stuart Foote, secretary; Century Furniture Co., D. H. Brown, secretary; Luce Furniture Co., John Hoult, vice president; Michigan Chair Co., H. S. Jordan, president; Nichols & Cox Lumber Co., F. I. Nichols, president; Phoenix Furniture Co., R. W. Merrill, secretary and treasurer; Nelson Matter Furniture Co., James G. McBride, secretary; The Gunn Furniture Co., Jno. P. Homiller, secretary; The Widdicomb Furniture Co., Wm. Widdicomb, president; John Widdicomb Co., H. Widdicomb, jr., president; Berkey & Gay Furniture Co., Jno. A. Cavode, secretary; Sterling Desk Co., D. C. Cawthra, president; Wm. A. Berkey Furniture Co., F. F. Peck, secretary; Mueller & Slack Co., Chas. A. Eckart, treasurer; Grand Rapids Furniture Co., E. W. Irwin, secretary; Wilmarth Show Case Co., O. B. Wilmarth, secretary and treasurer; Retting Furniture Co., Chas. B. Retting, treasurer; The Welch Manufacturing Co., L. W. Welch, treasurer; E. S. Paine Co. (Ltd.), E. S. Paine, chairman; Jno. D. Raab Chair Co., John D. Raab, president; Stickley Bros. Co., Albert Stickley, president; Royal Furniture Co., R. W. Irwin, secretary; Grand Rapids Chair Co., M. D. Ryan, treasurer; Grand Rapids Show Case Co., S. D. Young, treasurer; Wagemaker Co. (Ltd.), I. Wagemaker, chairman; Snyder Furniture Co., Chas. Snyder, secretary.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 16—Relative to the cession by the United States to the State of California of certain lands adjacent to Deadmans Island, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

Whereas by an act of the Legislature of the State of California entitled "An act relinquishing to the United States of America the title of this State to certain lands," approved March 9, 1897, the State of

California granted all its right and title in and to the parcels of land extending from high-water mark out to 300 yards below low-water mark, lying adjacent and contiguous to such lands of the United States in the State of California as lie upon tidal waters and are held, occupied, or reserved for military purposes or defense, lying adjacent and contiguous to any island, the title to which is in the United States, or which island is reserved by the United States for any military or naval purpose or for defense, were granted, released, and ceded to the United States of America under certain terms, conditions, and reservations expressed in said act; and

Whereas the title to Deadmans Island, a certain island situate in the waters of the Pacific Ocean, and being within the boundaries of the city of Los Angeles, in Los Angeles County, State of California, is in the United States, and by said act there was granted to the United States a certain tract of land consisting of tide and submerged land surrounding said island, which said tract of land is bounded by a line distant 300 yards out beyond low-water mark at all points where the boundaries of said island touch high-water mark; and

Whereas said Deadmans Island is situated on the easterly side of the main entrance channel to that portion of Los Angeles Harbor formerly known as the inner harbor of San Pedro, and the said tract of land surrounding said island and so granted to the United States includes a certain parcel of submerged land situated in the city of Los Angeles, in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the northerly boundary line of said tract of land so granted to the United States with the harbor line established by the United States on the westerly side of said channel, said point being at or near station No. 16 of said harbor line; thence southeasterly along said harbor line to station ZZ thereof; thence continuing southeasterly from said station ZZ of said harbor line in a straight line to the point of intersection of the southerly boundary line of said tract of land so granted to the United States, with the said harbor line, which said last-mentioned point is at or near station No. 15 of said harbor line; thence northwesterly, northerly, and northeasterly along the westerly boundary line of said tract of land to the point of beginning; and

Whereas said parcel of land above described is 1,875 feet, more or less, in length along the said channel and adjacent thereto, and has a maximum width of 360 feet, more or less, and contains approximately 11 acres of land; and said parcel of land lies adjacent to other tide and submerged lands wholly under public ownership and control, lying on the westerly side of said channel; and

Whereas the said city of Los Angeles has incurred a bonded indebtedness of $3,000,000 for the purpose of developing and improving said Los Angeles Harbor, including that portion of the lands and waters thereof adjacent to said parcel of land, by the construction of docks, wharves, and warehouses upon the water front of said city, the same to be owned and operated by said city, by the operating and construction of public streets and highways to the navigable waters of said harbor, and by the construction of slips, canals, and other waterways, and it is now proposed to expend the proceeds of said bonds for said purposes; and said parcel of land is so situated that it is urgently required for the construction and maintenance of public docks, wharves, slips, and other commercial appliances appurtenant thereto for the accommodation of commerce in said Los Angeles Harbor, and for the purpose of providing the necessary frontage for and access to the same upon and from said channel and the other navigable waters of said harbor; and the use of said parcel of land for said purposes is necessary in order that the said lands adjacent to said channel on the westerly side thereof may be adequately used for the purposes aforesaid, in order to properly develop and improve said harbor for commercial purposes; and

Whereas said parcel of land, by reason of its location and irregular shape, is not required or suitable for any of the purposes specified in said act, and the United States has never used and does not now use the same for any of said purposes, or for any other purpose: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Congress of the United States to cede to the State of California that certain parcel of land situate in the city of Los Angeles, county of Los Angeles, State of California, hereinbefore referred to and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the northerly boundary line of said tract of land so granted to the United States with the harbor line established by the United States on the westerly side of said channel, said point being at or near station No. 16 of said harbor line; thence southeasterly along said harbor line to station ZZ thereof; thence continuing southeasterly from said station ZZ of said harbor line in a straight line to the point of intersection of the southerly boundary line of said tract of land so granted to the United States, with the said harbor line, which said last-mentioned point is at or near station No. 15 of said harbor line; thence northwesterly, northerly, and northeasterly along the westerly boundary line of said tract of land to the point of beginning;

For use for the construction and maintenance of public docks, slips, and wharves, and other commercial appliances appurtenant thereto for the accommodation of commerce in said Los Angeles Harbor; and that the Government of the United States and the Secretary of War be requested not to use said parcel of land for any of the purposes specified in said act or for any other purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of California will accept the cession and transfer from the Government of the United States of said parcel of land last above described, to be held for public purposes, to wit, for the construction and maintenance of public docks, slips, and wharves, and other commercial appliances appurtenant thereto for the accommodation of commerce in Los Angeles Harbor; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of California hereby offers to grant and relinquish to the United States its right and title to such other lands in, upon, or adjacent to the waters of said harbor, in addition to the lands heretofore granted to the United States, as shall be selected by the United States for military purposes or defense, or for such other purposes as the Government of the United States may require; and be it further

Resolved, That upon the passage of this resolution the secretary of the senate be directed to forward a copy thereof to the Secretary of War and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress, requesting them to present the resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 10—Relative to the establishment of a parcels post.

Whereas the establishment of a parcels post would be an inestimable benefit to the State of California and an incalculable stimulus to trade, both domestic and foreign, throughout the whole of the United States; and

Whereas it has been found possible for the American express companies to unite in giving to the British post office a flat rate of 24 cents on parcels up to 11 pounds for all distances between New York and San Francisco, thus proving the economic practicability of such desired parcels post: Be it

Resolved, That the Senate and assembly of the State of California hereby join in requesting our Representatives in the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington to do their utmost to forward such legislation as may insure the establishment of a parcels post at rates not to exceed those accorded by American express companies to the foreigner, viz, 24 cents for packages up to 11 pounds; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and a copy hereof to each Member of Congress from the State of California.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Ministers' Association of Laconia, N. H., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and England, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Lincoln Park Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying that Lincoln Park, in the District of Columbia, be selected as the site for the proposed Lincoln Memorial, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Lincoln Park Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to systematize the finances of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURNHAM presented memorials of Fremont Grange, of Raymond; Pembroke Grange, of Pembroke; and of Candia Grange, No. 167, of Candia, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a memorial of Pioneer Grange, No. 69, Patrons of Husbandry, of Kansas, and a memorial of Mount Pleasant Grange, No. 1445, Patrons of Husbandry, of Kansas, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of William B. Meehan, of Boston, Mass., and of 600 citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wadena, Minn., remonstrating against the action of the President of the United States in sending United States troops to the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a petition of Thomas H. Marshall Post, No. 42, Grand Army of the Republic, of Belfast, Me., and a petition of the Somerset County Veterans' Association, of Madison, Me., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of the Maine State Grange; of Local Grange No. 338, of Monticello; of Eureka Grange, No. 113, of Mapleton; of Eastern Star Grange, No. 1, of Hampden, all of the Patrons of Husbandry; and of Amasa Howe and 50 other citizens of Aroostook County; of George H. Smith and 146 other citizens of Aroostook County, all in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of sundry members of the local chapter of the American Woman's League of Miami, Fla., remonstrating against the high rate of postage charged on the Woman's National Daily, published at University City, Mo., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, in behalf of soldiers who served in Indian wars. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, now in session, do hereby submit for your favorable consideration the following memorial:

Whereas the soldiers who served in the Indian campaigns from 1865 to 1883, rendering valuable service and enduring great hardship, many sacrificing their lives, and all giving to the Nation the best years of their life in opening up these vast western territories to be developed by the industry of the pioneer, have been unjustly neglected and forgotten by the National Government.

And while many whose services have made it possible to change the Great North American Desert, as it was called on the maps of less than 50 years ago, into rich and prosperous States have passed into eternity, there are a few aged veterans who still remain with us awaiting the final summons, we believe it to be the grateful duty of the Government to see that these men in their declining years shall not lack the necessities of life.

Therefore your memorialists respectfully request the passage of a bill giving to the surviving soldiers who served the United States Government 90 days or more in actual service in the Indian wars from 1865 to 1883, inclusive, the same pensions accorded those who served in the Indian wars previous to 1860, during the Civil War, and during the Spanish War.

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Senate of the State of Nebraska on March 29, 1911.

WM. H. SMITH,
Secretary State Senate.

Approved by the house of representatives March 31, 1911.

HARRY C. RICHARDSON,
Chief Clerk.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer a privileged resolution (S. Res. 6).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Senate by resolution adopted on the 20th day of June, 1910, authorized and directed the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate certain charges against WILLIAM LORIMER, a Senator from the State of Illinois, and to report to the Senate whether in the election of said LORIMER as a Senator of the United States from said State of Illinois there were used and employed corrupt methods and practices; and

Whereas said committee, pursuant to said resolution, took the testimony of a large number of witnesses, reduced the testimony to printed form, and reported the same to the Senate, which was thereafter considered and acted upon by the Senate; and

Whereas the Illinois State Senate thereafter appointed a committee to investigate like charges against WILLIAM LORIMER and to report to said State senate whether in the election of said LORIMER to the United States Senate corrupt methods and practices were employed and used; and

Whereas as it appears from the published reports of the proceedings of the said Illinois State Senate committee that witnesses who were not called and sworn by the committee of this Senate appointed to investigate said charges have appeared before the said committee of the Illinois State Senate, and upon being interrogated have given important material testimony tending to prove that $100,000 was corruptly expended to secure the election of WILLIAM LORIMER to the United States Senate:

Resolved, That Senators JOHN D. WORKS, CHARLES E. TOWNSEND, GEORGE P. MCLEAN, JOHN W. KERN, and ATLEE POMERENE be, and they are hereby, appointed a special committee, and as such committee be, and are hereby, authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate whether in the election of WILLIAM LORIMER, as a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois, there were used and employed corrupt methods and practices; that said committee be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of Congress, to hold sessions at such place or places as it shall deem most convenient for the purposes of the investigation, to employ stenographers, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to report the results of its investigation, including all testimony taken by it; and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask to have the resolution printed and lie on the table subject to call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is next in order.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 1) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 2) supplementary to and amendatory of the act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Nation of Indians in Oklahoma," approved June 28, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 3) to cooperate with the States in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in maintaining instruction in these vocational subjects in State normal schools; in maintaining extension departments in State colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 4) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Stumpff;

A bill (S. 5) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Whitwam; and

A bill (S. 6) granting an increase of pension to Leander O. Tucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 7) for the relief of Daniel M. Frost; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 8) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved February 9, 1909;

A bill (S. 9) to amend the act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat., p. 1567), regulating the manufacture of smoking opium within the United States; and

A bill (S. 10) imposing a tax upon and regulating the production, manufacture, and distribution of certain habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 11) authorizing the Supreme Court of the United States to make rules of practice (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 12) to give effect to the provisions of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the fisheries in waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada, signed at Washington on April 1, 1908, and ratified by the United States Senate April 13, 1908;

A bill (S. 13) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the consular districts of the United States in China; and

A bill (S. 14) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the reorganization of the Consular Service of the United States"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 15) for the relief of the North American Transportation & Trading Co.; and

A bill (S. 16) for the relief of George Q. Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 17) to amend an act entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances," approved March 23, 1906;

A bill (S. 18) to incorporate the Grand Army of the Republic;

A bill (S. 19) authorizing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding title of the United States to lots 3 and 4, square 103, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (S. 20) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to sublots Nos. 31, 32, and 33 of original lot No. 3, square No. 80, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

A bill (S. 21) for the relief of Ida A. Chew, owner of lot 112, square 721, Washington, D. C., with regard to assessment and payment of damages on account of changes of grade due to construction of the Union Station, District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 22) to establish and disburse a public-school teachers' retirement fund in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 23) to authorize the extension of Underwood Street NW.;

A bill (S. 24) for the creation of the police and firemen's relief fund, to provide for the retirement of members of the police and fire departments, to establish a method of procedure for such retirement, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 25) to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, pawnbrokers, and real-estate brokers in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 26) to authorize the acceptance by the United States of the gift of the Nathan Straus Pasteurized Milk Laboratory;

A bill (S. 27) to authorize the town of Chevy Chase, Md., to connect its water system with the water system of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 28) prohibiting corporations transacting business in the District of Columbia under a name similar to another corporation doing business therein;

A bill (S. 29) to amend paragraph 43 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902;

A bill (S. 30) to provide for the extension of Kenyon Street from Seventeenth Street to Mount Pleasant Street and for the extension of Seventeenth Street from Kenyon Street to Irving Street, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 31) to authorize the extension of Park Place NW.; and

A bill (S. 32) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of Newton Place NW. from New Hampshire Avenue to Georgia Avenue, and to connect Newton Place in Gass's subdivision with Newton Place in Whitney Close subdivision," approved February 21, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 33) granting an increase of pension to Ellen B. Kittredge; and

A bill (S. 34) granting an increase of pension to Truman Hall (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 35) creating an additional division of the Railway Mail Service, with headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., and providing the necessary officials therefor; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 36) granting an increase of pension to William W. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 37) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Stonebarger;

A bill (S. 38) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Mowry;

A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Wesley A. Maze;

A bill (S. 40) granting an increase of pension to E. J. Webb;

A bill (S. 41) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jefferson;

A bill (S. 42) granting an increase of pension to Robert Reynolds;

A bill (S. 43) granting an increase of pension to William Q. Mahan;

A bill (S. 44) granting an increase of pension to William Smith Brown;

A bill (S. 45) granting an increase of pension to Michael Liebhart;

A bill (S. 46) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Green;

A bill (S. 47) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius S. Munhall;

A bill (S. 48) granting an increase of pension to L. D. Forhand;

A bill (S. 49) granting an increase of pension to Arden R. Chapman;

A bill (S. 50) granting an increase of pension to Squire C. French;

A bill (S. 51) granting an increase of pension to John F. Scofield;

A bill (S. 52) granting an increase of pension to John Brown;

A bill (S. 53) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Wyatt;

A bill (S. 54) granting an increase of pension to David Pickerell;

A bill (S. 55) granting an increase of pension to Lester Walker;

A bill (S. 56) granting a pension to Joseph P. Morris;

A bill (S. 57) granting an increase of pension to Abel Buckingham;

A bill (S. 58) granting an increase of pension to John H. Lennon;

A bill (S. 59) granting an increase of pension to John F. King;

A bill (S. 60) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Stege;

A bill (S. 61) granting a pension to Katie A. Stewart;

A bill (S. 62) granting a pension to Susan Perry;

A bill (S. 63) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Aler (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 64) granting an increase of pension to Wingate K. Wachtel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON:

A bill (S. 65) providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 66) for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Crow Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 67) for the relief of Capt. Joseph Herring, United States Army, retired (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 68) for the relief of John Lynn;

A bill (S. 69) for the relief of William O. Mallahan;

A bill (S. 70) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Minor Berry (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 71) for the relief of James M. Mulcahy (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 72) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 73) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Lavelle;

A bill (S. 74) granting an increase of pension to Wade Beach (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 75) granting a pension to Lucretia Coleman; and

A bill (S. 76) for the relief of Bull Snake and Old Coyote, Crow Indians; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 77) to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge in and for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 78) to acquire a site for a public building at Sterling, Colo.;

A bill (S. 79) to acquire a site for a public building at Colorado City, Colo.;

A bill (S. 80) to acquire a site for a public building at Glenwood Springs, Colo.;

A bill (S. 81) to acquire a site for a public building at Montrose, Colo.;

A bill (S. 82) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Durango, in the State of Colorado; and

A bill (S. 83) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Fort Morgan, in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 84) to correct the military record of Evans Owens;

A bill (S. 85) for the relief of Simon P. O'Neil;

A bill (S. 86) for the relief of John Burke;

A bill (S. 87) for the relief of George W. Brown; and

A bill (S. 88) granting an honorable discharge to Daniel Booth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 89) to establish a subtreasury at Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 90) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 91) to provide for instruction in forestry in the colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts established under the provisions of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and for experiments in forestry in agricultural experiment stations;

A bill (S. 92) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to more effectually suppress and prevent the spread of diseases of potatoes known as black scab and wart disease, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 93) to establish a botanical laboratory at Denver, Colo.;

A bill (S. 94) for the building of a national road from Wagon Wheel Gap to the Wheeler National Monument, Colo.; and

A bill (S. 95) to establish standard packages and grades for apples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 96) granting to the State of Colorado for the Colorado State University certain lands in lieu of lands inclosed in forest reservations;

A bill (S. 97) for the relief of George W. Wicks; and

A bill (S. 98) creating the Monument National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 99) for the relief of the White River Utes, the Southern Utes, the Uncompahgre Utes, the Tabeguache, Muache, Capote, Weeminuche, Yampa, Grand River, and Uinta Bands of Ute Indians, known also as the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, of Colorado; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 100) to carry into effect the findings of the military board of officers in the case of George Ivers, administrator;

A bill (S. 101) for the relief of Jarib L. Sanderson;

A bill (S. 102) for the relief of Alfred James Saynor;

A bill (S. 103) for the relief of Samuel H. Caldwell;

A bill (S. 104) for the relief of Carl Krueger; and

A bill (S. 105) for the relief of Mrs. Julia L. Hall; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 106) to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk War, Creek War, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole War," approved July 27, 1892, and of the act amendatory thereto; and

A bill (S. 107) granting pensions to the surviving members and the widows of members of the Forsythe Scouts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 108) to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect;

A bill (S. 109) to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in the States of South Dakota and North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect;

A bill (S. 110) to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus and unallotted lands in Todd and Bennett Counties, in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect; and

A bill (S. 111) to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in Washabaugh County, in the Pine Ridge Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 112) granting an increase of pension to David Williams;

A bill (S. 113) granting an increase of pension to Philip Lucas;

A bill (S. 114) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Fassett; and

A bill (S. 115) granting an increase of pension to James Goodwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 116) to maintain at the United States Military Academy an Engineer detachment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 117) granting an increase of pension to Annie G. Hawkins; and

A bill (S. 118) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Pierson Porter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 119) regulating the manner of appointing postmasters of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

A bill (S. 120) for the relief of the several States under the act of July 8, 1898, and acts amendatory thereto; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 121) to authorize the use of certain unclaimed moneys now in the registry of the United States circuit court for the northern district of Ohio for the improvement of the libraries of the United States courts for said district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWLANDS:

A bill (S. 122) to create a Board of River Regulation and to provide a fund, for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 123) to alter the regulations respecting the manner of holding elections for Senators; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 124) to incorporate the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 125) to permit the American Academy in Rome to enlarge its purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 126) granting an increase of pension to Frank P. Sargent;

A bill (S. 127) granting an increase of pension to James Lynch;

A bill (S. 128) granting an increase of pension to Abner F. Clement;

A bill (S. 129) granting a pension to Jennie H. Dennett;

A bill (S. 130) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Esty;

A bill (S. 131) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Mitchell; and

A bill (S. 132) granting an increase of pension to Frank V. Marshall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 133) to provide for a site and the erection of a public building at Marianna, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 134) providing for amending section 3142 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, making the office of internal-revenue collector a term office and fixing the term at four years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEYBURN:

A bill (S. 135) to establish land courts of the United States and an appellate land court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 136) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 137) to prevent fraudulent representations as to Government guaranties of foods and medicines; and

A bill (S. 138) for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or mislabeled paint, turpentine, or linseed oil; to the Committee on Manufactures.

A bill (S. 139) authorizing the purchase of grounds for the accommodation of public buildings for the use of the Government of the United States in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 140) for the relief of Frank B. Crosthwaite; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 141) extending to the members of the Forsyth Scouts the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 142) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 143) to validate the location of mineral claims heretofore made by United States deputy mineral surveyors during their incumbency in office; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

A bill (S. 144) to legalize a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, in Stevens County, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 145) to authorize popular subscriptions at all post offices for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and for publishing and mailing the same; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 146) granting an increase of pension to Abram Trexler;

A bill (S. 147) granting an increase of pension to Sartin McComas;

A bill (S. 148) granting an increase of pension to Pierpont H. B. Moulton;

A bill (S. 149) granting an increase of pension to Israel Gamblin;

A bill (S. 150) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Back;

A bill (S. 151) granting an increase of pension to George I. Martin;

A bill (S. 152) granting a pension to Grant Noble;

A bill (S. 153) granting an increase of pension to Augustus L. Ward;

A bill (S. 154) granting an increase of pension to John W. Mowery;

A bill (S. 155) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Totteh;

A bill (S. 156) granting an increase of pension to Ansel Decatur;

A bill (S. 157) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Smith;

A bill (S. 158) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Norris;

A bill (S. 159) granting a pension to Cleora E. Masonheimer;

A bill (S. 160) granting an increase of pension to Hiram L. Edwards;

A bill (S. 161) granting an increase of pension to William Dickson;

A bill (S. 162) granting an additional pension to soldiers who were confined in Confederate prisons during the War of the Rebellion;

A bill (S. 163) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 164) granting an increase of pension to David D. Sullivan;

A bill (S. 165) granting an increase of pension to John W. Rogers;

A bill (S. 166) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Powers;

A bill (S. 167) granting an increase of pension to John Hays; and

A bill (S. 168) granting an increase of pension to John A. Chretien; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 169) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claims of Jones & Laughlin and others; and

A bill (S. 170) for the relief of Anna T. W. Albree, administratrix of James T. Wood, deceased, and the Safe Deposit & Trust Co. of Pittsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 171) placing John W. Saville, passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, on the retired list with an advanced rank; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 172) to amend an act authorizing the Washington, Spa Springs & Gretta Railroad Co., of Maryland, to enter the District of Columbia, with amendments, approved February 18, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YOUNG:

A bill (S. 173) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Allen (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 174) to provide for an experiment in the improvement of certain highways by the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 175) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer B. Sims;

A bill (S. 176) granting a pension to Silas Bradley;

A bill (S. 177) granting a pension to G. C. Acree;

A bill (S. 178) granting a pension to Harrie Pierson; and

A bill (S. 179) granting a pension to Isaac Wharton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 180) providing for the celebration of the semicentennial anniversary of the act of emancipation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

A bill (S. 181) for the relief of the estate of George Vaught, deceased;

A bill (S. 182) for the relief of George B. Duncan; and

A bill (S. 183) for the relief of G. A. Embry; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 184) for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Ky.; and

A bill (S. 185) for the erection of a public building at Ashland, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 186) to correct the military record of Francis M. Grinstead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 187) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius C. Vaughan;

A bill (S. 188) granting an increase of pension to Darius Young;

A bill (S. 189) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Phillips;

A bill (S. 190) granting a pension to William P. Mandeville;

A bill (S. 191) granting an increase of pension to Peter M. Bryant;

A bill (S. 192) granting an increase of pension to James Short;

A bill (S. 193) granting an increase of pension to S. Burdine;

A bill (S. 194) granting an increase of pension to John H. Jarrett;

A bill (S. 195) granting an increase of pension to John Lunsford;

A bill (S. 196) granting an increase of pension to David H. Burge;

A bill (S. 197) granting an increase of pension to James H. Baker;

A bill (S. 198) granting an increase of pension to H. J. Mullins;

A bill (S. 199) granting an increase of pension to John W. Slaughter;

A bill (S. 200) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lewis;

A bill (S. 201) granting an increase of pension to David T. Moneypenny;

A bill (S. 202) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Clay;

A bill (S. 203) granting an increase of pension to Asahel N. Wells;

A bill (S. 204) granting an increase of pension to William R. Jones;

A bill (S. 205) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Taylor;

A bill (S. 206) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Sumpter;

A bill (S. 207) granting an increase of pension to John J. Hill;

A bill (S. 208) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. North;

A bill (S. 209) granting an increase of pension to Abel Pennington;

A bill (S. 210) granting an increase of pension to W. J. Nash;

A bill (S. 211) granting an increase of pension to Peter S. Brady;

A bill (S. 212) granting an increase of pension to Julius A. Pherson; and

A bill (S. 213) granting an increase of pension to William R. Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 214) to provide for the opening to settlement of the Klamath Indian Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 215) to authorize allotments and the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Umatilla Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect; and

A bill (S. 216) to authorize allotments and the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 217) to provide for refund to Adam Pfeifer of money erroneously paid by said Adam Pfeifer to the Government of the United States in making final homestead proof;

A bill (S. 218) for the relief of George Thompson; and

A bill (S. 219) granting to the State of North Dakota 50,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a normal school at Minot, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 220) providing for the erection of a public building at Valley City, N. Dak.; and

A bill (S. 221) providing for the erection of a public building at Dickinson, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 222) to establish an agricultural plant, shrub, and tree experimental station at or near the city of Mandan, west of the Missouri River, in the State of North Dakota;

A bill (S. 223) to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, and to secure uniformity in standards and classification of grain, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 224) to establish an agricultural experiment station at or near the city of Williston, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 225) authorizing the cancellation of the Indian allotment of Peter Rousseau; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 226) to permit citizens of the United States to be admitted to Government tuberculosis hospitals; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 227) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States;" to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 228) for the relief of John H. Howlett; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 229) for the relief of Charles O. Hanna; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 230) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in buildings, ships, navy yards, and parks and other premises owned or used by the United States Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 231) to establish a fish-culture station at the city of Fargo, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 232) to provide for the incorporation, control, and government of associations organized to carry on business entering into or becoming a part of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 233) establishing rate of pay for rural free carriers; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 234) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908;

A bill (S. 235) granting an increase of pension to Cyril Boutiette; and

A bill (S. 236) granting an increase of pension to James Kenyon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A bill (S. 237) for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 238) to authorize the extension of Lamont Street NW., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 239) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 240) authorizing the Independent Order of B'Nai Brith of the United States to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the organization on lots Nos. 3 and 4, block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 241) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 242) to improve navigation on Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 243) for the relief of the heirs of Gen. John A. Quitman; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 244) extending the operation of the act of June 10, 1910, to coal lands in Alabama; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 245) providing for the adjustment of the claims of the States and Territories to lands within national forests; and

A bill (S. 246) to amend section 2291 and section 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to homesteads; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 247) to provide for the erection of a public building at Twin Falls, Idaho;

A bill (S. 248) providing for the erection of a Federal building at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho;

A bill (S. 249) to provide for the erection of a public building at Caldwell, Idaho;

A bill (S. 250) to provide for the erection of a public building at Idaho Falls, Idaho; and

A bill (S. 251) to provide for the erection of a public building at Nampa, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 252) to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the Children's Bureau;

A bill (S. 253) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States or for any Territory or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 254) to establish the United States University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 255) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee to the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions for certain lands situated in the State of Idaho; and

A bill (S. 256) affecting the sale and disposal of public or Indian lands in town sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 257) prohibiting Senators, Representatives, or Delegates from receiving compensation or acting as counsel in certain matters where the United States is interested, or for parties or corporations engaged in interstate commerce; and

A bill (S. 258) providing for the dismissal of indictments in case of failure to prosecute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 259) for the relief of the First National Bank of Cottonwood, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 260) providing that entrymen for homesteads within reclamation projects shall receive patent upon satisfactory proof of residence, improvement, and cultivation for five years, the same as though said entry had been made under the original homestead act; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

My Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 261) to create a Tariff Commission and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 262) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, and to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 263) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 264) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 265) to provide for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 266) authorizing national banking associations to make loans on real-estate security in certain cases; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 267) providing for assisting indigent persons, other than natives, in the District of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 268) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 269) referring the claim of the State of Rhode Island to the Court of Claims for adjudication (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 270) for the relief of Matthew Logan; and

A bill (S. 271) to authorize the compilation of the military and naval records of the Revolutionary War with a view to their publication; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 272) to accept and fund the bequest of Gertrude M. Hubbard; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 273) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 274) providing for the removal of snow and ice from the paved sidewalks of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 275) authorizing the appointment of an assistant appraiser at the port of Boston;

A bill (S. 276) to create a Tariff Board;

A bill (S. 277) to provide for refunding duties on bituminous and culm coal imported into the United States from October 6, 1902, to January 15, 1903, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 278) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to give to the city of Newburyport, in Massachusetts, the United States customs building in that city and the land upon which it stands; and

A bill (S. 279) providing for the refund of certain duties incorrectly collected on cutch; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 280) incorporating the National Academy of Arts and Letters; and

A bill (S. 281) incorporating the National Institute of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 282) to fix the sizes of baskets or other open containers for small fruits or berries; to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

A bill (S. 283) providing for a site for a public building at Provincetown, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 284) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore; and

A bill (S. 285) to indemnify the State of Massachusetts for expenses incurred by it in defense of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 286) to correct the military record of Henry Butterfield (also known as Henry Johnson) and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 287) for the relief of James Henry Payne; and

A bill (S. 288) to authorize the President to place Ensign John Tracey Edson on the retired list of the Navy with the rank of lieutenant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(By request.) A bill (S. 289) to establish a National Memorial Home for Aged and Infirm Colored People in the District of Columbia, and for Working Girls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 290) to authorize the appointment of dental surgeons in the United States Navy; and

A bill (S. 291) providing for the retirement of petty officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy or Marine Corps, and for the efficiency of the enlisted personnel; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 292) for the relief of the estate of John Frazer, deceased; and

A bill (S. 293) for the relief of the estate of Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAYNTER:

A bill (S. 294) granting an increase of pension to William F. McKellup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 295) to adjust the claims of certain settlers in Sherman County, Oreg. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 296) to direct the construction of a lightship and its maintenance near Orford Reef, off Cape Blanco, Oreg. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 297) for the establishment of a park at the junction of Maryland Avenue, Fifteenth Street, and H Street NE., Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BRISTOW. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States was read the first time by its title and the second time at length and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

Mr. BROWN. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read and lie on the table.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territory of New Mexico and the Territory of Arizona was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the constitution formed by the constitutional convention of the Territory of New Mexico, elected in accordance with the terms of the act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, etc.," approved June 20, A. D. 1910, which said constitutional convention met at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on the 3d day of October, A. D. 1910, and which adjourned November 21, A. D. 1910, and which constitution was subsequently ratified and adopted by the duly qualified electors of the Territory of New Mexico at an election held according to law on the 21st day of January, A. D. 1911, being republican in form and not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and complying with the terms of said enabling act, be, and the same is hereby, approved, subject to the terms and conditions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution reaffirming the boundary line between Texas and the Territory of New Mexico," approved on the 16th day of February, A. D. 1911.

SEC. 2. That the constitution formed by the constitutional convention of the Territory of Arizona, elected in accordance with the terms of the act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, etc.," approved June 20, A. D. 1910, which said constitutional convention met at Phoenix, Ariz., on the 10th day of October, A. D. 1910, and which constitution was subsequently ratified and adopted by the duly qualified electors of the Territory of Arizona at an election held according to law on the 9th day of February, A. D. 1911, being republican in form and not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence and complying with the terms of said enabling act, be, and the same is hereby, approved.

Mr. BROWN. I ask that the joint resolution may lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. BURTON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULBERSON. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and, if there is no objection, I ask for its present consideration. The Senate has heretofore acted upon a similar joint resolution. It is simply to provide for the continuance of the Joint Special Committee for the Revision and Codification of the Laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 5) to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a special joint committee be appointed, consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President from Members of the Sixty-second Congress, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker from the Members of the Sixty-second Congress, to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the revision and codification of laws reported by the Statutory Revision Commission, heretofore authorized to revise and codify the laws of the United States, including all laws of a general nature, permanent in character, passed since the submission to Congress, on December 15, 1906, of the final report of said commission; and that the said joint committee be authorized to sit during the recess of Congress and to employ necessary assistants, to order such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business, and to incur such expenses as may be deemed necessary, all such expense to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, under the law the joint resolution must necessarily go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It is a matter of statutory provision.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 6) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Finance.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 7) to print Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LODGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a statue of Alexander Hamilton in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona; to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BORAH. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—NANCY E. F. BAKER.

On motion of Mr. OLIVER, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Nancy E. F. Baker (S. 9245, 61st Cong., 3d sess.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—DAVID B. SPENCE.

On motion of Mr. SHIVELY, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of David B. Spence (S. 7554, 61st Cong.), for original pension, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RULES OF PROCEDURE.

Mr. ROOT. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 7) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, instructed to report for the consideration of the Senate a rule or rules to secure more effective control by the Senate over its procedure, and especially over its procedure upon conference reports and upon bills which have been passed by the House and have been favorably reported in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL LABORER IN STATIONERY ROOM.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 8), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ an additional laborer in the Senate stationery room at the rate of $720 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for.

UNITED STATES EXPRESS CO.

Mr. GORE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 9), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate a copy of the contract between the Government of the United States and the United States Express Co., entered into on or about April 21, 1889, together with any renewal or substitute contract therefor, and the annual amounts of compensation paid to said company in pursuance of said contract.

RULINGS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DAVIS. I submit a resolution, with an accompanying paper. I ask that the resolution be read, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 10) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be required and directed to furnish to the Senate copy of the rulings of his department, and his reasons therefor, in regard to the circulation of the Woman's National Weekly; also the Harpoon, of Denver, two newspapers published in the United States, inasmuch as serious charges are made against said rulings, as is shown by letter attached and made a part of this resolution; that said information be furnished to the Senate at the earliest possible convenience of the department.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask to have the letter read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read the letter for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

BANK OF DENNING,
Ozark, Ark., March 31, 1911.

Hon. JEFF DAVIS, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents in this neck of the woods, would like to ask that you give a few moments serious thought to some of the recent rulings of the postal department, from which it has been made to appear that certain officials have made arbitrary rulings relative to certain newspapers, and without apparent cause have demanded that one paper strike from its subscription list the names of upward of 100,000 subscribers for the reason that relatives or friends saw fit to make them a present of the paper for a year by paying in advance the regular subscription price of said publication.

It occurs to me that there is a rotten egg in the basket somewhere, that the postal department should say that, because a friend desires to give a year's subscription, that the department can step in and say that they can not receive same because they did not apparently send in the money in their own name.

Having followed your record for election of Senators by popular vote, and believing that you are in a sincere desire to give the common people a square deal, I will note with considerable pleasure any action you may take with reference to a thorough airing of the postal department and its arbitrary rulings.

Yours, very sincerely, R. M. ADAMS.

I refer to the Woman's National Daily, now the Woman's National Weekly; also the Harpoon, of Denver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BURTON. I ask that the resolution may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will lie over, objection having been made.

REPUBLIC OF PORTUGAL.

Mr. CULBERSON. I submit a resolution and ask that it be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 11), as follows:

Whereas under the impulse of the world movement for popular rights and republican government, with which the United States are and have ever been in sympathy, the people of Portugal in October, 1910, overthrew the monarchy and established a republic: It is therefore

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to inform the Senate whether the Republic so established has in operation a civil government capable of performing the duties and fulfilling the obligations of an independent power; and if so, whether the Republic has been officially and fully recognized by the executive department of the United States.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULBERSON. I hope the motion will not be adopted. The resolution merely requests of the President certain information, and that is its only purpose. The people of Portugal—I do not want to discuss the matter——

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me the resolution recites a good many facts. I think it ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope the Senator from Texas will not object to its reference.

Mr. CULBERSON. I presume the majority will sustain the motion of the Senator from Illinois, but the facts recited are those of current history and are known of all men—that the people of Portugal overthrew the monarchy, expelled the king from their borders, and established a republic in October, 1910.

Mr. CULLOM. If the resolution is all right it will be reported back from the committee very soon.

Mr. CULBERSON. I hope the motion of the Senator from Illinois will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on Monday next, if it shall be the pleasure of the Senate, immediately after the routine morning business, I desire to submit some remarks on certain reforms in representative government presented by various proposed constitutional amendments.

OPINION ON DIRECT LEGISLATION.

Mr. BROWN. I present an opinion by the supreme court of the State of Oregon involving the constitutionality of direct legislation provisions in their constitution. It is by Judge King, a very able judge. I ask that the paper be printed as a public document (S. Doc. No. 6).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Nebraska as to the character of the paper.

Mr. BROWN. It is the opinion of the supreme court of Oregon, speaking through Justice King. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to its being printed in that form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 10, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 6, 1911.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick C. Harper, of Washington, to be collector of customs for the district of Puget Sound, in the State of Washington. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

William L. Day, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Robert W. Tayler, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Ulysses G. Denman, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio, vice William L. Day, nominated to be United States district judge.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Col. Erasmus M. Weaver, Coast Artillery Corps, to be chief of Coast Artillery with the rank of brigadier general for the period of four years, beginning March 15, 1911, vice Brig. Gen. Arthur Murray, chief of Coast Artillery, who accepted an appointment as major general, United States Army, March 14, 1911.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

John S. Coulter, from February 2, 1911, vice Capt. Benjamin J. Edger, jr., promoted.

Frederick H. Foucar, from February 3, 1911, vice Capt. Samuel M. Waterhouse, promoted.

Paul W. Gibson, from February 4, 1911, vice Capt Eugene H. Hartnett, promoted.

George B. Lake, from February 5, 1911, vice Capt. Clyde S. Ford, promoted.

Frank N. Chilton, from February 6, 1911, vice Capt. Charles E. Marrow, promoted.

Horace M. Roberson, from February 7, 1911, vice Capt. Walter D. Webb, retired from active service January 1, 1909.

Leo C. Mudd, from February 8, 1911, vice Capt. M. A. W. Shockley, promoted.

Leonard S. Hughes, from February 9, 1911, vice Capt. Robert N. Winn, promoted.

Jay D. Whitham, from February 10, 1911, vice Capt. Theodore C. Lyster, promoted.

Henry P. Carter, from February 11, 1911, vice Capt. Sanford H. Wadhams, promoted.

James L. Robinson, from February 12, 1911, vice Capt. Chandler P. Robbins, promoted.

Francis X. Strong, from February 13, 1911, vice Capt. Thomas L. Rhoads, promoted.

Robert C. McDonald, from February 14, 1911, vice Capt. Harry L. Gilchrist, promoted.

Howard Clarke, from February 15, 1911, vice Capt. William J. L. Lyster, promoted.

Alleyne von Schrader, from February 16, 1911, vice Capt. Elbert E. Persons, promoted.

Clemens W. McMillan, from February 18, 1911, vice Capt. William N. Bispham, promoted.

Harry G. Ford, from February 19, 1911, vice Capt. Edward F. Geddings, promoted.

Raymond W. Mills, from February 20, 1911, vice Capt. Chester J. Stedman, honorably discharged February 17, 1909.

James F. Johnston, from February 21, 1911, vice Capt. William W. Quinton, retired from active service February 26, 1909.

Henry C. Maddux, from February 22, 1911, vice Capt. Edward P. Rockhill, retired from active service February 26, 1909.

Samuel S. Creighton, from February 23, 1911, vice Capt. Arthur W. Morse, promoted.

Bert R. Huntington, from February 24, 1911, vice Capt. Frank C. Baker, promoted.

Henry C. Michie, jr., from February 25, 1911, vice Capt. John D. Yost, retired from active service March 13, 1909.

Lauren S. Eckels, from February 26, 1911, vice Capt. Charles R. Reynolds, promoted.

Albert P. Clark, from February 27, 1911, vice Capt. Walter Cox, honorably discharged April 20, 1909.

Charles E. McBrayer, from February 28, 1911, vice First Lieut. Wallace E. Sabin, retired from active service June 7, 1909.

Eugene G. Northington, from March 1, 1911, vice Capt. Paul C. Hutton, promoted.

Harley J. Hallett, from March 2, 1911, vice Capt. Henry S. Kiersted, retired from active service June 26, 1909.

Josiah H. Holland, from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Howard A. Reed, retired from active service June 30, 1909.

Sanford W. French, from March 4, 1911, vice Capt. Frederick A. Dale, promoted.

Thomas J. Flynn, from March 5, 1911, vice Capt. William M. Roberts, promoted.

George E. Pariseau, from March 6, 1911, vice Capt. George P. Heard, honorably discharged December 15, 1909.

Robert H. Gantt, from March 7, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Daniel F. Maguire, from March 8, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Edward C. Register, from March 9, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

John M. Willis, from March 10, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Joseph L. Siner, from March 11, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

William Denton, from March 12, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Joseph O. Walkup, from March 13, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Fred R. Burnside, from March 14, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

John J. Reddy, from March 15, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Herbert H. Sharpe, from March 16, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Lloyd A. Kefauver, from March 17, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

William T. Cade, jr., from March 18, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

John R. McKnight, from March 19, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

George G. Divins, from March 20, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

Charles Loftus Grant Anderson, of the District of Columbia, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 21, 1911.

Joseph Milton Heller, of the District of Columbia, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 21, 1911.

John Adam Metzger, of Pennsylvania, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 24, 1911.

John George Ingold, of Illinois, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 25, 1911.

Douglas Wiltz McEnery, of Louisiana, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 25, 1911.

William Patrick Joseph Ruddy, of Pennsylvania, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 25, 1911.

Samuel Jay Turnbull, of Florida, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 25, 1911.

Alfred Parker Upshur, of Virginia, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 25, 1911.

Anton Robert Schier, of Georgia, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 27, 1911.

Charles John Boehs, of the District of Columbia, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 27, 1911.

William Culbert Lyon, of Maryland, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from March 31, 1911.

INFANTRY ARM.

William Allison Reed, of Tennessee, late second lieutenant Second Infantry, United States Army, to be second lieutenant of Infantry with rank from April 1, 1911, vice Second Lieut. Fred W. Pitts, Sixth Infantry, promoted June 29, 1910.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

Second Lieut. John Magruder, Twenty-second Infantry, to be second lieutenant of Field Artillery with rank from September 9, 1910.

Second Lieut. E. Francis Riggs, Eighth Infantry, to be second lieutenant of Field Artillery with rank from February 11, 1911.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Isaac W. Littell, deputy quartermaster general, to be assistant quartermaster general with the rank of colonel from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Lieut. Col. Gonzalez S. Bingham, deputy quartermaster general, to be assistant quartermaster general with the rank of colonel from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Maj. Winthrop S. Wood, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Isaac W. Littell, promoted.

Maj. Chauncey B. Baker, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Gonzalez S. Bingham, promoted.

Maj. George McK. Williamson, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Maj. Thomas H. Slavens, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Maj. David S. Stanley, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Harry B. Chamberlin, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Winthrop S. Wood, promoted.

Capt. Louis F. Garrard, jr., quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Chauncey B. Baker, promoted.

Capt. Bertram T. Clayton, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. George McK. Williamson, promoted.

Capt. Ira L. Fredendall, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Thomas H. Slavens, promoted.

Capt. Harry L. Pettus, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. David S. Stanley, promoted.

Capt. Frank A. Grant, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Archibald W. Butt, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Capt. Clement C. Whitcomb, Medical Corps, to be major from January 1, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. George H. Crabtree, Medical Corps, to be major from January 1, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

First Lieut. Clarence H. Knight, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from February 27, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Gustav Kaemmerling, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, with the officer next below him.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill vacancies:

Carl T. Vogelgesang,
John R. Edie, and
Clark D. Stearns.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill vacancies:

Halford R. Greenlee, and
Charles M. Austin.

Ensign Alexander S. Wadsworth, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1910, upon the completion of three years' service as an ensign.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 6, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized. The Chair, however, will request the gentleman to suspend a moment until a Member can be sworn in.

OATH OF OFFICE.

The oath of office was administered by the Speaker to Mr. KONIG, a Representative from Maryland.

PRESENTATION OF GAVEL TO THE SPEAKER.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am delegated by the people of Ralls County, in the ninth congressional district of Missouri, which is the district the Speaker has the honor to represent, to present to him on this occasion a gavel which he is expected, as the first Democratic Speaker west of the Mississippi River, to wield in evidence of his power. [General applause.]

There has been sent to me by mail a statement of the history of this mallet. I will ask the Clerk to read that statement, which has been prepared and sent to me by Hon. David Wallace, of Ralls County, Mo.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUR-OAK GAVEL MADE BY FRIENDS OF HON. CHAMP CLARK IN RALLS COUNTY, MO., AND TO BE PRESENTED TO HIM ON HIS ELECTION AS SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT WASHINGTON, D. C.—A BIT OF HISTORY ABOUT THIS GAVEL.

Enoch Matson, supposed to be the first white child born in Bourbon County, Ky., and a son of one of the patriots who followed Washington in the struggle for national independence, came to the Territory of Missouri in the year 1816, settling in the valley of the Father of Waters near the town of Clarksville, Pike County. The next year he moved to the banks of Peno, a very rapid stream of the county of Joe Bowers, and a little way up that stream built a dam across the water and put up the first gristmill run by water power north of the Missouri River. A tall and smooth bur-oak tree close by was felled, and from this a 50-foot section was taken, which became the apron log of the dam. The mill was operated for many years by the Matson family, and was from far and near visited by the early pioneers and Indians with grist to grind in the making of the ash-cooked pone bread. With the roll of years the mill went to decay, and even the spot was forgotten by many who formerly knew it well.

There was a member of the Matson family in these parts, and one of the descendants of the elder Matson took a party of Ralls friends with him last summer and went hunting for the old dam, with the view of uncarthing one of the timbers, from which to make a gavel for Mr. CLARK, so sure were they that he would be elected Speaker and need to control with mallet of oak the unruly Republican minority led by the to-be-deposed CANNON.

After diligent search Mr. A. P. Matson and Warren C. Hatcher, both Clark enthusiasts, discovered the sleeping apron log at the site of the old dam, deeply embedded in sand and water, and cut away a 5-foot section. The timber was well preserved, sound and hearty, and a team of Missouri mules pulled it out into daylight. A local sawmill cut the severed piece into dimension sizes, out of which a gavel has been made for the use of Mr. CLARK and another for the use of Hon. William T. Tagland, judge of the tenth judicial circuit court, and a number of walking sticks have been made. In the early use of this old mill it was a frequent custom of the patrons, in the absence of the owner, to do their own tolling and grinding of the grist by turning on the water which furnished the power for grinding, pouring in the rude hopper the grain to be ground, and then, at another place in the mill, down in the basement, to sack up the ground material. On one occasion, it is related, a neighbor came to the mill and following him was his pack of hounds. While attending to the grinding his attention was called to the fact that his dogs had left him, and the deep distant baying of the hounds told him that game had been found by them. On search it was discovered that the pack were in the basement of the mill with their mouths to the spout, lapping the meal as it slowly came forth. At times the water would slightly fail by getting low, and, the power ceasing, the supply of meal would stop. At this the hounds would set up a howling like Oliver Twist, asking for more. And it is further related that before the process had been discovered the grist was about all gone. Prior to the building of this old mill on Peno Creek by Enoch Matson he brought with him two hand-mill stones used in one of the Carolinas, and these, after being used in Kentucky for a number of years, were brought to Missouri and used until the Peno mill was put up. These faithful old stones, about 18 inches in diameter and 3½ inches thick, are now in the possession of Mr. A. P. Matson, of New London, Mo., and a grandson of the miller, Matson. The site of the old mill is thought by many to be haunted and that Indian spirits still linger around it. The legend runs that many years ago, in the days before the advent of the paleface, a beautiful Indian maiden who lived near the old dam site fell in love with a white man. She unrequited the love of the chief's son, a dashing young brave, and eloped with the white youth. This angered the old chief, and, gathering a number of his braves, he hunted and caught the pair and, after torturing both of them, threw the bodies in the deep water at the dam; hence the lingering spirits and the nightly visits of the phantom beings.

It may be that the span of mules which pulled the 5 feet of apron log out of its hiding place of nearly a century is not the team promised by Col. Luke M. Emerson, of Pike County, Mo., to carry Mr. CLARK down Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington in the event of his election to the seat so long and ably held by Henry Clay, but if they are, though the best in this imperial State, they came very near being lost

in that task by the treacherous quicksand in and about the old mill-dam; it was a narrow escape for team and men.

So Mr. CLARK will have a gavel with a history of love and romance attached; a history of ancient as well as present usefulness; a history of love, hatred, and revenge as well.

The gavel bears a silver plate on its face and handle, and on the larger plate is the following inscription: "Made from apron log of first mill built north of the Missouri River, on Peno, Pike County, by Enoch Matson, in 1817; presented to CHAMP CLARK, first Speaker of the House of Representatives from Missouri, by his constituents in Ralls County, 1911." On the other plate is the following quotation from one of Mr. CLARK's recent speeches and often used by him: "He serves his party best who serves his country well."

With the growth of the country and the clearing of the forest the water supply of Peno Creek became periodically insufficient to run the mill there, and Mr. Matson in after years abandoned this mill and put up another water mill on the bank of Salt River, where he followed the milling business for many years, and the ruins of this second mill are still to be seen.

DAVID WALLACE.

[Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure, on behalf of your own constituents, as an evidence of their confidence and esteem, in presenting to you at this time this gavel. [General applause.]

The SPEAKER. The first legislature of the State of Missouri did two remarkable things. The first was to elect David Barton United States Senator unanimously. That performance has been repeated a few times, notably in Michigan on one occasion. Then there was a prolonged deadlock for the other Senatorship. Colonel Thomas Hart Benton, one of the greatest of all American statesmen, Judge J. B. C. Lucas, whose son Benton had killed in a duel, and several other distinguished men were competitors for that place. The fight was intensely bitter. At last the legislature did a thing that has never been duplicated, and in all human probability never will be duplicated. They asked David Barton, the Senator elect, to pick his senatorial mate. He chose Colonel Benton, but the fight was so bitter that even after Barton picked him there was a prolonged struggle.

The legislature was holding its sessions in the lower story of the old St. Louis Hotel, the upper stories being used for hotel purposes. Hon. Daniel Ralls, one of the representatives of Pike County, the county in which I live, was sick unto death in one of the rooms upstairs. In the legislature they lacked 1 vote of having enough to elect Benton on the last ballot they took on Saturday. That night they got a French representative, by the name of Phillip Leduc, out and agonized with him all night to induce him to vote for Benton. He had sworn that he would have his arm cut off at the shoulder before he would do it. They induced him to vote for Benton by stating to him that Benton represented all the French land claimants out there, and Leduc was one of them. At about sun up on Sunday morning he finally agreed to vote for Benton. That would elect Benton, provided Daniel Ralls lived until noon on Monday, and the question uppermost in the public mind of St. Louis that day was to inquire after Daniel Ralls's health. He lived until noon on Monday. Four colored men carried him down into the legislative hall on a mattress. The last act of his life was to vote for Benton. They carried him back upstairs and he was dead within an hour. That legislature, out of gratitude for his services, cut a slice out of Pike County nearest her heart and constituted it into a new county, named Ralls County, in honor of Daniel Ralls.

David Barton and Col. Benton came to Washington and drew straws for the six-year and four-year terms. Benton drew the six-year straw, was reelected four times, and was the first man who ever served 30 years in the Senate of the United States. Senator Barton drew the four-year term, was reelected for six years, quarreled with Gen. Jackson, and that was the end of him, as it was of most men who quarreled with Gen. Jackson. Benton had nothing to do with promising Leduc assistance about the French land-grant claims, knew nothing about it, and so soon as he was elected called his clients together, retired from the cases, and refused even to nominate an attorney to succeed himself, on the ground that he might have to vote in the Senate on the subject; so jealous was he of his honor and reputation.

There is no better citizenship on the face of the earth than the people who live in the ninth congressional district of Missouri. [Applause.] The elder Matson, one of Washington's soldiers, who went out there a pioneer, was a type of the pioneers who settled that country, and it is fitting, meet, and proper to reflect on the simple beginning of that mill, which has developed into the splendid civilization that exists there now. I am not very old, but I myself have ridden astride of a horse on a sack of corn to an old-fashioned horse mill. [Applause.]

I thank the people of Ralls County for presenting to me this gavel. I will treasure it so long as I live and then transmit it to my son. I hope my friends in Ralls will be as enthusiastic about me when I finally lay it down as they are now.

With honest pride the gift I take,
And prize it for the givers' sake.

[Applause.]

MESSENGER TO SPEAKER'S TABLE.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which we passed the resolution (H. Res. 31) on yesterday afternoon affecting the messenger at the table of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves to reconsider the resolution passed concerning the messenger at the Speaker's desk yesterday.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States.

Resolved, etc., That a special joint committee be appointed, consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to the appointed by the Speaker, to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the revision and codification of laws reported by the statutory revision commission heretofore authorized to revise and codify the laws of the United States, including all laws of a general nature, permanent in character, passed since the submission to Congress on December 15, 1906, of the final report of said commission; and that the said joint commission be authorized to sit during the recess of Congress and to employ necessary assistants, to order such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business, and to incur such expense as may be deemed necessary; all such expenses to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman first whether the resolution limits the duration of the commission to this Congress?

Mr. SHERLEY. The resolution is in the exact form that has been twice approved and passed by previous Congresses, and is, in the contemplation of myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOON], intended to continue the commission only for the life of this Congress.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands, of course, as we all do, that it has been supposed that the joint commission heretofore created expired with the end of the Congress. If this is in the precise language of the former resolution, I have no objection to it, although on its face it would seem to create a commission which would exist hereafter.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is absolutely in the language of the former resolution and is not intended to create a commission to live beyond the life of this Congress.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if I correctly understood the gentleman from Kentucky to say that this committee is to be appointed by the Speaker?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is a joint committee, to be appointed from the Members of the Senate by the President of the Senate and from the Members of the House by the Speaker of the House, being a select committee and therefore not in contravention of the rule adopted yesterday.

Mr. OLMSTED. I have not the slightest objection to the appointment of the committee by the Speaker, but it seems to me that, to be in harmony with the doctrine advocated yesterday by that side of the House, the committee ought to be elected by the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if he will read the rule with some degree of care he will not make that statement.

Mr. OLMSTED. I have read the rule and heard the speeches, and I think, in order to be consistent with the doctrine there advocated, the committee should be elected by the House and not appointed by the Speaker. Personally, I have no objection to the appointment by the Speaker.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that the rule presented and adopted yesterday did provide for the election of the House Members to the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers, of which the gentleman from Maryland is one of the honored members, and has been acting in the past by virtue of the law which provides that the Speaker shall appoint that committee?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman's statement be accurate, it is sufficient answer to say that this is a joint committee designated for a special purpose and for a limited time.

Mr. MANN. I think it would be a sufficient answer to say that this is correct, and that the House yesterday made an unintentional mistake, because it was not informed on a particular subject.

Mr. BUTLER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. About how much will it cost the Government to maintain this commission?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can tell the gentleman what it has cost and what it should cost. It has cost for four years about $15,000 a year. But it is fair to say on behalf of those who had charge of the joint committee—and they were members of the gentleman's own party—that there was considerable work done that will simplify very materially the work to be done in this Congress. It is also fair to say to the gentleman that not in a generation have two bills of such magnitude, embracing such a wide field, been passed as what was known as the penal code bill and the judiciary title bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I think the country and the House gave the gentleman's committee full credit for the passage of those bills. I will ask the gentleman, further, what use is there for this commission now?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not a commission, if the gentleman will permit me. A commission existed some years ago, and upon my motion was abolished. What is now created is simply a joint committee of the House and the Senate, the purpose being to enable both the Senate and the House Members to act in concert, the matter being largely codification and revision, and by acting in concert to have the two Houses consider the matter practically at the same time, and thus make possible the enactment of this very important legislation.

Mr. BUTLER. It is not contemplated that the commission shall last longer than this term of Congress?

Mr. SHERLEY. As I have said, it is not a commission, but simply a committee of the House and of the Senate with the power of sitting together.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. What is to be accomplished by this joint committee?

Mr. SHERLEY. I answer the gentleman by saying that it is a continuation of the work heretofore done. We have now passed the penal code, which embraces all the penal laws of a general nature; we have passed that part of the judicial title which relates to the organization of the courts. We have yet remaining that part of the judiciary title which affects procedure, and we then have the Federal statutes on such subjects as internal-revenue law, the customs law, the Navy Department, the War Department, and various other departments.

It was contemplated in the beginning and it is hoped now by continuing this work to put within three or four small volumes the entire statute law of the United States that now must be sought for in forty-odd different volumes.

Mr. FINLEY. Why can not the Committee on the Judiciary do that work?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the gentleman by saying that, unquestionably, it could do it as well as could the Committee on Military Affairs, or any other committee, but this Committee on Revision of the Laws was created because its duty is not so much, as is the duty of the Committee on the Judiciary, to create new law as to codify, and every codification that has been made of United States law, and all that I know of that have been made in the States, have been made by special committees created for the purpose of codifying.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman says that it will cost about $15,000 a year.

Mr. SHERLEY. I said it had.

Mr. FINLEY. What will it cost?

Mr. SHERLEY. My own judgment is that in the future it will cost considerably less than that. I can not answer definitely, and simply answer the gentleman in this way. The work that committee does is of the very highest order and the clerical help, if it is to be of any value, must be of a high grade.

Mr. FINLEY. What is the nature of the expense?

Mr. SHERLEY. The nature of the expense is the employment of clerical and legal aid of a highly trained character. You can not get high-grade men at small salaries to do high-grade work. A mistake in this codification might cost the Government untold sums of money. It may cause confusion in all the courts of the land, and it is small economy to deny to a committee the proper aid.

Mr. FINLEY. What are some of the salaries paid to the help for this joint committee?

Mr. SHERLEY. Heretofore there has been one man who has been sent by the Department of Justice, who was paid $5,000 a year.

Mr. FINLEY. What is his name?

Mr. SHERLEY. His name is Locke. One man has been employed at the instance of the Senate, who has been paid $5,000 a year.

Mr. FINLEY. What is his name?

Mr. SHERLEY. Heyburn. There have been two other clerks and stenographers who have been employed from time to time. Now, it is my intention that there shall not be employed at this work, outside of occasional stenographic work which might have to be done, beyond three men.

Mr. FINLEY. Who appoints these gentlemen?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is left with the joint committee. They have been appointed heretofore by the joint committee upon the motion of the chairman of the House committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN].

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to pass the resolution just read.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kentucky will permit, I desire to say that if he makes a motion to pass this resolution, I would have to make a point of order. It is not privileged, so far as I can see. If it is a question of unanimous consent, that is something else.

Mr. SHERLEY. What else is there ahead of it in privilege?

Mr. OLMSTED. I do not know that there is anybody objecting. I would like to ask the gentleman another question, and that is whether the Committee on Revision of the Laws has a clerk?

Mr. SHERLEY. The Committee on the Revision of the Laws, I understand, has a clerk.

Mr. OLMSTED. What will he be doing while these high-priced clerks are doing the work?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will have to ask a member of the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Mr. OLMSTED. Why can not the Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the House and the Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the Senate prepare and report this bill just as well as the committee the gentleman seeks to have appointed?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can tell the gentleman why it did not do it. In the old days, when you had a House and Senate committee, the result simply was that they acted without any degree of concert, and frequently matter was considered in one House that had not been considered by the committee in the other body, and before the proper committee could consider matter that runs into hundreds of pages, and frequently thousands of pages, the session of Congress had died. Now, it was for the purpose of facilitating this enactment that we created a joint committee, and the result was that whereas you had these committees for a decade and had no legislation, the moment you created a joint committee, that seriously went to work, inside of four years, in two Congresses, they have codified two of the most important branches of the general law.

Mr. OLMSTED. Would the gentleman from Kentucky be willing to limit the salaries to be paid to these clerks or the number of clerks to be employed?

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no objection, but it seems to me to be hardly gracious on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania——

Mr. OLMSTED. I merely——

Mr. SHERLEY (continuing). That when his colleague [Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania] offered this resolution it was left to his discretion, and now the gentleman requests that there shall be put in this resolution a requirement that the salaries shall be limited.

Mr. OLMSTED. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania offered the resolution, it was objected to from that side, and now that we have entered upon an era of economy I want to see how it is working.

Mr. SHERLEY. It went through twice without objection from this side. Now, as far as I am concerned, I simply say to the House that for my part I have no desire that a dollar should be expended that is not needed, and I submit to any man here who has ever been engaged in work of this magnitude that it is not work that can be successfully done by cheap men.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina demands the regular order.

Mr. FINLEY. I have objected.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have moved, if I am recognized, that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Carolina on his point of order.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that proposes to appoint a joint committee. The gentleman from Kentucky has asked unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution. Objection was made. Then the gentleman moved that the joint committee be appointed; so, Mr. Speaker, this is the morning hour—I do not make the point that this committee——

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. FINLEY. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. I desire to ask the mover of this resolution a question bearing on it. Was not there a commission appointed some time in 1897 or 1898 for the purpose of codifying the laws?

Mr. SHERLEY. There was and that commission——

Mr. CULLOP. And at large salaries?

Mr. SHERLEY. And that commission was abolished, on my motion, because it seemed never to come any nearer to finishing its work.

Mr. CULLOP. They never did anything except draw their salaries.

Mr. SHERLEY. And because this work had to be gone all over again we abolished that expensive commission, and we created a joint committee. I do not know a Member of this House who was a Member of previous Congresses but who knows there has been labor of the very greatest magnitude performed by that joint committee.

Mr. CULLOP. That is what they are elected for, I presume.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, this matter brought up at this time is to appoint a special joint committee. The committees of the House are provided for, and while I do not make the point it is out of order to appoint this special committee in this way—I do not make that point—but I make the point it is not in order at this time. It is not business properly in order during the morning hour and besides that it is a matter that is not necessary from any standpoint——

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his point of order.

Mr. FINLEY. Well, I make the point of order the gentleman does not know what he is talking about. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARLIN. As this is a change of statute law it occurs to me under the rule it would have to be referred to a committee, and I therefore make the point of order that this ought to go to a committee

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will be perfectly fair to the Chair, I do not think it is in order under the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia is well taken. Clause 3, Rule 22, provides that resolutions shall be introduced by delivering them to the Speaker. The point of order is sustained.

RATIFICATION OF INCOME-TAX AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications announcing the ratification of the constitutional amendment relative to the taxation of incomes:

STATE OF IOWA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Des Moines, March 16, 1911.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE,
Congress of United States, Washington, D. C.

SIR: By direction of Gov. Carroll, of Iowa, I am inclosing herewith certified copy of a joint resolution passed by our last general assembly, and relating to the income-tax amendment.

Respectfully, yours,
C. C. NYE,
Secretary to the Governor.

STATE OF IOWA, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, greeting:

I, B. F. Carroll, governor of the State of Iowa, do hereby certify that the attached document is a true and correct copy of a joint resolution known as house joint resolution No. 1; that the same has passed both houses of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa and has been approved by me as governor of the State.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and have caused to be affixed an impression of the great seal of the State of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines, the capital of the State, this 15th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]
B. F. CARROLL,
Governor of Iowa.

Attest:
W. C. HAYWARD,
Secretary of State.

Joint resolution ratifying the amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by Congress as the sixteenth amendment thereto, relative to laying and collecting a tax on income.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America, at its first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"'ARTICLE XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.'"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington and to presiding officers of each House of the National Congress.

PAUL E. STILLMAN,
Speaker of the House.
GEORGE W. CLARKE,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that this joint resolution originated in the house, and is known as house joint resolution No. 1.

C. R. BENEDICT,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Approved, February 27, 1911.

B. F. CARROLL, *Governor.*

STATE OF MICHIGAN, EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lansing, March 17, 1911.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Under separate registered mail I am forwarding you house joint resolution No. 1 of the Michigan Legislature of 1911 relative to taxation of incomes and ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I am, sir, very respectfully,
SHEHAM R. OAKES,
Secretary to the Governor.

House joint resolution 1—Relative to the taxing of incomes and ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas the Congress of the United States, after solemn and mature deliberation therein, has, by a vote of two-thirds of both houses, passed a concurrent resolution, submitting to the legislatures of the several States a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States, which resolution is in the following words:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

"'ARTICLE XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration.'"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, That in the name and behalf of the people of this State, we do hereby ratify, approve, and assent to the said amendment.

Resolved, That a copy of this assent and ratification, engrossed on parchment, be transmitted by his excellency the governor to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, and to the Secretary of State of the United States.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the house of representatives January 19, 1911.

H. F. BAKER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
PAUL H. KING,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the senate February 23, 1911.

JOHN Q. ROSS,
President of the Senate.
E. V. CHILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Attest:
CHASE S. OSBORNE, *Governor.*

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the committees are not made up yet, and I wish to give time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to make up his list of committees, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourns to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourns to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, April 10, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a special report relating to the establishment of a Legislative Reference Bureau (S. Doc. No. 7), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 2576) for the erection of a public building at St. Marys, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 2577) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of De Land, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2578) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of St. Augustine, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2579) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sanford, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2580) to provide for the erection of a public building at Orlando, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2581) to provide for the erection of a public building at Live Oak, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2582) to prohibit the intermarriage of persons of the white and negro races within the District of Columbia; to declare such contracts of marriage null and void; to prescribe punishments for violations and attempts to violate its provisions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 2583) relating to the assessment of personal property within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2584) regulating wages in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 2585) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 2586) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2587) to improve and perpetuate the site of old Fort Hamilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 2588) to promote the efficiency of the Naval Militia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2589) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 2590) to provide for the erection of a public building at Hoosick Falls, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 2591) to amend the acts to regulate commerce so as to provide that interstate railroads may grant free or reduced transportation to agents and employees of the Cooperative Farm Demonstration Work of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 2592) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Washington Court House, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 2593) to amend an act authorizing the Secretary of War to erect headstones over the graves of Union soldiers who have been interred in private, village, or city cemeteries, as approved February 3, 1870; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 2594) providing for the appointment of an additional professor of mathematics in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 2595) putting bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, seg. Russian seg, New Zealand tow, aloe or mill waste on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2596) putting grain, buff, split, rough, and sole leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value from cattle hides or cattle skins, and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather, band, bend, or belting leather, on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2597) putting salt imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2598) putting wire nails or staples made of wrought iron or steel, horseshoe nails, horse or mule shoes, made of wrought iron or steel, round iron or steel wire not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge, and round iron or steel wire smaller than No. 13 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, and barbed fence wire, and hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity, on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2599) for the erection of a public building at the city of Red Bluff, State of California, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 2600) authorizing that commission of ensign be given midshipmen upon graduation from the Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 2601) for the erection of a public building at Delphos, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 2602) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 2603) to increase the limit of cost for the enlargement of the Federal building at Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 2604) to provide for repaying the rightful owners, their heirs or legal representatives, the proceeds of the tax illegally collected by the United States on cotton during the years 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868, and for the disposition of such proceeds as may remain unclaimed and unawarded; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2605) to authorize a survey of Yallabusha River, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2606) to provide a punishment for the procuring of a special retail liquor license under an assumed or fictitious name, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2607) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Winona, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2608) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2609) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Water Valley, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2610) to tax the manufacture and sale of deadly weapons and to tax the manufacture and sale of all cartridges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2611) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to grant and regrant all right, title, and interest of the United States of, in, and to all that particular tract of land known as the "Settling Basin," in Yuba County, Cal., which was obtained from James O'Brien by deed dated December 6, 1901, to James O'Brien, the original grantor thereof, and his heirs and assigns, upon repayment therefor to the United States of a certain amount; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution (H. Res. 32) providing for an investigation of the Panama purchase; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 40) providing for the termination of the treaty between the United States of America and Russia concluded at St. Petersburg, December 18, 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SISSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) directing the Attorney General to submit to the Supreme Court all information available bearing upon the validity of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A memorial from the Legislature of Ohio to define the law against polygamy as clearly as the law is defined against bigamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 2612) granting an increase of pension to James G. Demint; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2613) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Addington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2614) granting an increase of pension to Frederick S. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2615) granting an increase of pension to Peter Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2616) granting an increase of pension to William J. Davisson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2617) granting an increase of pension to James E. Ashvill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2618) granting an increase of pension to Nathan N. Spence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2619) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2620) granting an increase of pension to Ninyon McCurdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2621) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2622) granting an increase of pension to Michael Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2623) granting an increase of pension to William Wince; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2624) granting an increase of pension to Fred H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2625) granting an increase of pension to Albert P. Merkel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2626) granting an increase of pension to Solomon D. Stutz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 2627) for the relief of Dean Sage, executor of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 2628) granting an increase of pension to Robert Edmondson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2629) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2630) granting an increase of pension to William Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2631) granting an increase of pension to Alexander H. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2632) for the relief of the heirs of Alois Kodalle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 2633) granting an increase of pension to William Reer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2634) granting an increase of pension to J. E. Worster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 2635) for the relief of the heirs of Myra Clark Gaines, deceased; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2636) granting an increase of pension to David Amos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2637) granting an increase of pension to James Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 2638) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 2639) to correct the military record of George W. Stape; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 2640) granting an increase of pension to Taylor D. Rhines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2641) granting an increase of pension to Johnson J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2642) granting an increase of pension to Lucien H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2643) granting an increase of pension to Michael A. Overdorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2644) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2645) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Reid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 2646) granting a pension to Wilson C. Winslow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2647) granting a pension to Olive R. Sprague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2648) granting a pension to Nora C. Reid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2649) granting a pension to Nicholas Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2650) granting a pension to Charles J. Meggison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2651) granting a pension to Mathew M. Ledwien; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2652) granting a pension to Johanna Krumholz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2653) granting a pension to Alice W. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2654) granting a pension to Imogene P. Ingersoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2655) granting a pension to Sophia M. Hutchins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2656) granting a pension to Mary E. Hitchcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2657) granting a pension to Conrad Guenther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2658) granting a pension to Dudley C. Griswold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2659) granting a pension to Francis M. Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2660) granting a pension to Julia Dudley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2661) granting a pension to Eugenia A. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2662) granting a pension to Wilba E. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2663) granting a pension to Emeline R. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2664) granting a pension to Henry Beckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2665) granting a pension to Charles Almendinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2666) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Magrath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2667) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Wyeth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2668) granting an increase of pension to Roderick M. Woodville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2669) granting an increase of pension to C. H. Woodburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2670) granting an increase of pension to William H. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2671) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Whitcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2672) granting an increase of pension to George B. Whidden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2673) granting an increase of pension to George P. Wassman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2674) granting an increase of pension to George Washington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2675) granting an increase of pension to David S. Waltermire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2676) granting an increase of pension to James W. Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2677) granting an increase of pension to Oliver E. Tillotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2678) granting an increase of pension to David P. R. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2679) granting an increase of pension to David R. Shockey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2680) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Rutherford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2681) granting an increase of pension to Volney P. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2682) granting an increase of pension to Theophile Rainville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2683) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso C. Pray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2684) granting an increase of pension to Clinton E. Olmstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2685) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Norred; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2686) granting an increase of pension to William J. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2687) granting an increase of pension to Eben S. Nason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2688) granting an increase of pension to Columbus G. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2689) granting an increase of pension to Clement Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2690) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus B. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2691) granting an increase of pension to William F. Merriam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2692) granting an increase of pension to Albert D. Malin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2693) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2694) granting an increase of pension to Jay McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2695) granting an increase of pension to Clement Lovely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2696) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Longstaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2697) granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Longman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2698) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2699) granting an increase of pension to William H. Leavitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2700) granting an increase of pension to Eben Kneeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2701) granting an increase of pension to William G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2702) granting an increase of pension to Stanley H. Husted; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2703) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2704) granting an increase of pension to John Hodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2705) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2706) granting an increase of pension to Torger Hanson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2707) granting an increase of pension to Frank Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2708) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Golden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2709) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Getchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2710) granting an increase of pension to Eben E. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2711) granting an increase of pension to Dana S. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2712) granting an increase of pension to George M. Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2713) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Fels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2714) granting an increase of pension to Chester Durfee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2715) granting an increase of pension to William J. Denney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2716) granting an increase of pension to Burnett W. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2717) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey W. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2718) granting an increase of pension to George L. Crosier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2719) granting an increase of pension to Silas E. Crandall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2720) granting an increase of pension to George D. Corp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2721) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Cloutier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2722) granting an increase of pension to George W. Chilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2723) granting an increase of pension to Tobias Cederstrom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2724) granting an increase of pension to John Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2725) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Alexander A. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2727) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William Alonzo Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2728) to correct the military record of Silas Overmire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2729) to correct the military record of Patrick Mullen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2730) to correct the military record of Edwin F. McDonald; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2731) to correct the military record of Constant Livery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2732) to correct the military record of George E. Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2733) to correct the military record of James H. Bishop; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2734) to correct the military record of Calvin R. Benton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2735) to correct the military record of Robert Abernethy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2736) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 2737) granting an increase of pension to Lott D. Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2738) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Bonham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2739) granting a pension to Theodore Shockley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2740) to correct the military record of A. W. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2741) to correct the military record of James M. Wiley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2742) to correct the military record of James M. Wiley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2743) to correct the military record of William C. B. Gillman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2744) to correct the military record of Charles D. Morse; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2745) granting an increase of pension to William H. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2746) granting a pension to William I. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2747) granting a pension to Daniel P. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2748) granting an increase of pension to George Goodpastor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2749) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2750) granting a pension to Samuel Pollock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2751) granting a pension to William Bleckwendt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2752) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 2753) granting a pension to Peter M. Clause; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2754) granting a pension to Robert A. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2755) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2756) granting a pension to Herman Beyland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2757) granting a pension to Lydia M. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2758) granting a pension to Thornton Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2759) granting a pension to Henry D. Bender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2760) granting a pension to Henry H. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2761) granting a pension to Emily Crooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2762) granting a pension to Eliza J. Cameron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2763) granting a pension to Daniel L. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2764) granting a pension to James C. Darnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2765) granting a pension to Sarah E. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2766) granting a pension to William Dickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2767) granting a pension to Nettie Eckler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2768) granting a pension to William Fortner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2769) granting a pension to Alberta E. Fleming; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2770) granting a pension to Mary Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2771) granting a pension to Betsy Hare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2772) granting a pension to Catherine Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2773) granting a pension to Anna K. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2774) granting a pension to Thomas Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2775) granting a pension to William H. Liter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2776) granting a pension to Herbert Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2777) granting a pension to W. H. Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2778) granting a pension to Elizabeth Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2779) granting a pension to W. B. May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2780) granting a pension to James W. Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2781) granting a pension to Florence Meader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2782) granting a pension to Sarah Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2783) granting a pension to William McCormack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2784) granting a pension to Bridget M. Perry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2785) granting a pension to Coleman Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2786) granting a pension to Clara A. Ritter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2787) granting a pension to Henrietta B. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2788) granting a pension to David E. Redman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2789) granting a pension to Caroline Siebenthaler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2790) granting a pension to Retta S. Snowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2791) granting a pension to Alexander Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2792) granting a pension to Margaret Sylvester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2793) granting a pension to Josiah J. Salmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2794) granting a pension to Albert C. Skillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2795) granting a pension to Frank Taphorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2796) granting a pension to Thomas B. Youtsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2797) granting a pension to Augusta Wegford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2798) granting a pension to Maria M. Wandelohr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2799) granting a pension to Rachael E. Yager and two infant heirs, Thomas Yager and Ellick Yager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2800) granting a pension to Henry Wehrmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2801) granting a pension to Alpheus L. Woodard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2802) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bethel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2803) granting an increase of pension to Norval L. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2804) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Bickers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2805) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Bristow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2806) granting an increase of pension to James Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2807) granting an increase of pension to D. B. Finnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2808) granting an increase of pension to George G. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2809) granting an increase of pension to W. S. Hardin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2810) granting an increase of pension to Mary Kearns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2811) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Michael; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2812) granting an increase of pension to Walter McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2813) granting an increase of pension to Julius A. Pherson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2814) granting an increase of pension to Simon Schmitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2815) granting an increase of pension to William Selhorst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2816) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2817) granting an increase of pension to Julius Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2818) for the relief of Thomas Callahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2819) for the relief of John A. Cassell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2820) for the relief of Jerry Carpenter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2821) for the relief of John Armstrong, jr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2822) for the relief of Caroline Holder Harrell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2823) for the relief of John W. McKibben; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2824) for the relief of L. M. Northcutt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2825) for the relief of John Riley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2826) to remove the charge of desertion against Conrad Seither; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2827) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Anderson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2828) for the relief of the heirs of the late John Hawkins; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 2829) granting an increase of pension to Mary Rebecca Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2830) for the relief of Mrs. P. A. Eskridge; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2831) for the relief of the heirs of Stephen Daggett, deceased, Julia D. Harris, administratrix; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2832) for the relief of the heirs of William Price, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of the estate of Phereby R. Sheppard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2834) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Lewis Tindall, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 2835) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2836) granting an increase of pension to Alvan G. Fleury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2837) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Judson F. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2839) for the relief of William Hommelsberg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 2840) granting an increase of pension to John Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2841) granting an increase of pension to Israel Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2842) granting an increase of pension to Sewell L. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2843) granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2844) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 2845) for the relief of William T. Thacher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of F. M. Barnhart and 27 other farmers, of Lodi, Ohio, in opposition to the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition protesting against the indignities practiced on American citizens returning to their homes by the New York customhouse; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Protest of Williamsfield (Ohio) Grange, No. 1654; Burton Grange, No. 1580, of Burton, Ohio; and Saybrook (Ohio) Grange, No. 1739, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Farmers' Institute, of Thompson, Ohio, praying for a parcels post, and election of Senators by direct vote, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOEHNE: Petition asking for a more liberal procedure on the part of the Patent Office in granting patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Resolutions adopted by the directors of the National Tariff Commission Association and heartily approved and indorsed by the executive committee of the Dayton Chamber of Commerce, urging the enactment of a satisfactory law creating a permanent Tariff Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California, located at Pasadena, urging the passage of Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Papers to accompany bill for relief of J. E. Worster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Spring Valley, Ill., asking for the creation of a department of public health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of committees of wholesale grocers of New York, favoring reduction of duty on sugar, and petition of the American Paper & Pulp Association, concerning the proposed Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions from the Philo-Celtic Society of Haverhill, Mass., opposing any efforts looking toward arbitration between the United States and Great Britain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Resolutions passed by the Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, Aroostook County, Presque Isle, Me.; S. P. Archibald and others, of Monticello, Me.; S. S. Dudley and others, of Mapleton, Me.; Foster Gove and others, of Perry, county of Washington, Me.; protesting against the passage of the reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of Anderson & Buscho and 20 others, of Wells, Minn., protesting against the establishment of local rural parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 60 citizens of Brush Creek Township, of Faribault County, Minn., protesting against establishment of free trade with Canada; and resolutions of the Rotary Club, of St. Paul, favoring a reciprocal trade agreement with the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of Seattle Local, No. 2285, Farmers' Union, of Texas, asking for the enactment of a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NYE: Resolutions passed by the Rotary Club, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Petition of American Woman's League, of London, Ohio, for investigation of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Papers to accompany bills for relief of William Hommelsberg, Judson F. Snyder, Samuel B. Carson, Alvan G. Fleury, and Frederick Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of the Socialist Local of Flint, Mich., relative to the massing of United States troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protest of the South Lyon (Mich.) Socialist Party, against the interference by United States troops with Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 10, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Assistant Secretary read the following:

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 10, 1911.

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, Senator from Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WM. P. FRYE,
President Pro Tempore.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan thereupon took the chair as presiding officer.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

VESSEL SCHOONER "APOLLO."

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Apollo*, Richard H. Richards, master (H. Doc. No. 6), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the ratification of arbitration treaties with Great Britain, France, and other leading nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the creation of a permanent tariff board and also the ratification of the pending reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the committee of the Robert Emmet celebration, held at Passaic, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of a new arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Church of the Brethren of Hartman, Colo., and Mount Ida, Kans.; of the Ministerial Association of Franklin, Pa.; and of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Mitchell, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of opium and cocaine in the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Peoria; of the Alta Farmers' Elevator Co., of Alta; and of sundry citizens of Holder and Champaign County, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a bundle of coupons signed by policyholders in the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York, in favor of the establishment of a national department of health. It seems to be a propaganda on the part of that company, but the petitions should be received. I move that they be referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of the National State Grange; of Local Grange No. 1455, of Fontana; and of Local Grange No. 1461, of Westphalia, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted at a State convention held in the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., April 4, 1911. Mass meetings were held in every county in the State for the purpose of electing delegates to this convention. It was a nonpartisan one—Republicans, Democrats, and Socialists participating in the meeting. I am informed that it was the most harmonious and the most numerously attended convention ever held in the State. After the pending agreement known as the reciprocity agreement had been thoroughly discussed and was fully understood, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted. I ask that they may be read and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

We, the farmers and business men of North Dakota in convention assembled, protest against the ratification by the Congress of the United States of the pending trade agreement with Canada. In view of this attitude, the following declarations and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

(1) That it is unfair and unjust to the agricultural interests, offering to them no semblance of reciprocal equivalent in return for what it purposes to give.

(2) That it will bring suffering and disaster to a very large number of our producers with no hope that the price of bread will be lowered to the consumer.

(3) That the duty on barley will accrue in benefit solely to the brewer, incurring great loss to the producer.

(4) That it places our farmers in the position of competing in our own home markets with an alien people, upon conditions most advantageous to our competitors.

(5) That the Canadian producer, with his cheaper land, requires smaller investment, while his new, virgin soil returns greater yields with cheaper tillage, making the per bushel cost of his product much less than ours.

(6) That it "blazes the way" for the emigration of thousands of our people and millions of our wealth to a foreign field.

(7) That it will reduce farm values, increasing the burden of the debtor, destroy incentive for the greater development of farm production, and lure to alien benefit untold millions of our wealth that should and would accrue to this and future generations if employed in the development of those vast, untilled acres that lie between the Mississippi River and the Pacific within our own borders.

(8) That it will lower the standard of farm life, reducing it to one of drudgery, lessen the opportunities for the better education of farm children, and drive from, instead of encouraging them to remain upon the farm.

(9) That it will lessen the purchasing power of our own producers, and by so doing, the commercial interests will suffer a greater loss than can possibly be overcome by any gain in trade with Canada.

(10) That in trading our home markets of over 90,000,000 people (markets that are abundantly supplied by our own producers; markets that have been largely made and earned, and which, by every right and heritage, belong to our own producers), for that of 8,000,000 Canadians with its doubtful increased advantage to the commercial and manufacturing interests, is not only unfair and unjust, but reprehensible.

Adopted this 4th day of April, 1911.

R. S. LEWIS, *Chairman*,
THEO. B. ELTON, *Secretary*,
North Dakota Anti-Reciprocity Convention.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented memorials of Burritt Grange, No. 39, of New Britain; Local Grange No. 21, of Lebanon; Local Grange No. 171, of Mystic; Local Grange No. 158, of Chester; Local Grange No. 157, of East Lynne; Wichita Grange No. 132, of Warren; Local Grange No. 108, of Woodbridge; Unity Grange, No. 117, of Deep River; Local Grange No. 122, of Watertown; Farmill River Grange, No. 130, of Huntington; Senexet Grange, No. 40, of Woodstock; Local Grange No. 44, of Newington; Local Grange No. 75, of Coventry; Local Grange No. 176, of Groton; Local Grange No. 149, of Easton; Local Grange No. 112, of Killingly; Matabesset Grange, No. 42, of Middletown; Local Grange No. 82, of Colebrook; Local Grange No. 119, of Morris; Local Grange No. 154, of Kent; Local Grange No. 131, of Columbia; Local Grange No. 72, of Plymouth; Konomoc Grange, No. 41, of Waterford; Local Grange No. 136, of East Canaan; Local Grange No. 70, of Canterbury; Shetucket Grange, No. 69, of Scotland; Local Grange No. 170, of Gaylordsville; Woodstock Grange, No. 150, of North Woodstock; Local Grange of New Canaan; Local Grange of Glastonbury; Local Grange of Colchester; Local Grange of Ledyard; and of Local Grange of Winchester, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Rock Rimmon Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Beacon Falls, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Meriden, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the withdrawal of the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Clan-na-Gael, of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Rock Rimmon Grange, Silver Lake Grange, New Canaan Grange, Wichita Grange, North Stonington Grange, Canterbury Grange, Cheshire Grange, Orange Grange, Seymour Grange, North Haven Grange, Wallingford Grange, Totoket Grange, Indian River Grange, and North Cornwall Grange, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial adopted at the thirty-fifth annual convention of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, held at San Antonio, Tex., and a memorial of the legislative committee of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of the Society of Friends of Richmond, Lincolnville, Pennville, Westfield, and Milton, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against any appropriation being made for the fortification of the Panama Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 161, Order of Machinists, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the publishers of the College Journal and College Bulletin, of Goshen, Ind., praying that an increase be made in the rate of postage on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Marion County, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Goshen, Ind., remonstrating against enactment of legislation providing for the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bremen, Ind., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Heyburn cold-storage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of sundry veterans of the Grand Army of the Republic of Rockville, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Hope Grange, No. 2101, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wright Corner, Ind., and a memorial of Jefferson Pomona Grange, No. 22, Patrons of Husbandry, of Madison, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Florence Condrey, Belle Perry, Mrs. Mary Paynter, Miss Tulley, Robert Zimmerman, Charles Baaske, Frank Keller, Mary B. Hauck, Mrs. Anna Berg, John Winchester, May Barrett, Mrs. Minnie Walle, Mrs. F. G. Mohr, John Schneider, Sarah J. Williams, Lillie Emhardt, Mrs. Laura Davis, David Speerman, Mrs. T. F. Messer, John Dowden, Mrs. Arthur Todd, John R. Morgan, Mary J. Roell, Mrs. Rose Shepherd, Harrison Riley, Mrs. Minnie Bohn, Katherine Sutter, Mrs. Mary Martin, Mrs. Maude White, Rebecca Martin, Blanch Hill, Mrs. Mary Teeters, and sundry other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. CULBERSON. By special request, I present a memorial signed by 488 citizens of El Paso County, Tex., which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorial was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

EL PASO, TEX., *February 28, 1911.*

To President W. H. Taft and the honorable Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, greeting:

We, the undersigned citizens of the city of El Paso and bona fide residents of the State of Texas, being a liberty loving people, and believing in and espousing the cause of liberty in all that term implies, and being opposed to the suppression of liberty at home and abroad, and, further, believing it to be a God-given right and that this liberty should not only be enjoyed by the people of the United States, but by all the nations of the earth, we most respectfully submit our names and most earnestly and solemnly request that the United States take no steps or interest in the revolution which is being waged in the Republic of Mexico at present, and if any steps have been taken which would in any manner or in any degree interfere with the revolutionists or insurrectos, we respectfully request that such action or such steps may be rescinded at once.

Believing with all that is in us that this is a struggle for existence, for life, and for liberty on the part of the insurrectos.

Respectfully submitted.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a memorial of the Georgia-Florida Saw Mill Association, of Jacksonville, Fla., remonstrating

against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of Mystic Grange, of Mystic; Montville Grange, of Montville; Konomoc Grange, of Waterford; Colchester Grange, of Colchester; North Stonington Grange, of North Stonington; Wolcott Grange, of Wolcott; Norwich Grange, of Norwich; Cheshire Grange, of Cheshire; Totoket Grange, of Totoket; Indian River Grange, of Milford; Orange Grange, of Orange; Seymour Grange, of Seymour; North Haven Grange, of North Haven; Wallingford Grange, of Wallingford, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of Brooklyn Grange, of Brooklyn; Winchester Grange, of Winsted; Burritt Grange, of New Britain; Ledyard Grange, of Ledyard; Colchester Grange, of Colchester, of the Patrons of Husbandry, and the memorial of C. H. Dexter & Sons, of Windsor Locks, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of Local Union No. 5, Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the opening before March 1 of the life-saving stations on the Great Lakes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LORIMER presented memorials of Local Union No. 18, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Raleigh; of Turkey Hill Grange, No. 1370, of St. Clair County; of Local Grange No. 1751, of Belvidere; and of Local Grange No. 1757, of Farmdale, of the Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Chapter, American Women's League, of Belleville, and a memorial of sundry citizens of Kent, Morseville, and Willow, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against any change being made in the rate of postage on second-class mail matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Chestnut, Ill., remonstrating against the establishment of a national department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. CRANE presented the petitions of Adolf Siressman, of Adams, Mass., and 400 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

THE FORSYTH SCOUTS.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 141) extending to the members of the Forsyth Scouts the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and February 6, 1907, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Pensions, which was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 298) authorizing the Connecticut River Co. to construct a dam or dams across the Connecticut River above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 299) making appropriation for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 300) granting a pension to Thomas W. Dickey;

A bill (S. 301) granting a pension to Melvina Chambers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 302) granting an increase of pension to Robert Lipsey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 303) granting an increase of pension to Peter Foster (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 304) for the erection of a statue to the memory of Gen. James Miller, of Peterboro, N. H.; and

A bill (S. 305) for the erection of a statue of Maj. Gen. John Stark in the city of Manchester, N. H.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 306) to confirm the name of Commodore Barney Circle for the circle located at the eastern end of Pennsylvania Avenue SE., in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 307) to change the name of Fort Place, from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE., to Irving Street; and

A bill (S. 308) to amend an act entitled "An act to distinctively designate parcels of land in the District of Columbia for the purposes of assessment and taxation, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 309) to amend an act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and the acts supplementary thereto, so as to extend the benefits thereof to the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 310) relative to joint operations of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;

A bill (S. 311) to encourage rifle practice and promote a patriotic spirit among the citizens and youth of the United States;

A bill (S. 312) to provide for raising the volunteer forces of the United States in time of actual or threatened war;

A bill (S. 313) relative to the exchange of certain properties between the insular government of Porto Rico and the War Department;

A bill (S. 314) to transfer the Alaskan cable and telegraph system to the Post Office Department;

A bill (S. 315) fixing the rank of military attachés (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 316) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 4843 of the Revised Statutes," approved February 9, 1900, with reference to insane civilian employees of the Military Establishment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 317) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sundance, in the State of Wyoming; and

A bill (S. 318) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newcastle, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 319) for the relief of Emory Scott Land (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 320) for the relief of Herman Glafcke;

A bill (S. 321) for the relief of Clarence D. Houck;

A bill (S. 322) for the relief of Henry Altman;

A bill (S. 323) for the payment of certain claims for damages to and loss of private property;

A bill (S. 324) for the relief of Allen Edward O'Toole and others, who sustained damage by reason of accident at Rock Island Arsenal; and

A bill (S. 325) for the relief of Aaron H. Appel; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 326) authorizing the resurvey of certain lands in the State of Wyoming; and

A bill (S. 327) granting to the State of Wyoming 2,000,000 acres of land to aid in the maintenance of a system of public roads in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 328) granting an increase of pension to Annie Jane Saffell;

A bill (S. 329) granting an increase of pension to Susan R. Lovell;

A bill (S. 330) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia M. Clagett;

A bill (S. 331) granting an increase of pension to Carrie H. Travis;

A bill (S. 332) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Underwood;

A bill (S. 333) granting an increase of pension to Isabella S. Snyder; and

A bill (S. 334) granting an increase of pension to Kate Dodge Augur; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 335) granting an increase of pension to William H. Eagle (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 336) to amend section 1753 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

A bill (S. 337) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged

in interstate commerce to adopt uniform rules for the operation of railroad trains and to use a uniform system of signals for authorizing the movement of railroad trains; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 338) authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes; and

A bill (S. 339) providing for the reappraisement and sale of certain lands in the town site of Port Angeles, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(By request.) A bill (S. 340) to amend the national banking law; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 341) granting an increase of pension to Lorentz Thoreson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 342) for the relief of Daniel B. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 343) granting an increase of pension to Seth Goldthwait;

A bill (S. 344) granting an increase of pension to Philip Riley;

A bill (S. 345) granting a pension to Alfred Faucher;

A bill (S. 346) granting an increase of pension to Edwards O. Dodge;

A bill (S. 347) granting a pension to John A. Connolly;

A bill (S. 348) granting a pension to Verona Harriman;

A bill (S. 349) granting an increase of pension to Albert D. Scovell; and

A bill (S. 350) granting a pension to Edward F. Shaughnessy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 351) granting an increase of pension to John Bossinger;

A bill (S. 352) granting an increase of pension to Anna K. Rhoades;

A bill (S. 353) granting an increase of pension to William D. Kelley;

A bill (S. 354) granting an increase of pension to George A. Wingrove;

A bill (S. 355) granting an increase of pension to Adam Smith;

A bill (S. 356) granting an increase of pension to Henry Yost;

A bill (S. 357) granting an increase of pension to Israel Osman;

A bill (S. 358) granting an increase of pension to Abel Statton;

A bill (S. 359) granting an increase of pension to William Marks; and

A bill (S. 360) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda M. Marks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 361) to provide for the erection of a public building at Redfield, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (S. 362) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Chamberlain, in the State of South Dakota; and

A bill (S. 363) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rapid City, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 364) for the relief of Ranney Y. Lyman; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 365) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point in the eastern portion of the State of South Dakota to be selected by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 366) granting an increase of pension to William H. Scannel;

A bill (S. 367) granting a pension to Francis Bills;

A bill (S. 368) granting a pension to George Boothroyd;

A bill (S. 369) granting a pension to Urban Coon;

A bill (S. 370) granting a pension to Wellsley Crane;

A bill (S. 371) granting a pension to William H. Harvey;

A bill (S. 372) granting a pension to Charles H. Husbaw;

A bill (S. 373) granting an increase of pension to John Leister;

A bill (S. 374) granting a pension to William J. Marshall;

A bill (S. 375) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Moore;

A bill (S. 376) granting a pension to William Roach;

A bill (S. 377) granting an increase of pension to James L. Anderson;

A bill (S. 378) granting an increase of pension to David Strayer;

A bill (S. 379) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith;

A bill (S. 380) granting an increase of pension to John Powers;

A bill (S. 381) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Peterson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 382) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Norton (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 383) granting an increase of pension to George Kent (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 384) providing that a portion of the land which was formerly the right of way of the Washington branch of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, in the city of Washington, D. C., be reserved for use as an avenue and improved; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 385) to further exclude undesirable immigrants, improve conditions on immigrant vessels, and raise funds for the proper enforcement of the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 386) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick Heer (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 387) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Phillips (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 388) granting an increase of pension to William F. Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NIXON:

A bill (S. 389) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Fallon, Nev.;

A bill (S. 390) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Las Vegas, Nev.;

A bill (S. 391) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Elko, Nev.; and

A bill (S. 392) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Winnemucca, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 393) to place Luther Sage Kelly upon the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 394) granting an increase of pension to Frederick L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 395) for the relief of the estate of William Thomas Lowe; and

A bill (S. 396) for the relief of the county of Nelson, State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 397) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. Rivers;

A bill (S. 398) granting an increase of pension to Emma Montgomery;

A bill (S. 399) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Knowles;

A bill (S. 400) granting an increase of pension to William L. Goodsell;

A bill (S. 401) granting an increase of pension to John Covert;

A bill (S. 402) granting an increase of pension to Louis J. Hinkley;

A bill (S. 403) granting a pension to Minerva Keel; and

A bill (S. 404) granting a pension to Caroline Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 405) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to classify and appraise unallotted Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 406) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Vermilion, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (S. 407) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Madison, S. Dak.;

A bill (S. 408) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Canton, in the State of South Dakota;

A bill (S. 409) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Redfield, S. Dak.; and

A bill (S. 410) to provide for the acquisition of a site on which to erect a public building at Milbank, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 411) granting an increase of pension to James McCue (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 412) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 413) for the relief of Henry N. Bird;

A bill (S. 414) for the relief of Lemuel H. Redd;

A bill (S. 415) for the relief of Lachoneus Barnard; and

A bill (S. 416) for the relief of John F. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 417) to enlarge the Grand Canyon game refuge; to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

A bill (S. 418) to provide for the erection of a public building at Nephi, Utah; and

A bill (S. 419) to provide for the erection of a public building at American Fork, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 420) to correct the military record of Thomas Smith;

A bill (S. 421) to correct the military record of Joseph B. Forbes; and

A bill (S. 422) to correct the military record of James Judd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 423) to establish a fish-culture station in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 424) to reimburse George Heiner, postmaster at Morgan, Utah, for loss of postage stamps; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 425) granting an increase of pension to James Henry Martineau;

A bill (S. 426) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Liddle;

A bill (S. 427) granting a pension to Ann O. Burt;

A bill (S. 428) granting a pension to Gust Carlson;

A bill (S. 429) granting a pension to Mary Butterfield;

A bill (S. 430) granting a pension to John H. Kidd;

A bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Budge T. Underwood;

A bill (S. 432) granting an increase of pension to James A. Bean;

A bill (S. 433) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor P. Bigler;

A bill (S. 434) granting an increase of pension to John W. A. Lawson;

A bill (S. 435) granting an increase of pension to George W. Goshen; and

A bill (S. 436) granting an increase of pension to Seth H. Tolles (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER:

A bill (S. 437) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McDermott;

A bill (S. 438) granting an increase of pension to William F. Barnett;

A bill (S. 439) granting an increase of pension to George Reiber;

A bill (S. 440) granting a pension to Ulysses J. Wannemaker;

A bill (S. 441) granting a pension to James K. Rainey;

A bill (S. 442) granting a pension to Margaret Roddy;

A bill (S. 443) granting a pension to Warren Hilliard;

A bill (S. 444) granting a pension to Eliza Finley Fosha;

A bill (S. 445) granting an increase of pension to Olive A. Comfort;

A bill (S. 446) granting an increase of pension to Elijah C. Davey;

A bill (S. 447) granting a pension to Mrs. M. R. Clark;

A bill (S. 448) granting a pension to Lyda McKenna;

A bill (S. 449) granting an increase of pension to Susannah Roberts;

A bill (S. 450) granting a pension to Louisa May Losee;

A bill (S. 451) granting an increase of pension to Ira Howell;

A bill (S. 452) granting a pension to Mary A. Jones;

A bill (S. 453) granting a pension to Annie M. Lunn; and

A bill (S. 454) granting a pension to O. M. Towles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 455) for the relief of John I. Brown & Son and others; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 456) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma; and

A bill (S. 457) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 458) for the relief of the Turner Hardware Co.;

A bill (S. 459) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee and loyal Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians;

A bill (S. 460) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Tonkawa Tribe of Indians against the United States; and

A bill (S. 461) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Ponca Tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 462) for the relief of Slavo Ramadanovitch, of Cettigne, a Montenegrin subject, heir and administrator of Marcus Ramadanovitch, alias Radich, deceased; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 463) granting an increase of pension to Darius Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 464) to authorize the establishment of fish-cultural stations on the Columbia River or its tributaries in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 465) for the relief of the contributors to the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; and

A bill (S. 466) for the relief of the Bates & Guild Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 467) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Stuart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 468) to abolish the involuntary servitude imposed upon seamen in the merchant marine of the United States while in foreign ports, and the involuntary servitude imposed upon seamen of the merchant marine of foreign countries while in the ports of the United States, to prevent undermanning and unskilled manning of American vessels, to encourage the training of boys in the American merchant marine, and to amend the laws relative to American seamen; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 469) granting an increase of pension to August Scholz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 470) for the relief of Mrs. Tessie Du Bois; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 471) for the relief of John T. Glynn; and

A bill (S. 472) for the relief of the Watson Mill Co., of the city of Wichita, State of Kansas; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 473) relating to Navy retirements; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 474) granting an increase of pension to John Brannan;

A bill (S. 475) granting a pension to Daniel G. Webster (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 476) granting an increase of pension to Jesse J. W. Thompson;

A bill (S. 477) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Tyler;

A bill (S. 478) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Taylor;

A bill (S. 479) granting an increase of pension to James Scott;

A bill (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to William Bishop;

A bill (S. 481) granting a pension to Alexander R. Banks;

A bill (S. 482) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Wakefield;

A bill (S. 483) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico;

A bill (S. 484) granting an increase of pension to B. F. Havens;

A bill (S. 485) granting an increase of pension to Michael Connor;

A bill (S. 486) granting a pension to H. E. Hagar;

A bill (S. 487) granting an increase of pension to John C. Johnston;

A bill (S. 488) granting an increase of pension to Andrew O. Ramsey;

A bill (S. 489) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Fessenden, jr.;

A bill (S. 490) granting an increase of pension to William Ainsbury;
A bill (S. 491) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Mercer;
A bill (S. 492) granting a pension to Henry Sheairls (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 493) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Taylor (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 494) granting an increase of pension to Susan R. Lovell (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 495) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah Kramer (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 496) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Henry (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 497) granting an increase of pension to John E. Springer (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 498) granting an increase of pension to A. Dienst (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 499) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Eckert (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 500) granting an increase of pension to Davis J. Howard (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 501) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rumbley (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 502) granting an increase of pension to Zora W. Elder (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 503) granting an increase of pension to W. M. Copeland (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 504) granting an increase of pension to Arthur W. Brittingham (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 505) granting an increase of pension to William C. McClenney (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 506) granting an increase of pension to John Gibson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 507) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Eldred (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 508) granting an increase of pension to Abbott A. Mills;
A bill (S. 509) granting an increase of pension to George L. Hiatt (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 510) granting an increase of pension to William J. Lambden (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 511) granting a pension to Elise G. Irving (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 512) granting an increase of pension to S. D. Fulmer (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 513) granting a pension to Sarah Wilson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 514) granting an increase of pension to George W. Graham (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 515) granting a pension to Josephine P. Whitney (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 516) granting a pension to Cora E. Ruttinger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 517) granting an increase of pension to Warren Johnson;
A bill (S. 518) granting an increase of pension to William Comstock;
A bill (S. 519) granting an increase of pension to James Killmartin;
A bill (S. 520) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hogelan;
A bill (S. 521) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Hercher;
A bill (S. 522) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. O'Neill;
A bill (S. 523) granting an increase of pension to James T. Brown;
A bill (S. 524) granting an increase of pension to John T. Campbell;
A bill (S. 525) granting an increase of pension to James W. Thompson;
A bill (S. 526) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Fry;
A bill (S. 527) granting an increase of pension to James Ohaver;
A bill (S. 528) granting an increase of pension to John Jones;
A bill (S. 529) granting an increase of pension to Balaam Hornaday;
A bill (S. 530) granting a pension to Josephine Moore;
A bill (S. 531) granting a pension to E. Belle Piatt;
A bill (S. 532) granting a pension to Susannah Lindsey;
A bill (S. 533) granting an increase of pension to Frank Snurpus;
A bill (S. 534) granting an increase of pension to Nelson G. Smith;
A bill (S. 535) granting a pension to Mary S. King;
A bill (S. 536) granting a pension to Emily Velare Thompson;
A bill (S. 537) granting an increase of pension to Amos T. Phares (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 538) granting an increase of pension to George Milholland (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 539) granting an increase of pension to Richard F. Cain (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 540) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Riggs (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 541) granting an increase of pension to William H. Doty (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 542) granting an increase of pension to George P. McKee;
A bill (S. 543) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jones (with accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 544) granting an increase of pension to James Sexton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 545) for the relief of John Geabhart Abbott; to the Committee on Indian Depredations.
A bill (S. 546) authorizing the adjudication and payment of the claim of Charles Dupre; and
A bill (S. 547) for the relief of Sarah A. Waite; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 548) retiring Thomas Harrison, a clerk in the Naval Observatory, and for other purposes; and
A bill (S. 549) awarding a medal of honor to George Murphy, late private, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 550) for the relief of Thomas Huggins;
A bill (S. 551) for the relief of John Dalton; and
A bill (S. 552) for the relief of George Wilson, alias Jorgen Well; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 553) granting an increase of pension to John W. Holman;
A bill (S. 554) granting an increase of pension to John Leavell;
A bill (S. 555) granting an increase of pension to William Weaver;
A bill (S. 556) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mullen;
A bill (S. 557) granting an increase of pension to George H. Slightam;
A bill (S. 558) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Hoover;
A bill (S. 559) granting a pension to Martin Markeson;
A bill (S. 560) granting an increase of pension to William T. Douglas;
A bill (S. 561) granting an increase of pension to John M. Turner;
A bill (S. 562) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cox;
A bill (S. 563) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Gates;
A bill (S. 564) granting an increase of pension to Warren J. Bowman;
A bill (S. 565) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Parker;
A bill (S. 566) granting an increase of pension to David Mills;
A bill (S. 567) granting an increase of pension to Michael Culp;
A bill (S. 568) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey M. Carpenter;
A bill (S. 569) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Gould;
A bill (S. 570) granting a pension to George A. Torchio;
A bill (S. 571) granting a pension to Hannah J. Matter;
A bill (S. 572) granting an increase of pension to Asbery Byrd;
A bill (S. 573) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Warner;
A bill (S. 574) granting an increase of pensión to Howard Brooks;
A bill (S. 575) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Simmons;
A bill (S. 576) granting an increase of pension to Jens C. Jensen;
A bill (S. 577) granting an increase of pension to William H. Dupray;

A bill (S. 578) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKain;
A bill (S. 579) granting an increase of pension to George Liddle;
A bill (S. 580) granting an increase of pension to David W. Fox;
A bill (S. 581) granting an increase of pension to James R. McKee;
A bill (S. 582) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Blain;
A bill (S. 583) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah H. Robins;
A bill (S. 584) granting an increase of pension to Alfred E. Robinson;
A bill (S. 585) granting an increase of pension to William J. Salisbury; and
A bill (S. 586) granting an increase of pension to David Bishop; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 587) to authorize the President to appoint Col. James W. Pope, Assistant Quartermaster General, to the grade of brigadier general in the United States Army, and place him on the retired list;
A bill (S. 588) authorizing the appointment of M. J. Hogarty, captain, United States Army, retired, to the rank and grade of brigadier general on the retired list of the Army; and
A bill (S. 589) for the relief of George S. Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 590) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Heckelmann;
A bill (S. 591) granting an increase of pension to Matthew C. Deering;
A bill (S. 592) granting an increase of pension to Manford Mott;
A bill (S. 593) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Price;
A bill (S. 594) granting an increase of pension to Webster N. Smith;
A bill (S. 595) granting an increase of pension to John B. Starr;
A bill (S. 596) granting an increase of pension to James Stephenson;
A bill (S. 597) granting an increase of pension to Charles Swift;
A bill (S. 598) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Underwood;
A bill (S. 599) granting an increase of pension to David W. Miller;
A bill (S. 600) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Williams;
A bill (S. 601) granting an increase of pension to Henry Shafer;
A bill (S. 602) granting an increase of pension to Kate Brown;
A bill (S. 603) granting an increase of pension to John H. Williamson;
A bill (S. 604) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Milby;
A bill (S. 605) granting an increase of pension to Albert Clark;
A bill (S. 606) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Cooper;
A bill (S. 607) granting an increase of pension to David Milford;
A bill (S. 608) granting an increase of pension to James S. Carlton;
A bill (S. 609) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Burns;
A bill (S. 610) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Capansky;
A bill (S. 611) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Chatfield;
A bill (S. 612) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Lauman;
A bill (S. 613) granting an increase of pension to Christopher M. McGuire;
A bill (S. 614) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Madden;
A bill (S. 615) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Bacon;
A bill (S. 616) granting an increase of pension to George Ritchey;
A bill (S. 617) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Morton;
A bill (S. 618) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Johnson;
A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to David M. Harned;
A bill (S. 620) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Giller;
A bill (S. 621) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Carter;
A bill (S. 622) granting an increase of pension to Harriet L. Chittenden;
A bill (S. 623) granting an increase of pension to Adoniram J. Goff;
A bill (S. 624) granting an increase of pension to John N. Williams;
A bill (S. 625) granting an increase of pension to John Barthel;
A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Alice T. Smith;
A bill (S. 627) granting an increase of pension to Lorin N. Hawkins;
A bill (S. 628) granting an increase of pension to George H. Burnett;
A bill (S. 629) granting an increase of pension to Matthew B. Noel;
A bill (S. 630) granting an increase of pension to James R. Holdeman;
A bill (S. 631) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. White;
A bill (S. 632) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Stratton;
A bill (S. 633) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Noll;
A bill (S. 634) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Stephenson;
A bill (S. 635) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Price;
A bill (S. 636) granting an increase of pension to Willis J. Kendall;
A bill (S. 637) granting an increase of pension to David Lakin;
A bill (S. 638) granting an increase of pension to William A. Sharp;
A bill (S. 639) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo L. Baker;
A bill (S. 640) granting an increase of pension to Michael R. Shultz;
A bill (S. 641) granting an increase of pension to Betsy B. Simons;
A bill S. 642) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stewart;
A bill (S. 643) granting an increase of pension to John W. Watsbaugh;
A bill (S. 644) granting an increase of pension to Patrick G. Murphy;
A bill (S. 645) granting an increase of pension to Harry Jeremiah Parks;
A bill (S. 646) granting an increase of pension to Elmer Howe;
A bill (S. 647) granting an increase of pension to Willis G. Miner;
A bill (S. 648) granting an increase of pension to James H. Moser;
A bill (S. 649) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Welch;
A bill (S. 650) granting an increase of pension to Eunice A. Starr;
A bill (S. 651) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Selby;
A bill (S. 652) granting an increase of pension to Cora G. Davison;
A bill (S. 653) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Shields;
A bill (S. 654) granting an increase of pension to John C. Kennedy;
A bill (S. 655) granting an increase of pension to John G. Geiling;
A bill (S. 656) granting an increase of pension to Theodore A. Mather;
A bill (S. 657) granting an increase of pension to Annie George;
A bill (S. 658) granting an increase of pension to John Mather;
A bill (S. 659) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. McMahan;

A bill (S. 660) granting an increase of pension to Henry Butler;
A bill (S. 661) granting an increase of pension to Willis E. Hall;
A bill (S. 662) granting an increase of pension to John H. Mattocks;
A bill (S. 663) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Surby;
A bill (S. 664) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Rhodes;
A bill (S. 665) granting an increase of pension to William L. Switzer;
A bill (S. 666) granting an increase of pension to Hiram W. Foss;
A bill (S. 667) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Stauter;
A bill (S. 668) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Meade;
A bill (S. 669) granting an increase of pension to George W. Parks;
A bill (S. 670) granting an increase of pension to Charles Roden;
A bill (S. 671) granting an increase of pension to Cassius B. Kimball;
A bill (S. 672) granting an increase of pension to Sara B. C. Stephenson;
A bill (S. 673) granting an increase of pension to Leander Chase;
A bill (S. 674) granting an increase of pension to William J. Donley, alias Joseph McCormick;
A bill (S. 675) granting an increase of pension to Daniel D. Desmond;
A bill (S. 676) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lloyd;
A bill (S. 677) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Martin;
A bill (S. 678) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Meehan;
A bill (S. 679) granting an increase of pension to Christian Trostel;
A bill (S. 680) granting an increase of pension to Ruth Ann Baird;
A bill (S. 681) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Clark;
A bill (S. 682) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Edgar;
A bill (S. 683) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Withrow;
A bill (S. 684) granting an increase of pension to Oscar White;
A bill (S. 685) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Wallace;
A bill (S. 686) granting an increase of pension to James F. Farnsworth;
A bill (S. 687) granting an increase of pension to William Fullerton;
A bill (S. 688) granting an increase of pension to John R. Long;
A bill (S. 689) granting an increase of pension to Uriah J. Loop;
A bill (S. 690) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Osgood;
A bill (S. 691) granting an increase of pension to Shepard Goodwin Patrick;
A bill (S. 692) granting an increase of pension to Henry Andrews;
A bill (S. 693) granting an increase of pension to William F. Wahl;
A bill (S. 694) granting an increase of pension to William J. Benton;
A bill (S. 695) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie H. Dole;
A bill (S. 696) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Fisher;
A bill (S. 697) granting an increase of pension to John Roy;
A bill (S. 698) granting an increase of pension to W. P. Thompson;
A bill (S. 699) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Walker;
A bill (S. 700) granting an increase of pension to Tomas Escobado;
A bill (S. 701) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Edgecomb;
A bill (S. 702) granting an increase of pension to David Frazier;
A bill (S. 703) granting an increase of pension to Elmer D. Hackett;
A bill (S. 704) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester J. Hervey;
A bill (S. 705) granting an increase of pension to Gordon Kimball;
A bill (S. 706) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Edmonds;
A bill (S. 707) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Mangus;
A bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy;
A bill (S. 709) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Estes;
A bill (S. 710) granting an increase of pension to William B. Norton;
A bill (S. 711) granting an increase of pension to Luzerne Jones;
A bill (S. 712) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Johnson;
A bill (S. 713) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Price;
A bill (S. 714) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Anderson;
A bill (S. 715) granting an increase of pension to John B. Wilson;
A bill (S. 716) granting an increase of pension to Flavius J. Jordan;
A bill (S. 717) granting an increase of pension to Susannah Sprague;
A bill (S. 718) granting an increase of pension to Edward Clark;
A bill (S. 719) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Brown;
A bill (S. 720) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim P. Beers;
A bill (S. 721) granting an increase of pension to Thereon G. Crowningshield;
A bill (S. 722) granting an increase of pension to James D. Smith;
A bill (S. 723) granting an increase of pension to John F. Smith;
A bill (S. 724) granting an increase of pension to Jackson H. Thompson;
A bill (S. 725) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Fernsworth;
A bill (S. 726) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Faught;
A bill (S. 727) granting an increase of pension to Jonas Schrock;
A bill (S. 728) granting an increase of pension to Hiram R. Smith;
A bill (S. 729) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Tovey;
A bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to William Bradley;
A bill (S. 731) granting an increase of pension to John O. Mow;
A bill (S. 732) granting an increase of pension to Henry Blakewell;
A bill (S. 733) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McIlvain;
A bill (S. 734) granting an increase of pension to Sadie M. W. Likens;
A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to James C. Sellers;
A bill (S. 736) granting a pension to Francis E. Searway;
A bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Harry M. Osborne;
A bill (S. 738) granting a pension to William J. Clark;
A bill (S. 739) granting an increase of pension to Jacques Lapp;
A bill (S. 740) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tanner;
A bill (S. 741) granting an increase of pension to James W. Nelson;
A bill (S. 742) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Wilsey;
A bill (S. 743) granting an increase of pension to Frederick H. Williams; and
A bill (S. 744) granting an increase of pension to Mahala A. Brumley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona; to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. WORKS. I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver a condemned cannon to the National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to deliver to the order of Col. D. R. Stowits, quartermaster general of the Grand Army of the Republic, one dismounted, condemned bronze cannon, used in the Civil War, to be used by the Grand Army of the Republic for the purpose of furnishing official badges of the order: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States through the delivery of said condemned cannon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the joint resolution ought to go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to submit a notice of a resolution proposing certain amendments to the rules. I ask that the resolution be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the resolution be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 12), as follows:

NOTICE TO AMEND THE RULES.

Resolved, That the rules of the Senate be, and are hereby, amended as follows:

Amend Rule VII by striking out all after the word "for," in line 7, down to and including the word "resolutions," in line 11.

Beginning with the word "pension," in the first line of section 2 of Rule VII, strike out all down to and including the word "hour," in line 3 of said section, and insert the words "bills and report of a committee."

Strike out all of the second paragraph of section 2.

Amend Rule VIII by striking out the figure "2" in the first line of the second paragraph and inserting the figure "3."

Amend Rule VIII by striking out, in line 4, the figure "2" and insert the figure "3."

Amend Rule IX by striking out the figure "2" in the second line and inserting the figure "3."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I only desire to say that those are amendments to the rules which will be made necessary if the Senate should determine to amend its standing order and meet at 2 instead of 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Texas asks that the resolution lie upon the table?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That course will be taken.

TREATY OF 1832 WITH RUSSIA.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, on the 21st of February last I introduced a resolution looking to the abrogation of the treaty of 1832 with Russia. I reintroduce the resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is short, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution, as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the treaty of 1832 between the United States and Russia should be abrogated because of the discrimination by Russia between American citizens in the administration of the treaty.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC LANDS IN PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (H. Doc. No. 8), which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Philippines and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 13 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I submit herewith an act of the Philippine Legislature amending the public-land laws of the Philippine Islands by specifying the officials before whom the final evidence to perfect homestead grants may be taken. The law as it stands requires applicants for homesteads to furnish certain affidavits, but does not indicate the officials before whom they may be executed.

The amendment seems essential to a proper understanding by homesteaders as to what is required of them. I have therefore approved the act in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the act of Congress above mentioned.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 10, 1911.*

RULINGS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 10), submitted by Mr. DAVIS on the 6th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be required and directed to furnish to the Senate copy of the rulings of his department, and his reasons therefor, in regard to the circulation of the Woman's National Weekly; also the Harpoon, of Denver, two newspapers published in the United States, inasmuch as serious charges are made against said rulings, as is shown by letter attached and made a part of this resolution; that said information be furnished to the Senate at the earliest possible convenience of the department.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to submit, for the information of the Senate, a letter from one of my constituents. I ask that it be read for the information of the Senate, or, if preferred, that it may be printed in the RECORD. I also have a clipping, which is quite lengthy, relating strictly to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire the letter to be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir. I want to say, Mr. President, that the only object of the resolution is that the Post Office Department shall furnish the Senate its reasons for discriminating against the two papers referred to. I know that the Woman's National Weekly, formerly a daily, has a large circulation in my State, and I am constantly receiving a great many complaints, especially from the ladies of my State, asking why the Post Office Department has arbitrarily ordered this paper to discontinue 103,000 copies of its circulation. This paper is sent to ladies of the country and to friends largely by other people—for instance, each Member of the Senate might send to others 10 or a hundred copies of the paper. It is a very cheap paper, devoted to literature, art, education, domestic duties, and matters of that kind. It seems that the Post Office Department contends that the person receiving the paper must pay for it himself. I want to know why this ruling has been made. Therefore I ask that the resolution be adopted directing the Post Office Department to furnish us the information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas presents a communication, together with a clipping, which he asks may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. Let it be read, Mr. President.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no objection to having it read. It is quite lengthy, but it relates entirely to the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. I desire that the resolution be again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts requests that the resolution be again read. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary again read the resolution of Mr. DAVIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, what is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Arkansas is that the communication which he has sent to the Secretary's desk may be printed in the RECORD. In the absence of objection it will be so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

HARRISON, ARK., *April 3, 1911.*

Hon. JEFF DAVIS,
Senator from Arkansas.

MOST HONORABLE SIR: I am a full-paid member of the American Woman's League; subscribed for the Woman's National Daily, and paid for it with my own hard-earned money. Because it was a clean, pure, honest, moral, educational paper I sent it to some of my friends whom I was under obligations to for similar favors. Since they received it, the most of them have paid me for it, because they found it met the demands of the tired, busy housewife and mother in her own home in that it was small, easily handled, no extra advertising sheets to litter up the house, clean, pure, and inspiring to higher ideals in honesty, refinement, and culture along all lines that make for the best type of womanhood and manhood.

Now, because some of Uncle Sam's employees think that too many such people are reading such a clean, pure, little paper daily, he raises the rate of postage and says 103,000 of these readers shall not have their paper.

I have a right to demand that the United States mails bring me my mail if I pay, or am willing to pay, the same postage that other people pay for the same kind of mail or literature. That the Government has no right to stop, or raise the postage on it as long as it is paid for; and a clean, moral, newsy paper is what we demand in the name of liberty and justice in this the land of the free and home of the brave.

We mothers and wives have, through that little paper and the league, been given greater opportunities for the education of ourselves and children than any State can give us, because the time and place to secure an education could not be had for lack of means. It has opened wide the doors for higher education in art, music, business, domestic

science, and every line of education given to-day by correspondence, and as citizens of these United States of America we demand that our rights be given us and humbly beg your honorable self to do all within your power to secure for us our rights in working, praying, and fighting to have the postage reduced and the restricted number be allowed to receive their paper. The last two papers have been filled with advertising matter to meet the extra postage. We trust that the spirit of liberty, justice, and honor is still alive in the hearts and minds of our Representatives and that you will see that this postal law is righted.

Sincerely,

MRS. DANNIE MAGGARD BAKER.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am informed that one of the publications named in the resolution is now under investigation, and it seems to me, therefore, there should be added to the resolution the language "if not incompatible with the public interest." If that addition be made, I have no objection to the adoption of the resolution. I think the department should clearly state the ruling it has made. Does the Senator from Arkansas object to that?

Mr. DAVIS. I do. Mr. President, I am not ordinarily the champion of newspapers. I have received no kindness nor consideration at their hands. I have been hounded and dogged by these emissaries of advanced thought until the epidermis has become a little bit raw; but it seems to me that here are two worthy newspapers. One is the Woman's National Weekly, purely a home paper, and as to the other, while the Senator from Ohio has said it is under investigation, I may say that it has under investigation certain Federal officials in the columns of its paper, and is making certain exposures that I think are entirely proper, if true; exposures that go to the very root of things; exposures that ought to be made, if the charges are true, and if not, there is a proper mode of suppression. Therefore I think the papers, especially the paper for the benefit of the homes and families of the country, ought to be given the widest circulation, no matter who pays for them, no matter whether they are paid for directly by the person who receives them or by his friend or neighbor.

I certainly think, Mr. President, that the Harpoon, of Denver, so long as it has the fight on its hands that it has, ought to be given the widest circulation and ought not to be restricted by arbitrary rulings of the Post Office Department. To say that this resolution shall be answered, provided it is not incompatible with the public service, is simply to say to the Post Office Department, "You may refuse to answer if you so elect; if some little spirit of delicacy prompts you to do so, you may refuse to answer it." No, sir, I want this resolution passed as it is, and let the Post Office Department say to the Senate why it is——

Mr. BURTON. I yielded to the Senator from Arkansas merely for an answer to a question. I have no objection, however, to his proceeding for a reasonable time during the course of my remarks.

Mr. DAVIS. I am through, sir. Mr. President, I have finished. I want this resolution passed as it is, and let the Post Office Department say to the Senate why these unreasonable and unheard of restrictions are placed against these two publications.

Mr. BURTON. I do not care to enter into the merits of this particular controversy. I will only say, in passing, that it is evident that the writer of the letter, whose epistle is set forth here on page 91, must have been laboring under some misapprehension. He says that objection was made and the sending of papers was withheld in a hundred thousand cases where the papers were subscribed for by relatives and friends. It shows a very unusual assistance from relatives and friends, which enlarges the subscriptions to the extent of a hundred thousand copies.

What I wish to call attention to, however, is the precedent that would be established by passing this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. To enlighten the Senator from Ohio on the question as to the 103,000 subscriptions, I ask that the clipping from the paper of Mr. Lewis be read to the Senate for its information, together with the so-called ruling of the Post Office Department.

Mr. BURTON. I prefer to proceed. The point to which I wish to call attention, which furnishes the substantial objection here, is this: We would, by passing this resolution, make it possible, whenever a publication was under investigation, even under criminal accusation—under any accusation—for it to come here and make a demand upon the Post Office Department to give its reasons for its proceedings, and thus unfold to the public and give to those against whom the department is proceeding, or whose transactions it is investigating, all the facts and circumstances upon which a possible prosecution might be based.

It seems to me, Mr. President, we can not for a moment think of establishing such a precedent, and I therefore move as an amendment that there be added at the end of the resolution the words "if not incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

Mr. DAVIS. If the Senator from Georgia will pardon me for a moment, I will be through.

There is no criminal charge pending against the Woman's Weekly Journal, published by Mr. Lewis. The Post Office Department has given him a pretended reason there for the taking away of 103,000 of his circulation, and the reason is simply puerile and silly. There is no criminal prosecution pending and no criminal investigation being had.

It is a woman's paper, published purely for women, for their education and enlightenment and their home use, and now the Post Office Department simply says "You can not let one of your friends send out 50 copies of this paper and pay for it at 25 cents a year." It says so there, as shown by the report of the department. "You can not let one of your friends send out 50 or 100 copies of this paper to his friends." A Senator could not send a hundred copies of this paper to his friends and pay for it. That has brought this paper under the ban of the Post Office Department, and they arbitrarily say to Mr. Lewis "You must cut off 103,000 of your subscribers which we find are unpaid subscribers."

I am receiving letters constantly from people in my State saying "We have paid for this paper, and it is being cut off by the Post Office Department under this arbitrary ruling. We want to know why it is so." That relates purely to this woman's paper.

As regards the other, if the Senate of the United States wants to interpose whitewash proceedings here as against charges that are being fought out by the Harpoon, of Denver, against certain Federal officials, the sooner the country knows it the better. The paper is making certain charges against certain Federal officials. I do not know whether they are true or false, but there is a fight on between them. But if the charges are not true, let these Federal officials show it to the country. If they are true, the officials ought to be turned out of office; and I say that the Senate of the United States is in no position to-day to take the side of a whitewash proceeding and say that the Post Office Department shall not furnish this information to the Senate and to the country.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have no information such as would give me a very definite opinion as to the merits of the particular matter being discussed by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Ohio. I think, however, that the Senate should determine definitely whether or not it desires this information, and it is simply with reference to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio that I desire to say a word to the Senate.

It is not in accord with the practice of the Senate, it is not in harmony with what I may say is the uniform, unvarying practice of the Senate, to add the words which are now suggested by the Senator from Ohio, except in case of communications addressed to the State Department, and the reason for that is manifest. Matters within the jurisdiction of the State Department frequently concern relations between this Government and foreign Governments which are necessarily of a nature where their publication may sometimes be not compatible with the public interest. Therefore whenever a request is addressed to the President of the United States it is the custom of the Senate not only when it relates to foreign affairs, but to any other affairs, as a matter of courtesy, to say to the President of the United States that the request is made if it is not incompatible with the public interest, and whenever addressed to the Secretary of State, he having charge of that particular branch of the governmental functions which relates to foreign affairs, it is the custom to add the words. But it is not the custom in case the direction is given to any other of the departments.

Now, I wish to say, Mr. President, that in the days when I first had the honor to come into the Senate there was no possible question upon this subject, and the men from whom I first learned that such was the practice were men who had been of the longest experience in the Senate. I recollect that the first Senator from whom I ever heard the objection made when a similar amendment was proposed, or when the original resolution had come in to that effect, was Mr. Sherman of Ohio, who sat only three seats, I think, to the right of where the present Senator sits, though possibly I may be mistaken about that; the seat to the immediate right of the seat of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. The statement was then made

by him that the Senate, except in cases where it desired to get information from the State Department, should always "direct" the department as to what it wished to have done and not leave it to the discretion of the department; that it was not consistent with the necessities of the Senate in dealing with the large public affairs which were committed to it to have it in the discretion of the head of a department to say whether he would or would not comply with such a direction.

One of the Senators who was most insistent upon that rule was Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, than whom a more accomplished man, I think, never sat in the Senate, either before his day or subsequent to it. Possibly some men excelled him in some particulars, but I use the word "accomplished" with due regard to its weight, for I do not think a more accomplished man in all respects ever sat in the Senate; certainly not one who had a more just and proper conception of the attributes and functions and prerogatives of the Senate.

Therefore I hope that if the Senator from Ohio thinks the information should not be required, and the Senate agrees with him, it will determine it upon the question whether or not we want the information. If we do want the information, there ought to be a direction to the department in accordance with what I say has been the uniform, unvaried practice of the Senate, except in cases of matters within the charge and keeping of the State Department. If the Senate desire the information, we ought to direct it to be furnished. If we do not think it is proper information to be required, we ought not to pass the resolution.

I do not express any opinion as to whether or not the information should be required.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. LODGE. Is there not sometimes a third course adopted—to refer the resolution to the committee having the subject in charge——

Mr. BACON. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. To determine whether or not it is wise to make the inquiry?

Mr. BACON. I think that has frequently been done, and it is a very wise disposition of a doubtful matter rather than to leave it to the discretion of a department; and I think that might be the best direction to be given to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate? The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not an expert in the postal laws; I have no doubt the Senator from Arkansas has given this matter a great deal of consideration; but I should like to ask him whether it is not the case that gratuitous copies fall under a different class. For instance, if any one of us buys a thousand copies of a newspaper in circulation, I do not understand that we can send them at the pound rate. It has to be a legitimate subscription, and that applies alike to every publication. The Senator can tell me whether that is the law or not.

Mr. DAVIS. That is the very information we want. We want to know whether it is a just or unjust discrimination against the Woman's Weekly. My constituents claim that it is an unjust discrimination.

The Senator from Ohio says that the man who wrote me the letter, which accompanies the resolution, must be misinformed. Mr. R. M. Adams, of Ozark, Ark., is one of the best citizens of our State, a man of general information, a banker. He says that he has bought this paper, that he has paid the subscription price for a number of his friends, and the paper was sent to them.

Now, the Post Office Department makes the complaint that because each person receiving the paper does not himself pay for it, it falls under this ban. I say that is not just; that it is not fair.

Mr. LODGE. Do I understand that he has paid a subscription for each paper?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LODGE. That is a different thing.

Mr. DAVIS. That is exactly the situation.

And to clarify this matter—I am in earnest about it—I ask that the clerk read the clipping from Mr. Lewis's paper for the information of the Senate. It will not be but a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the clipping will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE REASON.

One hundred and three thousand paid-in-advance subscribers of this paper will fail to get it. Who they are we do not as yet know ourselves. The reason why they will not get it is shown below. When we temporarily changed the National Daily to a weekly, in accordance with the postal requirements, we made an application for a new entry. Seizing this opportunity to further hound this concern, the postal officials at Washington applied the extraordinary ruling that we must deposit third-class postage of 8 cents per pound, but also construed this to mean 1 cent for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof and demanded that we pay postage at the rate of 1 cent per copy, or 17 cents per pound, nearly $5,000 per issue more than the lawful postage rate charged all other publishers. We refused flatly to submit to this outrage, and after many telegrams back and forth and the holding up of the issue for a week, we appealed direct by telegram to Postmaster General Hitchcock and asked him to give this paper lawful treatment and a square deal. The response was quick and to the point, and the following telegram was received Monday from Third Assistant Postmaster General Britt, who had previously demanded the exorbitant and unlawful postage and refused to reconsider his demand. Here is the message:

MARCH 27, 1911.

POSTMASTER, *St. Louis, Mo.*

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of the 27th of March, inclosing the copy of telegram from James J. Britt, Third Assistant Postmaster General, as follows:

"Application of publisher of the Woman's National Weekly, dated March 21, received to-day. Information in possession of the department obtained through queries to claimed subscribers to the publication indicates that at least 24 per cent thereof are not subscribers in fact. This is strongly corroborated by reports of nonacceptance of publication by alleged subscribers at many post offices throughout the country, as well as by the statement of the publisher in admitting that a large percentage are gift subscriptions and also by excessive use of premiums. You will inform publisher that upon removal of 24 per cent of the claimed list, 103,920, required deposit will be waived. Effective with date of application, pending further inquiry. Should the publisher desire to mail copies of the publication to persons whose names are eliminated from claimed list, they may be accepted at the transient second-class postage rate of 1 cent for each 4 ounces or fraction thereof, prepaid by stamps affixed. You will obtain the publishers' decision and report to this bureau immediately.

"JAMES J. BRITT,
"Third Assistant Postmaster General."

It seems that Mr. Britt objects to the "gift" subscriptions (subscriptions paid for by others as a gift). We have long warned our friends to be very careful about "gift" subscriptions, even furnishing a separate blank form for them. Of course this ruling that "gift" subscriptions are not legitimate is, as usual, applied to this paper only. The ridiculous part of the matter is that we are ordered to cut off 103,000 subscribers without being informed which ones to cut off. Not being mind readers, we can only bow our heads, chop off a hundred and three thousand subscribers with our eyes shut, and submit, so that the other hundreds of thousands may get their papers. We replied to Mr. Britt's telegram as follows:

"We beg to state that having no option in the matter other than to submit to the decision of the department or else face complete ruin and confiscation of our journal, we therefore must submit, under protest, and will reduce the amount of our mailings as required, by 103,920 copies, but as we are not informed as to which one of the subscribers on our list of more than 400,000 paid-in-advance subscribers are taken by the department to be illegitimate, we are, therefore, under the necessity of arbitrarily cutting off the required number of copies. As soon as the department will inform us which particular subscriptions the department takes exception to, we will eliminate these particular subscriptions and notify the subscriber of the reason therefor; but until so advised by the department as to which particular subscriptions it has taken exception to, we, of course, have no means of knowing which subscriptions they consider legitimate and which subscribers they do not, and must, therefore, mail the number permitted us arbitrarily without any power to conform to the department's requirement of eliminating objectionable subscriptions until such time as we are advised by the department which are the objectionable subscriptions. The result of this, of course, must be that many thousands of subscribers to whose subscriptions the department has taken no exception will fail to receive their papers, while many thousands of subscribers to whom the department has taken exception will continue to receive their papers until such a time as we are duly advised which to eliminate and which to retain. If the subscriptions to which the department has taken exception are those paid by others as gifts, if the department will so advise us, we can then intelligently eliminate such subscriptions from the list and explain the reason to the subscribers; but as we are not so advised by the department, but are simply arbitrarily directed to reduce our subscription list by 103,920 regardless of whether those so eliminated are bona fide paid-in-advance subscribers of lawful age and sound mind who have paid for the papers with their own money, or whether they are subscribers whose subscriptions have been paid for by others, we can only act to the best of our intelligence in the light of the information vouchsafed us. We will, therefore, proceed to mail the Woman's National Weekly to 351,580 of the subscribers on our list taken at random, and the remaining 103,920 subscribers eliminated will be obliged to whistle for their papers until the department vouchsafes us sufficient information to intelligently comply with its rulings. We therefore bow and submit under protest to the superior and arbitrary power of the department as outlined in this ruling.

"Thanking the department for the privilege accorded us of mailing to our subscribers at least a portion of the papers for which they have paid in advance,

"Very respectfully,
E. G. LEWIS."

If you or any of your friends fail to get their papers, don't blame us; we are doing the best we can under the oppressive and arbitrary rulings made for our particular benefit. There was no doubt but that it was intended to suppress and destroy this great newspaper, but the women of America again made themselves felt. We shall, however, do as we said we would—stay on the job of exposing the rottenness of Judge Goodwin's department until either Judge Goodwin succeeds in suppressing this newspaper or we succeed in lifting the lid off his department by a congressional investigation.

We desire to express our thanks to Mr. Hitchcock for the promptness and courtesy with which he dropped other pressing matters and took hold of our demand for lawful treatment. May he continue with the

job until this newspaper is fully accorded the same treatment, rights, or "privileges" accorded all others. We never asked for anything else.
E. G. LEWIS.

N. B.—Write a few more letters to your Congressman. This is the second battle you have won for justice from the Post Office Department. Before we get through there may yet be a free press in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Evidently this is a question as to what subscriptions are entitled to second-class privileges. Is that all there is of it?

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; it is a question as to whether or not this paper shall be stopped or whether it shall be printed to be sent out to patrons—the papers that are paid for, whether paid for by the persons receiving them or paid for by other people and sent to them in a complimentary way. They are all paid subscriptions, paid in cash, paid in advance.

Mr. BURTON. I had supposed that some other questions were involved, but I do not see more in it than a plain controversy in regard to the extent of the second-class privileges as to newspaper subscriptions. I think we had better refer the resolution to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and I make that motion.

Mr. CULBERSON. I should like to ask the Senator what becomes of the amendment he proposed?

Mr. BURTON. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio withdraws his amendment, and moves that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, to refer it to that committee means its death. There it sleeps "the sleep that knows no waking"; that is to say, it goes to a graveyard. If the Senate wants to adopt that course and wants to shirk the responsibility of calling on the department for this information, of course the Senate is at liberty to do it, but on the motion of the Senator from Ohio I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BURTON. That is not the intention of the motion in any degree. This is rather a general question pertaining to all newspapers than to this specific one, and it is one on which perhaps there should be legislation defining and making clearer the rule to be adopted. I see no reason for calling on the Post Office Department for this specific information, and it might work a prejudice.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a word. I have some familiarity with this controversy between Mr. Lewis, the publisher of the Woman's Journal and the publisher of other papers as well, and the Post Office Department. I do not arise, however, to discuss that controversy or lay before the Senate the information in my possession.

I understand that there are two questions, as they might be designated, running through this controversy. One is as to the price at which the paper is sold to subscribers. It is claimed to be purely a nominal sum, and that it is issued as an advertising sheet rather than as a newspaper.

Another question is that the paper has been subscribed for and is sent out through the mails by persons other than those receiving it, and it is objected by the department that that is not permissive. The intention of the department is, I understand, that in order to make a publication admissible to the mails under the pound rate it must be subscribed for by the individual to whom it is sent and not by another and forwarded in a complimentary way.

I will not say anything about this latter phase or this second question involved in the controversy to which I have just addressed myself, but as to the first issue between the department and publisher—that is, as to the price at which the paper is sold and the contention that it is a mere advertising sheet—I wish to say that I know of papers printed daily in this country, some of them in my own State—great newspapers, as great newspapers as are printed in any section of the Union, with a great corps of correspondents scattered all over the continent, receiving the Associated Press dispatches, ably edited, ably conducted, with a large circulation—the price of which to the subscriber does not exceed that at which the Woman's Journal is sold to subscribers.

I have not heard of any objection coming from the Post Office Department against the admission of those great daily political journals to the mails. I have in mind now one publication of that character. It is hardly necessary to designate it, but the company which prints it publishes a journal in the morning and another in the afternoon, and these papers are scattered all over my State and all over Kansas and Oklahoma and Arkansas and go in large numbers into other States. Just before I returned to this session of Congress I had occasion to go to a news dealer in a town where I was sojourning for a short time and make arrangements to have the publication of which I am speaking, both the morning and the afternoon editions, sent to my room, and the two cost me only 10 cents a week, including the Sunday edition.

The point I wish to make, if there be any point to it, the objection I urge against this edict excluding the Woman's Journal from the mails, is that if it is to be the rule of the department it ought to be universal in its application. I see no reason why a weekly paper, and I believe this is a weekly journal——

Mr. DAVIS. It is.

Mr. STONE. I see no reason why a paper that is sent out to subscribers who are scattered through numerous States and read by the mothers and daughters of the land should be discriminated against when great political journals are put into the mail every day at a price equally low. I protest against that as a manifest injustice.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I am rather prompted to seek information in this matter. I did not know that the Post Office Department held to it as a legal proposition that the person to whom the paper is sent must pay for it. Personally I have been all my life in the habit—and I assume that to be the case with many others in this Chamber and out of it—of subscribing to papers on behalf of others, where I desired that they should have the benefit of a certain class of journalism. In political times it is a common practice by both or all political parties.

I am rather astonished, if I correctly understand this situation, to be informed that the department maintains the position that one may not subscribe to a newspaper for another and receive the same benefits as to the rates of mail. I had never heard of it before.

I have received many circulars and documents in reference, I presume, to the papers that are included within this resolution. I have read some of them. I have read enough of them to give me a general understanding of the situation involved, but I did not know that it involved the question of the right of one person to subscribe for another. It should not. There is no more beneficial act performed by any part of the people than that of assisting through this means in the dissemination of knowledge of which they approve. It is perfectly legitimate.

I will not go into the question of the character of these papers because I do not know enough about it, but if it is applied to one class of papers it should be applied to all.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to ask the Senator a question, for I desire information, as he does. I should like to know whether these two papers are on the same plane and whether that is the whole difficulty? I understood that there was a criminal proceeding against one of them.

Mr. HEYBURN. In answer to the question of the Senator from Massachusetts I will say that through something that fell from the lips of the reading clerk in regard to the matter it appears that so far as the paper that is designated the Woman's Journal is concerned the objection is not based upon the character of the paper, because they concede the right of 45,000 copies of it to go through the mails that are not within this particular class of subscription, so that——

Mr. DAVIS. Three hundred and three thousand copies are excluded.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, whatever the number; any number of them; if 10 might go through the mails it could not be urged that the prohibition was because of the character of the paper.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. That did not include the Harpoon, I understood.

Mr. DAVIS. No, sir; it did not. I understood from the Senator from Massachusetts or from some Senator who has addressed the Chair on this question that probably there was a criminal investigation against the Harpoon. I do not know anything about that personally.

Mr. LODGE. That was suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON. I suggested it merely as an illustration. I do not know of any criminal proceeding pending against either publication. I said, however, merely by way of illustration, that if criminal proceedings or any other were contemplated, the Government would show its case.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not take into consideration whether there was or was not a criminal proceeding existing. I was inquiring as to the legal proposition whether or not any part of the Government was authorized by law to say that one might not subscribe on behalf of another to a paper. If you can not subscribe on behalf of 100 or 1,000, you can not subscribe on behalf of one.

Mr. PAGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to know how the Senator would treat this case. I am in a business, and I wish to advertise it. I have to pay 1 cent on each circular I send out. But I start a newspaper, a nominal newspaper, for the purpose of advertising my business. I go to the editor or publisher with whom I arrange and I say, "I want to send out my circular. It will cost a cent to send out the circular. I want to give you an order for 100,000 copies of your paper. Your paper will have enough news matter to be a newspaper, but in reality the paper is to advertise my business. Here is my check for a hundred thousand subscribers. Send out the papers."

The purpose of this ruling on the part of the Government is to prevent such a procedure. I think the Senator will see how this matter may be abused very gravely. If you permit a man to subscribe for 100,000 copies for the purpose of advertising his business, as in the case of the Woman's Journal, he would furnish perhaps 100,000 subscribers and a premium be given with each subscription, and all at the rate of 10 cents.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have not reached the consideration of the question of advertising, directly or indirectly, because that is a very large question, and its discussion would involve the consideration of not only newspapers, but of other classes of publications. I rose to the single inquiry as to whether any part of this Government was authorized to discriminate between the man who subscribed for one paper for one person and the man who subscribed for 100,000. The question whether it is a legitimate newspaper or not is not involved in this matter, at least it is not involved in my consideration of it, because that comes under a different provision of the law. It is competent, and we have provided the method of determining the fact, to discriminate between purely advertising sheets and newspapers.

I think they have a rule; but whether they have it or not, some one is authorized to determine it, because I, in common with other Senators, have had many letters from those who have been put to the test for the purpose of determining whether their newspapers were entitled to come in under newspaper rates or whether they should pay the rates that belong to an advertising sheet. I do not intend to pursue it that far, because that question is not necessarily involved in the issue I raised; but I should like to know from some one under what section of the statute, under what law, any part of the Government may say that one may not subscribe for another and have the paper go directly from the publisher to the beneficiary.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. I ask the Senator if he can not readily see how easily a great abuse might be practiced upon the public and the department if a publisher having a real newspaper, if you wish to call it so, or some one who introduces enough news matter into a publication so that it becomes a newspaper, should permit an advertiser pure and simple, for no other purpose than to advertise his own wares, to give to the publisher his check for 100, or 200, or 500,000 copies, thus enabling him to reach a constituency as an advertiser purely under the guise of publishing a paper? Would not that be a fraud upon the department?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, there are perhaps very few laws upon the statute books that might not be made the medium of doing wrong. My right to walk across the street might be questioned, because, forsooth, in doing so I might do wrong. That foundation for reasoning is not a very safe one, especially in regard to this matter.

My conscience was pricked at once when it was stated here that you might not hand to a publisher a list of names to whom you desired to send a paper and pay him for it, because I have done that during the greater portion of my life. I am now doing it, and I supposed that I was entirely within my legal rights when I did it. When I find that a publication is maintaining a high order of journalism and is a useful paper, I think of young men or others in different parts of the country whose minds I am anxious to have directed in the right course, and I frequently ask the publisher to send his paper for a year or some other period to a list of subscribers, and I pay for them. Is that to be a crime—for this action is based upon the proposition that this is a criminal proceeding? Such orders can only be issued against criminal proceedings. The question whether the paper is an advertising sheet or is a legitimate newspaper is far distant in the future consideration of this question.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], I desire to say that his illustration is not apt, because this is not a fraud; it is a real, genuine newspaper, a wholesome journal, sent to the mothers and wives of our country for their weekly betterment. We do not give the women of this country many rights; we do not allow them to vote or to hold office; they have very little control of their domestic affairs; and of all the men on earth that ought not to object to a little latitude being given to the women of this country the Senator from Vermont is the last one, I think.

As I have said, this is a wholesome, clean paper. Why the department arbitrarily says "you must shut off 103,000 subscribers," without giving any rhyme or reason or the name of the subscribers, is more than I can understand.

It seems to me that we can discuss the merits of the proposition after the reply of the department shall have been given. I only ask by the resolution for information. Why the Senate should attempt to—I will not say it in an offensive sense, because I do not mean it in that way—thwart the object of the resolution by sending it to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I am at a loss to know. I want the information, and if the Senate agrees with me, I should like to have the resolution passed.

Can it be said that I can not go down town to-morrow morning and ask the publishers of the Washington Herald to send 10,000 copies of their paper to my constituents, giving their names and post-office addresses and my check for the money? Shall it be said that postage on that paper shall be increased, or that an edict shall go from the department that that is an improper subscription simply because I pay for it? Why, Mr. President, at every session of my legislature in Arkansas they appropriate 25 cents per diem for each member of the house and senate to pay the postage and subscription for two daily newspapers to send to their constituents. Shall that be said to be an improper subscription?

Sir, this is a most remarkable discussion here. I simply ask for a little information, and it brings up all this row. If the Senate does not want the information, refer the resolution to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; but if the Senate does want the information, then pass the resolution.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it seems to me that we have launched upon the discussion of a very important question. I should like to know if it is not possible for the Post Office Department to invoke this same rule with reference to the club system that is almost universally used in this country by publishers in order to secure subscribers to their papers. That method is especially used with reference to the country press.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Alabama if he does not think it would be well, first, to have the statement of the department as to why it issued this order? The discussion has gone on for an hour or two here without any knowledge as to why the Postmaster General has issued the order that is complained of. It seems to me that the resolution which the Senator from Arkansas has introduced is all right. Let us have the reasons which the Postmaster General assigns for taking this position.

If it is thought wise that the resolution should first go to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I can see no objection to that. The Senator from Alabama is a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and I take it for granted he would favor reporting out the resolution. A great many important questions have been discussed, but none of us know the reason upon which the Postmaster General bases the order as affecting either of the publications in question. We are discussing at random something upon which we all have convictions, but we do not know what his purpose was at all. I would inquire of the Senator if he does not think it would be well to send the resolution either to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads or direct to the Postmaster General, and let us get the information, and then we can discuss it with more definite purpose?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas anticipates my motive and purpose. I rose merely for the purpose of suggesting the importance of this question and to add that, in my opinion, it deserves very careful consideration. There must be some evil at the back of this that ought to be developed and remedied. Therefore I rose for the purpose of suggesting that the resolution should properly go to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and let them summon the Postmaster General or anybody else—they can do it very speedily—inquire into this whole matter and report by bill or

otherwise a remedy for the evil, if one exists. I hope the resolution will go to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, just a moment. As the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has suggested, the method of subscribing for papers by clubs is perhaps the method that has been pursued with reference to the Woman's National Weekly. I have received a number of petitions from the American Woman's League, which is evidently a league made up of a number of clubs formed by women in different parts of the country. They are in my State, I know, of the very highest position in every way, and are engaged in a splendid work of civic improvement and development. Unquestionably the Woman's National Weekly is a newspaper within the meaning of the law, and is not simply an advertising scheme, or, as it has been designated, an advertising sheet.

The point raised with reference to its circulation is the point which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] has so strenuously insisted is without merit; and that is that the subscriptions are paid for by the various clubs and sent in in that way to the newspaper. I myself think the resolution does not get to the root of the difficulty, it does not solve any question, but it will bring forth the ruling of the department, and when that ruling is before the Senate it can then be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for them to determine what amendment to the law, if any, is required to meet a situation of this kind. I am in favor of adopting the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio, on which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS] has demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, it seems to me the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS] for the information——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. After hearing the remarks of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], I am inclined to think that his is the best suggestion that has been made covering this proposition; that is, for the report of the Postmaster General to come in, and then to refer that report to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for such action as they may deem proper.

Mr. DAVIS. That suits me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am perfectly willing that it shall take that course.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for a moment? I did not exactly understand the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The suggestion was that of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] that the resolution be adopted, let the Postmaster General reply to it, and when his report is received, if the Senate shall so desire, it may refer that report to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for such action as they deem necessary. I think that is perhaps the wiser course.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma further yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. I desire once again to ask whether there is anything more contemplated in the resolution, as originally introduced, than information why certain subscriptions are denied the second-class privilege?

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Senator from Ohio direct his question to me?

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Arkansas, I presume, is best informed in the matter.

Mr. OWEN. I should be glad to have the Senator from Arkansas reply to that question.

Mr. DAVIS. The only object I had in offering the resolution, Mr. President, was to get the information. Then if the information furnishes the basis for further action I shall undertake to carry out what seems proper after the information is at hand. Now, just on that line, if the Senator from Oklahoma will pardon me, I will accept the suggestion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] that the resolution be passed and the information be furnished, and then refer the whole matter to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. It seems to me that that will expedite matters and end the discussion.

Mr. BURTON. That would require a further proceeding possibly; but, Mr. President, in view of that assurance, I withdraw the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the more recent action of the various Senators makes unnecessary the remarks I had proposed to make. I rose merely to emphasize the point made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], and to insist upon the information being obtained, which would automatically go, when furnished, to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for their action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Arkansas.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, if I had anticipated the long and interesting debate which has just taken place on the matter of newspaper circulation and postage, I should not have given notice of an intention to submit remarks to-day on a subject involving many phases of representative government.

The intelligent observer must have discovered during the past 25 years a constant and general increase, not in the functions of government, but in the subdivisions and consequent division of authority among those who discharge those functions. I refer to the government of the States as well as to the government of the Nation. In every State there are samples of duplicated power. For instance, where a county contains a large city there is maintained both a county and a city government. In the Nation lately the country had an example of an effort upon the part of the President of the United States to discover whether he or the head of the Bureau of Forestry was running the country. Strangely enough a considerable number of American people joined in the controversy and helped the subordinate to the belief that he was running the country.

I believe that government is best which is most simple and direct and thus easily comprehended. The tendency in the business world has been for many years toward concentration, but in our political affairs we may be following the example of the Chinese Empire, where every educated man is supposed to be in the employ of the Government. When he comes out of school, if there is no office for him to hold, they assign him to watching another Chinaman who already holds an office. In other words, they put the young Chinamen to watching the old Chinamen. The division and diversification of authority has resulted in the "bluebooks" of the majority of the States being burdened with the names of boards of review, committees, and commissions almost without number. It is a peculiarity of American government for those charged with authority to delegate a part of it to somebody else. This results in great confusion and in no practical help to the people.

Some years ago there came to the western country a distinguished railroad manager from Pennsylvania. He thought he could teach the western railroad managers how to run railroads. His road in the East had been hauling hard coal. The cars could be switched and jammed around the sidetracks without much danger of damage. He thought the hog and cattle trains could be treated in the same way. He boasted that he was going to take as many as 40 cars of live stock in one train. While congregating his trains the animals would lie down. When he started his trains those that happened to be standing up were thrown onto those that were lying down. He found out, also, when he started his trains there was considerable slack at the couplings. This was so much that the last car in the train had a lurch of about 3½ feet, which was not very healthy for cattle. He soon discovered that his idea of hauling big trains of cattle and hogs was a mistake. He had to return to the simplicity of the methods which had preceded him. Our American system of government has spread out to such an extent that, in my judgment, it is time to begin to take up the slack. Our railroad man is not thus moving live stock to-day. He has learned better methods. The American system of government is rapidly reaching a condition where it is well enough to consider better business methods.

In every county in the Middle West you will find governmental functions multiplied. I presume the same is true elsewhere. In a county which also supports a city there are township clerks and clerks of independent school districts; township treasurers and treasurers of independent school districts. Then, besides all this, there are township trustees and road supervisors. Above all these in a county there are boards of super-

visors, and if a city is included in the county, there will be found a mayor, a city council, and all the officers incident to a city government. All this machinery is cumbersome, and though the officeholders draw small salaries, in the aggregate they consume large parts of the taxpayers' money. An effort to abolish any of these offices is like taking one's life in one's hand. Thus a government to insure the protection of life and property and which ought to be an incident of citizenship becomes one of the objects of existence. As a consequence, we can almost say that we have a professional officeholding class. Young men are urged to hold offices. They are told to adopt a "career," and by career is meant a life of office-holding. The real career ought to be in one of the great professions or in manufacturing or farming. Victories won in any of these fields can not be taken away by a primary election.

The government nearest to the people ought to be the city or village government, and being nearest the people ought to be the nearest perfect. But this is not a fact. The usual city or municipal government is the one for which all men now apologize.

It seems that our forefathers were so afraid that our Republic would be converted into a monarchy that they thought it necessary that every municipal government should imitate a republic in its form. Therefore every municipal government has been endowed with legislative authority. It is true it is limited, but notwithstanding that limitation every municipal government has been operated as if its main function were that of making laws. For this purpose every city building has what they call a city hall. In this city hall the legislative body meets, and the gentlemen from the various wards are there. The mayor presides, and all the formalities of a deliberative body are observed. The gentleman from the third ward addresses the presiding officer and the gallery, having in mind his intelligent constituents, as he frequently remarks, and also having in mind his own reelection. The alderman has been called a "false-alarm statesman," but he deceives a great many people. He is doubtless at his best when speaking in opposition to the abolition of any office. He regards such a move as one toward curbing the liberties of the people. His admiring constituents and his admiring contractors are prepared to applaud his utterances. In some States cities have been known to have two branches of a legislative body, an upper and a lower house. Yet their authority is so limited that they can neither add to nor subtract from the penalty of any offense against the laws. They can order sewers and sidewalks and designate what months within which dogs shall be muzzled. They can also prohibit chickens from running at large. The legislatures of States make the important laws, and practically every function discharged by a city council is executive rather than legislative. The claims are allowed by a committee on claims. The report is generally adopted without reading. The men who believe in committees on claims and who are willing to adopt the report of the same are radically opposed to reducing the number of members of the council, and they are especially opposed to the abolition of ward lines.

It happens in many cities that men who represent wards practically represent contractors. Having members of a city government from subdivisions of any nature is a mistake. Men are elected from wards who never could be elected from the city at large. Bad men are elected from bad wards and good men are elected from good wards. But the good men oftentimes receive as much criticism and as much blame for a bad city government as do those who are really responsible. Thus good men are deterred from becoming members of the city council because the general citizenship has been in the habit of dismissing all city councils as being inefficient, neglectful, if not actually corrupt. People have been deterred from undertaking to reform city governments because they regard the task as too large ever to be successfully performed.

The principal error in municipal government of the old style has been in connecting politics with it. The average American connects politics with every form of government. But this has been especially true with municipal government. In many cities candidates for the municipal offices are nominated by political parties, which ought never to be the case. It ought not to matter what a man believes in regard to tariff or reciprocity. He may be as badly mistaken as the most radical insurgent, yet he might make a good member of a city government. Clays and Websters are not demanded to look after letting sewer contracts or putting down pavement. Municipal governments need men who know how to transact business in a businesslike way. Municipal governments do not need theorists nor dreamers. Men are wanted who know when contractors are properly doing their work.

I am trying to illustrate the follies and foolishness of city governments in America. Until recently no thought of actual business has ever entered the head of the men in cities. They have always had bad government, and they are used to it. They have always submitted to graft and are accustomed to it. A man in Arkansas told me the best story illustrating how men become used to graft. It is related that an employee of a grain elevator discovered a knot hole in the lower part of a bin. He stopped up the hole with a cob, and when night came he went by stealth to the elevator and filled bags with the grain which trickled out through the knot hole. He then restored the cob. Every night of his life for 25 years he stole a wagonload of grain from his employer, and when he died he undertook to leave that knot hole to his heirs by his will as part of his estate. This illustrates the acceptance of the situation and the legitimacy of graft.

In the old form of municipal government, where the responsibilities are so divided, it is impossible to find out who is to blame when anything goes wrong. To have a good government, those who do right should be praised and those who do wrong should be criticized. But the public has formed the habit of criticizing everybody and praising nobody. The public formed this plan because there has been vastly more for the critic than for the eulogist.

The public is scarcely informed as to the never-ending division of authority under the old plan of city government, with boards of public works, cemetery boards, library boards, fire and police boards, boards of review, boards of inspection, boards of public parks, boards having charge of the waterworks, and so forth. No man has yet made a list of the boards having to do with the old form of city government. Some months ago I was in a city in Michigan and having occasion to refer to the telephone directory I discovered four pages of the telephone book made up of those who had telephones for the use of the city. Every man had some authority or else he would not have had a telephone at the expense of the city. Such an array of official dignity and authority could not be found on this continent. If every man in that Michigan town having municipal authority should go to the world's fair on the same particular day, there would not be men enough left at home in that town to milk the cows, provided they have not reached that stage of intelligence where they let the women do the work. This is cited as a sample of the overgrown municipal system prevailing in most cities. This distribution of authority is not the result of one year, but of a century's growth. It has resulted in inefficiency and, in most cases, inaction. The same system has been provoking to the taxpayer, who has never been able to find out or locate the blame when anything has gone wrong.

If any man in any modern city undertook to find out who was to blame about any minor happening in his local government, he would be old enough to be a Revolutionary pensioner before he discovered and located the blame.

In one western city it is related that at the time of high water a man whose home was on low ground had his cellar flooded with water. He resorted to the city government for relief. He called on the mayor, who was polite, but could not help him. He made the rounds of all the boards and commissions and finally came back to the board of public works and complained that he could get no relief. Having on a former visit related that the high water had drowned his chickens, a waggish member of the board of public works told him to go back home and go to raising ducks instead of chickens.

In many cities political machines have been formed and have been so strong that their destruction has seemed impossible. The municipal machine has been the "mother" in the municipal vinegar

The American people have been eager to correct political ills far away, but have been neglecting the ills immediately around them.

In the year 1907 we adopted in the city of Des Moines, where I live, a simplified form of city government. It consists of five trustees, or commissioners, elected by the entire city at one election, each for a two-year term and without any ward lines. This has been called the Des Moines plan of city government. The idea originated at Galveston, Tex. The people of Galveston, in their distress after their great calamity, had to have a simplified form of city government. Their affairs were too complicated for the old form. It is a strange fact that a few men can do successfully what a large number of men are unable to do. For instance, we often discover that a receiver appointed by the courts can make a business successful, the very business that a large number of stockholders had failed in. The Des Moines plan, while evolved from Galveston, is greatly improved and seems to us quite complete. The five commissioners have power to elect all the other city officers. They select the auditor, clerk, treasurer, city solicitor, police judge, and so forth. The people hold these five men responsible for the city government,

They do not go to their subordinates when things go wrong, they go to the commissioners direct, or the commissioner. The idea in the Des Moines plan has been concentration of power and concentration of responsibility. We are building a city building which shall not have a legislative chamber in it. We have abolished party politics. We have, as near as may be, established a business government. The people are backing the commissioners in every good thing. Publicity is a main factor. Notice must be given before any ordinance is passed, but we have but few ordinances. We have cleaner streets, better pavements, and in all respects we have a better governed city. A great move is made forward when partisan politics is abolished. The commissioners are chosen at a nonpartisan primary. The 10 receiving the highest number of votes are voted for at the polls. Five of these are elected. One of the number is called mayor. However, he has no more authority than his associates. Each commissioner is the head of a department by mutual agreement. The commissioners give their whole time to work and are on duty during business hours. We have the initiative, the referendum, and recall for the commissioners, but not for any of their subordinates. None of these features of the charter have been used. I would not favor the recall in an organization so large as a State. I have never observed the workings of the initiative and referendum in a State. I am much opposed to the recall when applied to the judiciary. Such a restriction would embarrass an honest judge and do no particular good with one who did not desire to do right. All candidates for commissioner must publish an account of their campaign expenditures, and there can be no promises made for offices to be distributed.

In regard to the recall as applied to the judiciary, I would like to ask what would become of the former decisions of such a discredited judge?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. Do you have municipal judges who could be recalled?

Mr. YOUNG. No, sir. These five men who compose the board of commissioners are selected by the people, and they select the judge. The recall applies only to those who are elected.

Mr. HEYBURN. You elect judges in your municipality?

Mr. YOUNG. No, sir; not in the city. Every official, every judge, attorney, auditor, treasurer are appointed by the commission.

Mr. HEYBURN. And they can be recalled?

Mr. YOUNG. No, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. You could recall the power that created them, but you could not recall the creature created?

Mr. YOUNG. Certainly, we could recall the commission. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall insert the Des Moines charter, under which our municipality operates.

Mr. President, I am a mechanic. In years gone by the upper part of every building used for manufacturing was filled with shafting and belting. These were for the distribution of power. The engineer and fireman worked longer hours than anybody else to take care of this belting and shafting. It took 40 per cent of all the fuel to run the idle shafting and belting without turning a single machine. All the shafting had to run or none of it. Now every modern factory runs its machines with separately connected power, and when one machine only is running expenses are cut down accordingly. Why should not the improvements in the political world be kept apace with the improvements in the mechanical world? The useless offices represent the pulleys and shafting of the political machines. Forty per cent of the public money is spent in maintaining this useless expense. Why not reduce it? This is the purpose of the Des Moines plan.

There is not a great railway enterprise in America that could operate for one year if it were conducted with as little system and with as many independent heads as characterize the average city government of the old plan, with ward aldermen and all the old machinery.

It is pleasant to know that American people are giving some attention to reforms in municipal governments. It is satisfying to know that nearly 100 American cities have adopted the commission form of government. This form of government puts the control closely into the hands of the people.

Some men who have considered this subject have suggested that the commissioners ought not to be elected or retired at the same time. But, upon second thought, this will be found to be a virtue. When the people of a given city are all awakened at one time, they can make a revolution at one election. Revolutions in municipal affairs in many cities have never been attempted because of their seeming impossibility. Hunters in the West years ago delighted to have prairie chickens sit in a row on the top rail of a fence so that the hunter could kill a number of them with one shot. This commission form of government, with two-year terms, figuratively speaking, puts the five commissioners on the top rail of the municipal fence to be swept off at one ballot by the voter. When people find that it is possible to produce a change in the entire city government at one election, they will take hope and attempt to act.

Great men are not required to manage the affairs of a city. They need not be familiar with Greek and Roman history. They may not be able to name many of the constellations. But they ought to be able to take care of small details. They ought to keep a city clean. They ought to see that sidewalks and pavements are in repair. These things we have accomplished in Des Moines. We have not attempted to reduce taxation because that is hard to do in a growing city. But we do say we have the best government we have had in 50 years. Des Moines has been under the commission system about 3 years, and there has not been a voice raised in favor of going back to the old system. There is no complaint that the city government has been taken out of the hands of the people. I think the old form of city government is as far behind the times as the ox cart is behind the automobile.

I am in favor of simplifying the forms of government in the State, in the Nation, in the municipality. I am in favor of making governmental matters so plain that there can be no mistake made. The present or the old style city government is as much out of date to-day and as far behind the demands of the present as the ox cart is behind the automobile.

Every State and every community should have well-restricted primary election laws, where the partisans shall determine separately who their nominees shall be. Political platforms ought to be so clear that there could be no misunderstandings of them, and parties should adhere to their platforms. Every public office should be properly filled. Every man in city, State, or municipal employment should earn his salary. Integrity should be demanded in all the small as well as in the large places. In the larger States state-wide primaries for nominations of all offices are impractical. I would advocate nominating a governor, lieutenant governor, and candidate for United States Senator by direct vote of partisans at state-wide primaries. I am in favor of all other nominations being made by State conventions. I am in favor of delegates being elected to State conventions by partisan voters at county primaries, they being obliged to announce themselves as candidates, the delegates to be chosen to the State conventions by partisan votes direct, without the intervention of county conventions. All district nominations should be made by direct partisan principles. I am in favor of electing United States Senators as Representatives in Congress are now elected. I am in favor of keeping all departments of the Government as free from complications as possible. I think the time will come when it will be necessary for every man who holds a public office to tell the truth about his own government and about other men as well as himself. I am in favor of every rational reform which can help in the upbuilding of a great country. I need not say what I have said many times before, that I am in favor of looking after the welfare of the American people before giving particular attention to the welfare of any other people.

In the interest of honesty in public life, in the interest of general political integrity, we all owe it to ourselves not to complicate the Government further, but to simplify it. Not to make it so complex that no one can understand it, but to make it so plain that all can understand it.

APPENDIX.

THE DES MOINES PLAN OF CITY GOVERNMENT.

[Passed by the Thirty-second General Assembly of Iowa and amendments passed by the thirty-third general assembly. Adopted by the city of Des Moines, Iowa, at a special election held June 20, 1907. The election of the first council (commissioners) provided for in the act took place in March, 1908. The "plan" became operative April 1, 1908.]

An act to provide for the government of certain cities, and the adoption thereof by special election "additional to Title V of the code."

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

SECTION 1. That any city of the first class, or with special charter, now or hereafter having a population of 25,000 or over, as shown by the last preceding State census, may become organized as a city under the provisions of this act by proceeding as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. Upon petition of electors equal in number to 25 per cent of the votes cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding city election of any such city, the mayor shall, by a proclamation, submit the question of organizing as a city under this act at a special election to be held at a time specified therein and within two months after said petition is filed. If said plan is not adopted at the special election

called, the question of adopting said plan shall not be resubmitted to the voters of said city for adoption within two years thereafter, and then the question to adopt shall be resubmitted upon the presentation of a petition signed by electors equal in number to 25 per cent of the votes cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general city election.

At such election the proposition to be submitted shall be, "Shall the proposition to organize the city of (name of a city), under chapter (naming the chapter containing this act) of the acts of the thirty-second general assembly be adopted?" and the election thereupon shall be conducted, the vote canvassed, and the result declared in the same manner as provided by law in respect to other city elections. If the majority of the votes cast shall be in favor thereof, the city shall thereupon proceed to the election of a new mayor and four councilmen, as hereinafter provided. Immediately after such proposition is adopted, the mayor shall transmit to the governor, to the secretary of state, and to the county auditor each a certificate stating that such proposition was adopted.

At the regular city election after the adoption of such proposition there shall be elected a mayor and four councilmen. In the event, however, that the next regular city election does not occur within one year after such special election, the mayor shall, within 10 days after such special election, by proclamation, call a special election for the election of mayor and four councilmen, 60 days' notice thereof being given in such call, such election in either case to be conducted as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. All laws governing cities of the first class and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act and sections 955, 956, 959, 964, 989, 1000, 1023, and 1053 of the code now applicable to special-charter cities and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall apply to and govern cities organized under this act. All by-laws, ordinances, and resolutions lawfully passed and in force in any such city under its former organization shall remain in force until altered or repealed by the council elected under the provisions of this act. The territorial limits of such city shall remain the same as under its former organization, and all rights and property of every description which were vested in any city under its former organization shall vest in the same under the organization herein contemplated, and no right or liability, either in favor of or against it, existing at the time, and no suit or prosecution of any kind shall be affected by such change unless otherwise provided for in this act.

SEC. 4. In every such city there shall be elected at the regular biennial municipal election a mayor and four councilmen.

If any vacancy occurs in any such office, the remaining members of said council shall appoint a person to fill such vacancy during the balance of the unexpired term.

Said officers shall be nominated and elected at large. Said officers shall qualify and their terms of office shall begin on the first Monday after their election. The terms of office of the mayor and councilmen or aldermen in such city in office at the beginning of the terms of office of the mayor and councilmen first elected under the provisions of this act shall then cease and determine, and the terms of office of all other appointive officers in force in such city, except as hereinafter provided, shall cease and determine as soon as the council shall by resolution declare.

SEC. 5. Candidates to be voted for at all general municipal elections at which a mayor and four councilmen are to be elected under the provisions of this act shall be nominated by a primary election, and no other names shall be placed upon the general ballot except those selected in the manner hereinafter prescribed. The primary election for such nomination shall be held on the second Monday preceding the general municipal election. The judges of election appointed for the general municipal election shall be the judges of the primary election, and it shall be held at the same place, so far as possible, and the polls shall be opened and closed at the same hours, with the same clerks as are required for said general municipal election.

Any person desiring to become a candidate for mayor or councilman shall, at least 10 days prior to said primary election, file with the said clerk a statement of such candidacy, in substantially the following form:

STATE OF IOWA, ——— *County, ss:*

I ——— ———, being first duly sworn, say that I reside at ——— Street, city of ——, county of ——, State of Iowa; that I am a qualified voter therein; that I am a candidate for nomination to the office of (mayor or councilman) to be voted upon at the primary election to be held on the —— Monday of ———, 19—, and I hereby request that my name be printed upon the official primary ballot for nomination by such primary election for such office.

——— ———.

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me by ——— ——— on this — day of ———, 19—.

——— ———.

and shall at the same time file therewith the petition of at least 25 qualified voters requesting such candidacy. Each petition shall be verified by one or more persons as to the qualifications and residence, with street number, of each of the persons so signing the said petition, and the said petition shall be in substantially the following form:

PETITION ACCOMPANYING NOMINATING STATEMENT.

The undersigned, duly qualified electors of the city of ——— and residing at the places set opposite our respective names hereto, do hereby request that the name of (name of candidate) be placed on the ballot as a candidate for nomination for (name of office) at the primary election to be held in such city on the —— Monday of ———, 19—. We further state that we know him to be a qualified elector of said city and a man of good moral character and qualified, in our judgment, for the duties of such office.

Names of qualified electors.	Number.	Streets.

Immediately upon the expiration of the time of filing the statements and petitions for candidacies, the said city clerk shall cause to be published for three successive days in all the daily newspapers published in the city, in proper form, the names of the persons as they appear upon the primary ballots, and if there be no daily newspaper, then in two issues of any other newspapers that may be published in said city; and the said clerk shall thereupon cause the primary ballots to be printed, authenticated with a facsimile of his signature. Upon the said ballot the names of the candidates for mayor, arranged alphabetically, shall first be placed, with a square at the left of each name, and immediately below the words "Vote for one." Following these names, likewise arranged in alphabetical order, shall appear the names of the candidates for councilmen, with a square at the left of each name, and immediately below the names of such candidates shall appear the words "Vote for four." The ballots shall be printed upon plain, substantial white paper, and shall be headed:

CANDIDATES FOR NOMINATION FOR MAYOR AND COUNCILMEN OF ——— CITY AT THE PRIMARY ELECTION.

But shall have no party designation or mark whatever. The ballots shall be in substantially the following form:

[Place a cross in the square preceding the names of the parties you favor as candidates for the respective positions.]

OFFICIAL PRIMARY BALLOT.

(Candidate for nomination for mayor and councilmen of ——— city at the primary election.)

For mayor.

☐ (Name of candidate.)
(Vote for one.)

For councilman.

☐ (Name of candidate.)
(Vote for four.)

Official ballot attest:

(Signature.)

———.
City Clerk.

Having caused said ballots to be printed, the said city clerk shall cause to be delivered at each polling place a number of said ballots equal to twice the number of votes cast in such polling precinct at the last general municipal election for mayor. The persons who are qualified to vote at the general municipal election shall be qualified to vote at such primary election, and challenges can be made by not more than two persons, to be appointed at the time of opening the polls by the judges of election; and the law applicable to challenges at a general municipal election shall be applicable to challenges made at such primary election. Judges of election shall, immediately upon the closing of the polls, count the ballots and ascertain the number of votes cast in such precinct for each of the candidates, and make return thereof to the city clerk, upon proper blanks, to be furnished by the said clerk, within six hours of the closing of the polls. On the day following the said primary election the said city clerk shall canvass said returns so received from all the polling precincts, and shall make and publish in all the newspapers of said city, at least once, the result thereof. Said canvass by the city clerk shall be publicly made. The two candidates receiving the highest number of votes for mayor shall be the candidates and the only candidates whose names shall be placed upon the ballot for mayor at the next succeeding general municipal election, and the eight candidates receiving the highest number of votes for councilman, or all such candidates if less than eight, shall be placed upon the ballot for councilman at such municipal election.

All electors of cities under this act who by the laws governing cities of the first class and cities acting under special charter would be entitled to vote for the election of officers at any general municipal election in such cities, shall be qualified to vote at all elections under this act; and the ballot at such general municipal election shall be in the same general form as for such primary election, so far as applicable, and in all elections in such city the election precincts, voting places, method of conducting the election, canvassing the votes, and announcing the results shall be the same as by law provided for election of officers in such cities, so far as the same are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5A. Any person who shall agree to perform any services in the interest of any candidate for any office provided in this act in consideration of any money or other valuable thing for such services performed in the interest of any candidate shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $300 or be imprisoned in the county jail not exceeding 30 days.

SEC. 5B. Any person offering a bribe, either in money or other consideration, to any elector for the purpose of influencing his vote at any election provided in this act, or any elector entitled to vote at any such election receiving and accepting such bribe or other consideration; any person making false answer to any of the provisions of this act relative to his qualifications to vote at said election; any person willfully voting or offering to vote at such election who has not been a resident of this State for six months next preceding said election, or who is not 21 years of age, or is not a citizen of the United States, or knowing himself not to be a qualified elector of such precinct where he offers to vote; any person knowingly procuring, aiding, or abetting any violation hereof shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be fined a sum not less than $100 nor more than $500, and be imprisoned in the county jail not less than 10 nor more than 90 days.

SEC. 6. Every such city shall be governed by a council, consisting of the mayor and four councilmen, chosen as provided in this act, each of whom shall have the right to vote on all questions coming before the council. Three members of the council shall constitute a quorum, and the affirmative vote of three members shall be necessary to adopt any motion, resolution, or ordinance, or pass any measure, unless a greater number is provided for in this act. Upon every vote the yeas and nays shall be called and recorded, and every motion, resolution, or ordinance shall be reduced to writing and read before the vote is taken thereon. The mayor shall preside at all meetings of the council; he shall have no power to veto any measure, but every resolution or ordinance passed by the council must be signed by the mayor, or by two councilmen, and be recorded before the same shall be in force.

SEC. 7. The council shall have and possess and the council and its members shall exercise all executive, legislative, and judicial powers and duties now had, possessed, and exercised by the mayor, city council, board of public work, park commissioners, board of police and fire commissioners, board of waterworks trustees, board of library trustees, solicitor, assessor, treasurer, auditor, city engineer, and other executive and administrative officers in cities of the first class and cities acting under special charter. The executive and administrative powers, authority, and duties in such cities shall be distributed into and among five departments, as follows:

1. Department of public affairs.
2. Department of accounts and finance.
3. Department of public safety.

4. Department of streets and public improvements.
5. Department of parks and public property.

The council shall determine the powers and duties to be performed by, and assign them to, the appropriate department; shall prescribe the powers and duties of officers and employees; may assign particular officers and employees to one or more of the departments; may require an officer or employee to perform duties in two or more departments; and may make such other rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper for the efficient and economical conduct of the business of the city.

SEC. 8. The mayor shall be superintendent of the department of public affairs, and the council shall, at the first regular meeting after election of its members, designate by majority vote one councilman to be superintendent of the department of accounts and finances, one to be superintendent of the department of public safety, one to be superintendent of the department of streets and public improvements, and one to be superintendent of the department of parks and public property, but such designation shall be changed whenever it appears that the public service would be benefited thereby.

The council shall, at said first meeting, or as soon as practicable thereafter, elect by majority vote the following officers: A city clerk, solicitor, assessor, treasurer, auditor, civil engineer, city physician, marshal, chief of fire department, market master, street commissioner, three library trustees, and such other officers and assistants as shall be provided for by ordinance and necessary to the proper and efficient conduct of the affairs of the city, and shall appoint a police judge in those cities not having a superior court. Any officer or assistant elected or appointed by the council may be removed from office at any time by vote of a majority of the members of the council, except as otherwise provided for in this act.

SEC. 9. The council shall have power from time to time to create, fill, and discontinue offices and employments other than herein prescribed, according to their judgment of the needs of the city; and may by majority vote of all the members remove any such officer or employee, except as otherwise provided for in this act; and may by resolution or otherwise prescribe, limit, or change the compensation of such officers or employees.

SEC. 10. The mayor and council shall have an office at the city hall, and their total compensation shall be as follows: In cities having by the last preceding State or national census from 25,000 to 40,000 people, the annual salary of the mayor shall be $2,500 and of each councilman $1,800. In cities having by such census from 40,000 to 60,000 people, the mayor's annual salary shall be $3,000 and that of each councilman $2,500; and in cities having by such census over 60,000 population, the mayor's annual salary shall be $3,500 and that of each councilman $3,000. Such salaries shall be payable in equal monthly installments.

Any increase in salary occasioned under the provisions of this scale by increase in population in any city shall commence with the month next after the official publication of the census showing such increase therein.

Every other officer or assistant shall receive such salary or compensation as the council shall by ordinance provide, payable in equal monthly installments.

The salary or compensation of all other employees of such city shall be fixed by the council and shall be payable monthly or at such shorter periods as the council shall determine.

SEC. 11. Regular meetings of the council shall be held on the first Monday after the election of councilmen, and thereafter at least once each month. The council shall provide by ordinance for the time of holding regular meetings, and special meetings may be called from time to time by the mayor or two councilmen. All meetings of the council, whether regular or special, at which any person not a city officer is admitted shall be open to the public.

The mayor shall be president of the council and preside at its meetings, and shall supervise all departments and report to the council for its action all matters requiring attention in either. The superintendent of the department of accounts and finances shall be vice president of the council, and in case of vacancy in the office of mayor, or the absence or inability of the mayor, shall perform the duties of the mayor.

SEC. 12. Every ordinance or resolution appropriating money or ordering any street improvement or sewer, or making or authorizing the making of any contract, or granting any franchise or right to occupy or use the streets, highways, bridges, or public places in the city for any purpose, shall be complete in the form in which it is finally passed, and remain on file with the city clerk for public inspection at least one week before the final passage or adoption thereof. No franchise or right to occupy or use the streets, highways, bridges, or public places in any city shall be granted, renewed, or extended, except by ordinance, and every franchise or grant for interurban or street railways, gas, or waterworks, electric light or power plants, heating plants, telegraph or telephone systems, or other public service utilities within said city, must be authorized or approved by a majority of the electors voting thereon at a general or special election, as provided in section 770 of the code.

SEC. 13. No officer or employee elected or appointed in any such city shall be interested, directly or indirectly, in any contract or job for work or materials, or the profits thereof, or services to be furnished or performed for the city; and no such officer or employee shall be interested, directly or indirectly, in any contract or job for work or materials, or the profits thereof, or services to be furnished or performed for any person, firm, or corporation operating interurban railway, street railway, gas works, waterworks, electric light or power plant, heating plant, telegraph line, telephone exchange, or other public utility within the territorial limits of said city. No such officer or employee shall accept or receive, directly or indirectly, from any person, firm, or corporation operating within the territorial limits of said city, any interurban railway, street railway, gas works, waterworks, electric light or power plant, heating plant, telegraph line or telephone exchange, or other business using or operating under a public franchise, any frank, free ticket or free service, or accept or receive, directly or indirectly, from any such person, firm, or corporation, any other service upon terms more favorable than is granted to the public generally. Any violation of the provisions of this section shall be a misdemeanor, and every such contract or agreement shall be void.

Such prohibition of free transportation shall not apply to policemen or firemen in uniform; nor shall any free service to city officials heretofore provided by any franchise or ordinance be affected by this section. Any officer or employee of such city who, by solicitation or otherwise, shall exert his influence, directly or indirectly, to influence other officers or employees of such city to adopt his political views or to favor any particular person or candidate for office, or who shall in any manner contribute money, labor, or other valuable thing to any person for election purposes, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine not exceeding three hundred dollars ($300) or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding thirty (30) days.

SEC. 14. Immediately after organizing the council shall by ordinance appoint three civil service commissioners, who shall hold office, one until the first Monday in April in the second year after his appointment, and one until the first Monday in April of the fourth year after his appointment, and one until the first Monday in April of the sixth year after his appointment. Each succeeding council shall, as soon as practicable after organizing, appoint one commissioner for six years, who shall take the place of the commissioner whose term of office expires. The chairman of the commission for each biennial period shall be the member whose term first expires. No person while on the said commission shall hold or be a candidate for any office of public trust. Two of said members shall constitute a quorum to transact business. The commissioners must be citizens of Iowa, and residents of the city for more than three years next preceding their appointment.

The council may remove any of said commissioners during their term of office for cause, four councilmen voting in favor of such removal, and shall fill any vacancy that may occur in said commission for the unexpired term. The city council shall provide suitable rooms in which the said civil service commission may hold its meetings. They shall have a clerk, who shall keep a record of all its meetings, such city to supply the said commission with all necessary equipment to properly attend to such business.

(*a*) Before entering upon the duties of their office, each of said commissioners shall take and subscribe an oath, which shall be filed and kept in the office of the city clerk, to support the Constitution of the United States and the State of Iowa, and to obey the laws, and to aim to secure and maintain an honest and efficient force, free from partisan distinction or control, and to perform the duties of his office to the best of his ability.

(*b*) Said commission shall, on the first Monday of April and October of each year, or oftener if it shall be deemed necessary, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the council, hold examinations for the purpose of determining the qualifications of applicants for positions, which examination shall be practical and shall fairly test the fitness of the persons examined to discharge the duties of the position to which they seek to be appointed. Said commission shall as soon as possible after such examination certify to the council double the number of persons necessary to fill vacancies, who, according to its records, have the highest standing for the position they seek to fill as a result of such examination, and all vacancies which occur, that come under the civil service, prior to the date of the next regular examination, shall be filled from said list so certified: *Provided, however,* That should the list for any cause be reduced to less than three for any division, then the council or the head of the proper department may temporarily fill a vacancy, but not to exceed 30 days.

(*c*) All persons subject to such civil-service examinations shall be subject to removal from office or employment by the council for misconduct or failure to perform their duties under such rules and regulations as it may adopt, and the chief of police, chief of the fire department, or any superintendent or foreman in charge of municipal work, may peremptorily suspend or discharge any subordinate then under his direction for neglect of duty or disobedience of his orders, but shall, within 24 hours thereafter, report such suspension or discharge, and the reason therefor, to the superintendent of his department, who shall thereupon affirm or revoke such discharge or suspension, according to the facts.

Such employee (or the officer discharging or suspending him) may, within five days of such ruling, appeal therefrom to the council, which shall fully hear and determine the matter.

(*d*) The council shall have the power to enforce the attendance of witnesses, the production of books and papers, and power to administer oaths in the same manner and with like effect, and under the same penalties, as in the case of magistrates exercising criminal or civil jurisdiction under the statutes of Iowa.

Said commissioners shall make annual report to the council, and it may require a special report from said commission at any time; and said council may prescribe such rules and regulations for the proper conduct of the business of the said commission as shall be found expedient and advisable, including restrictions on appointment, promotions, removals for cause, roster of employees, certification of records to the auditor, and restrictions on payment to persons improperly employed.

(*e*) The council of such city shall have power to pass ordinances imposing suitable penalties for the punishment of persons violating any of the provisions of this act relating to the civil service commission.

(*f*) The provisions of this section shall apply to all appointive officers and employees of such city, except those especially named in section 8 of this act, commissioners of any kind (laborers whose occupation requires no special skill or fitness), election officials, and mayor's secretary and assistant solicitor, where such officers are appointed: *Provided, however,* That existing employees heretofore appointed or employed after competitive examination, or for long service under the provisions of chapter 31, acts of the Twenty-ninth General Assembly, and subsequent amendments thereto, shall retain their positions without further examination unless removed for cause.

All officers and employees in any such city shall be elected or appointed with reference to their qualifications and fitness, and for the good of the public service, and without reference to their political faith or party affiliations.

It shall be unlawful for any candidate for office, or any officer in any such city, directly or indirectly, to give or promise any person or persons any office, position, employment, benefit, or anything of value, for the purpose of influencing or obtaining the political support, aid, or vote of any person or persons.

Every elective officer in any such city shall, within 30 days after qualifying, file with the city clerk, and publish at least once in a daily newspaper of general circulation, his sworn statement of all his election and campaign expenses, and by whom such funds were contributed.

Any violation of the provisions of this section shall be a misdemeanor and be a ground for removal from office.

SEC. 15. The council shall each month print in pamphlet form a detailed itemized statement of all receipts and expenses of the city and a summary of its proceedings during the preceding month, and furnish printed copies thereof to the State library, the city library, the daily newspapers of the city, and to persons who shall apply therefor at the office of the city clerk. At the end of each year the council shall cause a full and complete examination of all the books and accounts of the city to be made by competent accountants, and shall publish the

result of such examination in the manner above provided for publication of statements of monthly expenditures.

SEC. 16. If at the beginning of the term of office of the first council elected in such city under the provisions of this act the appropriations for the expenditures of the city government for the current fiscal year have been made, said council shall have power, by ordinance, to revise, to repeal, or change said appropriations and to make additional appropriations.

SEC. 17. In the construction of this act the following rules shall be observed, unless such construction would be inconsistent with the manifest intent, or repugnant to the context of the statute:

1. The words "councilman" or "alderman" shall be construed to mean "councilman" when applied to cities under this act.

2. When an office or officer is named in any law referred to in this act, it shall, when applied to cities under this act, be construed to mean the office or officer having the same functions or duties under the provisions of this act, or under ordinances passed under authority thereof.

3. The word "franchise" shall include every special privilege in the streets, highways, and public places of the city, whether granted by the State or the city, which does not belong to the citizens generally by common right.

4. The word "electors" shall be construed to mean persons qualified to vote for elective offices at regular municipal elections.

SEC. 18. The holder of any elective office may be removed at any time by the electors qualified to vote for a successor of such incumbent. The procedure to effect the removal of an incumbent of an elective office shall be as follows: A petition signed by electors entitled to vote for a successor to the incumbent sought to be removed, equal in number to at least 25 per cent of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding general municipal election, demanding an election of a successor of the person sought to be removed, shall be filed with the city clerk, which petition shall contain a general statement of the grounds for which the removal is sought. The signatures to the petition need not all be appended to one paper, but each signer shall add to his signature his place of residence, giving the street and number. One of the signers of each such paper shall make oath before an officer competent to administer oaths that the statements therein made are true as he believes, and that each signature to the paper appended is the genuine signature of the person whose name it purports to be. Within 10 days from the date of filing such petition the city clerk shall examine and from the voters' register ascertain whether or not said petition is signed by the requisite number of qualified electors, and, if necessary, the council shall allow him extra help for that purpose; and he shall attach to said petition his certificate, showing the result of said examination. If by the clerk's certificate the petition is shown to be insufficient, it may be amended within 10 days from the date of said certificate. The clerk shall, within 10 days after such amendment, make like examination of the amended petition, and if his certificate shall show the same to be insufficient, it shall be returned to the person filing the same; without prejudice, however, to the filing of a new petition to the same effect. If the petition shall be deemed to be sufficient, the clerk shall submit the same to the council without delay. If the petition shall be found to be sufficient, the council shall order and fix a date for holding the said election not less than 30 days or more than 40 days from the date of the clerk's certificate to the council that a sufficient petition is filed.

The council shall make, or cause to be made, publication of notice and all arrangements for holding such election, and the same shall be conducted, returned, and the result thereof declared, in all respects as are other city election. The successor of any officer so removed shall hold office during the unexpired term of his predecessor. Any person sought to be removed may be a candidate to succeed himself, and unless he requests otherwise in writing, the clerk shall place his name on the official ballot without nomination. In any such removal election, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes shall be declared elected. At such election if some other person than the incumbent receives the highest number of votes the incumbent shall thereupon be deemed removed from the office upon qualification of his successor. In case the party who receives the highest number of votes should fail to qualify, within 10 days after receiving notification of election, the office shall be deemed vacant. If the incumbent receives the highest number of votes he shall continue in office. The same method of removal shall be cumulative and additional to the methods heretofore provided by law.

SEC. 19. Any proposed ordinance may be submitted to the council by petition signed by electors of the city equal in number to the percentage hereinafter required. The signatures, verification, authentication, inspection, certification, amendment, and submission of such petition shall be the same as provided for petitions under section 18 hereof.

If the petition accompanying the proposed ordinance be signed by electors equal in number to 25 per cent of the votes cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general election, and contains a request that the said ordinance be submitted to a vote of the people if not passed by the council, such council shall either—

(*a*) Pass said ordinance without alteration within 20 days after attachment of the clerk's certificate to the accompanying petition, or

(*b*) Forthwith after the clerk shall attach to the petition accompanying such ordinance his certificate of sufficiency, the council shall call a special election, unless a general municipal election is fixed within 90 days thereafter, and at such special or general municipal election, if one is so fixed, such ordinance shall be submitted without alteration to the vote of the electors of said city.

But if the petition is signed by not less than 10 nor more than 25 per cent of the electors, as above defined, then the council shall, within 20 days, pass said ordinance without change, or submit the same at the next general city election occurring not more than 30 days after the clerk's certificate of sufficiency is attached to said petition.

The ballots used when voting upon said ordinance shall contain these words: "For the ordinance" (stating the nature of the proposed ordinance) and "Against the ordinance" (stating the nature of the proposed ordinance). If a majority of the qualified electors voting on the proposed ordinance shall vote in favor thereof, such ordinance shall thereupon become a valid and binding ordinance of the city; and any ordinance proposed by petition, or which shall be adopted by a vote of the people, can not be repealed or amended except by a vote of the people.

Any number of proposed ordinances may be voted upon at the same election, in accordance with the provisions of this section; but there shall not be more than one special election in any period of six months for such purpose.

The council may submit a proposition for the repeal of any such ordinance or for amendments thereto, to be voted upon at any succeeding general city election; and should such proposition so submitted receive a majority of the votes cast thereon at such election, such ordinance shall thereby be repealed or amended accordingly. Whenever any ordinance or proposition is required by this act to be submitted to the voters of the city at any election, the city clerk shall cause such ordinance or proposition to be published once in each of the daily newspapers published in said city, such publication to be not more than 20 nor less than 5 days before the submission of such proposition or ordinance to be voted on.

SEC. 20. No ordinance passed by the council, except when otherwise required by the general laws of the State or by the provisions of this act, except an ordinance for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, which contains a statement of its urgency and is passed by a two-thirds vote of the council, shall go into effect before 10 days from the time of its final passage; and if during said 10 days a petition signed by electors of the city equal in number to at least 25 per cent of the entire vote cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general municipal election at which a mayor was elected, protesting against the passage of such ordinance, be presented to the council, the same shall thereupon be suspended from going into operation, and it shall be the duty of the council to reconsider such ordinance; and if the same is not entirely repealed, the council shall submit the ordinance, as is provided by subsection (*b*) of section 19 of this act, to the vote of the electors of the city, either at the general election or at a special municipal election to be called for that purpose; and such ordinance shall not go into effect or become operative unless a majority of the qualified electors voting on the same shall vote in favor thereof. Said petition shall be in all respects in accordance with the provisions of said section 19, except as to the percentage of signers, and be examined and certified to by the clerk in all respects as therein provided.

SEC. 21. Any city which shall have operated for more than six years under the provisions of this act may abandon such organization hereunder and accept the provisions of the general law of the State then applicable to cities of its population, or if now organized under special charter, may resume said special charter by proceeding as follows:

Upon the petition of not less than 25 per cent of the electors of such city a special election shall be called, at which the following proposition only shall be submitted: "Shall the city of (name the city) abandon its organization under chapter — of the acts of the thirty-second general assembly and become a city under the general law governing cities of like population, or if now organized under special charter, shall resume said special charter?"

If a majority of the votes cast at such special election be in favor of such proposition, the officers elected at the next succeeding biennial election shall be those then prescribed by the general law of the State for cities of like population, and upon the qualification of such officers such city shall become a city under such general law of the State; but such change shall not in any manner or degree affect the property, right, or liabilities of any nature of such city, but shall merely extend to such change in its form of government.

The sufficiency of such petition shall be determined, the election ordered and conducted, and the results declared, generally as provided by section 18 of this act, in so far as the provisions thereof are applicable.

SEC. 22. Petitions provided for in this act shall be signed by none but legal voters of the city. Each petition shall contain, in addition to the names of the petitioners, the street and house number in which the petitioner resides, his age, and length of residence in the city. It shall also be accompanied by the affidavit of one or more legal voters of the city stating that the signers thereof were, at the time of signing, legal voters of said city, and the number of signers at the time the affidavit was made.

SEC. 23. This act, being deemed of immediate importance, shall take effect and be in force from and after its publication in the Register and Leader and Des Moines Capital, newspapers published in Des Moines, Iowa.

Approved March 29, A. D. 1907.

AMENDMENT TO RECALL CLAUSE.

Chapter 65. Recalling of elective officers in certain cities. H. F. 508.

An act to amend the law as it appears in section 1056a 36 of the supplement to the code, 1907, relating to the government of certain cities and the recalling of elective officers therein.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

SECTION 1. Statement of candidacy—petition—ballot—form. That section 1056a 36 of the supplement to the code, 1907, be amended by inserting, after the word "elections" at the end of the thirty-fourth line in said section, the following:

"So far as applicable, except as otherwise herein provided, nominations hereunder shall be made without the intervention of a primary election by filing with the clerk, at least 10 days prior to said election, a statement of candidacy accompanied by a petition signed by electors entitled to vote at said special election equal in number to at least 10 per cent of the entire vote for all candidates for the office of mayor at the last preceding general municipal election, which said statement of candidacy and petition shall be substantially in the form set out in section 1056a 21 of the supplement to the code, 1907, so far as the same is applicable, substituting the word 'special' for the word 'primary' in such statement and petition, and stating therein that such person is a candidate for election instead of nomination."

The ballot for such special election shall be in substantially the following form:

OFFICIAL BALLOT.

Special election for the balance of the unexpired term of ——— ——— as ———.

For ———.

☐ (Names of candidates.)

(Vote for one only.)

———

Name of present incumbent.

Official ballot attest:

(Signature.)

———

City Clerk.

SEC. 2. In effect. This act being deemed of immediate importance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and approval and publication in the Des Moines Register and Leader and Des Moines Capital, newspapers published in Des Moines, Iowa.

CHAPTER 64.

Government of certain cities. H. F. 2.

An act to repeal sections 1056a 17, 1056a 18, 1056a 21, and 1056a 26 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, and to enact substitutes therefor, and to amend sections 1056a 19, 1056a 20, 1056a 24, 1056a 25, 1056a 28, 1056a 32, and 1056a 39 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, all relating to the government of certain cities.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

SECTION 1. Repeal—cities affected. That section 1056a 17 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, repealed and the following enacted in lieu thereof:

"Cities having by the last preceding State or national census a population of 7,000 or over, including any such city acting under special charter, may become organized as a city under the provisions of this act by proceeding as hereinafter provided."

SEC. 2. Repeal—petition—question submitted—result certified—election of officers. That section 1056a 18 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, repealed and the following enacted in lieu thereof:

"Upon petition of electors equal in number to 25 per cent of the votes cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding city election of any such city, the mayor shall, by proclamation, submit the question of organizing as a city under this act at a special election to be held at a time specified therein, and within two months after said petition is filed: *Provided, however,* That in case any city is located in two or more townships said petition shall be signed by 25 per cent of the qualified electors of said city residing in each of said townships. If said plan is not adopted at the special election called, the question of adopting said plan shall not be resubmitted to the voters of said city for adoption within two years thereafter, and then the question to adopt shall be resubmitted upon the presentation of a petition signed by electors as hereinbefore provided, equal in number to 25 per cent of the votes cast for all candidates for mayor at the last preceding general city election. At such election the proposition to be submitted shall be: 'Shall the proposition to organize the city of (name the city) under chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, as amended by the acts of the thirty-third general assembly, be adopted?' and the election thereupon shall be conducted, the vote canvassed, and the result declared in the same manner as provided by law in respect to other city elections. If the majority of the votes cast shall be in favor thereof, cities having a population of 25,000 and over shall thereupon proceed to the election of a mayor and four councilmen, and cities having a population of 7,000, and less than 25,000, shall proceed to the election of a mayor and two councilmen, as hereinafter provided. Immediately after such proposition is adopted, the mayor shall transmit to the governor, to the secretary of state, and to the county auditor each a certificate stating that such proposition was adopted. At the next regular city election, after the adoption of such proposition, there shall be elected a mayor and councilmen. In the event, however, that the next regular city election does not occur within one year after such special election the mayor shall within 10 days after such special election, by proclamation, call a special election for the election of a mayor and councilmen, 60 days' notice thereof being given in such call; such election in either case to be conducted as hereinafter provided."

SEC. 3. Statutes relating to cities of second class applicable. That section 1056a 19 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting after the word "first" and before the word "class" in the first line thereof the words "and second."

SEC. 4. Elective officers. That section 1056a 20 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the first sentence of said section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"In every city having a population of 25,000 and over there shall be elected at the regular biennial municipal election a mayor and four councilmen, and in every city having a population of 7,000 and less than 25,000, there shall be elected at such election a mayor and two councilmen."

SEC. 5. Repeal—candidates—how nominated—primary election—ballot—canvass of vote—result published—municipal election. That section 1056a 21 of the supplement to the code, 1907, be repealed and the following enacted in lieu thereof:

"Candidates to be voted for at all general municipal elections at which a mayor and councilmen are to be elected under the provisions of this act shall be nominated by a primary election, and no other names shall be placed upon the general ballot except those selected in the manner hereinafter prescribed. The primary election for such nomination shall be held on the second Monday preceding the general municipal election. The judges of election appointed for the general municipal election shall be the judges of the primary election, and it shall be held at the same place, so far as possible, and the polls shall be opened and closed at the same hours, with the same clerks as are required for said general municipal election. Any person desiring to become a candidate for mayor or councilman shall, at least 10 days prior to said primary election, file with the said clerk a statement of such candidacy, in substantially the following form:

STATE OF IOWA, ——— *County, ss:*

I (——— ———), being first duly sworn, say that I reside at — Street, city of ———, county of ———, State of Iowa; that I am a qualified voter therein; that I am a candidate for nomination to the office of (mayor or councilman) to be voted upon at the primary election to be held on the ——— Monday of ———, 19—, and I hereby request that my name be printed upon the official primary ballot for nomination by such primary election for such office.

——— ———

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me by ——— ——— on this ——— day of ———, 19—.

——— ———

and shall at the same time file therewith the petition of at least 25 qualified voters requesting such candidacy. Each petition shall be verified by one or more persons as to the qualifications and residence, with street number, of each of the persons so signing the said petition, and the said petition shall be in substantially the following form:

PETITION ACCOMPANYING NOMINATING STATEMENT.

The undersigned, duly qualified electors of the city of ——— and residing at the places set opposite our respective names hereto, do hereby request that the name of (name of candidate) be placed on the ballot as a candidate for nomination for (name of office) at the primary election to be held in such city on the — Monday of ———, 19—. We further state that we know him to be a qualified elector of said city and a man of good moral character and qualified, in our judgment, for the duties of such office.

Names of qualified electors.	Number.	Street.

Immediately upon the expiration of the time of filing the statements and petitions for candidacies, the said city clerk shall cause to be published for three successive days in all the daily newspapers published in the city, in proper form, the names of the persons as they are to appear upon the primary ballot, and if there be no daily newspaper, then in two issues of any other newspapers that may be published in said city; and the said clerk shall thereupon cause the primary ballots to be printed, authenticated with a facsimile of his signature. Upon the said ballot the names of the candidates for mayor, arranged alphabetically, shall first be placed, with a square at the left of each name and immediately below the words "Vote for one." Following these names, likewise arranged in alphabetical order, shall appear the names of the candidates for councilmen, with a square at the left of each name, and below the names of such candidates shall appear the words "Vote for four" or "Vote for two," as the case may be. The ballot shall be printed upon plain, substantial, white paper and shall be headed:

CANDIDATES FOR NOMINATION FOR MAYOR AND COUNCILMEN OF ——— CITY AT THE PRIMARY ELECTION.

But shall have no party designation or mark whatever. The ballots shall be in substantially the following form:

[Place a cross in the square preceding the names of the parties you favor as candidates for the respective positions.]

OFFICIAL PRIMARY BALLOT.

(Candidates for nomination for mayor and councilmen of ——— city at the primary election.)

For mayor.

☐ (Name of candidate.)

(Vote for one.)

For councilman.

☐ (Name of candidate.)

(Vote for four) or (Vote for two) as the case may be.

Official ballot attest:

(Signature)

——— ———

City Clerk.

Having caused said ballots to be printed, the said city clerk shall cause to be delivered at each polling place a number of said ballots equal to twice the number of votes cast in such polling precinct at the last general municipal election for mayor. The persons who are qualified to vote at the general municipal election shall be qualified to vote at such primary election, and challenges can be made by not more than two persons, to be appointed at the time of opening the polls by the judges of election; and the law applicable to challenges at a general municipal election shall be applicable to challenges made at such primary election. Judges of election shall, immediately upon the closing of the polls, count the ballots and ascertain the number of votes cast in such precinct for each of the candidates, and make return thereof to the city clerk, upon proper blanks to be furnished by the said clerk, within six hours of the closing of the polls. On the day following the said primary election the said city clerk shall canvass said returns so received from all the polling precincts, and shall make and publish in all the newspapers of said city, at least once, the result thereof. Said canvass by the city clerk shall be publicly made. The 2 candidates receiving the highest number of votes for mayor shall be the candidates, and the only candidates, whose names shall be placed upon the ballot for mayor at the next succeeding general municipal election, and in cities having a population of 25,000 and over, the 8 candidates receiving the highest number of votes for councilman, or all such candidates if less than 8, and in cities having a population of 7,000 and less than 25,000, the 4 candidates receiving the highest number of votes for councilman, or all such candidates if less than 4, shall be the candidates, and the only candidates whose names shall be placed upon the ballot for councilman at such municipal election. All electors of cities under this act who by the laws governing cities of the first and second class and cities acting under special charter would be entitled to vote for the election of officers at any general municipal election in such cities, shall be qualified to vote at all elections under this act; and the ballot at such general municipal election shall be in the same general form as for such primary election, so far as applicable, and in all elections in such city the election precinct, voting places, method of conducting election, canvassing the vote, and announcing the results, shall be the same as by law provided for election of officers in such cities, so far as the same are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act."

SEC. 6. Council—quorum: That section 1056a 24 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of said section beginning with the word "every," in the first line thereof, down to and including the word "act," in the seventh line of said section, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Every city having a population of 25,000 and over shall be governed by a council consisting of the mayor and 4 councilmen, and every city having a population of 7,000 and less than 25,000 shall be governed by a council consisting of the mayor and 2 councilmen, chosen as provided in this act, each of whom shall have the right to vote on all questions coming before the council. In cities having 4 councilmen 3 members of the council shall constitute a quorum, and in cities having 2 councilmen, 2 members of the council shall constitute a quorum, and in cities having 4 councilmen the affirmative vote of 3 members, and in cities having 2 councilmen the affirmative vote of 2 members shall be necessary to adopt any motion, resolution, or ordinance, or pass any measure unless a greater number is provided for in this act."

SEC. 7. Council—powers and duties: That section 1056a 25 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of said section, beginning with the

word "The," in the first line thereof, and closing with the word "charter," in the eighth line thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The council shall have and possess, and the council and its members shall exercise all executive, legislative, and judicial powers and duties now had, possessed, and exercised by the mayor, city council, solicitor, assessor, treasurer, auditor, city engineer, and other executive and administrative officers in cities of the first and second class, and in cities under special charter, and shall also possess and exercise all executive, legislative, and judicial powers and duties now had and exercised by the board of public works, park commissioners, the board of police and fire commissioners, board of waterworks trustees, and board of library trustees in all cities wherein a board of public works, park commissioners, board of police and fire commissioners, board of waterworks trustees, and board of library trustees now exist or may be hereafter created."

SEC. 8. Repeal—department superintendents—officers and assistants: That section 1056a 26 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, and the following enacted in lieu thereof:

"The mayor shall be superintendent of the department of public affairs, and the council shall at the first regular meeting after election of its members designate by majority vote one councilman to be superintendent of the department of accounts and finances; one to be superintendent of the department of public safety; one to be superintendent of the department of street and public improvements; and one to be superintendent of the department of parks and public property: *Provided, however,* That in cities having a population of less than 25,000 there shall be designated to each councilman two of said departments. Such designation shall be changed whenever it appears that the public service would be benefited thereby. The council shall, at said first meeting, or as soon as practicable thereafter, elect by majority vote the following officers: A city clerk, solicitor, assessor, treasurer, auditor, civil engineer, city physician, marshal, chief of fire department, market master, street commissioner, three library trustees, and such other officers and assistants as shall be provided for by ordinance and necessary to the proper and efficient conduct of the affairs of the city: *Provided, however,* That in cities having a population of less than 25,000 such only of the above-named officers shall be appointed as may, in the judgment of the mayor and councilmen be necessary for the proper and efficient transaction of the affairs of the city. In those cities of the first class not having a superior court, the council shall appoint a police judge. In cities of the second class not having a superior court the mayor shall hold police court, as now provided by law. Any officer or assistant elected or appointed by the council may be removed from office at any time by vote of a majority of the members of the council, except as otherwise provided for in this act."

SEC. 9. Office in city hall—salaries: That section 1056a 28 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of said section beginning with the word "The," in the first line thereof, and ending with the figures and dollar mark "$3,000" in the third line from the top of page 214 as the same appears in the supplement to the code, 1907, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The mayor and councilmen shall have an office at the city hall, and their total compensation shall be as follows: In cities having by the last preceding State or national census a population of 7,000 and less than 10,000 the mayor's annual salary shall be $600 and each councilman $450. In cities having by such census a population of 10,000 and less than 15,000 the mayor's annual salary shall be $1,200 and each councilman $900. In cities having by such census a population of 15,000 and less than 25,000 the mayor's annual salary shall be $1,500 and each councilman $1,200. In cities having by such census a population of 25,000 and less than 40,000 the mayor's annual salary shall be $2,500 and each councilman $1,800. In cities having by such census a population of 40,000 and less than 60,000 the mayor's annual salary shall be $3,000 and each councilman $2,500; and in cities having by such census a population of 60,000 or more the mayor's annual salary shall be $3,500 and that of councilman $3,000."

SEC. 10. Civil service commissioners—terms. That section 1056a 32 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the first two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"In cities having a population of 25,000 and over the council shall, and in cities having a population of 7,000 and less than 25,000 the council may, immediately after organizing, by ordinance, appoint three civil service commissioners, who shall hold office, one until the first Monday in April of the second year after his appointment, one until the first Monday in April of the fourth year after his appointment, and one until the first Monday in April of the sixth year after his appointment: *Provided, however,* That in all cases in which no civil service commissioners are appointed by the council, the council shall have the same powers and shall exercise and perform all the duties devolving upon such commissioners, as provided for in this act. In cities wherein civil service commissioners have been appointed under the provisions of this act each succeeding council shall, as soon as practicable after organizing, appoint one commissioner for six years, who shall take the place of the commissioner whose term of office expires."

SEC. 11. Abandonment of commission plan of government. That section 1056a 39 of chapter 14c of the supplement to the code, 1907, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all of that portion of said section beginning with the word "Shall," in the ninth line thereof, and closing with the word "charter," in the twelfth line, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Shall the city of (name of city) abandon its organization under chapter 14c of the supplement of the code, 1907, as amended by the acts of the thirty-third general assembly, and become a city under the general law governing cities, or, if now organized under special charter, shall resume said special charter?"

SEC. 12. In effect: This act being deemed of immediate importance, shall take effect and be in full force from and after its publication in the Register and Leader and the Des Moines Capital, newspapers published at Des Moines, Iowa.

Approved, March 30, A. D. 1909.

I hereby certify that the foregoing act was published in the Register and Leader and Des Moines Capital April 1, A. D. 1909.

W. C. HAYWARD, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 13, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 10, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 6, was read and approved.

OATH OF OFFICE.

The oath of office was administered by the Speaker to Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. SABATH, Representatives from the State of Illinois; Mr. HAUGEN and Mr. PICKETT, Representatives from the State of Iowa; Mr. LOUD and Mr. YOUNG, Representatives from the State of Michigan; Mr. TAYLOR, a Representative from the State of Ohio; Mr. GODWIN, a Representative from the State of North Carolina; and Mr. HOWARD, a Representative from the State of Georgia.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 34.

Resolved, That during the Sixty-second Congress, and until the organization of the Sixty-third Congress, Joseph G. Rogers, of Pennsylvania, be authorized to act as special employee of the House of Representatives, to receive compensation at the rate of $1,800 per annum; that Joseph C. Weir, of the State of Illinois, and John H. Hollingsworth, of the State of New York, be authorized to act as special employees and pair clerks, at a compensation of $1,800 per annum each; and that Bert W. Kennedy, of the State of Michigan, and Frank W. Collier, of the State of Wisconsin, be authorized to act as messengers, at a compensation of $1,500 each; and that A. W. Chaffee, of the State of Nebraska, be authorized to act as minority telephone operator, at a compensation of $1,200 per annum.

Said officers shall at all times be under control of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and they shall be subject to removal for cause at any time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a provision for the House employees conceded to the minority by the majority.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he has compared the list and if it is just exactly in accordance with what was conceded by the majority?

Mr. DALZELL. It is identical. I have compared it with the provision in the legislative bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] for unanimous consent?

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to make an inquiry. In this list, do you not bring in one position that was formerly controlled by the Doorkeeper?

Mr. DALZELL. This appointment is made in the same way it has always been made in previous Congresses.

Mr. LLOYD. There is no attempt on the part of the minority to take any advantage of the majority. They are now simply seeking to obtain places for the minority side which have heretofore been held by the minority side, but which formerly was Democratic instead of Republican.

Mr. DALZELL. That is right.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. If I understand it, the employees provided for in this resolution are similar to what were known as the Democratic employees nominated by the Democratic caucus and agreed to by the House.

Several MEMBERS. No; the Republican caucus.

Mr. BARTLETT. No; I think I am right. They are the same character of employees, so far as positions are concerned, that the Democratic caucus presented at the beginning of the Sixty-first Congress, and which were conceded to the minority by the majority on resolutions that theretofore had been offered. Is not that correct?

Mr. CARLIN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will permit me a moment, I think the gentleman from Georgia is mistaken in that. I understand that this position was originally filled by a gentleman named Blanchard, on the Democratic

side, but subsequently the majority took the place and appointed to fill it a gentleman named Earle that we have never seen around here.

Mr. DALZELL. I think the gentleman is mista[illegible]. I am satisfied that I am correct in the statement I made.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I think I can explain the matter about which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN] speaks. Mr. Blanchard did represent the majority, in charge of the telephone. Unfortunately—and I say unfortunately by intention—he has been removed, and that is the thing about which Mr. CARLIN complains.

Mr. CARLIN. Exactly.

Mr. LLOYD. But notwithstanding that, I think this House should act fairly with the minority, and this place belongs to the minority. I do not think that side of the House ought to be held responsible for the misconduct of one man.

Mr. CARLIN. I was just trying to get at the truth about it. I am in favor of the minority having all they are entitled to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

CERTAIN COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a privileged resolution, which I ask that the Clerk will read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 35.

Resolved, That the following-named positions under the committees of the House as organized in the Sixty-first Congress are entirely unnecessary and useless, and that none of said positions as hereinafter named shall be continued or maintained or created during the Sixty-second Congress, viz: Assistant clerk and stenographer to the Ways and Means Committee, whose salary is $2,000 per annum; assistant clerk to Committee on Accounts, whose salary is $1,800 per annum; assistant clerk to Committee on Agriculture, whose salary is $1,800 per annum; assistant clerk to Committee on Claims, whose salary is $1,200 per annum; assistant clerk to the Committee on the District of Columbia, whose salary is $1,800 per annum; assistant clerk to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose salary is $1,800 per annum; assistant clerk to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, whose salary is $1,500 per annum; assistant clerk to the Committee on Indian Affairs, whose salary is $1,800 per annum; stenographer to Committee on Invalid Pensions, whose salary is $2,190 per annum; stenographer to Committee on Invalid Pensions (for session), whose salary is $100 per month; assistant clerk to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, whose salary is $1,200 per annum; clerk to continue digest of claims to Committee on War Claims, whose salary is $2,500 per annum; stenographer (for session) to Committee on War Claims, whose salary is $75 per month; assistant clerk to the Committee on Banking and Currency, whose salary is $1,200 per annum; assistant clerk to the Committee on Public Lands, whose salary is $1,200 per annum; session clerk to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, whose salary is $6 per day; session clerks, whose salaries are $125 per month each, for the following-named committees, viz: Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that this proposition is offered as a privileged motion?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the resolution is not privileged. It should go to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. On that, Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Florida on the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Rule IX of the rules recently adopted by this House, and which is an exact copy of Rule IX of the rules of the Sixty-first Congress, from which I read, provides:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members—

And so forth.

That rule has been construed by a number of Speakers of this House in past years, and, regardless of the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I assert that any resolution which affects the organization of the House is privileged by every recorded decision every time the question has been presented for decision.

For instance, in Hinds' Precedents, Volume I, section 189—which I do not contend is analogous to this particular case, because it refers to officers of the House, and I understand the difference between officers and employees—the Speaker held that a resolution that the House proceed to the election of an officer presents a question of privilege.

In Hinds' Precedents, Volume IV, section 4407, a resolution establishing certain select committees is held privileged. Why? Because it relates to the organization of the House. I have five volumes of Hinds' Precedents here, full of these decisions, and it has always been held, whenever a resolution was offered which related in any way to the organization of the House, that it was privileged under this rule.

And surely, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], logician as he is, and parliamentarian without a peer perhaps, on this side of the House at least, will not contend that the selection of committee clerks, who are to be instrumentalities for carrying out the will of the House, is not a step relating to the organization of the House.

These clerks have not been selected. The House committees have not been selected. Therefore these employees can not be selected until the committees are chosen and until they meet and organize. Then they select their respective clerical forces.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, and there is abundant authority here for that, that at any time before the organization is perfected a resolution relating to that organization is absolutely privileged under the rules.

But the House has gone even further than that, Mr. Speaker. In Volume V of Hinds' Precedents, section 7273, a resolution assigning a room to a committee was held to present a question of privilege. Yet it is to be contended here that although the mere assignment of a committee room to a committee is privileged, when you come to select the agents who are to permit the committees to discharge their duties, and therefore carry out the will of the House, that that does not relate to the organization of the House. And the gentleman from Alabama will be driven to that position before the point of order can be sustained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have offered this resolution to the House, in line with the declared policy of the majority. I will not attempt to discuss the merits of it at this time. Gentlemen can examine these committees and find that they are loaded down with employees drawing immense salaries, when there is absolutely no more use for some of them than "a hog has use for a side pocket." [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have not examined all the committees, to know whether the places that the gentleman from Florida desires to abolish are needed by the committees to do useful work. This side of the House has already agreed to cut the employees of this House to the amount of $180,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he thinks that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which I am a member, which frames a bill once every two years, needs a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a janitor?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have just stated to the gentleman and to the House that I am not familiar with the workings of all these committees, and I am not advised as to whether that committee, and possibly others, have clerks that are not needed; but I do not think that a question of this kind should be disposed of by the House without proper investigation. It ought to go to a proper committee to consider it and report to the House, if it is to be considered at all. For that reason I have made the point of order that this is not a privileged matter. Now, I agree with the gentleman that one of the elective officers of this House, the Speaker himself, for instance, may be removed from office upon motion, and that would be a privileged motion; but some of these places that the gentleman names in his resolution are session clerks, not yet provided for at all. Others are clerks of committees, that are appointed by the chairmen of those committees, discharged by the chairmen, and are statutory places. Other places are not——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit one question right there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman mean to say that the assistant clerks are provided for by statute?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know whether all of them named in the resolution are provided for by statute or not, because I have not had an opportunity to read the resolution, but I know that many are.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman name one assistant clerk provided for by statute that is named in the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The assistant clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means is provided for by statute and carried under the general appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Is it not true that this resolution abolishes only one assistant clerk and leaves a clerk and an assistant clerk for your committee, and that this is a minor assistant clerk?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand, all of the clerks of that committee are provided for by statute, and their pay does not come out of the contingent fund of the House. I understand that they hold a statutory place; and as to the necessity for these committee clerks, I will say to the gentleman from Florida that not only are the men that are provided for by statute for the Ways and Means Committee working every day, but there is an additional force endeavoring to prepare the legislation that this House is demanding to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman is now discussing the merits of the resolution, which I scrupulously avoided. I am ready to meet that issue when the time comes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman started the discussion on the merits of the question, but I recognize that it is not in order. I simply say that this is not a privileged question. I do not deny the right of this House as a privileged matter to remove one of the elective officers of this House or to remove a committee of this House, but I say that these places are established by statute, that the salary runs unless we abolish them by statute, that they are not designated by this House, but are designated by the chairmen of the committees, and therefore I say that a resolution of this kind should be referred to the appropriate committee in the House for consideration, to report it back in the regular order, and is not a privileged matter to be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained and the resolution is referred to the Committee on Accounts.

CLALLAM TRIBE OF INDIANS.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter and a petition signed by the Clallam Tribe of Indians of the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the papers which he holds in his hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not ask to have them read. It is a letter that I have received from an Indian, a member of the Clallam Tribe, and a petition signed by the men of that tribe in regard to the way they have been treated by the United States Government. In other words, in 1855 this Government entered into a treaty with the Indians which they claim the Government has not kept. This letter and the petition are from the Indians themselves, and are brief, and I think they contain information which the House ought to have.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Washington that he ask permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and then print the letter and petition. It has not been the custom to grant permission to have petitions printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. What purpose will it serve to print this petition and letter in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It will serve the purpose of furnishing information to the House. This Clallam Tribe of Indians claim that the treaty with them has not been kept by the Government; that it took all their land, and that they have received nothing in return. I think it ought to go into the RECORD.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As I understand, this is a memorial from an individual touching Indian property.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; it is a brief statement by one Indian and a memorial signed by the members of the tribe.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Has the gentleman the memorial to present with the letter?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

UNION, WASH., *December 22, 1910.*

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sending you a petition signed by Indians of the Clallam Tribe. They are a remnant of a once large and powerful tribe occuping lands on the American side of the straits as far as the lands occupied by the Makah or Neah Bay Indians. They do not now number much more than 200 souls, adults, children, and all. About half of these Indians have purchased a small tract of land near Dungeness, Jefferson County, upon which they have a small village. The Government maintains a day school in this village. But they find these small tracts of land not large enough to make a living on, so they are compelled at times to leave and go where they could earn their living in other lines of work. The other half make their homes in Port Gamble, Kitsap County, on a sand spit owned by the Puget Mill Co. The Government also maintained a day school in this village up to July 1, 1910, when it was abolished for no apparent reason, but an injustice, as there are about 25 children in the village. The Indians' rights to live on land owned by the mill company rests entirely with the company. In the event of a change of management of the company's affairs, and in case a new management is opposed to the Indians living on their lands and orders them to vacate the premises, where would they go? They would be practically homeless.

I am an Indian also, belonging to the Skokomish Tribe. I was in the Government Indian service since September, 1902, as teacher. On December 1, 1909, I was transferred from the Skokomish day school to the Port Gamble day school, which I taught till June 30, 1910. This school was then abolished and I was transferred to Fort Peck Reservation, Mont. I declined the transfer and resigned. It was while I was in charge of the Port Gamble school that I saw the efforts of these Indians to acquire lands upon which they could build homes of their own. But the price of land is much more than their slender means could meet. I believe that arrangements could be made with the Puget Mill Co. for a piece of logged-off land on the water front, as these Indians are a part of the laboring population of Port Gamble, and do all their trading there. I would be glad to furnish any information in the matter, and I join with the petitioners in begging you, in the name of humanity and justice, to do something for this people, once the proud possessors of all the lands now occupied by white citizens who have become prosperous and independent.

Very respectfully,

ANDREW P. PETERSON.

PORT GAMBLE, WASH., *December, 1910.*

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On January 26, 1855, a treaty was signed by Gov. Isaac I. Stevens, representing the United States, and the chiefs and headmen of the Clallam, Skokomish, and Chemikum Tribes of Indians, in which these Indians ceded to the United States vast tracts of lands.

The Clallam Indians, in common with the other tribes of Indians, relinquished all their right, title, and interest in the lands occupied by them.

In consideration of the cession, the United States agreed to pay to the said tribes the sum of $60,000. Also the sum of $6,000 to be used in paying the expenses of the Indians to remove to the reservation, the said reservation being set aside by order of Executive, dated February 25, 1874, and containing 6 sections of land, situated in the Skokomish Valley, State of Washington (then Territory of Washington), County of Mason.

According to the treaty aforesaid, this reservation was to be occupied by the tribes mentioned in the treaty.

Now, we, your petitioners, are members of the Clallam Tribe. Our chiefs and headmen were signers of the treaty of Point no Point. We respectfully beg to state that since conveying to the United States all our rights and interests in and to the lands which our fathers and forefathers have occupied for countless generations we have not in manner molested the settlers to whom the United States gave these lands; we have kept our part of the treaty faithfully and have always lived on friendly terms with the white people.

Of the $66,000 which the United States promised to pay for our lands, all that we remember to have received were a few blankets, a few farming implements, and we can not say where or to whom the money was paid.

No one ever offered us a dollar of the $6,000 which was provided by the treaty to pay for our removal to the reservation.

When the 6 sections of land were reserved for our use in common with the other tribes, the Skokomish Tribe, in whose land the reserve was made, was given the prior rights to take up lands, and when each adult and head of a family had been allotted there was no land left for the Clallam Tribe. Consequently, we have never been allotted lands under the treaty.

A few of our tribe have purchased small tracts of land, upon which they have built homes, but they can not depend upon these little tracts for a living, as they are wholly inadequate.

We are desirous of building permanent homes for ourselves and our children on lands which we can call our own.

For this reason we are addressing you this and trespassing upon your valuable time.

We beg that you will, in any manner in which you see fit and in accordance with our treaty, secure lands for the Clallam Tribe of Indians.

We acknowledge our dependence on the Government of the United States, and we ask the Government protection in our rights, and we feel sure that when the facts are fully investigated we will be accorded our rights.

Your espousal of our cause will win our lasting gratitude.

Very respectfully submitted.

Robert Collier, John (his x sign) Cook, Wm. (his x sign) Newton, Wm. (his x sign) Williams, Jesse Cook, Richard Wood, John Allen, Wm. Allen, Wm. Hall, Wilson Johnson, Harvey Hall, Jimmie Dick, Charlie (his x mark) Lewis, Fred Hall, Jacob Hall, Dan Wood, David Hunter, Joseph Allen, George D. Howell, Joe Anderson, Harry Fulton, Wm. George, Jacob Janes, H. Lamen, Peter Jackson, Geo. Sparks, Thomas Charles, Jas. (his x mark) Henry, Wm. Henry, Eddie George, Newton M. Pulsifer, Chas. Jackson, George (his x mark) Adams, Tom (his x mark) Mitchell, Skookune (his x mark) John, Sammy Charles.

ADDITIONAL DELEGATES, COMMITTEES ON TERRITORIES AND PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the rules provide that there shall be an additional Delegate on the Committee on Public Lands and two Delegates as additional members on the Committee on Territories. I ask unanimous consent that there may be elected as additional members to the Committee on Public Lands two Delegates instead of one, and four Delegates in place of two to the Committee on Territories. Of course it is known that these Delegates do not vote in the committees.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not understand what the request of the gentleman is, Mr Speaker.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House and of the last House provided that as additional members there might be appointed two Delegates to the Committee on Territories. It has been the custom heretofore, by unanimous consent, to appoint all of the Delegates on the Committee on Territories, and I desire to have that done again.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I will state that in the last Congress the Delegates were put on these committees by unanimous consent. They have no vote in the committee and can not disturb the equilibrium of the committee. These committees are places where they naturally desire to be in order to keep up with the business of their Territories. I can see no objection whatever to the request of the gentleman from Illinois being granted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the number of Delegates on the Committee on Public Lands be increased from one to two and on the Committee on Territories from two to four. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ASSIGNMENT OF ROOMS IN THE CAPITOL.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following as a privileged resolution and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 33.

Resolved, That the following assignments of rooms in the Capitol and House Office Building be, and the same are hereby, made:

1. To the Committee on Pensions, rooms 222 and 223 in the House Office Building.

2. To the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor, the room in the House Office Building heretofore assigned to the Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics.

3. To the Committee on Mines and Mining, the rooms in the House Office Building heretofore assigned to the Committee on Militia, Nos. 289 and 289–A.

4. To the Committee on Rules, as additional space, the room in the Capitol Building heretofore occupied by the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

5. To the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, the room in the Capitol Building heretofore assigned to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and the room heretofore assigned to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

6. To the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, two of the rooms in the House Office Building heretofore assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary, being room No. 483, and the committee room adjacent thereto.

7. To the Committee on the Judiciary, the room in the House Office Building, No. 379, and the hearing room adjacent thereto.

8. To the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, the room on the gallery floor, No. 49, in the Capitol Building, heretofore assigned to the Committee on Pensions, and the room heretofore assigned to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

9. To the minority conference, as additional space, room on the principal floor, No. 5, heretofore assigned to the Committee on Pensions, and the room on the ground floor, No. 5, heretofore assigned to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

10. That the caucus room in the House Office Building be assigned for general hearing room for committees.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order on the resolution as to its being privileged.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I find there is a typographical error in paragraph 1. It should be rooms 221 and 223, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be modified in that respect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modification of the resolution as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MANN. Without affecting the point of order?

The SPEAKER. Certainly, without affecting the point of order. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the resolution is in order as a privileged resolution.

Mr. MANN. Let us first refer to the resolution. I would ask the gentleman if he will yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I thought, as I heard the resolution read, that there was some discrepancy in reference to the assignment of the rooms formerly occupied by the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER. I think not. The understanding is that the minority shall have the room on this floor heretofore occupied by the Committee on Pensions, and, in addition to that, the committee room immediately under that, the room heretofore occupied by the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Mr. MANN. I would like to inform the gentleman that the minority already has the room formerly occupied by the Committee on Pensions on this floor.

Mr. PALMER. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. And it is not necessary to carry that in this resolution.

Mr. PALMER. It was only to put it all in one basket, put it all on record in one place, that we put it in this resolution. I understood, in my conference with the gentleman from Illinois, that that is all the minority desired. Now, as to the other pension room, I refer to the room which is marked in the diagram in the Congressional Directory as room 49 on the gallery floor, immediately over the room of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and adjoining the room of the Committee on Pacific Railroads. The resolution transfers the room of the Committee on Pacific Railroads to the Committee on Rules, and gives the adjoining room to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, together with the small inside room across the hall, which becomes vacant.

Mr. MANN. To that part of it I have no objection, of course. The two rooms—the Committee on Invalid Pensions and the Committee on Pensions—were formerly assigned in the last House to the Committee on Pensions. Where does the gentleman get the numbering of the rooms in the Capitol?

Mr. PALMER. I took that from the Congressional Directory map. I do not know whether it is official, or anything of the sort, but it is shown upon the diagram as printed in the Congressional Directory. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CARLIN. May I ask the gentleman a question? Does it change the Judiciary Committee rooms?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Illinois had not concluded his questions, I think.

Mr. MANN. In this number 9 you say the minority conference has additional space. What you intend there is that they are assigned both of these rooms, and that is all the space they have.

Mr. PALMER. I was under the impression that the minority conference had use of some space in the House Office Building.

Mr. MANN. They have not.

Mr. PALMER. There is a minority room——

Mr. MANN. A minority room, that is true.

Mr. PALMER. That is an explanation of it.

Mr. MANN. Now, I want to ask the gentleman further in reference to the assignment of the Committee on the Judiciary. The large room over there, diagonally across the building from the Committee on Ways and Means, and similar to the room of the Committee on Ways and Means, was by order of the Sixtieth Congress reserved as a special committee room, with the design of permitting any of the committees of the House which have to have hearings to have hearings in that committee room when they had a large number of people. I notice now the proposition is that the Committee on the Judiciary is assigned the large caucus room for hearings. It is quite certain that the caucus room will not be suited for hearings. The room you now propose to assign to the Committee on the Judiciary will not be suited to the Committee on the Judiciary for ordinary business. My committee had hearings in the room, and I can assure the gentlemen on the Committee on the Judiciary that if they take that room and only one other room, and intend to have all their hearings in that room, or rather, all the meetings in that room, they will not find it very satisfactory. The caucus room will never be suited for a hearing room, in my judgment.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, the way that has come about is this: The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, by reason of the desire to accommodate the convenience of the chairman, who was anxious to remain in the Capitol Building, has been occupying a very small room in the Capitol Building. Their hearings are numerous, I understand, and the attendance at the hearings is considerable, and the prospective chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, desirous of getting larger quarters—and, in my judgment, they are entitled to larger quarters——

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). Asked for committee rooms 153 and 154, in the House Office Building. Those rooms have been used ever since the erection of the House Office Building for the use of special committees, and it is important that

they should be retained for that purpose. The problem with us was where to put the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I want to further explain that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, being a large committee and having necessarily large hearings, after they found they could not get Nos. 153 and 154, wanted the rooms of the Committee on Militia, which has been abolished. It was impossible to give them those rooms, because of the conflicting necessities of other committees, and the Committee on the Judiciary, having been increased in size, is now too large to occupy the committee room in its present suite, and the prospective chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary states that the so-called hearing room, to which the gentleman from Illinois has referred as being diagonally across the building from the Committee on Ways and Means, was originally designed for the occupancy of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that it was actually occupied by the Committee on the Judiciary for a brief period, with the name of the committee put over its doors, but that Judge Jenkins, who was then the chairman of the committee, refused to move into it, and it was finally put upstairs in the other quarters.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary says that he will give up the three rooms to which he is now entitled and take only the two, if he can have the one large hearing room. Further than that, the superintendent of the House Office Building says that the hearing room has been inadequate for the purposes of public hearings; that upon three or four occasions during the Sixty-first Congress the attendance was so large that it overflowed into the hall, notably during the hearings of the Industrial Arts and Expositions Committee on the question of a site for the holding of the Panama Exposition, and one or two other hearings which I have forgotten. He says that the caucus room, without any expense, can be fitted up for a hearing room, which will be fully adequate to supply the needs of any committee in the House which must have a large general hearing space. I think, and I will say that I puzzled over this thing for a couple of days at the request of these various chairmen in an attempt to act as a clearing house and to get all desires and necessities satisfied, that the arrangement which we have worked out is the only feasible, if not the only possible, solution of the problem.

Mr. CARLIN. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN]?

Mr. PALMER. I do.

Mr. CARLIN. What becomes of the rooms now occupied by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. PALMER. They go to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization—two of them.

Mr. CARLIN. What becomes of the other room?

Mr. PALMER. It is an office room.

Mr. CARLIN. Now, I wanted to ask the gentleman by what authority this resolution is reported here? Who has the authority to make this distribution of rooms?

Mr. PALMER. I do not know that anybody has any particular authority over the question. It is a privileged matter, which any gentleman may call up on the floor of the House, but I will state to the gentleman with all frankness how I came to do this work. The prospective chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was being asked, as the floor leader on this side, by the chairmen of the various committees to assign different quarters to them, assuming that, while no particular person had the jurisdiction, he, as the leader, might be willing to assume it.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is a reasonably busy man, and has upon his committee a few young, live, healthy fellows whom he thinks he can work, and he asked me to take the work off his shoulders, and I am simply doing it as a favor to the gentleman from Alabama, who was asked by a number of other Members to work this thing out. I do not want to assume any jurisdiction in the matter.

Mr. CARLIN. That is exactly what the gentleman is doing.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Virginia can offer a resolution if he desires.

Mr. CARLIN. I understand what my privileges are, but I am trying to get at whose duty it is to assign these rooms, and whether the Ways and Means Committee are assuming to do things which they have nothing to do with.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, this is not——

Mr. CARLIN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that there is a commission authorized by law which has heretofore exercised this authority.

Mr. PALMER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will say in answer to that——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). That the law is this: That as to vacant, unassigned rooms in the Capitol the Speaker has jurisdiction and may assign any committee to any vacant room in the Capitol that he desires. As to rooms that are occupied, the proper practice is for a resolution of the House to be passed covering the question. And I will say that this is a matter that somebody has had to assume jurisdiction of always. I think it is a fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in recent Congresses, without having any more authority in the premises than any other Member in the House, but being an extremely willing worker, took upon himself the job of satisfying the various and conflicting requirements of committee-room assignments.

Mr. CARLIN. And the gentleman now has taken the job of the gentleman from Illinois upon himself?

Mr. PALMER. No; I have explained to the gentleman from Virginia why I introduced the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN].

Mr. CARLIN. I was going to say this, that I have no earthly objection to somebody doing this work.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman seems to have.

Mr. CARLIN. I think it ought to be done, but I do not want to consume the time of this valuable Ways and Means Committee, appointed here for a specific purpose, namely, revising the tariff, with looking after matters of patronage, reducing charwomen and expenses, and now assigning offices, when they have more important work to do.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that the valuable time of the Committee on Ways and Means has not been taken up more than about a minute by this resolution, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means can not prevent Members of the House from coming to him and asking him to do this thing.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield a moment, Mr. Speaker, I will say this, that a number of gentlemen on this side of the House found out that their committee rooms were unsatisfactory and that they were old rooms, and that there was an opportunity to move into better rooms, and they wanted to make changes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desired to make some changes with reference to the minority room. They came to me and asked me to do it, and I had so many things on my hands to attend to that I did not have the time to attend to it. It was not the Ways and Means Committee that took the matter up. I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to take the matter off of my hands and see the gentleman from Illinois, and to see the gentlemen on this side who wanted to change their rooms, and to report the matter to this House, so that the House could dispose of it, and so that our colleagues could be satisfied in reference to their rooms. Somebody had to do it.

Mr. CARLIN. The gentleman understands that he had no more to do with that than any other individual Member of the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly not; but some individual Member of the House had the right to do it.

Mr. CARLIN. The House had the right to do it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Virginia will permit, I will say that the committee of which I am to be the chairman had considerable trouble about sufficient space, and we found out that somebody had to take hold of the matter and work out a solution of the conflicts between gentlemen and committees. Accordingly, we called upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and asked them if they could help us out.

Mr. CARLIN. It seems to me it is becoming the habit of Members to call on them for everything that is done around here.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. They have been doing so well what they have done and what has been intrusted to them to do that I think we do well in going to them.

Mr. CARLIN. The gentleman is perfectly satisfied, apparently, because he has got what he wanted.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I got one small additional room.

Mr. CARLIN. But the gentleman concedes that he did get an additional room. I simply wanted to ascertain the authority by which we are doing this. It may be that I may want to

change my room hereafter, and in that case I shall want to know how to go about it and who to go to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can assure the gentleman that there is no jurisdiction given to any committee of this House to attend to this matter, and the only place that the gentleman can go to is this House; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, representing a number of his colleagues, has brought the matter to the floor of the House, the only place to which it can go.

Mr. CARLIN. I do not object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an additional statement in reference to this matter, partly in justice to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the gentleman from Alabama. At the beginning of the Sixtieth Congress, four years ago, when Congress met—of course, later in the year—the House Office Building was approaching completion, and there was no method then devised for assigning rooms. I offered a resolution for the appointment of a special committee, and I was afterwards made chairman of that special committee, consisting of six members. We made the recommendations to the House for the assignment of committee rooms both in the House Office Building and in the Capitol. As chairman of that committee I continued in operation until the end of the Sixtieth Congress. There was no committee appointed in the last Congress. But gentlemen of the House, chairmen of committees, and others who desired changes of committee rooms, came to me, there seeming to be no special provision in the rules for the reference of such a matter to a committee, and the result was that during the last Congress, on several occasions, I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of resolutions reassigning or making assignments of rooms. Gentlemen on that side of the House became so in the habit of coming to me about assignments of rooms that when the majority was transferred, and the responsibility and control with it, a number of the prospective chairmen of committees, both at the end of the last session of Congress and since that time, have appealed to me in reference to the assignment of rooms. It did not seem to me that it was the duty of any Member on this side of the House to arrogate to himself the duty of offering a resolution on the subject.

Therefore I asked the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the floor leader on that side of the House, if he would not take up the matter of the assignment of rooms, so that gentlemen who came to me might be referred by me to him, and other gentlemen might go to him. I understand that he referred the matter to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who now has the floor, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania did me the courtesy to come to me and discuss the matter with me.

When we made the original assignment of rooms to the Committee on Mines and Mining, the chairman, then being Mr. Huff, of Pennsylvania, was exceedingly anxious to remain in the Capitol Building in the room he then occupied. I objected to it for a long time, because the room was not sufficient, but finally we let him have his way. The same was true of one or two other committees, which ought to be transferred to the House Office Building. That was true of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, which had one little room, a very desirable room, except that it was very small, having a west front, in the old library part of the Capitol.

So far as I am concerned, I shall make no objection to the assignment of the room now proposed, after the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that the Superintendent of the Capitol, Mr. Woods, or his force, state that the caucus room can be made amply sufficient for committee meetings, and put in such shape that people can be heard in it without difficulty.

Mr. PALMER. I will say to the gentleman that that statement was made by Mr. Woolley.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Woolley, of course, is the representative of Mr. Woods in charge of the House Office Building. I have considerable doubt about it, although it may be that by putting up a large number of hangings in the room they can reduce the reverberations so that a small number of people can be heard. Even in the general committee room over there now, when only a few Members are present, it is very difficult to be heard, on account of the echo, although we have hangings up.

I suggest to the gentleman, who offers his resolution as a privileged one, that I hope there will be no objection to its passage by unanimous consent. I do not think it is a privileged resolution, and I do not think it wise to endeavor to establish the precedent that it is a privileged resolution, so that any Member at any time can take the floor to offer a privileged resolution, using it possibly for obstructive purposes, if not for the purpose of obtaining a change of room. I hope that, if there be no objection to the resolution, the gentleman will ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I will say in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that there is no difficulty about making the precedent, because the precedent has already been made. Mr. Garfield, of Ohio, presented a similar resolution many years ago, and the Speaker held it to be privileged.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. But in view of what the gentleman from Illinois has just stated I am perfectly willing to prefer the request in that way, and I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has been reported.

Mr. MANN. In view of the statement of the gentleman I hope he will yield to me to make this statement——

Mr. PALMER. Why, certainly.

Mr. MANN. When I was looking after this matter I went over the subject as carefully as I could with the then parliamentarian of the House and with others, and while I do not remember the opinion of Mr. HINDS, now the distinguished Member from Maine, my own impression was that it was not a privileged resolution, notwithstanding the precedent that the gentleman refers to, which I hope will not be followed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has been under discussion. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The question being taken, the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PALMER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

ASSIGNMENT OF ROOM FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the room in the Capitol now temporarily occupied by the Journal clerk be, and the same hereby is, assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and that the Journal clerk be, and he hereby is, assigned to the room in the Capitol prepared for him by the Superintendent of the Capitol.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say that there is no room temporarily occupied by the Journal clerk; it is permanently occupied by him. The file room has been moved to the one adjoining the Journal clerk's room.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from New York will not ask for the consideration of this resolution at the present time, but will call it up later after we have had time to look into it.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York that the room now occupied by the Journal clerk adjoins and belongs to the Committee on Foreign Affairs——

Mr. MANN. It never has, never was, and never did.

Mr. SULZER. And the Journal clerk, I am informed, is only occupying it temporarily.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York is mistaken. I made the assignment.

Mr. SULZER. The Superintendent of the Capitol will assign the Journal clerk a suitable room.

Mr. MANN. But we are all interested in the room for the Journal clerk. Every Representative has to go there. It is now in connection with the file room, and the two rooms ought to be together. It is a matter of convenience. I hope the gentleman will postpone the consideration of his resolution until we can ascertain about it.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been said, I will withdraw the resolution until gentlemen can inform themselves about it.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

HOMESTEAD GRANTS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (H. Doc. No. 8), which was read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 13 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I submit herewith an act

of the Philippine Legislature amending the public-land laws of the Philippine Islands by specifying the officials before whom the final evidence to perfect homestead grants may be taken. The law as it stands requires applicants for homesteads to furnish certain affidavits, but does not indicate the officials before whom they may be executed.

The amendment seems essential to a proper understanding by homesteaders as to what is required of them. I have therefore approved the act, in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the act of Congress above mentioned.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 10, 1911.*

COMMISSION ON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING.

The SPEAKER announced the following appointment:

JOSEPH G. CANNON as a member of the commission in control of the House Office Building, authorized by the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 4, 1907, to succeed Walter I. Smith, resigned.

RATIFICATION OF THE INCOME-TAX AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the secretary of state of Kansas announcing the ratification of the income-tax amendment:

STATE OF KANSAS, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Topeka, April 6, 1911.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith certified copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 2, in accordance with the terms of said resolution.

Very respectfully,
CHAS. H. SESSIONS,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF KANSAS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, Charles H. Sessions, secretary of state of the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that the following and hereto attached is a true copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 2, relating to a certain proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, passed by the Legislature of the State of Kansas and approved by the governor March 6, 1911, the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand and cause to be affixed my official seal.

Done at the city of Topeka this 4th day of April, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] CHAS. H. SESSIONS, *Secretary of State.*

Senate concurrent resolution 2—Relating to a certain proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the Congress of the United States has submitted the following proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to the legislatures of the several States of the Union for their ratification, viz:

"Article XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration:"

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and the same is hereby, ratified: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly certified by the presiding officers of the two houses of the legislature, the chief clerk of the house and secretary of the senate, by the governor of the State of Kansas, certified under the great seal of the State of Kansas, be transmitted to the President of the United States, and to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the senate, and passed that body January 19, 1911.

House amendment concurred in March 2, 1911.

RICHARD J. HOPKINS,
President of the Senate.
WALTER A. JOHNSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house February 18, 1911.

G. H. BUCKMAN,
Speaker of the House.
EARL AKERS,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Approved, March 6, 1911.

W. R. STUBBS, *Governor.*

STATE OF KANSAS, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Office of the Governor.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I, W. R. Stubbs, governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of senate concurrent resolution No. 2, duly certified by the president of the senate of the State of Kansas and the secretary of the senate and speaker of the house and clerk of the house of the State of Kansas, approved by the governor of the State of Kansas and certified under the hand and seal of the secretary of state of the State of Kansas:

And I do further certify that Charles H. Sessions is the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Kansas and having in charge the original bills and resolutions adopted by the Legislature of said State.

In witness whereof I, W. R. Stubbs, governor of the State of Kansas, have caused my hand, as governor, and the great seal of the State of Kansas to be hereto attached this 5th day of April, 1911.

[SEAL.] W. R. STUBBS, *Governor.*

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. BATES, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. EVANS, for one week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. BURGESS, for two months, on account of illness.

To Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Albert Freitag, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. WHITE, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of John W. Mercer, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the House that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] this morning presented me with a list of the minority members of the committees. That list, with that of the majority members, has gone to the Printing Office to be printed. It will not be available for action to-day, but I will move the election of the committees to-morrow morning as soon as the House meets. I now move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, April 11, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Apollo*, Richard H. Richards, master (H. Doc. No. 6); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the brig *Sally*, James Wallace, master (S. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Yeatman*, Roger Crane, master (S. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Ellen Comstock, executrix of estate of Cyrus B. Comstock *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 7); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 2846) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building in the city of De Funiak, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2847) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station in the third congressional district of Florida; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 2848) to repeal paragraph 355, section 1, of the tariff act of 1909, and to provide for the importation of cotton bagging and all fibers used in the manufacture of cotton bagging free of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 2849) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building in the city of Woodward, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2850) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Anadarko, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2851) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Alva, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2852) allowing homestead entrymen credit for residence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2853) extending the time for payment of balance due on purchase price of a certain tract of land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 2854) authorizing the sale of certain lands in the Colville Indian Reservation to the town of Okanogan, State of Washington, for public-park purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 2855) providing for the construction of a public well at Buxton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2856) providing for a site for a public building at Alamogordo, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 1 of the act of August 4, 1892, by permitting the entry of land chiefly valuable for commercial sand and gravel under the placer-claims law; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2858) providing for the construction of a test well at Newkirk, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2859) providing for the construction of a public well at Ingleville, N. Mex., in the Gramma Valley; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2860) providing for the construction of a public well at Byried, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2861) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain school lands to the village of Deming, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2862) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain school lands to the town of Melrose, Curry County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2863) providing for the construction of a public well at Hyer, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2864) providing for the construction of a public well at Venus, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2865) for the development of water for irrigation purposes in Chaves County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2866) to create an additional land district in the Territory of New Mexico, to be known as the Socorro land district; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2867) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Las Cruces, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2868) to establish a fish-cultural station in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2869) for the purchase of a site and the erection of an electrical power plant for irrigation purposes in Deming, N. Mex., or vicinity; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2870) providing for acquiring a site for a public building at Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2871) providing for the construction of two public test wells in Union County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2872) donating 100,000 acres of land to Cumberland College, Cumberland, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2873) for the purchase of a site and the erection of an electrical power plant for irrigation purposes in Portales, N. Mex., or vicinity; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2874) authorizing the county of Taos, Territory of New Mexico, to issue bonds for the erection of a courthouse; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2875) to provide for the exchange of national forest timber in New Mexico for private lands lying within the exterior limits of the Zuni National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2876) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2877) for the relief of the county of Torrance, in the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2878) for the relief of the Urton Lake reclamation project in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) to eradicate the grama-grass caterpillar in the several States and Territories of the Southwest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) providing for the construction of a bridge at Walmsleys Crossing, Taos County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) giving pensionable status to United States Volunteers who had rendered prior service to the Confederate States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2882) providing for the construction of two bridges across the Red River in Taos County, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2883) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 2884) to correct the military record of the officers and enlisted men of the Enrolled Missouri Militia and all other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2885) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and cannon balls to the city of Gallatin, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2886) granting pensions to the teamsters who served the Government of the United States in the War with Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2887) making appropriations for the improvement of the Missouri River from its mouth to Kansas City, Mo.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Liberty, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2889) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at the city of Cameron, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 2890) to extend the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, to the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military or naval forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2891) concerning permits to sell intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2892) concerning jurisdiction in judicial proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2893) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1893, as amended by subsequent acts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 2894) to provide for the erection of a public building at the town of Rumford, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 2895) granting restoration of pensions to certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 2896) to provide for a tax upon white phosphorus matches, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2897) to reimburse the State of California for arms, ordnance and ordnance stores, quartermaster's supplies, medical property, signal property, and other stores, supplies, and property belonging to said State and furnished by the United States, and lost or destroyed in the city of San Francisco, State of California, in the earthquake of April 18, 1906, and the fire subsequent thereto; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2898) to restore the status of the First Battalion Mountaineers, California Volunteers, who served during the late Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2899) appropriating money for the improvement of harbor at the entrance to Humboldt Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 2900) to authorize the acceptance by the United States of the gift of the Nathan Straus

Pasteurized Milk Laboratory; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2901) to encourage and promote the sinking of wells and building of reservoirs and dams on desert lands in the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 2902) forbidding judges to charge juries with regard to matters of fact, but requiring judges to declare the law, and in jury trials to reduce their charge or instructions to writing on the request of either party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2903) providing for the erection of a public building at Lock Haven, Clinton County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2904) to amend the laws relative to American seamen, to prevent undermanning and unskilled manning of American vessels, and to encourage the training of boys in the American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 2905) to provide campaign badges for officers, enlisted men, sailors, or marines who served honorably in the Spanish, Philippine, or China campaigns and who were not in the United States service on January 11, 1905; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2906) to provide campaign badges for officers and enlisted men of the Army who served honorably in the Spanish, Philippine, or China campaigns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2907) to cooperate with the States in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for those vocational subjects in state normal schools; and to appropriate money therefor and to regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 2908) directing the Secretary of War to cause a survey and examination to be made of Eel River from its mouth to the mouth of Van Duzen River, with a view to the improvement of said river for navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 2909) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Beaver Dam, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. YOUNG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 2910) to provide for the erection of a public building at Beloit, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 2911) to provide for the construction of a telephone and cable line between the quarantine station, Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and Forts Pickens and Barrancas, Fla., and for exchange service from Pensacola, Fla., to said Fort Barrancas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 2912) to divest whisky of its interstate-commerce character in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 2913) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mystic, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2914) to establish a life-saving station at New London, Conn., on the coast of Long Island or Fishers Island Sound, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2915) to establish a fish hatchery in the county of Windham or New London, Conn.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2916) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter of the first class for service at the port of New London, Conn., and adjacent waters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 2917) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for second homestead and desert-land entries," approved February 3, 1911 (Public, No. 340); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 2918) to improve the Missouri River near St. Joseph, Mo.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. UTTER: A bill (H. R. 2919) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2920) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2921) to amend the act of Congress approved July 16, 1894, providing that publications of societies be rated as second class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2922) to pension the widows and minor children of deceased soldiers and sailors of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2923) to pay all Federal soldiers honorably discharged $2 a day while confined in Confederate military prisons 30 days or more; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2924) to amend section 178 of an act entitled "An act to revise, consolidate, and amend the statutes relating to the Post Office Department," approved June 8, 1872; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 2925) to extend the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the port of Brownsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 2926) to extend the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, to all State militia and other organizations that were organized for the defense of the Union and cooperated with the militia or naval forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 2927) to make Cherryvale, in the State of Kansas, a subport of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2928) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the bureau of public highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2929) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, the act of April 19, 1908, and other acts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2930) suspending the patent and copyright laws of the United States when a patent or copyright or any article or product protected by patent or copyright is owned, used, or leased by any trust or monopoly in violation of any law in restraint of trade; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2931) for the relief of registers and receivers of the United States land offices in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2932) granting pensions to ex-prisoners of war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 2933) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Pittston, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2934) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Nanticoke, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2935) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Plymouth, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 2936) to correct the military record of the officers and enlisted men of the Enrolled Missouri Militia and all other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 2937) to amend section 100 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, and commonly known as "The Judicial Code," so as to provide for sittings of the United States court at the city of Portsmouth, in the southern judicial district of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2938) for the preparation of a plan for the erection of a foundation and pedestal on ground belonging to the United States Government, in the city of Washington, upon which to place a statue, to be furnished by the State of Pennsylvania, of Maj. Gen. George Gordon Meade; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 2939) to provide for the survey of Blackwater River and East and Pensacola Bays in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2940) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 2941) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2942) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Canyon City, in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2943) providing for the resurvey of the lands in Kiowa County, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2944) for the relief of the White River Utes, the Southern Utes, the Uncompahgre Utes, the Tabeguache, Muache, Capote, Weeminuche, Yampa, Grand River, and Uinta Bands of Ute Indians, known also as the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, of Colorado; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2945) to construct a road in the State of Colorado, between the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway station in the town of Las Animas and the United States Naval Hospital, and to make an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2946) to amend section 3 of the act approved June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2947) to promote the reclamation of arid lands; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2948) to promote the safety of employees and travelers on railroads by requiring common carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad to establish and maintain a safe and sufficient clearance between structures located on their roadways and cars passing over their lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 2949) providing for the erection of a public building at Valley City, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2950) providing for the erection of a public building at Dickinson, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2951) providing for the erection of a public building at Jamestown, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2952) granting certain public lands to the State of North Dakota for educational purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2953) to extend the time of payments on entries within the former Devils Lake Indian Reservation, in North Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across and over the Arkansas River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2955) supplementary to and amendatory of the act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Nation of Indians in Oklahoma," approved June 28, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2956) to amend the postal laws by preventing competition by express companies or other common carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2957) to extend the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military or naval forces of the United States in the war for the suppression of the rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2958) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected"; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 2959) to prohibit the receipt, delivery, or transmission of interstate or foreign messages, or other information to be used in connection with, and to prohibit interstate and foreign transactions of every character and description that in anywise depend upon margins as a part thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2960) to prevent the use of the mails, the telegraph or telephone lines, and the railroads by any company, corporation, etc., for purposes of interstate or foreign commerce where the aggregate value represented by their stocks, bonds, etc., exceeds the aggregate physical value of the property and the reasonable value of the business, privilege, or franchise that they are issued to represent the value of, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2961) to provide for the erection of a public building at Marianna, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2962) to provide for the erection of a public building at Blytheville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2963) to refund the cotton tax; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2964) to provide for the construction and maintenance of levees along the Mississippi River, from Cape Girardeau, Mo., to the Head of the Passes, by the Government of the United States of America; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2965) appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States to the construction of works for the drainage or reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands belonging to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2966) to prohibit the collection of a revenue tax, or the granting of other authority permitting or authorizing the sale or giving away of foreign or domestic distilled spirits, intoxicating liquors, wines, or any compound thereof in any district or territory of any of the several States or Territories of the United States of America where the sale or giving away of such foreign or domestic distilled spirits, intoxicating liquors, wines, or any compound thereof are prohibited by the laws of said States or Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2967) providing for the use of $3,000,000 of the money that would otherwise become a part of the reclamation fund for the drainage of certain lands in Arkansas and Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2968) to prohibit the receipt, delivery, or transmission of interstate or foreign messages, or other information to be used in connection with or furtherance of any project or transaction concerning the interstate or foreign buying or selling or otherwise dealing in futures in agricultural products or commodities, and to prohibit the interstate or foreign buying or selling or otherwise dealing in futures in said products and commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2969) for the improvement of the navigation of the St. Francis River in Arkansas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2970) to amend an act entitled "An act granting an increase of pensions to soldiers of the Mexican War in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2971) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of churches, lodges, and educational or eleemosynary institutions arising from the late Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2972) to require persons carrying on occupations and trades subject to the regulative power of Congress to pay compensation to employees injured, and to change the general law for personal injuries received on mail routes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 2973) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARBURTON: A bill (H. R. 2974) providing for the reappraisement and sale of certain lands in the town site of Port Angeles, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 2975) authorizing the detail of officers for inspection, instruction, and observation of military and uniform-rank organizations of fraternal societies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2976) establishing maximum salary of rural free-delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 2977) to extend the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, to the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military or naval forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 2978) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2979) providing for the requirements of final proof and issuance of patents upon lands heretofore sold

in conformity with the acts of Congress of March 3, 1885, and July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2980) to provide for the conveyance of the forest reserves in the several States to the States wherein they are situated, in trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2981) to set apart certain lands in the State of Oregon as a public park, to be known as the Saddle Mountain National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2982) to establish land courts of the United States and an appellate land court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 2983) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 2984) relating to the taxation of interest-bearing deposits of national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2985) amending the fee table of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2986) for the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UTTER: A bill (H. R. 2987) referring the claim of the State of Rhode Island to the Court of Claims for adjudication; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 2988) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2989) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Franklin, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2990) establishing the Franklin National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2991) authorizing the Secretary of War to have erected at Hohenwald, Tenn., a monument in honor of Meriwether Lewis; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 2992) to erect a monument to the memory of Gen. Peter Gabriel Muhlenburg at Woodstock, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 2993) for certain improvements at Fort Screven, Tybee Island, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2994) providing for a survey of Savannah River and Harbor, with a view of securing a depth of 35 feet; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2995) for survey of Abercorn and Mill Creek, in Georgia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 2996) to amend section 4488, Revised Statutes, for the greater safety and protection of passengers on steam vessels of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2997) to fix the price of gas in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2998) regulating the compensation of stationary firemen employed in Federal Government buildings in the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2999) to regulate the hours of labor on contracts with the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3000) granting an increase of compensation to bookbinders, printers, pressmen, clerks, and laborers in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3001) providing for the appointment of inspectors to take the state of the meters for the gas consumers of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3002) to provide for the testing of electric meters in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3003) to amend the present method of collecting garbage, ashes, and other refuse in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3004) to promote the production of domestic industrial alcohol, increase the productive value of the land, and maintain its fertile qualities through the establishment of small and scattered distilleries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3005) to increase the pensions of the blind who served in the War with Mexico, the Civil War, and the War with Spain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3006) to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to procure postal cars and contract for hauling them, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3007) appropriating $5,000 for the improvement of that portion of National Avenue, village of West Milwaukee, Milwaukee County, Wis., abutting the grounds of the Northwestern Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3008) for the erection of a public building at Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3009) to prevent discrimination by the mailing or otherwise forwarding, except by telegraph or telephone, of telegrams or messages by telegraph companies when same are accepted for telegraphic transmission by wire; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3010) to fix the requirements governing the receipt, transmission, delivery, and preservation of messages of interstate telegraph and telephone companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 3011) to construct two bridges over the Rio Grande, one at Isleta and one at San Felipe, for the benefit of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3012) in reference to the issuance of patents and copies of surveys of private land claims; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3013) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain school lands to the town of Gallup, McKinley County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3014) authorizing a bond issue of the city of Gallup, N. Mex., for reservoir purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3015) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain school lands to the city of Roswell, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3016) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain school lands to the town of Melrose, Curry County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3017) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain school lands to the town of Artesia, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3018) providing for the construction of a reservoir for irrigation and domestic use at Cerro, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3019) providing for a site for a public building at Raton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3020) reserving from entry, location, or sale lots 1 and 2 in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, in Sierra County, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3021) to create an additional land district in the Territory of New Mexico, to be known as the Clovis land district; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3022) to validate a certain act of the Legislative Assembly of New Mexico with reference to issuance of certain bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3023) authorizing the Territory of New Mexico to sell and transfer certain school lands to the city of Tucumcari, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3024) creating the National Battle Ground at Glorietta, Santa Fe County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 3025) providing for the erection of a suitable monument to Gen. Edward Richard Sprigg Canby at Alturas, Cal.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 35) relating to organization of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 36) requesting certain information from the Attorney General of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 37) directing investigation of health department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 42) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 43) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing for the election of Senators of the United

States by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 44) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 45) proposing an amendment to Article XI of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 46) providing for the termination of the treaty between the United States of America and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg, December 18, 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 47) authorizing the Secretary of War to award the congressional medal of honor to Henry M. Neil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PROUTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 48) requesting the President to open negotiations with the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of securing a supplemental reciprocal contract; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 49) creating a commission to investigate and report on the advisability of holding an exposition commemorative of the semicentennial of negro freedom; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 50) to create and creating a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 51) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver a condemned cannon to the National Encampment, Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 52) to change and improve the present method of distributing vegetable seeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 53) directing the expenditure of the "reclamation fund" provided for by the act approved June 17, 1902, entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands;" to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 54) authorizing and directing the President to eliminate certain nontimbered lands from forest reserves, reclamation projects, and withdrawals for power sites, and to restore such lands to entry under the homestead laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the election of Representatives for a four-year instead of a two-year term; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of the Legislature of Nebraska, favoring an amendment to the Constitution for the prohibition of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWITZER: Memorial of the Legislature of Ohio, to define the law against polygamy as clearly as the law is defined against bigamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3026) granting an increase of pension to Arthur D. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3027) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3028) granting an increase of pension to James Hopper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3029) granting an increase of pension to William D. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3030) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. De Witt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3031) granting an increase of pension to John H. Poynter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3032) granting an increase of pension to Abraham B. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3033) granting an increase of pension to J. P. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3034) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3035) granting an increase of pension to John Q. Hickman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3036) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3037) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Peery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3038) granting an increase of pension to William Mapel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3039) granting an increase of pension to Allen Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3040) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. D. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3041) granting an increase of pension to Amanzel L. Spore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3042) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3043) granting an increase of pension to James K. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3044) granting a pension to James A. Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3045) granting a pension to Evander Agee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3046) granting a pension to Jeremiah R. Whitsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3047) granting a pension to Ruben Driskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3048) granting a pension to C. H. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3049) granting a pension to Mary A. Hooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3050) granting a pension to John W. Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3051) granting a pension to James R. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3052) granting a pension to Thomas T. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3053) granting a pension to Ambrose Giseburt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3054) granting a pension to Lucy R. Woodward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3055) granting a pension to William Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3056) granting a pension to George Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3057) granting a pension to W. J. Prater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3058) granting a pension to Rebecca Schofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3059) granting a pension to John E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3060) granting a pension to Catharine J. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3061) granting a pension to John N. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3062) granting a pension to Sabina Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3063) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ballew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3064) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3065) granting a pension to Elizabeth Morrison and her heirs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3066) granting a pension to Martha J. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3067) granting a pension to Phillip Gentry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3068) granting a pension to Richard Franklin Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3069) for the relief of Jesse Lee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3070) for the relief of James B. Norman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Christopher L. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3072) for the relief of Allen Place; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3073) for the relief of Robert Griffin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3074) for the relief of William M. Critten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3075) for the relief of the heirs of John G. W. Brooks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3076) to correct the military record of John B. Hutchings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3077) to correct the military record of Harrison R. Crecelius; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3078) to correct the military record of Anderson Creason; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3079) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to examine and adjust the accounts of William R. Little, or his heirs, with the Sac and Fox Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 3080) granting a pension to Edgar T. Lassiter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 3081) for the relief of the widow and heirs of Juna D. Montoya; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3082) for the relief of Francisco Giron, heir of Nicolas Giron, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3083) for the relief of Emiliano Martinez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3084) for the relief of Roman Moya, administrator of the estate of Pablo Moya, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3085) for the relief of Theophilous L. Keen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3086) for the relief of the heirs of Pablo Eugenio Romero; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3087) for the relief of Atancio Casans; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3088) for the relief of Santiago Boney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Dolores P. Bennett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3090) for the relief of Jose Salazar; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3091) for the relief of John F. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3092) for the relief of Juan C. Jaramillo; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3093) for the relief of Theophilus L. Keen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3094) for the relief of Manuel Madril; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3095) for the relief of Fernando Baca; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3096) for the relief of Bicento Fresquez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3097) for the relief of W. J. Hendrix; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3098) for the relief of certain persons residing at Monticello, Sierra County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3099) for the relief of the Artesia school district, Artesia, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3100) for the relief of the city of Tucumcari, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3101) for the relief of Pablo Eugenio Romero; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3102) for the relief of Jesus Gallegos y Vigil; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3103) for the relief of William Strover; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3104) for the relief of A. H. Raynolds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3105) for the relief of Manuelita Swope; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3106) for the relief of Pablo Ciriaco Baca; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3107) for the relief of the estate of Matias Baca, deceased, and his son, Juan Rey Baca; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3108) for the relief of the estate of Fritz Eggert, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3109) for the relief of the estate of Justiniano Castillo; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3110) for the relief of the estate of Francisco Montoya; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3111) for the relief of the heirs of Diego Antonio Sanchez on account of losses sustained through depredation of Navajo Indians; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3112) for the relief of the heirs of John Lemon, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3113) for the relief of the heirs of Francisco Barela; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3114) for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Maria Candelaria, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3115) for the relief of the heirs of Howard Leland, late register of the United States land office at Roswell, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3116) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of the late William Bishop, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3117) to correct the military record of Ignacio Herrera; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3118) to correct the military record of Jose de Jesus Romero; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3119) to correct the military record of Lieut. Robert C. Hoggins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3120) to correct the military record of Jose Montoya; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3121) to correct the military record of Juan Sanchez; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3122) to correct the military record of Francisco Medina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3123) to correct the military record of Isidro Talamante; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3124) to correct the military record of John D. Hopper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3125) to correct the military record of Ramon Tafoya; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3126) to correct the military record of Jos. D. Depue; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3127) to correct the military record of A. W. Sudduth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3128) to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of Robert Burns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3129) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Christobal Martinez, alias Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3130) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the heirs and legal representatives of John P. Maxwell and Hugh H. Maxwell, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3131) to place Austin J. Chapman on the retired list of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3132) confirming title to the Canoncito de Nuanez grant; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3133) granting an increase of pension to James A. Betts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3134) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. May, alias Joseph W. Swan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3135) granting an increase of pension to Maria Garcia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3136) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Mundell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3137) granting an increase of pension to Annie J. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3138) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. A. J. Fountain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3139) granting an increase of pension to William S. Smock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3140) granting an increase of pension to Hattie E. Crary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3141) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Eckel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3142) granting an increase of pension to Maria C. Lopez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3143) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3144) granting an increase of pension to William J. Worden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3145) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3146) granting an increase of pension to Martha McGregor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3147) granting an increase of pension to Eveline H. Crichton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3148) granting an increase of pension to Antonio Jose Mares; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3149) granting an increase of pension to D. M. Sutherland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3150) granting an increase of pension to James F. Bandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3151) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Bonsall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3152) granting an increase of pension to Placido Salazar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3153) granting an increase of pension to Leroy Shakespeare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3154) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Gentner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3155) granting an increase of pension to Otto Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3156) granting an increase of pension to Sybille Grossart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3157) granting an increase of pension to John P. O'Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3158) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3159) granting an increase of pension to Eleno Samora; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3160) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin W. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3161) granting an increase of pension to Simon Arias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3162) granting an increase of pension to Jose Baca; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3163) granting an increase of pension to Belle Forsha; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3164) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Honzaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3165) granting an increase of pension to George W. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3166) granting an increase of pension to H. A. Van Epps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to Leverett Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3168) granting an increase of pension to Maria S. B. Sanchez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3169) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3170) granting an increase of pension to Roque Candelaria; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3171) granting an increase of pension to Juan Baca y Sais, alias Juan Baca No. 2; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3172) granting an increase of pension to S. D. Longstreet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3173) granting an increase of pension to William Mueller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3174) granting an increase of pension to John A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3175) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Shont; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3176) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Shield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3177) granting an increase of pension to E. W. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3178) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Paxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3179) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McQuillin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3180) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3181) granting an increase of pension to James T. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3182) granting an increase of pension to John C. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3183) granting an increase of pension to Philip L. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3184) granting an increase of pension to Emeline Dalton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3185) granting an increase of pension to A. E. Chaffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3186) granting an increase of pension to Irene Schormoyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3187) granting an increase of pension to C. H. Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3188) granting an increase of pension to Maria Soledad Montoya de Trujillo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3189) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3190) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Esquibel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3191) granting an increase of pension to Anthony McRobertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3192) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3193) granting an increase of pension to Juan Francisco Griego; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3194) granting an increase of pension to Pablo Bargas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3195) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3196) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Megraw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3197) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3198) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon Tulip; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3199) granting an increase of pension to James Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3200) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Metzger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3201) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3202) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Bostick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3203) granting a pension to Juan Antonio Griego; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3204) granting a pension to William Sweeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3205) granting a pension to Francisco Perea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3206) granting a pension to Harris B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3207) granting a pension to Samuel Barbeau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3208) granting a pension to George R. Watt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3209) granting a pension to Frank A. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3210) granting a pension to Howard Bromagem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3211) granting a pension to Francisco Montoya; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3212) granting a pension to John Ritter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3213) granting a pension to Joseph B. Watrous; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3214) granting a pension to Juanita Leyva de Sanchez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3215) granting a pension to Alexander May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3216) granting a pension to Ignacio Salazar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3217) granting a pension to Mariana L. de Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3218) granting a pension to Bernard Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3219) granting a pension to George W. Mossman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3220) granting a pension to Quincy Adams Stiteler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3221) granting a pension to John J. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3222) granting a pension to C. B. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3223) granting a pension to Sara A. Geck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3224) granting a pension to Edwin Kraemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3225) granting a pension to W. H. Gooden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3226) granting a pension to Julian Lujan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3227) granting a pension to James W. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3228) granting a pension to Marilita Luna de Baca; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3229) granting a pension to Sophia Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3230) granting a pension to John Kinchlow to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3231) granting a pension to Michael Rahilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3232) granting a pension to Magdalena L. de Ortiz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3233) granting a pension to Lottie Szymanski; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3234) granting a pension to John W. McSparron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3235) granting a pension to Presciliana F. Valdez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3236) granting a pension to William C. Stanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3237) granting a pension to Antonio Rendon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3238) granting a pension to Nicanor Quintana; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3239) granting a pension to George A. Rigdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3240) granting a pension to F. Salazar y Jimines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3241) granting a pension to Doroteo Duran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3242) granting a pension to John W. Irvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3243) granting a pension to Lou Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3244) granting a pension to George Leihy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3245) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Gumm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3246) granting a pension to Wilmont E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3247) granting a pension to Gus M. Brass, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3248) granting a pension to Dale C. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3249) granting a pension to Ignacio Salazar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3250) granting a pension to Frank A. Pfefferle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3251) granting a pension to R. J. Jamison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3252) granting a pension to Grace F. Lebo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3253) granting a pension to Charles G. Sherer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3254) granting a pension to Bertie L. Wade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3255) granting a pension to Anna Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3256) granting a pension to Carey C. Seemuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3257) granting a pension to Martha E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3258) granting a pension to Alvina McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3259) granting a pension to David Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3260) granting a pension to Antonio Armenta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3261) granting a pension to Mrs. John H. Leighner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 3262) granting an increase of pension to William Sharrer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 3263) granting an increase of pension to Miles Boland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 3264) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester J. Conklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3265) granting a pension to Ella Broderick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 3266) granting a pension to Thomas McKenna; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 3267) to correct the relative and lineal rank of an officer of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 3268) granting an increase of pension to David C. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3269) granting an increase of pension to John E. Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 3270) granting a pension to Lottie Menefee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 3271) granting an increase of pension to John H. Slatton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3272) granting an increase of pension to Zachary T. Fortner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 3273) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Sherrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3274) granting an increase of pension to Charles Ruby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3275) granting an increase of pension to John McIndoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3276) granting an increase of pension to William H. R. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3277) granting an increase of pension to James W. Whitlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3278) granting an increase of pension to Nathan T. Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3279) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Tedrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3280) granting an increase of pension to William Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3281) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Thorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3282) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3283) granting an increase of pension to Moses Killinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3284) granting an increase of pension to Moses M. Fulk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3285) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Y. Reeder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3286) granting an increase of pension to William S. Powell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3287) for the relief of the estate of Isham Butterworth, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3288) for the relief of the heirs of Nash L. Cox, deceased, to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3289) for the relief of Reverend Ambrose D. Brooks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3290) for the relief of heirs of W. K. Moore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 3291) for the relief of Phillip A. Thompson; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3292) for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 3293) granting an increase of pension to Hector L. Lindsay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3294) granting an increase of pension to Caroline W. Crittenden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 3295) granting an increase of pension to Abner Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3296) granting an increase of pension to Dudley G. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3297) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Titus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3298) granting an increase of pension to Ira McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3299) granting a pension to Elizabeth Staffen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3300) granting a pension to Oscar Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3301) granting a pension to Jake H. Wickert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3302) to remove the charge of desertion against John Walther; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 3303) granting an increase of pension to John T. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3304) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3305) granting an increase of pension to Edwin G. Wellman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3306) granting an increase of pension to Frank West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3307) granting an increase of pension to Lee Toms; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3308) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Thornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3309) granting an increase of pension to Sunley J. A. Thrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3310) granting an increase of pension to James H. Trenary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3311) granting an increase of pension to Albert Teets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3312) granting an increase of pension to Israel Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3313) granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Shivley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3314) granting an increase of pension to Andrew N. Stamm; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3315) granting an increase of pension to John L. Sumner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3316) granting an increase of pension to Alvis Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3317) granting an increase of pension to Madison Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3318) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Showalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3319) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Seward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3320) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Shively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3321) granting an increase of pension to John H. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3322) granting an increase of pension to Tyler B. Stearns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3323) granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Studley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) granting an increase of pension to James Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3325) granting an increase of pension to John Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3326) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Sprouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3327) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) granting an increase of pension to John J. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Rood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3330) granting an increase of pension to Washington A. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3331) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Penturff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3332) granting an increase of pension to George Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3333) granting an increase of pension to Neal J. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3334) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Park; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3335) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3336) granting an increase of pension to Smith A. Nicholson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3337) granting an increase of pension to Horace W. Nungesser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3338) granting an increase of pension to Clinton McMickle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3339) granting an increase of pension to Mary Moriarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3340) granting an increase of pension to William L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3341) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. McNair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3344) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Mather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3345) granting an increase of pension to Eli Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3346) granting an increase of pension to William L. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3347) granting an increase of pension to James P. Lewman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3348) granting an increase of pension to Jasper D. Lacy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) granting an increase of pension to William Lees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3350) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Lawler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) granting an increase of pension to Elvina Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3352) granting an increase of pension to William T. Kitchin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3353) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Hurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3354) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Howey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3355) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3356) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Hizar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) granting an increase of pension to Lyman U. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) granting an increase of pension to Shedrick Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) granting an increase of pension to Hugh D. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3361) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3362) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3363) granting an increase of pension to Temple H. Duff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3364) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3365) granting an increase of pension to Abijah Crow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Comer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) granting an increase of pension to Elmer R. Chamness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus D. Christy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) granting an increase of pension to Jason Cutler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) granting an increase of pension to Roth L. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3371) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3372) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Croll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. A. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Osmer C. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3374) granting an increase of pension to William W. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3375) granting an increase of pension to David D. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Connery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Bales; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Eliphaz C. Burnette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3379) granting an increase of pension to Roten Burchfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3380) granting an increase of pension to Jesse D. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3381) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3382) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Bendure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3383) granting an increase of pension to Jerome E. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3384) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3385) granting an increase of pension to David Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3386) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Bird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3387) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3388) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Abshear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3389) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3390) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3391) granting a pension to Sallie Jane West; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3392) granting a pension to Henry N. Wilks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3393) granting a pension to Albert B. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3394) granting a pension to Jasper N. Swisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3395) granting a pension to Madison M. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3396) granting a pension to Iva Sexton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3397) granting a pension to George F. Riffle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3398) granting a pension to Polly W. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3399) granting a pension to Paschal Y. Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3400) granting a pension to John W. Linder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3401) granting a pension to John S. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3402) granting a pension to William Lawler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3403) granting a pension to Catherine Killian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3404) granting a pension to Andrew M. Jordan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3405) granting a pension to Ruth C. Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3406) granting a pension to Pearl Halstead; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3407) granting a pension to Samuel Faust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3408) granting a pension to Charles B. Fessenden, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3409) granting a pension to Elizabeth Evinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3410) granting a pension to Catherine Malissa Kennedy Downs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3411) granting a pension to William T. Conklin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3412) granting a pension to Adam H. Constant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3413) granting a pension to James L. Canaday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3414) granting a pension to Charles F. Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3415) granting a pension to Sarah G. Bloxom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3416) granting a pension to George R. Bathe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3417) for the relief of William West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3418) for the relief of James Tulley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3419) for the relief of Thomas Todd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3420) for the relief of William Thornburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3421) for the relief of John W. Richardson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3422) for the relief of F. N. Perkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3423) for the relief of George W. McKean; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3424) for the relief of William Martinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3425) for the relief of Charles W. Munn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3426) for the relief of C. E. Moore; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3427) for the relief of Thomas F. Kelley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3428) for the relief of William A. J. Kerr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3429) for the relief of Samuel T. King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of Francis M. Hill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3431) for the relief of Benjamin F. Glore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3432) for the relief of Edward Griffith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3433) for the relief of William T. Grady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3434) for the relief of Benjamin Day; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3435) for the relief of Austin T. Dickerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3436) for the relief of Charles W. Cathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3437) for the relief of John Carr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3438) for the relief of John C. Bogard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3439) for the relief of E. A. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3440) for the relief of Edward L. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3441) for the relief of John Allen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3442) to correct the military record of Joshua O. Marks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3443) to amend the military record of George W. Cathus; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 3444) granting an increase of pension to William Esser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3445) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bolien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3446) granting an increase of pension to Mary Fanning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3447) granting an increase of pension to M. J. McRaith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3448) granting an increase of pension to Andrew K. M. Pickert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3449) granting an increase of pension to Dennis H. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3450) granting an increase of pension to Johnie E. Pogue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3451) granting an increase of pension to John T. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3452) granting an increase of pension to William A. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3453) granting an increase of pension to Georg Larson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3454) granting an increase of pension to John Phelan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3455) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Jordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3456) granting an increase of pension to James Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3457) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Schumacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3458) granting an increase of pension to Hermann Klein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3459) granting an increase of pension to George R. Creveling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3460) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3461) granting an increase of pension to David J. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3462) granting an increase of pension to Henry Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3463) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3464) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Grindle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3465) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3466) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Benney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3467) granting an increase of pension to Charles Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3468) granting an increase of pension to James Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3469) granting an increase of pension to John McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3470) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Auer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3471) granting an increase of pension to Mathew O'Regan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3472) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3473) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Logan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3474) granting an increase of pension to Max Yonker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3475) granting an increase of pension to John Phelan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3476) granting an increase of pension to Edward Lahey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3477) granting an increase of pension to Isaac O. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3478) granting an increase of pension to Frank Limpo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3479) granting an increase of pension to John Ghastin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3480) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3481) granting an increase of pension to John Sweeney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3482) granting an increase of pension to Charles Russe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3483) granting an increase of pension to Lester L. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3484) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Bacon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3485) granting an increase of pension to Fritz Janzen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3486) granting an increase of pension to John Gunnie, alias Alfred Michlette, alias Louis Alfred Michlette, alias Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3487) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Hanson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3488) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bolien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3489) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jeffers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3490) granting an increase of pension to Angela Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3491) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Eachus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3492) granting an increase of pension to John H. La Pointe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3493) granting an increase of pension to George H. Fisler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3494) granting an increase of pension to Alva M. Courtright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3495) granting an increase of pension to William Esser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3496) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Guptill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3497) granting an increase of pension to Maurice E. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3498) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3499) granting an increase of pension to George L. Vanderpool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3500) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Plemons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3501) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3502) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Foot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3503) granting an increase of pension to Martin King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to Martin P. Broberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3505) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Vine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3506) granting an increase of pension to William J. Courtney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3507) granting an increase of pension to Edward Lahey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3508) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Claus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3509) granting an increase of pension to Herman J. P. Schulz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3510) granting an increase of pension to Peter A. Livoni; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3511) granting an increase of pension to Martin P. Broberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3512) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. R. Forbes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3513) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Gram; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Albison Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3515) granting an increase of pension to Hugh B. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3516) granting an increase of pension to John Dooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3517) granting an increase of pension to William Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3518) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Merigold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3519) granting an increase of pension to John L. Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3520) granting an increase of pension to Alice L. Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3521) granting an increase of pension to James A. Shout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3522) granting an increase of pension to Henry Schaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3523) granting an increase of pension to William F. Towers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3524) granting an increase of pension to Sheldon F. Ketchum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3525) granting an increase of pension to James Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3526) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mininger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3527) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Cavanaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3528) granting a pension to Mariah Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3529) granting a pension to Stephen A. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3530) granting a pension to Fred Meyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3531) granting a pension to Jane F. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3532) granting a pension to James H. Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3533) granting a pension to Frank G. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3534) granting a pension to Anna Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3535) granting a pension to Frank D. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3536) for the relief of Patrick Powers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3537) for the relief of Thomas J. McCarty; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of Timothy Donahoe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3539) for the relief of Willie L. Cornwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3540) for the relief of Leonard Seis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3541) to remove the charge of desertion from record of Matthew Sloan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 3542) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3543) granting an increase of pension to Willard E. Waldron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3544) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Thorp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3545) granting an increase of pension to James E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3546) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Shults; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3547) granting an increase of pension to William Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3548) granting an increase of pension to John Shelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3549) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey Pickell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3550) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Osburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3551) granting an increase of pension to Allison M. Munn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3552) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Hoag; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3553) granting an increase of pension to Warren G. Griswold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3554) granting an increase of pension to Sidney D. Frost; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3555) granting an increase of pension to John B. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3556) granting an increase of pension to David Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3557) granting an increase of pension to William H. Conklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3558) granting an increase of pension to James Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3559) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Bolser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3560) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon L. Angel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3561) granting an increase of pension to George W. Steel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3562) granting an increase of pension to William C. Carnahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3563) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3564) granting an increase of pension to Michael Bronstetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3565) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3566) granting a pension to Frank D. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3567) granting a pension to California Haysmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3568) granting a pension to Harriet M. Hakes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3569) granting a pension to Rachel Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 3570) granting a pension to Freda Burow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3571) granting a pension to Elijah Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 3572) granting an increase of pension to George Bath; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3573) granting a pension to James A. Coyne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3574) for the relief of the estate of William F. Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3575) for the relief of the heirs of Amos A. Cordson and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3576) for the relief of the heirs at law of Charles Evans, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3577) for the relief of Jacob Cohen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3578) for the relief of Abraham Leffler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3579) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church of Darien, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3580) for the relief of the Lutheran Church of the Ascension of Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3581) for the relief of the White Baptist Church at Sunbury, in Liberty County, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3582) for the relief of the Jerusalem Evangelical Lutheran Church, Ebenezer, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3583) for the relief of the Importing & Exporting Co. of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 3584) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Van Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3585) granting a pension to Rachel Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 3586) for the relief of William J. Ahern, alias James Ahern; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 3587) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3588) granting an increase of pension to Isaac F. Lapham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3589) granting an increase of pension to Rufus N. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3590) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Goodwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3591) granting a pension to Sarah J. Hamlen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 3592) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3593) granting an increase of pension to Josephine M. B. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3594) granting an increase of pension to Thomas N. Thacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3595) granting an increase of pension to Nathan S. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3596) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3597) granting an increase of pension to Leander Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3598) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3599) granting an increase of pension to George H. Rock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3600) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe F. Malone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3601) granting a pension to Arthur W. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3602) granting a pension to William S. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3603) granting a pension to Stephen Easterbrooks Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3604) granting a pension to Ellen M. Ashley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3605) for the relief of Spencer Borden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3606) for the relief of Messrs. Darling and Slade; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 3607) granting a pension to Emma M. Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3608) granting a pension to Joseph McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3609) granting a pension to Mary E. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3610) granting a pension to Joseph W. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 3611) granting an increase of pension to James Carver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3612) granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3613) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Kunoski; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3614) granting an increase of pension to Humphrey Gallivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3615) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey A. Geer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3616) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin G. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3617) to correct the military record of Dwight Bromley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3618) to correct the military record of Charles H. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 3619) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Quick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3620) granting a pension to Daniel B. O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 3621) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3622) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Keefe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3623) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Buffum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 3624) for the relief of Killian Simon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 3625) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Paup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3626) granting an increase of pension to Adam F. Becker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 3627) granting an increase of pension to John Beazan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3628) granting an increase of pension to William H. Packwood, sr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3629) granting a pension to Louisa Jane Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3630) granting a pension to Daniel J. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 3631) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3632) granting an increase of pension to John H. Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3633) granting an increase of pension to John Mullin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3634) granting an increase of pension to George B. Priestly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3635) granting an increase of pension to William F. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3636) granting an increase of pension to Harvey W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3637) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3639) granting an increase of pension to Jeptha Pierson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Reahm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3641) granting an increase of pension to Frank H. Galbraith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3642) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey Cronk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) granting an increase of pension to John Coonrod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3645) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Allberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3646) granting an increase of pension to James W. Mackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3647) granting an increase of pension to James W. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3648) granting an increase of pension to John Dineen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3649) granting an increase of pension to Miles Zentmyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3650) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Maple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3651) granting an increase of pension to John Keeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3652) granting an increase of pension to Benton O. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3653) granting an increase of pension to Albert Kinnear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) granting an increase of pension to Hans H. Moeller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3655) granting an increase of pension to William H. Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3656) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Corby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Addington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) granting an increase of pension to William H. Strain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) granting an increase of pension to Abraham D. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Butt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) granting an increase of pension to Andre C. Chamberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Tuttle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3663) granting an increase of pension to Isaac T. Schriver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3664) granting an increase of pension to J. R. McCartney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3665) granting an increase of pension to George Franks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3666) granting a pension to D. R. Curas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3667) granting a pension to James D. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of William F. Norris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3669) to correct the military record of William McCormick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 3670) granting an increase of pension to Edwin H. Farnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3671) granting an increase of pension to John W. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 3672) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Hickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3673) granting an increase of pension to John M. Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3674) granting a pension to Anna Meilstrup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 3675) granting an increase of pension to George L. Causey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3676) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Mick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) granting an increase of pension to Jesse R. Hendrix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) granting a pension to T. P. Allmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) for the relief of Lucy Moore, widow, and the heirs of W. P. Moore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3680), for the relief of the Old School Presbyterian Church, of Helena, Phillips County, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3681) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3682) for the relief of Henry Shenep; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3683) for the relief of Thomas D. Ruffin, of Woodruff County, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3684) for the relief of the estate of James S. Ford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3685) for the relief of the estate of John Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3686) for the relief of the estate of Julia E. Rightor, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) for the relief of the estate of John Holleman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) for the relief of the estate of E. A. Mays, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) for the relief of heirs or estate of Mrs. M. A. Lanford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) for the relief of heirs or estate of Q. K. Underwood, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) for the relief of heirs of J. R. Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3692) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. D. E. Barrett and B. G. Beadle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) for the relief of the heirs of John McAnulty, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Elizabeth B. Higgins, as sole heir of Annie G. Higgins, Joel G. Higgins, and Brand Higgins in their own rights; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3695) to carry into effect the findings of fact of the Court of Claims in the case of Burns Polk, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3696) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of heirs of Alfred Mullins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3697) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Thaddeus C. Ferrell, Mattie U. Boykin, and Lula D. Meriwether; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the heirs of Allen J. Polk, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the First Baptist Church of Helena, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Richard D. Lamb and Ira M. Lamb, heirs of Caroline Lamb, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 3701) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Syfrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3702) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Wester; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3703) granting a pension to John J. Boggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3704) for the relief of A. Purdee; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3705) granting an increase of pension to James Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3706) granting an increase of pension to Sidney R. Wolcott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) granting an increase of pension to Elis F. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) granting an increase of pension to John L. Shipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3709) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) granting an increase of pension to Charles McBee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) granting an increase of pension to Lou Pitney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Lashley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) granting an increase of pension to Edward Kiniry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) granting an increase of pension to Levi L. Ferrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Edgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) granting an increase of pension to Fernando D. Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3717) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) granting an increase of pension to James P. Nesbitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3719) granting an increase of pension to Calvin R. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3720) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3721) granting an increase of pension to Martha H. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) granting an increase of pension to Aaron H. Keene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) granting a pension to Edgar G. Langston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3724) granting a pension to Thomas Inman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3725) granting a pension to Irving Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3726) granting a pension to Esther C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3727) granting a pension to George Washington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3728) granting a pension to Charles A. Van Atta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) granting a pension to Harriet Pringle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3730) granting a pension to Mattie J. Sarver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3731) granting a pension to Eliza Pettit; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3732) granting a pension to Hattie M. Pitcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3733) granting a pension to Edwina C. Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3734) granting a pension to John McRoberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3735) granting a pension to Emma R. Deyo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3736) granting a pension to Edward Dooley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3737) granting a pension to Sarah Feely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3738) granting a pension to Ruth A. Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3739) granting a pension to James Lawton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3740) granting a pension to William G. Neeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) granting a pension to Ellen J. Merritt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3742) granting a pension to Hanora Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3743) for the relief of Jose Felix Ulibarri; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) for the relief of Alfred J. Saynor; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3745) for the relief of Harriet M. Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3746) for the relief of Pete Jelovac; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3747) for the relief of Edwin M. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3748) for the relief of John M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3749) for the relief of Jesse W. Coleman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3750) for the relief of Charles A. W. Gordon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3751) for the relief of Felipe de Jesus Cantee; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3752) for the relief of Parintha McCluer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3753) for the relief of Acencion Lucero, widow of Gabriel Lucero, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3754) for the relief of Kit Carson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3755) to carry into effect the findings of the military board of officers in the case of George Ivers, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3756) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward H. Bergmann; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3757) granting to the city of La Junta, in the State of Colorado, certain lands for desert park and sky line drive purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3758) granting an honorable discharge to Seth Wardell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3759) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Carlisle and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3760) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles Coburn and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3761) removing the charge of desertion from the name of George A. McKenzie, alias William A. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3762) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Irick and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Holderby and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alexander B. Stevenson and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 3765) granting an increase of pension to William Anthony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3766) granting an increase of pension to William J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3767) granting an increase of pension to Bailey E. Poor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 3768) for the relief of Matthew Logan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3769) to grant an honorable discharge to Theodore N. Gates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3770) granting an increase of pension to William Menser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) granting an increase of pension to James S. Shoppard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3772) granting an increase of pension to John W. Lucore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3773) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3774) granting an increase of pension to Margery Isabella Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3775) for the relief of Mary Loy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 3776) granting an increase of pension to Mary Gorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3777) granting a pension to Katherine A. Belford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3778) granting a pension to Alice B. Homer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3779) for the relief of Patrick H. Murphy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3780) for the relief of William R. Boag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3781) for the relief of Maxwell Carpenter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3782) for the relief of John A. Ganley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3783) for the relief of Thomas C. Hyde; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3784) for the relief of Charles T. Hanson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3785) for the relief of Robert Downing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 3786) granting a pension to Barzillai H. Dersbem; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3787) granting a pension to John Boone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 3788) granting a pension to Joseph Younker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3789) for the relief of W. S. Curless, of California; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3790) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Very, jr.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 3791) granting an increase of pension to William W. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3792) granting an increase of pension to John Collar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3793) granting an increase of pension to William Glidewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3794) granting an increase of pension to Philip Farrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3795) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3796) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3797) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brookover, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3798) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3799) granting an increase of pension to Logan A. Tallman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3800) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Banning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3801) granting an increase of pension to Elijah G. Ballard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3802) granting an increase of pension to John T. Burriss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3803) granting an increase of pension to William T. Snow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3804) granting an increase of pension to Charity Breeding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3805) granting an increase of pension to George W. Sorrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3806) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3807) granting an increase of pension to James Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3808) granting an increase of pension to John C. Schnelle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3809) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Rosenbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3810) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. McClanahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3811) granting an increase of pension to James B. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3812) granting an increase of pension to Israel Sturges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3813) granting an increase of pension to Vincent Tharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3814) granting an increase of pension to John W. Toppass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3815) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Bruce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3816) granting an increase of pension to Melchert H. Raney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3817) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3818) granting an increase of pension to Howard Gittings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3819) granting an increase of pension to William J. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3820) granting an increase of pension to William Fleetwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Isaac West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3822) granting an increase of pension to John Fort; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3823) granting an increase of pension to Abraham H. Burkeholder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3824) granting an increase of pension to John E. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3825) granting an increase of pension to James Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3826) granting an increase of pension to James Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3827) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3828) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3829) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Quick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3830) granting an increase of pension to William M. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3831) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Buckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3832) granting a pension to Hugh W. Sawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3833) granting a pension to Thomas Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3834) granting a pension to Taylor Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3835) granting a pension to James M. Finnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3836) for the relief of McCarty and Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3837) granting an increase of pension to William S. Tweed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3838) granting a pension to Mary M. Steinback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3839) for the relief of William Slater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 3840) granting an increase of pension to Mathew K. Amyx; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3841) granting an increase of pension to Henry Cutbirth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3842) granting an increase of pension to George W. Plank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3843) granting an increase of pension to Edmond Melton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3844) granting an increase of pension to Paul E. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3845) granting an increase of pension to James A. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3846) granting an increase of pension to William F. Laton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3847) granting an increase of pension to Isaac A. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3848) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3849) granting an increase of pension to William J. Chinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3850) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3851) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fletcher, alias John W. Henley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3852) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bristol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3853) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3854) granting an increase of pension to Julia Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3855) granting a pension to Charles C. Mauch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3856) granting a pension to Amanda E. Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3857) granting a pension to Samuel Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3858) granting a pension to Isham M. Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3859) granting a pension to Carl Schrock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3860) granting a pension to Benjamin B. Bast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3861) granting a pension to Walter P. Chatham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3862) granting a pension to Wilson Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3863) granting a pension to Richard A. Gamble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3864) granting a pension to Catherine Wagener; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3865) granting a pension to Alfred R. D Hamby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3866) for the relief of William R. Mc Lane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3867) for the relief of James W. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 3868) granting an increase of pension to John H. Herring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3869) granting an increase of pension to James G. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3870) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Robertson, alias Charles D. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 3871) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3872) granting an increase of pension to David Kronk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3873) granting an increase of pension to James Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3874) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Rairden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3875) granting an increase of pension to Perry Workman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3876) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wiggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3877) granting an increase of pension to Darius M. Smeltzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3878) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Corn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3879) granting an increase of pension to William M. Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3880) granting an increase of pension to William Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3881) granting a pension to Mary A. Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3882) for the relief of the estate of Robert Barker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3883) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 3884) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. Pixley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3885) granting an increase of pension to William B. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3886) granting an increase of pension to William M. Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3887) granting an increase of pension to Melissa Fisk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3888) granting an increase of pension to William Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3889) granting an increase of pension to John W. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3890) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3891) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3892) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Altman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3893) granting an increase of pension to Jasper Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3894) granting an increase of pension to David L. Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3895) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Irey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3896) granting an increase of pension to Peter Findling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3897) granting an increase of pension to Russell B. Conant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3898) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah C. Chaffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3899) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3900) granting an increase of pension to John Ashenhurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3901) granting an increase of pension to George S. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3902) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3903) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3904) granting an increase of pension to John Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3905) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3906) granting an increase of pension to Truman Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3907) granting an increase of pension to Mary Highland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3908) granting an increase of pension to Peter Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3909) granting an increase of pension to John D. Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3910) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Suver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3911) granting an increase of pension to Matthew R. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3912) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bedell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3913) granting an increase of pension to Anna Elizabeth Botsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3914) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3915) granting an increase of pension to Joel Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3916) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Leport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3917) granting an increase of pension to Noah T. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3918) granting an increase of pension to Lucian L. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3919) granting an increase of pension to William Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3920) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wayne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3921) granting an increase of pension to Allen M. Gibbons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3922) granting an increase of pension to William R. Milot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3923) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Denny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3924) granting an increase of pension to James E. Winegardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3925) granting an increase of pension to John W. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3926) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3927) granting an increase of pension to John D. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3928) granting an increase of pension to William Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3929) granting an increase of pension to John S. Windsor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3930) granting an increase of pension to Willard B. Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3931) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Kemper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3932) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Hughey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3933) granting an increase of pension to Isaac T. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3934) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Gunder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3935) granting an increase of pension to Martin Modie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3936) granting an increase of pension to Anna N. Burnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3937) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Swank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3938) granting a pension to Jeanette Blandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3939) granting a pension to Bertha Greaves; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3940) granting a pension to Pearl L. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3941) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3942) granting a pension to Frances E. McKenna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3943) granting a pension to Kate Lackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3944) granting a pension to Nancy Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3945) granting a pension to Anna L. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3946) granting a pension to Aschah Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3947) granting a pension to Grace L. Finsterwald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3948) granting a pension to John H. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3949) granting a pension to George A. De Voe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3950) granting a pension to Winfield S. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3951) granting a pension to James M. Polsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3952) granting a pension to Sarah Needham; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3953) granting a pension to Martha A. Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3954) granting a pension to Celia Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3955) granting a pension to Charles McCollister; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3956) granting a pension to Rhoda Allwine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3957) for the relief of Isaac Thompson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3958) for the relief of the heirs of Charles E. Stump; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3959) for the relief of Philip Reiss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3960) for the relief of William C. McCoy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3961) for the relief of Raymond R. Ridenour; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3962) for the relief of Capt. Wilson Strickler, Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3963) for the relief of Peter W. Wigginton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of Robert W. Caldwell, First Regiment Ohio Heavy Artillery Volunteers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3965) to correct the military record of William C. Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3966) to correct the military record of W. F. Barr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 3967) granting an increase of pension to John R. Fugill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3968) granting an increase of pension to Noah Switzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3969) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3970) granting a pension to James F. Lingafelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Richard Franklin Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Allen Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Arthur D. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of James K. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Daniel W. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph R. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Amanxel L. Spore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Samuel L. D. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of William Mapel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Sandy Valley Grange, No. 1764, of Mineral City, Ohio, in opposition to the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of the New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, in favor of the reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Atlantic Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, Atlantic, Pa., and Lake Shore Grange, Girard, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petitions of Bugby Grange, No. 1639, of Kingsville, Ohio, and Denmark Grange, No. 1544, of Dorset, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Kent, Barberton, Cuyahoga Falls, Cortland, Mineral Ridge, Girard, Niles, Warren, Newton Falls, and Ravenna, Ohio, against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition of George R. Johnson and 29 others, of Freeland, Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Resolution of the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring a permanent independent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest adopted at meeting on March 29, 1911, by the Cleveland (Ohio) Federation of Labor, against any intervention by the United States in the affairs of Mexico for the purpose of suppressing the present insurrection; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Resolutions of citizens of Brookings, S. Dak., against mobilizing the United States Army on the border line of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: Petitions of New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, International Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union, New York, and Union League Club of New York City, in favor of Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, reaffirming its concurrence in the recommendations of the Park Commission; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Miami Chapter of the American Woman's League, of Miami, Fla., asking investigation of the Post Office Department ruling in matter of the Woman's National Daily; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the retention of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Wisconsin and of Arkansaw, Wis., and resolutions of town meeting in the town of York, Clark County, Wis., in opposition to reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of citizens of Arkansaw, Wis., against interference of the United States with Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the executive committee of the Lake Michigan Sanitary Association, of Chicago, urging Congress to consider and enact legislation looking to the investigation of conditions, the determination of practical remedies, and the inauguration of administration machinery as may effectively offer and enforce protection and relief; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolution of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring the passage of the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, reaffirming its concurrence in the recommendations of the Park Commission and urging upon the Lincoln Memorial Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts their adoption of a site proposed in said report; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of the Union League Club, of New York, asking for necessary legislation for reciprocity with Canada; of the New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, favoring reciprocity treaty between United States and Canada; and of the American Tariff League, opposing adoption of the Canadian tariff agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petitions of William Ellwood, of De Kalb, Ill., in opposition to Canadian tariff agreement, and of the Congress of the Knights of Labor, against the pulp and paper provisions of the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Ottawa, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenses in the Interior Department.

Also, petitions of W. H. Fowlie, of Utica, Ill., for increase of pay of clerks in third-class post offices, and of E. J. Lockreim and others, of Gardner, Ill., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Miles Boland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Oyster Growers and Dealers' Association of North America, favoring the proposed tariff agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of numerous farmers of Michigan, urging that the Canadian reciprocity bill should not become a law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of farmers, business men, and citizens of Sharon and vicinity, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of La Moure and Norma, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of a local rural parcels-post service on rural free-delivery routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of the Willimantic (Conn.) Woman's Club, for repeal of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Roswell A. Benedict, of Norwalk, Conn., and of Brooklyn County Grange, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of Otto Horsmann and others, of Gillett, Wis., urging immediate withdrawal of the American Army from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of the Socialists of Wadena, Minn., protesting against Mexican intervention; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Rotary Club, of St. Paul, Minn., urging passage of Canadian reciprocity bill, and of citizens and farmers of Lake George, Stearns County, Minn., protesting against passage of bill for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER: Petitions of citizens of Minnesota, asking for the recall of American troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of 16 citizens of El Reno, Okla., favoring a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolutions of the Business Men's Association of Pawtucket, R. I., in favor of the reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Petition of the Orr Felt & Blanket Co., of Piqua, Ohio, against the enactment of the reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of numerous citizens of Massachusetts, including the towns of Charlestown, Lynn, and Somerville, favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Rotary Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., asking for the passage of the bill appropriating $50,000 for Rainier National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of California, urging the building of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, urging upon the Lincoln Memorial Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts their adoption of a site for said memorial west of the Washington Monument; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Niagara Alkali Co., urging an import duty of at least 2 cents per pound on all caustic potash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Stereotypers' Union No. 1, of New York, approving the pending reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petitions of Logan County Pomona Grange, No. 3, and Harrison Grange, of Bellefontaine, Ohio; of Cyrus Zimmerman, H. C. Marsh, and other members of Canaan Grange, No. 857, Amlin, Ohio; and of G. C. Groat, C. W. Lease, and O. M. Dirmeyer, a committee representing Pomona Grange, Hardin County, Ohio, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. E. Todd and other members of Greenwood Lodge, No. 341, International Association of Machinists, Delaware, Ohio, in favor of the enactment of a law providing for the reading or illiteracy test of immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 11, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. CARY and Mr. KAHN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

LIST OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a list of the chairmen and the members of the standing committees of the House and move their election by the House of Representatives (H. Res. 77).

The Clerk read as follows:

Elections No. 1.—Messrs. Ansberry (chairman), Edwards, Collier, Covington, Holland, Patten of New York, Prouty, Matthews, and Willis.

Elections No. 2.—Messrs. Hamill (chairman), Korbly, Broussary, Linthicum, Allen, Jacoway, Nelson, Switzer, and Anderson of Minnesota.

Elections No. 3.—Messrs. Goldfogle (chairman), Carlin, Wickliffe, Whitacre, Davis of West Virginia, Goodwin of Arkansas, Cooper, McKenzie, and Harris.

Ways and Means.—Messrs. Underwood (chairman), Randell of Texas, Harrison of New York, Brantley, Shackleford, Kitchin, James, Rainey, Dixon of Indiana, Hughes of New Jersey, Hull, Hammond, Peters, Palmer, Payne, Dalzell, McCall, Hill, Needham, Fordney, and Longworth.

Appropriations.—Messrs. Fitzgerald (chairman), Burleson, Sherley, Bartlett, Johnson of South Carolina, Page, Saunders, McHenry, Rauch, Byrns of Tennessee, Sisson, Kinkead of New Jersey, Cox of Ohio, Borland, Cannon, Bingham, Gillett, Taylor of Ohio, Malby, Dwight, and Good.

The Judiciary.—Messrs. Clayton (chairman), Henry of Texas, Webb, Carlin, Rucker of Missouri, Houston, Floyd of Arkansas, Thomas, Graham, Dupre, Littleton, McCoy, Davis of West Virginia, McGillicuddy, Sterling, Moon of Pennsylvania, Higgins, Howland, Nye, Norris, and Dodds.

Banking and Currency.—Messrs. Pujo (chairman), Glass, Talbott of Maryland, Taylor of Alabama, Moore of Texas, Latta, Korbly, Brown, Bulkley, Doughton, Stephens of Mississippi, Daugherty, Kindred, Byrnes of South Carolina, Vreeland, McMorran, McCreary, Hayes, McKinney, Guernsey, and Campbell.

Coinage, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. Hardwick (chairman), Riordan, Ashbrook, Carlin, Ransdell of Louisiana, Burgess, Tuttle, Donohoe, Reilly, Curley, Griest, Heald, Lindbergh, Thistlewood, Mott, Utter, La Follette, Rees, and Kalanianaole.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce.—Messrs. Adamson (chairman), Richardson, Sims, Smith of Texas, Broussard, Goldfogle, Hamlin, Sabath, Martin of Colorado, Covington, Cullop, Gould, Doremus, Goeke, Stevens of Minnesota, Esch, Knowland, Calder, Hamilton of Michigan, Michael E. Driscoll, and Martin of South Dakota.

Rivers and Harbors.—Messrs. Sparkman (chairman), Ransdell of Louisiana, Burgess, Humphreys of Mississippi, Taylor of Alabama, Ellerbe, Edwards, Small, Booher, Gallagher, Boehne, Daniel A. Driscoll, Donohoe, Scully, Lawrence, Davidson, Young of Michigan, Rodenberg, Humphrey of Washington, Kennedy, and Barchfeld.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries.—Messrs. Alexander (chairman), Hardy, Robinson, Wilson of Pennsylvania, Carter, Barnhart, Collier, Ayres, Thayer, Burke of Wisconsin, Stone, Young of Texas, Post, Faison, Greene, Humphrey of Washington, Henry of Connecticut, Hinds, Porter, Stephens of California, and Parran.

Agriculture.—Messrs. Lamb (chairman), Lever, Beall of Texas, Stanley, Lee of Georgia, Candler, Heflin, McDermott, Wickliffe, Maguire of Nebraska, Kipp, Whitacre, Talcott of New York, Rubey, Haugen, McLaughlin, Hawley, Howell, Hanna, Plumley, Simmons, and Andrews.

Foreign Affairs.—Messrs. Sulzer (chairman), Flood of Virginia, Garner, Legare, Sharp, Cline, Levy, Curley, Linthicum, Difenderfer, Goodwin of Arkansas, Stedman, Townsend, Harrison of Mississippi, Foster of Vermont, McKinley, Cooper, Wood of New Jersey, Bartholdt, Fairchild, and Kendall.

Military Affairs.—Messrs. Hay (chairman), Slayden, Gordon, Dent, Watkins, Conry, Hughes of Georgia, Fields, Lewis, Sweet, Patten of New York, Pepper, Evans, Hamilton of West Virginia, Prince, Kahn, Burke of Pennsylvania, Bradley, Anthony, Tilson, Ames, and Wickersham.

Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Padgett (chairman), Gregg of Texas, Talbott of Maryland, Hobson, Macon, Estopinal, Riordan, Turnbull, Tribble, Witherspoon, Hensley, Buchanan, Bathrick, Lee of Pennsylvania, Foss, Loudenslager, Butler, Roberts of Massachusetts, Loud, Bates, and Kopp.

The Post Office and Post Roads.—Messrs. Moon of Tennessee (chairman), Finley, Lloyd, Bell of Georgia, Cox of Indiana, Wilson of New York, Mays, Tuttle, Rouse, Fowler, Blackmon, Gregg of Pennsylvania, Allen, Reilly, Weeks, Gardner of New Jersey, Murdock, Samuel W. Smith, Lafean, Steenerson, Madden, and Cameron.

The Public Lands.—Messrs. Robinson (chairman), Graham, Ferris, Taylor of Colorado, Beall of Texas, Estopinal, Dent, Raker, Godwin of North Carolina, Claypool, Murray, Maher, Rubey, George, Mondell, Volstead, Smith of California, Pray, Morgan, Pickett, Speer, and Andrews.

Indian Affairs.—Messrs. Stephens of Texas (chairman), Latta, Ferris, Carter, Gudger, Rucker of Colorado, Russell, Konop, Smith of New York, Jacoway, Post, Burke of South Dakota, Campbell, McGuire of Oklahoma, Miller, Patton of Pennsylvania, Jackson, Warburton, Helgesen, and Cameron.

The Territories.—Messrs. Flood of Virginia (chairman), Houston, Humphreys of Mississippi, Legare, Booher, Hardy, Martin of Colorado, Davenport, Holland, Connell, Draper, Guernsey, Langham, Wedemeyer, Willis, Young of Kansas, Andrews, Wickersham, Cameron, and Kalanianaole.

Insular Affairs.—Messrs. Jones (chairman), Garrett, Denver, Fornes, Helm, Clark of Florida, Morrison, Dickson of Mississippi, Dickinson, Davenport, Callaway, Littlepage, Howard, Murray, Olmsted, Crumpacker, Fuller, Hubbard, Davis of Minnesota, Morse of Wisconsin, Towner, and Rivera.

Railways and Canals.—Messrs. Korbly (chairman), Sharp, Broussard, Ellerbe, Gordon, Conry, O'Shaunessy, Harrison of Mississippi, Davidson, Kendall, Matthews, Wilder, and La Follette.

Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Foster of Illinois (chairman), Wilson of Pennsylvania, Taylor of Colorado, Moss of Indiana, White, Fields, Gregg of Pennsylvania, Daugherty, Littlepage, Howell, Pray, Slemp, Switzer, Bowman, and Cameron.

Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Sheppard (chairman), Burnett, Clark of Florida, Cantrill, Roddenbery, Glass, Ashbrook, Barnhart, Gudger, Underhill, Andrus, Austin, Nelson, French, Towner, Copley, and Hartman.

Education.—Messrs. Lever (chairman), Ansberry, Garner, Hobson, Hughes of Georgia, Stack, Thayer, Kindred, Burke of Pennsylvania, Volstead, Cary, Farr, Powers, and Akin of New York.

Labor.—Messrs. Wilson of Pennsylvania (chairman), Hensley, Maher, Rouse, Lewis, Howard, Buchanan, Gray, Gardner of New Jersey, Vreeland, Madison, Hawley, and J. M. C. Smith.

Patents.—Messrs. Oldfield (chairman), Morrison, Webb, Clark of Florida, Alexander, Bulkley, Littleton, Callaway, Witherspoon, Currier, Henry of Connecticut, Wilson of Illinois, Lenroot, and Wilder.

Invalid Pensions.—Messrs. Sherwood (chairman), Lindsay, Anderson of Ohio, Adair, Russell, Kipp, Jacoway, Burke of Wisconsin, Hamilton of West Virginia, Fields, Sulloway, Bradley, Fuller, Thistlewood, Langham, and Langley.

Pensions.—Messrs. Richardson (chairman), Dickson of Mississippi, Daniel A. Driscoll, Aiken of South Carolina, Wilson of New York, Rucker of Colorado, Gray, White, Difenderfer, Wood of New Jersey, Sells, Rees, Crago, Utter, and Anderson of Minnesota.

Claims.—Messrs. Pou (chairman), Maguire of Nebraska, Dies, Cantrill, Dickinson, Levy, Stephens of Mississippi, Fowler, Francis, Lindbergh, Heald, Woods of Iowa, Mott, Mitchell, and Farr.

War Claims.—Messrs. Sims (chairman), Gregg of Texas, Lee of Georgia, Thomas, Byrnes of South Carolina, Ayres, Connell, Pepper, Stone, Morse of Wisconsin, Plumley, Danforth, Sloan, J. M. C. Smith, and Sells.

The District of Columbia.—Messrs. Johnson of Kentucky (chairman), Aiken of South Carolina, Rothermel, Hamill, Adair, Anderson of Ohio, Dies, Oldfield, O'Shaunessy, George, Stack, Lobeck, Redfield, Konig, Moore of Pennsylvania, Kahn, Cary, Sulloway, Dyer, De Forest, and Berger.

Revision of the Laws.—Messrs. Watkins (chairman), Morrison, Cullop, Raker, Francis, Gould, Young of Texas, Moon of Pennsylvania, Danforth, McKenzie, and Harris.

Reform in the Civil Service.—Messrs. Godwin of North Carolina (chairman), Finley, Pujo, Carter, Dies, Boehne, Dupre, Talcott of New York, Gillett, Young of Kansas, Kent, and Prouty.

Election of President, Vice President, etc.—Messrs. Rucker of Missouri (chairman), Conry, Turnbull, Hobson, Thomas, Stedman, Tribble, Claypool, Olmsted, Young of Michigan, Slemp, Danforth, and Porter.

Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.—Messrs. Candler (chairman), Sabath, Gregg of Texas, Edwards, Francis, Lee of Pennsylvania, Smith of New York, Barchfeld, Pray, Longworth, and Roberts of Nevada.

Irrigation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. Smith of Texas (chairman), Pujo, Ellerbe, Rucker of Colorado, Hughes of Georgia, Taylor of Colorado, Raker, Smith of New York, Kinkaid of Nebraska, Greene, Andrus, Roberts of Nevada, and Lafferty.

Immigration and Naturalization.—Messrs. Burnett (chairman), Sabath, Moore of Texas, Adair, Goldfogle, Bell of Georgia, Curley, Brown, Konig, Gardner of Massachusetts, Hayes, Moore of Pennsylvania, Catlin, Helgesen, and Powers.

Expenditures in the State Department.—Messrs. Hamlin (chairman), Dent, Roddenbery, Stephens of Mississippi, Davis of Minnesota, Tilson, and Wedemeyer.

Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Cox of Indiana (chairman), Garrett, Lobeck, Goeke, Hill, Young of Michigan, and Morgan.

Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. Helm (chairman), Booher, Martin of Colorado, Bulkley, Hinds, Speer, and Warburton.

Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. Hardy (chairman), Sherwood, Doremus, Faison, McKinley, McMorran, and Miller.

Expenditures in the Post Office Department.—Messrs. Ashbrook (chairman), Alexander, Redfield, McCoy, Austin, Slemp, and Towner.

Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Graham (chairman), Ferris, George, Hensley, Mondell, Hanna, and Catlin.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. Beall of Texas (chairman), Macon, Cantrill, Murray, Hubbard, Howland, and Porter.

Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Moss of Indiana (chairman), Floyd of Arkansas, Mays, Doughton, Higgins, French, and Sloan.

Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.—Messrs. Rothermel (chairman), McDermott, Young of Texas, McGillicuddy, McGuire of Oklahoma, Madden, and Patton of Pennsylvania.

Expenditures on Public Buildings.—Messrs. Cline (chairman), Konop, Blackmon, Bathrick, Henry of Connecticut, Esch, and McLaughlin.

Rules.—Messrs. Henry of Texas (chairman), Pou, Hardwick, Stanley, Garrett, Foster of Illinois, Denver, Dalzell, Wilson of Illinois, Madison, and Lenroot.

Accounts.—Messrs. Lloyd (chairman), Garner, Floyd of Arkansas, Fornes, Latta, Roddenbery, ———, Hughes of West Virginia, Currier, Draper, and Griest.

Mileage.—Messrs. Lee of Pennsylvania (chairman), Konop, Scully, Kennedy, and Lafferty.

The Census.—Messrs. Houston (chairman), Small, Bell of Georgia, Moore of Texas, Helm, Rothermel, Cline, Gallagher, Russell, Holland, Crumpacker, Hughes of West Virginia, Langley, Stephens of California, Crago, and Mitchell.

The Library.—Messrs. Slayden (chairman), Townsend, Evans, Gardner of Massachusetts, and Pickett.

Printing.—Messrs. Finley (chairman), Barnhart, and Focht.

Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. Cravens (chairman), Ayres, Thayer, Whitacre, Anthony, Parran, and Akin of New York.

Industrial Arts and Expositions.—Messrs. Heflin (chairman), Collier, Cullop, Covington, Cravens, Turnbull, White, Sweet, Hamilton of West Virginia, Underhill, Rodenberg, Woods of Iowa, Kahn, Bowman, and Kent.

Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.—Messrs. Talbott of Maryland (chairman) and McCreary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state to the House that on this list of committees that I have sent to the Clerk's desk there are two Democratic vacancies, one on the Committee on Accounts, which was created by an amendment to the rules after the Democratic caucus had adopted the list of Democratic members, and the other on the Committee on Revision of the Laws, which was left vacant through a mistake. I understand that there are five or six places that the minority have left vacant, which, of course, will be at their disposition to fill at any time.

Mr. MANN. There being two vacancies in the membership, which may possibly be filled by minority Members later.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, if the gentleman from Illinois desires to occupy any time on the question I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire simply to ask a question for information. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER] charged to the minority?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He is charged to the minority.

Mr. KENDALL. And his position on committees is to be deducted from the minority membership?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely. It has always been that way.

Mr. KENDALL. I simply wanted to inquire whether the majority had refused to recognize his right to representation upon committees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all. Mr. BERGER is not a member of the majority party. He belongs to a party that is not in control in this House, and all parties that are not in control in this House belong to the minority. We gave Mr. BERGER the place on the committee on which he desired to be placed.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has criticized the Democratic side of the House because of the fact that it had increased some of the large committees of the House to 21 members, and of those members taken 14 and given 7 to the minority. I do not think it is a serious charge, but as I desire the RECORD to state our position in the matter, I have prepared a statement, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask the Clerk to read in my time, so that it may appear in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under a resolution of the Democratic caucus 15 committees of the House were increased to 21 members, to be divided 14 to the majority and 7 to the minority.

The representation of the two parties on these committees in the last Congress and in the present one is as follows:

Committees.	Sixty-first Congress.		Sixty-second Congress.	
	Democrats.	Republicans.	Democrats.	Republicans.
1. Agriculture	7	12	14	7
2. Appropriations	6	11	14	7
3. Banking and Currency	7	12	14	7
4. District of Columbia	7	12	14	7
5. Foreign Affairs	7	12	14	7
6. Interstate and Foreign Commerce	6	12	14	7
7. Judiciary	6	12	14	7
8. Merchant Marine and Fisheries	7	12	14	7
9. Military Affairs	7	13	14	7
10. Naval Affairs	7	12	14	7
11. Insular Affairs	7	12	14	7
12. Post Offices and Post Roads	6	13	14	7
13. Public Lands	7	13	14	7
14. Rivers and Harbors	8	12	14	7
15. Ways and Means	7	12	14	7
Total	102	182	210	105

In the Sixty-first Congress there were 215 Republicans and 176 Democrats and independents when the committees were made up. In the Sixty-second Congress (the present one) there are 227 Democrats and 164 Republicans and independents.

These 15 committees had an aggregate membership in the Sixty-first Congress of 284 members, and in this Congress of 315. The Democratic minority had 102 places in the last Congress, and the Republican minority has been given 105 places in this Congress, an increase of three places, but the total membership of these committees has been increased from 284 to 315, so to maintain the relative proportion of numbers the equation would be as 284, the total number in the Sixty-first Congress, is to 102, the representation accorded the Democrats by the Republicans, as would 315 be to the number the minority would be entitled to if they had maintained their relative number in the House. 284 : 102 : : 315 : x=113.

The answer of course would be 113, but the Republicans came back with only 164 Members, as compared to 176 for the Democrats in the former Congress, so to ascertain what their relative strength on these committees should be, the equation would be to compare 164 Members with 113 committee places, as 176 Members would compare with the answer. 164 : 113 : : 176 : x=105.

The resulting answer is 105 Members on the 15 committees that were increased in numbers, and this is exactly what the Democrats gave the Republican minority on these committees.

On the other committees in the House the Republicans were given the same representation that the Democrats had before in the same proportion of members to the relative size of the committees, notwithstanding the fact that the Republican minority is much smaller in members than was the Democratic minority in the last Congress. So that the Republicans have more places in proportion to the number of places on the committees and their Members in the House than was accorded the Democrats in the last Congress by the Republicans.

Six committees were abolished because they were a useless charge on the Treasury, the Democrats losing 44 and the Republicans 30 places, as they were apportioned in the last Congress.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I notice that in the figures that the gentleman gives he charges to the Republicans on committees the Delegates of the last Congress. Does the gentleman think that that is a fair representation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not in this list of committees. There is no Delegate on this proposition at all.

Mr. MANN. I will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Clerk just read that in the last House the Republicans had 13 on the Committee on Military Affairs and the Democrats 7. That included the Delegates. There are other cases in the same list. Evidently whoever prepared that did not consider the difference between a voting member of the committee and a looking-on member.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The only men who were put on this committee as Delegates were placed there because the places were created as unanimous-consent places, and of course, if the gentleman has the Delegates to fill the places, he is chargeable with them. If we had had the Delegates, we would have been chargeable with them also.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands that under the rules the number on a committee is fixed at a certain figure and Delegates are not included in that number at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They are on some committees.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; in no case is a Delegate included as a part of the membership of a committee where the number of the committee is given. In every case the Delegate is an additional member of the committee, made by the rules an additional member and not a portion of the number fixed by the rules, but in the gentleman's figures he has included the Delegates as part of the number on the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On which committee?

Mr. MANN. The Military Affairs is one. I caught others; at least one other, as they were being read. I will not undertake to say which it was.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is mistaken in his statement, but if I did include one it would not change the equation.

Mr. MANN. More than one——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. The figures will speak for themselves.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not intend to change them.

Mr. MANN. I know the gentleman does not intend to do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois this: He has charged this side of the House, in the public press, with being unfair to the minority. Now, I want to say to him that when we increased these 15 big committees to the size of 21 and took two-thirds for our side and one-third for his side we, in the first place, gave him two more Members—three more Members—he could find places for on that side of the House than we had in the last Congress.

Mr. MANN. Two more is correct.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. More than that, on these 15 committees when you work out the relative proportion of the membership of the two sides of this House you have got identically on these committees the same proportion to-day that we had in the last Congress, and you can not figure it any other way. That proportion, if you work out the ratio in proportion to the membership, is 105 places and we have given 105 places. Now, more than that, on all the other committees of this House, many of them important committees, although we increase our majority over your majority, there we not only give you as many places as we had before, but we have given you a few additional places to what we had before on these committees. We have not cut you down at all. More than that, this is the first time in the history of this House, so far as the memory of man runs to it, when a majority of this House has allowed the minority leader to bring a list of committee assignments to their committee and accept his assignment of his own people to represent his own party without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." [Loud and continued applause on the Democratic side.] It does not lie in the mouth of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois to charge this side of the Chamber with unfairness when he knows and I know, without calling names, that in the making up of the great committees of this House in the past men have been put on the committees to represent the minority side of the House who he knows and I know did not represent the political principles of the party to which they were charged. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Alabama answer one question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If I can.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Has there ever been an instance throughout this whole country's history up to the present day when the minority party has been allowed such a small proportional share of representation on committees?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; in the last Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is that true of the important committees?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You asked me in reference to all the committees.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I asked you if it is true of the important committees, the ones which are under discussion, and not the small and unimportant committees which you have abolished.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me to answer him, I will say that I have already stated that in these 15 great committees the proportion in the number of the majority and the number of the minority—the relative proportion—on those committees to-day is identically what it was two years ago. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And on the smaller committees of the House you have a larger proportion of representation than we had two years ago.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in his facts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not entirely mistaken. I will ask the gentleman in what instance?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has asked you whether or not in the history of Congress any such proportion of representation was given to the minority on important committees. I desire to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in the Fifty-first Congress, known as the "Reed" Congress, where the representation was 166 Republicans to 159 Democrats, a majority of only 7, the Speaker only allowed a representation on the important committees, like Ways and Means—which consisted of 13 members—of the Democrats 5 members and the Republicans 8, and that upon the Committee on Appropriations, consisting of 15 members, the Democrats were only permitted to have 6, and that on the Judiciary Committee they were allowed the same proportion, and on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, consisting of 17 members, the Republicans were given 10 members and the Democrats 7? That was when the Republicans came back to power in the Fifty-first Congress. Is it not a fact that in this Congress the representation given by the majority to the Republicans now is far more favorable to the Republicans than was given to the Democrats by the Republican majority for the last 20 years when the Republicans had control?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no doubt the gentleman is right.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has had read at the Clerk's desk a complicated problem in mathematics, which even an expert or actuary would not be able to comprehend in its entirety without examining it. I want a few simple facts from the gentleman. I gathered from those figures that whereas on those 15 principal committees in the last Congress the majority had 182 members it now has 210. Is that correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No, sir. You are entirely mistaken. The majority in the last Congress had 248.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Members of the 15 committees referred to?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Two hundred and forty-eight members of these 15 committees.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Wait a minute. In the Sixty-first Congress the majority—that is, the Republican Party—had 182 members.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is precisely what I said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And in this Congress the majority has 210.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is precisely what I inquired. That makes the majority gaining, by this readjustment of committees, 28 members, the difference between 182 and 210.

Mr. MANN. That includes five Delegates.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. As to that I am not aware.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. I will refer him to my list.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The minority on these 15 committees in the last Congress had 102 members.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I understood from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] the other day that the Republicans now actually have only 104 instead of 105.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the gentleman is making a speech and not asking a question.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I am asking for the facts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will give the facts.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If I understand correctly, the minority has upon these 15 committees now, under the claim of the gentleman from Alabama, three more members than before.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman upon what hypothesis or theory he is endeavoring to convince the minority that it has the same proportion of the increase of the membership of these committees, when there has been an increase in the entire 15 committees of 31 members and the majority has taken an increase of 28 and the minority 3, or less than one-ninth of the increase?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It might be an impossible proposition for me to try to convince my distinguished friend of anything on this subject, but I want to say this: If you had received your proportion of increase in this Congress, without regard to the loss of Members, if the membership had been identically the same, the number of places you would have been entitled to on these 15 committees would have been 113 instead of 105. But you lost a number of men in proportionate representation. You have 25 less, or about that, and when you work out your relative proportion in loss of Members, it brings you down to 105, identically the number that we have given.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit me to say just a word before I take my seat, I want to say it certainly will be impossible of demonstration; we have not the time at this moment to make the computation; but when out of an increase of 31 members the minority is given only 3 of the increase and the majority 28, or nine times as many, the minority certainly has not been treated the same as the majority.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If you work out the equation, you will find out.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that I will work it out, and I will later give the result.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Alabama to yield just for a little statement. The gentleman has stated, as I understood now, that the majority membership of these committees in the last House was 182. The gentleman must be in error about that, unless he has included the 5 Delegates. The actual majority membership representation in the last House was 177.

The gentleman has also stated that the minority representation was 102. The actual minority membership representation was 103.

Now, the gentleman's side has increased the committees by 35. It has given to the minority 2 of the increase, 1 going to the Republicans and 1 to the Socialists, and the gentleman's side has taken 33 of the increase. How, then, can the gentleman say that the proportion is the same, when, with a majority of 16 Members they get 33 more places on the 15 leading committees, which is more than two places to a Member, and when the fact is that the representation on the committees does not equal one place to a Member?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I stated the equation. In adding up the minority places on these committees—I think the total is 102—the gentleman's arithmetic does not agree with mine in one place. Possibly the gentleman is right. Possibly I am right.

But I want to say this further to the gentleman from Illinois: It is a well-known fact in this House that when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was made up, of which he had the honor to be the distinguished chairman, it was understood that it was made up at his suggestion and at his request at the last Congress, and when he suggested the making up of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee there were 12 Republicans and 6 Democrats placed on that committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is in the proportion of two to one.

When we made up these great legislative committees, not attempting to take any of your representation and place it at the weak points, but giving you full opportunity to place your battle line as strong as you can, we have only taken the proportionate representation that the gentleman from Illinois thought was fair in making up his own great committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I think it is due to me to say that I did not make up the committee. That ends that argument.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was so understood.

Mr. CANNON rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield to me for five minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield whatever time the gentleman desires.

Mr. CANNON. Three minutes or five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the reading of the percentage statement by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Frankly, it seems to me that in effect the statement darkens counsel where the fact is patent. The gentleman has referred to the organization of the House for four Congresses in the past, and more particularly I take it to the organization of the House in the Sixty-first Congress. There never has been a time in the history of the Government when the House could not have elected its committees under the rules, if it desired so to do; and yet, so far as I recollect, never perhaps but once or twice in the life of the Nation has the House elected its committees, preferring under all administrations to leave that matter to the Speaker, holding him responsible for the organization. So that what has been done in this respect in the past has been done substantially with the approval of the House. So much for that.

When I first became Speaker there had always been complaint that the minority was not organized for strength, and in a spirit of fairness, as I thought at that time, I tendered to the minority leader, Representative WILLIAMS, the request that he organize the minority; and I advised him that, while the majority was responsible for the organization, the appointments would be made substantially in accordance with his selections except where they interfered with the geographical plan of the majority by including on the same committee a disproportionate representation from a particular State or section. Representative WILLIAMS, the minority leader, organized the minority in three Congresses, and, so far as I recollect, his recommendations were literally adopted, with perhaps four or five exceptions, in cases where I, representing the majority, made objection. I believe in a majority of the instances he acquiesced in my view, and in perhaps two out of the five he said I, representing the majority, must assume the responsibility, which I did.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois such further time as he desires.

Mr. CANNON. Not much time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I was the object of much criticism in the country and of some criticism from the majority side. Nevertheless I do not regret my action.

At the last session of Congress it was determined by the then minority leader [Mr. CLARK of Missouri], as I was informed, that he would not organize the minority unless the organization he offered should be written in without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." I said the majority was responsible, and that I, representing the majority, would treat his recommendations in the same spirit that I had treated the recommendations of his predecessor in the three preceding Congresses. The gentleman declined, and I organized the minority. I did it to the best of my ability, and I am delighted to know that, following substantially the rule of seniority, you have practically accepted the organization that I made as Speaker of the House in the last Congress. [Applause on the Republican side]. I think that is quite a compliment to me and to the majority side.

That I made mistakes in organizing the majority, and perchance the minority, is I presume true; but, as the representative of the majority, I was responsible, and I performed my duty honestly, after diligent inquiry and consideration, and I have no apologies to make. I made mistakes; yes. I doubt if this House could be organized by any agency, whether by the Speaker, by the minority leader, or by a caucus, without mistakes being made. I have heard some rumblings from members of the present majority, so that perchance if you should all be placed under oath it might not appear that every individual is pleased with the organization. If all are pleased, I would be glad to be informed of that fact.

Now, coming down to the absolute merits of the proposition, I am not going to complain touching the action of the majority. If you have not given the minority sufficient representation, you are responsible. The majority is always responsible. You bear the responsibility for the organization, not only of the majority, but of the minority as well. You have allowed us to organize the minority, and our minority leader has made the organization. You are responsible for that. You are responsible for selecting the committees by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. I have no objection to your doing so, because you have supreme power and absolute responsibility, and this Congress, and the House of Representatives composing a part of the Congress, are not going to be condemned or approved because of the personnel of the various committees. You will stand or fall by the legislation that you assist in enacting, and I am willing to abide that test. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 25 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this time to detain the House with a dissertation on the mathematical situation. I propose to analyze the mathematics of this situation in some remarks which I shall have printed in the RECORD under the leave to extend a speech which I made a few days ago. But it is so easy as to the mathematics that a child capable of entering the third grade in school would know that the mathematics of the gentleman from Alabama, or whoever prepared the figures for him, are incorrect.

In the last House the Republicans had a majority of 47. In this House the Democrats have a majority of 63, only 16 more majority. They have increased the number of places on the 15 leading committees by 35, and of those places they have taken 33 and given the minority but 2. As the number of places on these committees is not equal to the number of Members in the House, it is mathematically impossible to prove that the ratio is the same when they now take more than twice as many new places as they have increased their majority.

I commend that statement to the gentleman who prepared the figures for the gentleman from Alabama. In the first place, they include the Delegates in their computation, not knowing that the Delegates were not members of the committee as fixed by the number in the rules, but under a special rule were added as additional members without the authority to vote in the committee at all. I suppose it is not strange that the gentleman from Alabama who has not served on one of these committees for years, because he has been on a more responsible committee, did not know that a Delegate was only seen and heard and had no vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one word to this side of the House in regard to the committee assignments. The gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, the former Speaker of this House, made the committee assignments for four Congresses, and on this occasion, the responsibility having been placed on me by this side of the House and by that side of the House, I have made the recommendations which I made that are now up for approval by the House, working in connection with the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, the former Speaker; as to all the assignments which have now been proposed to this side of the House, I have availed myself of his knowledge, of his skill, of his superior wisdom in connection with them, and I hope that the assignments which have been made may receive the approval not only of this side of the House in general, but of each individual Member. [Applause.] I hope that it may help to result in a unified minority which, when the time rolls on a little further, will again become a powerful majority. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Texas desires to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question, and I will yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. As I understand it, in the last Congress the Committee on Indian Affairs was composed of 18 members, and now it is composed of 19 members, and that additional member is a Republican. They have one more on

the minority at this session than they had at the last Congress, and I do not think that is fair and just.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, who has served on the Committee on Indian Affairs for years, and who now has his attention for the first time directed to the fact that the rules for years have provided for 19 members on the Committee on Indian Affairs, that no one apparently on the committee representing the majority discovered that fact, and they only named 11 majority members for the Committee on Indian Affairs, and left the balance of the committee to be named by me. Knowing the rules, we named 8 members of that committee. I called the attention of the Ways and Means Committee to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I called it to the gentleman's attention a few minutes ago.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas, having served for years on the committee, has not discovered the number allowed that committee by the rules. The gentleman can learn some things by asking questions.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to see the amiable face of the ex-Speaker on the floor of the House to-day, while he seems to be so very fair in his statements. Mr. Speaker, I also have great respect for the distinguished leader of the minority of the House [Mr. MANN], but it seems to me that so far he has been dealing in rather trivial politics. He would have the country believe that the Democratic Party prevented his side from having due consideration when the rules came up for adoption last Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, we accorded the gentleman's party 4 hours' debate, and we were willing to give an additional 40 minutes if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] had not objected. We also gave them the right of offering a substitute for our rules, and provided that in the substitute his party could embrace one amendment, or one hundred or more amendments, if they had chosen to do so.

We remember that for the preceding 14 years the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has risen in his place and offered the rules of the former Republican Congress without giving us the right to amend in any respect. If he had given us the privilege of offering a substitute, with only one amendment to the old rules, we would have been contented; and the country, perhaps, would have been satisfied. Democrats would have offered an amendment taking the power of appointing committees from the Speaker, thus restoring it where it belongs—to the membership of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] simply offered the rules of the former House and moved the previous question. We were not permitted the poor privilege of offering one amendment.

The gentleman from Illinois, the ex-Speaker of this House, is apparently very fair this morning in his statements. I have always believed that this is a Government of parties, and have thought the majority responsible for the Government when they are in the ascendancy and that the minority should be responsible for their own party affairs. After long deliberation it is evident to me that the minority should have the absolute right to fix their representation on standing committees, a privilege we are now according the minority. And if anyone will fairly investigate and make the calculation for himself he will ascertain we have done no injustice to gentlemen on that side of the House.

Let us take the committees in the Sixty-first Congress. The Committee on Agriculture was composed of 12 Republicans and 6 Democrats, the same proportion we have used in this Congress. On the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads the Republicans took 12 members and gave the Democrats 6. In constituting the Committee on the Judiciary the Republicans took 12 members and gave the Democrats 6. With the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the last Congress, the Republicans took 12 members and gave the Democrats 6; and we are dealing just as fairly with Republicans as they did with Democrats, and we intend that the country shall thoroughly understand it from this discussion to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says that as Speaker in practically all instances he deferred to the minority leader, and that he yielded to the Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS in the make-up of certain committees; that sometimes, for "geographical reasons" he could not concur with the selection made by that gentleman. Let us see. He removed from the Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. He removed from the Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. He refused to appoint the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] on the Committee on the Judiciary after Mr. WILLIAMS had recommended him. He refused to appoint the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors after Mr. WILLIAMS had indorsed him. He now says he did this in order to maintain the "geographical parity" on the committees. He did other eccentric things in the make-up of committees on both sides of the House. We submit that question to the candid consideration of the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, we should put aside these small quibblings, and go forward and meet the great issues confronting the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the last analysis it will be found that we will stand for our pledges to the country, and when the gavel falls at the end of the Sixty-second Congress it will be ascertained that we have kept the faith in letter, in spirit, and in substance to the American voters and redeemed every promise we made them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution for the election of the committees of the House.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the adoption of the resolution to elect the Members named in the places on the committees as designated.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 47.

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the gentleman means to ask unanimous consent for the passage of that resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I also offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration and adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama offers the following resolution and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 49.

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House and during the recess of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I present the following joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration and adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) to create and creating a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States.

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee be, and hereby is, appointed, consisting of the Senators composing the committee of the Senate on Revision of the Laws of the United States and the members of the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the revision and codification of laws reported by the statutory revision commission heretofore authorized to revise and codify the laws of the United States, including all laws of a general nature, permanent in character, passed since the submission to Congress on December 15, 1906, of the final report of said commission, and that the said joint committee be authorized to sit during the recess of Congress, to order such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business, and to incur such expense as may be deemed necessary; all such expenses to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida objects.

PRINTING AND BINDING, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 43.

Resolved, That authority is granted to do all printing and binding for the Committee on Appropriations deemed necessary in connection with the subjects considered by said committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING THE SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I also offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 42.

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or such subcommittee as they may designate, shall have leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the Sixty-second Congress and during the recesses of that Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 45.

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress is authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary for the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to suggest to the gentlemen offering these resolutions that they include everything in one resolution. It is a waste of time to pass two resolutions here, one authorizing printing and binding and the other authorizing such committees to sit.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman as far as I am concerned I am not going to ask anything except the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Some of the committees are not asking for that privilege and some should not be given that privilege.

Mr. MANN. That may be, but gentlemen ought not to put in two resolutions; it is a waste of the time of the House when one would accomplish the purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Somebody might object to one and not to the other.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 46.

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 44.

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I also offer a further resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if there is immediate necessity for the Committee on the District of Columbia meeting during the sessions of the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that these are exactly the same resolutions that were adopted at the beginning of the last session of Congress and were clipped from the RECORD. There are 25 or 30 bills pending before the committee now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The question is whether the Members of the minority who are on the committee will not have their hands so filled with other business that they will not be able to accommodate themselves wholly to the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia should it meet during sessions of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can give no answer to that. But I will say to the gentleman that the committee will be called together and their convenience consulted as to meeting days and time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that the Committee on the District of Columbia is a very busy one, that much local business arises, and that it takes a great deal of the time of the members, both of the majority and the minority, and if there is no real, actual, hurrying necessity for meetings of the committee during the sessions of the House, it would seem to me inadvisable to pass this resolution at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I can say to the gentleman that I care nothing in the world about it, as to whether it passes or not. If he is not willing to conduct the business of the committee, nail up the doors.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would it not be better to let it stand until the necessity arises?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky permit me to interject a remark?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] can object all he wants to.

Mr. MANN. I would like to make this suggestion to the gentlemen who are asking leave for their committees to sit during the sessions of the House. I have been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a number of years, and have been chairman of it for two years, and during the last two years that committee reported in more than 30 per cent of the bills that finally became laws during the Sixty-first Congress, and yet that committee never asked leave to sit during the sessions of the House. That was one reason why the work it brought before this House always received careful and generous attention on the part of the House. The members of the committee were here on the floor instead of being off in a committee room. They were able to transact the business of the committee in the morning and be in the House during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object for the present.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 38.

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON WAR CLAIMS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 41.

Resolved, That the Committee on War Claims be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 51.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Library be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary in the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 53.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Territories be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as shall be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 54.

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be, and the same hereby is, authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the use of the committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 55.

Resolved, That the Committee on Insular Affairs be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 56.

Resolved, That the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic be, and is hereby, authorized to have such printing and binding done as shall be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if this same resolution has heretofore been passed by the House?

Mr. CANDLER. It has.

Mr. MANN. Has that committee had the privilege heretofore?

Mr. CANDLER. It has.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 3.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 57.

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No. 3 is hereby authorized during the Sixty-second Congress to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not any notices of contests have come to this House up to this time?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think so.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I am quite certain they have.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to have some definite information.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I am so informed.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What are they?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. There is one from Iowa and one from Maryland. There are several, as I understand.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that I am not disposed to make any captious objection, but unless I can get some more information than simply the statement that the gentleman believes that there is a case——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I will say to the gentleman that there are several cases.

Mr. HAMILL. There is the Gill case, from Maryland.

Mr. MANN. The business of an Elections Committee can not be conducted without authority to print.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand that; but unless there is some business to transact I do not see how they can do any printing. Will the gentleman from Illinois state what binding they would do? I can understand that they ought to have the right to print stationery, but as to binding, I can not see how they need do that unless there is business.

Mr. MANN. I have served on the committee so long that I can tell the gentleman it is quite necessary to print the briefs, and sometimes necessary to bind them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is in case of contested elections. In the event they do not have any contested elections they can not need any binding.

Mr. MANN. In that case they will not need to have anything printed or bound; but there are some contested-election cases.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 40.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands is authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. OLDFIELD] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 50.

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 39.

Resolved, That the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures be authorized to have such printing and binding done as shall be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

MANUAL AND DIGEST.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia offers another resolution and asks unanimous consent for its present consideration. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 48.

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 copies of a manual and digest of the rules and practice of the House of Representatives for the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, the same to be bound and distributed under the direction of the Speaker and Clerk of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. This is a resolution to print 2,000 copies of the Manual and Digest.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes. It is in the exact words of the resolution adopted in the last Congress.

Mr. MANN. Was that resolution passed without reference to the Printing Committee?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows there is some limitation in the law in regard to these things.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand that. This resolution conforms to the law and the practice as it has been every time.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it the rule and has it been the practice for the Speaker of the House to distribute the Digest?

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no. That is not this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. What does this resolution provide?

Mr. HARDWICK. That the Digest shall be prepared under the direction of the Speaker, and distributed by the Clerk.

Mr. MADDEN. As I understood the reading of the resolution, it provided that the Speaker should distribute.

Mr. HARDWICK. Oh, no. It is to be distributed in the usual way.

Mr. MADDEN. Is this in the usual form?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In the usual form of resolutions that have been passed before?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. It has been the practice to have these Manuals distributed through the Clerk's document room. Would it not be a good thing to change that practice and have them distributed to the Members through the folding room, and to give each one his proportional share?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDWICK. There would not be any particular objection to it, but it seems to me that these Manuals were intended for the use of the Members alone, and this is a method by which Members can get them.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is true; but this provides for the printing of 2,000 copies, which gives to each Member, if he can get them from the Clerk's document room, a certain number. Now, the gentleman knows, if he has had the experience that a number of Members have, that some Members get more than their share and some get less than their share. The only fair way to distribute these Manuals, which ought to be the property of the Members, is through the folding room.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will say that I never have had any trouble myself, and I do not know of any Member on either side that has had any trouble, in getting a sufficient number of Manuals. I can assure the gentleman from Georgia that this distribution will be fair, just, and equitable. It is in exact accordance with the unbroken practice in the past.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Georgia is mistaken about some Members not having trouble in getting all that they desire.

Mr. HARDWICK. I mean all that they were entitled to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, all that they were entitled to either; the gentleman is mistaken. I do not say that I have had any trouble myself; but I know of Members that have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the resolution ought to be amended so as to distribute these Manuals through the folding room.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] at all. I quite agree with the gentleman from Georgia who introduced the resolution. There are many Members who do not want three or four of these Manuals, and if you distribute them through the folding room they are sent to some one in the country who does not want them. When some Member does want them he can not get them, or else they are left in the folding room until after the Congress adjourns, when they are of no value. If they go to the Clerk's document room, when a Member wants a Manual he can get one as long as they last, and if they run out we will have more printed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Let me call attention to the fact that under the resolution of the Democratic caucus it is intended to abolish the Clerk's document room.

Mr. MANN. Abolish it theoretically, but there will be some place where documents can be obtained, and with the same expense and doing the same business.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree with the gentleman. I think a great many things have been suggested to be abolished by the Democratic caucus that is mere theory and which will turn out that way.

Mr. MANN. And which have not been abolished.

Mr. BARTLETT. And which will not be.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION OF ARID LANDS.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 65.

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary in the conduct of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 61.

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 72.

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary in the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to ask whether it is usual for the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to have anything that requires printing to be done?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am advised that there will be. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department expects to have something to do.

Mr. MADDEN. I think I will object for the present, and if they have anything to do they can offer the resolution again.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 60.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Census be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY.

Mr. PUJO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 69.

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to have such printing and binding done as shall be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 66.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the use of such committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF REFORM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DWIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 64.

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs have authority to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business during this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 68.

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 67.

Resolved, That the Committee on Pensions be, and hereby is, authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 62.

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-second Congress to have such printing and binding done as may be required for the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Revision of the Laws be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 63.

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be authorized to have such printing and binding done as is necessary in the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 2.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 58.

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No. 2 be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object until I can hear what it is.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will please report the resolution again.

The resolution was again reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary in the conduct of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Mr. KORBLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Railways and Canals be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as shall be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman to let that go over until I can look up

in reference to it. I ask that it be passed over until we can find out about it.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, ETC.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 59.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the use of said committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken and the resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I do not know that I will in the end—but I would ask the gentleman to let that go over. If these committees are going to work, they will have to have the right. I suppose that will be the case; but as one has gone over, they ought all to be treated alike.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Let it go over without prejudice, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the resolution go over without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the following joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Kentucky will withhold his resolution for a moment, there are some matters on the Speaker's table. The Chair presents a communication from the secretary of state of the State of Colorado announcing the ratification of the income-tax amendment [applause] and orders it to be printed in the RECORD and Journal, and that it lie upon the table.

The communication is as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Colorado, ss:*

I, James B. Pearce, secretary of state of the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate concurrent resolution No. 3, by Senator Garman, ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which was filed in this office the 21st day of February, A. D. 1911, at 5.43 o'clock p. m., and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Colorado, at the city of Denver, this 23d day of February, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

JAMES B. PEARCE,
Secretary of State.
By THOMAS F. DILLON, Jr.,
Deputy.

Senate concurrent resolution 3—Ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America, at its first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution, namely:

"'ARTICLE XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration.'"

Therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado.

That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the governor of this State to the President of the United States, Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

STEPHEN R. FITZGARRALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved this 20th day of February, A. D. 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on the 21st day of February, A. D. 1911, at 5.43 o'clock p. m.

JAMES B. PEARCE,
Secretary of State.
By THOMAS F. DILLON, Jr.,
Deputy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also lays before the House the following personal requests:

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia was granted leave of absence from Wednesday, the 12th, until the 22d, inclusive, on account of important business.

By unanimous consent Mr. CURLEY was granted indefinite leave of absence on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent Mr. MITCHELL was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Albert H. Campbell, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

By unanimous consent Mr. BARCHFELD was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Edward M. Keating, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

By unanimous consent Mr. FOSTER of Illinois was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of James Wiley, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon; also, leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Sarah C. James, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following joint resolution——

EX-REPRESENTATIVE TOM L. JOHNSON.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent, and I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky to withhold his motion for just a moment, for the immediate consideration of the following resolution.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky had the floor.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am willing to hear the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 52.

Resolved, That the House has heard with regret of the death of the Hon. Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, Ohio, a former distinguished Member of this House, and hereby extends its sympathy to his family. In his death the country has lost one of its foremost citizens.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio whether there is any precedent for this?

Mr. HOWLAND. I do not know whether there is any precedent for it or not. I think it is a matter in place, and proper at this time.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object to this resolution, but if this is to become the fashion—and setting a precedent is liable to cause it to become a fashionable thing—I shall object to the next and succeeding resolutions of this character.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. As I understand it, the gentleman was a Member of this House at one time.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And I think we can well confine it to Members and ex-Members.

Mr. MANN. I think we can well confine it to Members. They all pass away in the course of time, and if it becomes so that it is a slight if the resolution is not offered, then, every time, the friends of a deceased ex-Member will have to see that a resolution is offered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky offers a joint resolution and moves its adoption. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States.

Resolved, etc., That a special joint committee be appointed, consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the revision and codification of laws reported by the statutory revision commission heretofore authorized to revise and codify the laws of the United States, including all laws of a general nature, permanent in character, passed since the submission to Congress on December 15, 1906, of the final report of said commission; and that the said joint commission be authorized to sit during the recess of Congress and to employ necessary assistants, to order such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business, and to incur such expense as may be deemed necessary; all such expenses to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the resolution is not a privileged resolution. However, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not want the point of order to be reserved, Mr. Speaker. I simply call the Chair's attention to the fact that there is nothing now in order of a higher privilege, and that in the previous Congress twice the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], then Speaker of the House, held, on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Tawney, that it was in order if nothing of a higher privilege was pending to call up from the floor a resolution of this kind. If the Chair has not the precedents, I can furnish him with a memorandum of them.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire to be heard?

Mr. MANN. I call for the regular order.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] a question.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to dispose of the point of order, and then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. I reserve a point of order as well.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not want it reserved. It has been made.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. That is the regular order. We have exhausted the regular order——

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Speaker, the precedent to which the gentleman from Kentucky refers is a matter of calling up something on the floor of the House which is not contrary to the other rules. It is now in order in the House to demand the regular order, and if the regular order, under the calendar, is exhausted, it is in order to proceed to something else—anything that is before the House. The gentleman from Kentucky the other day would have been correct. Before the rules were adopted he could have demanded the consideration of this resolution.

But the rules provide, Rule XI—

All proposed legislation shall be referred to the committees named in the preceding rule, as follows, viz: Subjects relating—

* * * * * * *

35. To the revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

And the rules provide that when this resolution be introduced it shall be referred by the Speaker to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws. That is regardless of the regular order, regardless of whether it is in order to take the matter up.

If this were a report from a committee, although no committee call was being made and there was nothing else before the House, it would be in order to call up this resolution, it having been reported from the committee, because there is nothing else ahead of it. But the rules require that the resolution, when introduced, shall be referred to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

I would like also to call the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to this fact, a little aside from the point of order: I asked him when he introduced the resolution the other day—and I assume this is the same resolution—whether it was similar to the resolutions which have heretofore been passed. I understood him to say that it was the same resolution. I afterwards compared the resolution which the gentleman introduced with the resolutions which have heretofore been enacted into law, and there is a very broad difference between them.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to be perfectly fair with the gentleman and with the House in that particular. I made that statement on the word of the clerk of the Joint Committee on the Revision of the Laws, who said that he had followed the exact wording of the previous resolutions. I assumed that to be true. Certainly, there is nothing in this resolution that contemplates doing anything other than the other resolution did.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman will pardon me. Of course the gentleman understands very well that he is the last man in the House that I would think capable of endeavoring to mislead me or mislead the House as to a statement. That goes without saying. However, the resolution which the gentleman introduced provided that there should be appointed a joint committee, while the resolutions which have heretofore passed provided that there should be appointed a joint committee consisting of certain Senators of the Sixty-second Congress and certain Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress, thereby, in effect, as it has been interpreted, limiting the life of the joint committee to the Congress.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, right in that connection I will concede that that is a distinction; but I think the gentleman will find it is the only one. And the reason for that is this, that the other resolutions were offered in the closing days of a Congress and provided that the Speaker of that particular Congress, together with the then existing Vice President, should appoint the joint committee, but in order that the members should be Members of the new Congress it expressly so stated, and named them. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOON], in the closing days of the last Congress offered the resolution in the form that the gentleman suggested. Manifestly, in the beginning of this Congress it seemed to me improper to designate the personnel of this joint committee. It was a matter that should properly be left both to the Vice President and to the Speaker, and those names were left out.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. The resolution has never designated the names. But let me get the distinction——

Mr. SHERLEY. I see the distinction.

Mr. MANN. Under the resolution as passed, providing that the joint committee should consist of two or three members—whatever their number is—or Representatives in a certain Congress, it was construed to limit the life of the committee to the Congress.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I think we can readily meet the situation. In the event the Chair shall hold the matter to be in order, I will offer in my own time an amendment providing that the joint committee shall be for the life of the Sixty-second Congress only.

Mr. MANN. All right. The resolution offered this morning, providing for a joint committee on the revision of the laws, if adopted would have made the members of that committee members of it as long as they lived.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not responsible for that.

Mr. MANN. It has always been held that where you appoint a joint committee, or something of that sort, without making some limitation upon it, its members continue in office, whether they went out as Members of Congress or not, just like the Monetary Commission, which now consists in the main of ex-Members of Congress who were appointed while they were Members of Congress.

Now, there is no desire, I think, to create a joint commission on the revision of the laws that shall be never ending. We had trouble enough to get rid of one, without creating another permanent one.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. MANN. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. What is the difference between the resolution offered by the gentleman from California and the one offered by the gentleman from Kentucky as to the time that this commission shall end?

Mr. MANN. There is no difference. I was just calling the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky to that fact.

Mr. RAKER. What is intended is simply to continue it during the Sixty-second Congress and no further.

Mr. MANN. What is intended by the gentleman and what the men who are appointed on the commission may intend, if

they happen to go out of the House, may be very different things. Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] proposes, if his resolution is considered, to put in an amendment which will limit it to the life of the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I should like to ask the gentleman if the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky is not, in effect, a motion to suspend the rules?

Mr. MANN. I think it is a motion to throw the rules to the winds.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And it would require a two-thirds vote.

Mr. MANN. I have suggested that to the Speaker.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will permit me, I will read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 24, 1909, page 3737:

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the bill H. R. 10933—the census appropriation bill—and move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union under the rules. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman from Minnesota offers the bill?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union under the rules.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the bill is in the hands of the Appropriation Committee, or, at least, has been referred by the Speaker to the Appropriation Committee; that no report has been made upon it; and that it is not properly before the House, inasmuch as the committee has not been properly discharged from the further consideration of it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the bill has not been referred to any committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Journal does not disclose any record of the bill. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Minnesota——

Mr. MACON. Then I make the point of order——

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Minnesota offers the bill from the floor.

Mr. MACON. I make the point of order that the bill is improperly before the House for the reason that it must be referred to the committee and presented by it to the House under the rules before it can be considered in any other manner than by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Was that the census bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. That was the census bill.

Mr. MANN. We nearly had a great riot here over the census bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; the gentleman is speaking of the census apportionment bill, and I am speaking of the census appropriation bill; not the Crumpacker bill, but the bill presented by Mr. Tawney.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but it has always been contended that anything relating to the census was privileged, and undoubtedly that was the contention then.

Mr. SHERLEY. The Speaker did not put it on that ground.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker did not put it on either ground, as I think the gentleman will see.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I should like to ask the gentleman why the necessity of this hurry in the passage of this resolution?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is a question that may properly be considered when the matter is up for consideration. In my judgment, I have offered it at a proper time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Has the gentleman any objection to its going to the proper committee and being considered by it?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman from Kentucky had not thought this was a proper course to take, he would have sent it to a committee.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy Members present, not a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 12, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 3971) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the construction of a floating steel dry dock to be stationed within Curtis Bay, a tributary of the Patapsco River, and near Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 3972) to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by or under the auspices of benevolent and fraternal societies and orders and institutions of learning or by trades-unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TURNBULL: A bill (H. R. 3973) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Farmville, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 3974) to reinstate certain homestead entries in the Ozark and Arkansas National Forests and to confirm titles to the lands embraced therein in the original claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3975) providing that any person who has heretofore made a homestead entry or entries and has failed from any cause to perfect his title to any lands embraced in such entry or entries may make a further homestead entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3976) to authorize the purchase of additional grounds to be used in connection with the national cemetery at Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3977) to relieve the governor of the State of Arkansas from accountability for certain funds under section 1661 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3978) to abolish the Ozark National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 3979) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Daingerfield, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3980) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Atlanta, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3981) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Mount Pleasant, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3982) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Cooper, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3983) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Mount Vernon, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3984) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Pittsburg, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3985) for the erection of a new Federal building for court, post-office, and other Government purposes at Jefferson, Tex., and for the disposition of the present structure; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3986) for the erection of a new Federal building for courthouse, post office, and other governmental purposes at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., and for the disposition of the present structure; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3987) for the enlargement of the Federal building at Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 3988) providing for the erection of a public building at Fairfield, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 3989) to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the "children's bureau"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 3990) providing for a military highway between the city of Savannah, Ga., and Fort Screven, Tybee Island, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 3991) to increase pensions to soldiers of the Mexican and Civil Wars, and amending other pension acts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 3992) for the erection of a public building at Sidney, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 3993) granting to the State of Utah 1,000,000 acres of public land within the State, to reimburse the State for expenses incurred in suppressing Indian disturbances from 1865 to 1868; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3994) providing for the establishment and maintenance of a Weather Bureau station at Brigham City, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3995) providing for the establishment of a Weather Bureau station at Provo, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 3996) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Decennial Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3997) to provide for the erection of a public building at Williamson, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3998) to provide for the enlargement of the Federal building at Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3999) to provide for the erection of a public building at Beckley, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4000) for the relief of persons who participated in the suppression of Indian hostilities in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4001) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk War, Cherokee disturbances, and the Seminole War,' approved July 27, 1892"; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4002) granting pensions to the soldiers of the Blackhawk Indian wars and to their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4003) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men of the Utah volunteers employed in the defense of the frontier settlements of the Territory of Utah against Indian depredations during the years from 1865 to 1868, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4004) increasing the cost of erecting a public building at Brigham City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4005) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Nephi, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4006) for the erection of a public building at Ephraim, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4007) for continuing the survey of public lands in Garfield, Iron, Kane, San Juan, and Washington Counties, in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4008) to provide for the erection of a public building at Vernal, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4009) for the establishment of a national sanitarium for disabled soldiers at Becks Hot Springs, in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4010) to amend section 1 of the act of May 30, 1908, entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment"; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4011) amending sections 2541 and 2543 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, defining the boundaries of the customs collection districts of Philadelphia, Pa., and Bridgeton, N. J., and establishing ports of entry and subports of entry therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4012) to authorize the exchange of certain lands with the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Calumet, in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Houghton, in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4015) to regulate the issue of injunctions from the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 4016) to amend the national banking laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4017) to establish an agricultural experiment station in the fifth congressional district of West Virginia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the southern judicial district of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4019) to establish a national wagon roads commission, with a view to the improvement and construction of wagon roads in conjunction with the several States, in the interest of commerce and the postal service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4020) to enlarge, extend, remodel, etc., post-office and customhouse building at Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4021) to establish a fish-hatchery and biological station in the sixth congressional district of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4022) to organize an Army corps, prescribe qualifications for enlistment, define the duties, and fix the compensation and term of enlistment of privates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4023) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1907; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4024) to allow pensions from date of disability; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4025) for acquiring a site and the erection of a Federal building for the post office at Marion, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4026) for acquiring a site and the erection of a Federal building for the post office at Carbondale, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 4027) authorizing the creating and maintaining of a rural parcel-delivery system by the Post Office Department of the United States on rural routes and a general parcel post for agricultural, horticultural, dairy, and poultry products; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 4028) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4029) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bucyrus, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) for the erection of a public building at the city of Sandusky, in the State of Ohio, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 4031) to divide the State of Virginia into three judicial districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish the town of Wise, Va., with two condemned cannons and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) to erect a monument to commemorate the Battle of Cloyd's Farm, Pulaski County, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a sanitarium for disabled volunteer soldiers at New River, White Sulphur Springs, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. William Campbell; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint shorthand reporters for the circuit and district courts of the United States, to fix their duties and compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) to provide for the improvement of the headwaters of Big Sandy River in Virginia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) to provide for the erection of a public building at Norton, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pulaski, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) to establish a mine rescue station and an experiment station for analyzing and testing coals, lignite, and mineral substances at or near Norton, Va.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) providing for the use of $2,000,000 of the money that would otherwise become a part of the reclamation fund for the drainage of certain lands in Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4042) to provide for the improvement of Powell River, in Virginia; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 4043) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Burlington, Racine County, in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4044) to amend existing laws and equalize pay for mail service on railroad lines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4045) to regulate the quantity of tin to be used in the coating of tin plate composing cans made to be hermetically sealed and to contain canned food, and for regulating the traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4046) to appropriate $50,000 for the resurvey of public lands in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 4047) to provide for the erection of a public building at Washington, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 4048) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Branford, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 4049) to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make rules of practice for courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution (H. Res. 70) providing for a committee to investigate the method of enforcement of the antitrust act and other matters; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Resolution (H. Res. 71) requesting the Postmaster General to furnish certain information; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution (H. Res. 72) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to have printing and binding done; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Resolution (H. Res. 73) calling for information and facts regarding the condition of the Alaskan fur-seal herd and the conduct of the agents of the Government in charge thereof, lessees, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Resolution (H. Res. 74) changing the rules of the House in the matter of printing speeches in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) to create and creating a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) authorizing the President of the United States to invite foreign governments to participate in the Second International Brewers' Congress in connection with the International Barley and Hops Exhibition to be held in the city of Chicago, United States of America, in October, 1911; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 3) providing for the printing of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Baron von Steuben; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 4) to print additional copies of the Report on the Mountain Meadow Massacre; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 4050) granting an increase of pension to John W. Starbuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Addington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4052) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bremercamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4053) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Maloney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) granting a pension to Nannie Slayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Grundich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4056) granting an increase of pension to Alexander S. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4057) granting an increase of pension to David Mooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4058) granting an increase of pension to John Deal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4059) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius J. McLean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4060) granting a pension to Mary Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 4061) for the relief of Ethel M. Young; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 4062) granting an increase of pension to George Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4063) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4064) granting an increase of pension to Charles Saladin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4065) granting an increase of pension to Frank Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 4066) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Manyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4067) granting an increase of pension to Jehu Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4068) granting an increase of pension to George W. Land; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4069) granting an increase of pension to John Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Friend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4071) granting an increase of pension to John Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4072) granting an increase of pension to Ralph G. Bergemann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4073) granting an increase of pension to John Bonheyo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4074) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bender; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4075) granting a pension to Hugh H. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4076) granting a pension to John T. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4077) granting a pension to Joseph Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4078) granting a pension to George W. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4079) granting a pension to Frederick B. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4080) granting a pension to James C. Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4081) granting a pension to Edward Joseph Chester; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4082) granting a pension to Joseph Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 4083) granting an increase of pension to William Shively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) granting an increase of pension to Clarence P. Holloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4085) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Welsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4086) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4087) granting an increase of pension to Nelson E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4088) granting an increase of pension to Artemus Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4089) granting an increase of pension to Philip Cornelius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4090) granting an increase of pension to Albert Mikel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4091) granting an increase of pension to William Inks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) granting an increase of pension to Orlando A. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4093) granting an increase of pension to Elisha L. Hargrave; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4094) granting an increase of pension to Johnson Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4095) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Wheadon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4096) granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4097) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Kate Morehead and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 4098) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4099) granting an increase of pension to Fayette Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4100) granting an increase of pension to Anderson M. Basquin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4101) granting an increase of pension to John Timms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) to remove the charge of desertion against Adam B. Ackerman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4103) restoring to the pension roll the name of Robert J. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 4104) granting an increase of pension to Noah Sipes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4105) granting an increase of pension to George N. Dragoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4106) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) granting an increase of pension to George J. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) granting an increase of pension to William L. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) granting a pension to John Glaback; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 4110) granting a pension to John W. McKissick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4111) granting a pension to Mary E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 4112) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to approve allotments to Joseph Ellis, jr., and Lydia Irene Simmons; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 4113) for the relief of Robert E. Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 4114) for the relief of Charles M. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4115) to correct the military record of Robert Abernethy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 4116) granting an increase of pension to James A. McIntosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4117) granting an increase of pension to John W. Stiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 4118) granting an increase of pension to William P. Fulmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 4119) granting an increase of pension to James H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 4120) granting an increase of pension to Orren J. Cary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4121) granting an increase of pension to Solomon F. Frye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4122) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hoffmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 4123) for the relief of the estate of Johnson Miller, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4124) for the relief of J. W. Freeman, receiver of the United States land office, Harrison, Ark.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 4125) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin S. Roberts; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 4126) granting an increase of pension to John Faulkner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) granting a pension to Job Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4128) granting an increase of pension to Aaron T. Macklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4129) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Quillen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4130) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Gilmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4131) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4132) granting an increase of pension to Linden Batten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4133) granting an increase of pension to Eli W. Metcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) granting a pension to Oma Harshbarger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4135) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4136) granting an increase of pension to William Satow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4137) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4138) granting an increase of pension to John Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4140) granting an increase of pension to James W. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4141) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4142) granting a pension to Mary E. Ice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4143) granting a pension to Ida M. Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4144) granting a pension to Eliza J. Gay; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4145) granting a pension to Dovie Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4146) granting an increase of pension to George E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4147) granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Sturtevant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4148) granting a pension to Frances A. Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4149) granting a pension to Charles L. Stevens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4150) for the relief of James B. Garrison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 4151) for the relief of George P. Howard; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4152) granting an increase of pension to William J. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4153) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Pridemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4154) granting an increase of pension to John B. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4155) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Adkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4156) granting an increase of pension to Franklin D. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4157) granting an increase of pension to Fannie E. Pennypacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4158) granting an increase of pension to Maurice Hungerford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4159) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stephenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4160) granting an increase of pension to James C. Lovejoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4161) granting an increase of pension to Noah Sias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4162) granting an increase of pension to C. Milstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4163) granting a pension to John Muck Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4164) for the relief of F. F. Morris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4165) for the relief of Louis F. Brooks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4166) for the relief of the heirs of John Morgan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4167) for the relief of Jacob Harshbarger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4168) for the relief of James M. Clouston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4169) for the relief of the Hurricane Baptist Church, Hurricane, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4170) for the relief of Leroy Douglass; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4171) for the relief of John H. Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4172) for the relief of Venila Browning, née Kinder; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4173) for the relief of West Virginia State troops; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4174) for the relief of Mary A. Smith and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4175) for the relief of James M. Stephenson, of Point Pleasant, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4176) for the relief of Thomas McCallister; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4177) for the relief of heirs of William Douthit; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4178) for the relief of the heirs of Edward and William Holderby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4179) for the relief of the heirs of Richard Parsons and Mildred Parsons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of the heirs of Charles Ruffner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4181) for the relief of Charles Cook, administrator of the estate of John Cook, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4182) for the relief of the estate of Philip Null, deceased; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4183) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Point Pleasant, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4184) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Barboursville, W. Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4185) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John W. Shelton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4186) to remove the charge of desertion from the records of the War Department against James T. Billups; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 4187) for the relief of Allison Woodville Pollard; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 4188) granting an increase of pension to Andrew G. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4189) granting an increase of pension to William R. Bolding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4190) granting an increase of pension to J. T. Axline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4191) granting an increase of pension to James H. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4192) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4193) granting an increase of pension to Philip Heiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4194) granting an increase of pension to James G. Pickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4195) granting an increase of pension to James P. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4196) granting an increase of pension to Freeman G. Chesley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4197) granting an increase of pension to John W. Iler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4198) granting an increase of pension to John Hinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4199) granting an increase of pension to George Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4200) granting an increase of pension to Abraham R. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4201) granting an increase of pension to John H. Downard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4202) granting an increase of pension to Jane Bosworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4203) granting an increase of pension to Westley Shonafelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4204) granting an increase of pension to James Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4205) granting an increase of pension to William Goodin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4206) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4207) granting an increase of pension to James Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4208) granting an increase of pension to N. H. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4209) granting an increase of pension to Eli W. Bradford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4210) granting an increase of pension to William Dalton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4211) granting an increase of pension to John B. Whisler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4212) granting an increase of pension to Walton Bancroft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4213) granting an increase of pension to James Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4214) granting an increase of pension to Christian Rockey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4215) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Easling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4216) granting an increase of pension to George F. Balding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4217) granting an increase of pension to Martin H. Corns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4218) granting an increase of pension to Mathias O'Blennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4219) granting an increase of pension to David P. Dunkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4220) granting a pension to Robert Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4221) granting a pension to Cornelius Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4222) for the relief of Nathan Crutchfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4223) for the relief of Jonah B. Eaton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4224) for the relief of A. V. Coles; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4225) for the relief of Ward Brothers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 4226) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4227) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ostrander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4228) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus G. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4229) granting an increase of pension to John I. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4230) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4231) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Flower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4232) granting an increase of pension to William A. Keister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4233) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4234) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Posey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4235) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4236) granting an increase of pension to George D. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4237) granting an increase of pension to George French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4238) granting an increase of pension to James Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4239) granting an increase of pension to William C. Couch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4240) granting an increase of pension to William Darling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4241) granting an increase of pension to Jame L. Randolph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4243) granting an increase of pension to John H. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4244) granting an increase of pension to George Sowerwine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4245) granting an increase of pension to Hanford N. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4246) granting an increase of pension to Richard W. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4247) granting an increase of pension to Marcus De Lafayette Fauver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4248) granting an increase of pension to Otis Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4249) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4250) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4251) granting an increase of pension to John Weyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4252) granting an increase of pension to William W. Thompson, alias Wallace Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4253) granting a pension to John Klemann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4254) granting a pension to Charlotte A. Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4255) granting a pension to John Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4256) granting an increase of pension to William Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4257) granting a pension to Rosetta Graves Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4258) granting a pension to Mary Shattuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 4259) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4260) granting an increase of pension to Charles Randle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4261) granting an increase of pension to William Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 4262) granting an increase of pension to James Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4263) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4264) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Heidel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 4265) granting an increase of pension to William Harman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4266) granting an increase of pension to William H. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4267) granting a pension to Adley R. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4268) granting an increase of pension to Jasper S. Streeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 4269) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Reardon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4270) granting an increase of pension to William W. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4271) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4272) granting an increase of pension to James B. David; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4273) granting an increase of pension to Moses W. Emerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4274) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Charlston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4275) for the relief of Samuel M. Blair; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4276) for the relief of Edward C. Jacobs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4277) for the relief of James Woods; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4278) for the relief of Charles F. West; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4279) for the relief of Arthur R. Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4280) for the relief of Philip Maher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4281) for the relief of William R. Corlew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4282) for the relief of Albert G. Fellows; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4283) for the relief of William R. Boag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4284) for the relief of Stephen A. Merrill, alias George Holmes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4285) for the relief of Henry A. Hunting; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4286) for the relief of John Coughlan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4287) for the relief of Patrick H. Dolan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4288) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph E. Wakefield; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4289) for the relief of the legal representatives of Paul Curtis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4290) to appropriate the sum of $1,000, to be paid to Alfred Roberts for personal injuries received at the United States customhouse in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 4291) granting an increase of pension to Plummer R. Nevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4292) granting an increase of pension to George E. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4293) granting an increase of pension to William P. Damon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4294) granting an increase of pension to John J. Curran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 4295) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Zerbe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4296) to correct the military record of John Curry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4297) for the relief of James M. Powell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 4298) granting an increase of pension to Robert Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4299) granting an increase of pension to James Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4300) for the relief of Joseph Cameron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4301) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Fugatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4302) granting an increase of pension to William J. Helms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4303) granting an increase of pension to John C. Dunehew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4304) granting an increase of pension to James S. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4305) granting a pension to Charles E. Frizzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4306) granting a pension to Bertha Oglesby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4307) granting a pension to James W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4308) granting a pension to Lowry Holman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4309) for the relief of L. D. Bryant, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 4310) granting an increase of pension to James Coats; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4311) granting a pension to Nathan Shipman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 4312) to correct the military record of H. S. Hathaway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 4313) granting an increase of pension to Frank Brownlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4314) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4315) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4316) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4317) granting an increase of pension to James Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4318) granting an increase of pension to William J. Hudgens, alias Richard H. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4319) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4320) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4321) granting an increase of pension to John A. Lovin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4322) granting an increase of pension to La Salle Corbell Pickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4323) granting an increase of pension to Felix L. Huff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4324) granting a pension to Nathaniel L. Lawrence; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4325) granting a pension to Pleasant D. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4326) granting a pension to Nathan C. Castle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4327) granting a pension to Boyd Suthers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4328) granting a pension to F. M. Parsons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4329) granting a pension to Solomon Pippin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4330) granting a pension to Andrew J. Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4331) granting a pension to Victoria G. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4332) granting a pension to Erskine E. Teague; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4333) granting a pension to Henry T. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4334) for the relief of Swan Hamlen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4335) for the relief of John W. Hyatt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4336) for the relief of Almareen Owens, sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4337) for the relief of John E. McDowell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4338) for the relief of Shelby Lodge, No. 162, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, Bristol, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4339) for the relief of the heirs of Henry Sinon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4340) granting an honorable discharge to George W. Dutton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4341) granting an honorable discharge to J. L. M. Wilcox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4342) granting an honorable discharge to Joseph Fisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4343) granting an honorable discharge to Elias Branham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4344) to correct the military record of Richard Baker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4345) to correct the military record of William Doss, alias William D. Doss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4346) to correct the military record of James B. Franklin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4347) to pay Isaac W. Airey for services rendered to the United States Army during the late Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4348) to authorize and direct the President of the United States to place upon the retired list of the United States Navy late Midshipman John Benton Ewald, with the rank of ensign; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4349) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Wytheville, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4350) granting a pension to Sallie L. Lipscomb; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4351) granting an increase of pension to Peter U. Gadbow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4352) granting an increase of pension to Frank Kirkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4353) granting an increase of pension to John N. Doty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4354) granting an increase of pension to James Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4355) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4356) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Muth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4357) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wallis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4358) granting an increase of pension to Granville T. Shanck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4359) granting an increase of pension to Annie O. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4360) granting an increase of pension to Mary Corrine Blandin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4361) granting an increase of pension to John T. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4362) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Abel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4363) granting an increase of pension to John H. Kite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4364) granting a pension to Robert P. Frazier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4365) granting a pension to Effie Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4366) granting a pension to William Hinker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4367) granting a pension to Frank M. Soop; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4368) for the relief of J. H. Mullen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4369) authorizing an honorable discharge to Henry Briel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4370) placing John W. Saville, passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, on the retired list with an advanced rank; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 4371) granting an increase of pension to George F. Harwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4372) granting a pension to Patrick Lavin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4373) granting an increase of pension to James M. Ing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4374) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Houser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4375) granting an increase of pension to John W. Toler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4376) granting an increase of pension to James N. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4377) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Asbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4378) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4379) granting an increase of pension to Aaron F. Youngblood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4380) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Atwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4381) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Lanham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4382) granting an increase of pension to James N. McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4383) granting an increase of pension to Edward Corder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4384) granting an increase of pension to Nathan G. Springs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4385) granting an increase of pension to Richard Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4386) granting an increase of pension to William T. Freeze; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4387) granting an increase of pension to Stephen T. Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4388) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4389) granting an increase of pension to Henry Nausley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4390) granting an increase of pension to John Lewis Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4391) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Eddleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4392) granting an increase of pension to John T. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4393) granting an increase of pension to James B. Jernigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4394) granting an increase of pension to Harvey J. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4395) granting a pension to Lucretia J. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4396) granting a pension to Polly Ann Voight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4397) granting a pension to Herbert W. Atwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4398) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James Orange; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 4399) granting a pension to Isaac Almand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 4400) granting an increase of pension to James T. Stillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 4401) granting an increase of pension to John Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4402) granting an increase of pension to John Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4403) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4404) to correct the military record of Lanson Zane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4405) to correct the military record of William Loar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4406) granting a pension to Emma C. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4407) granting a pension to Fred Hugoboom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4408) granting a pension to Fred Brassel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4409) granting a pension to Susanna A. Laplant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4410) granting a pension to George L. Steward, alias George Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4411) for the relief of C. Horatio Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Petition of Thomas Welch and others, of Union City, Ind., asking for the withdrawal of troops on Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of West Grove Grange, No. 2117, of Pennville, Ind., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Telegraphic protests against a reduction of the tariff on wool by J. W. Innis & Son, of Pataskala, Ohio; Isaac Grubb and W. L. White, of Johnstown, Ohio; J. H. Krantz & Son, of Canal Dover, Ohio; Joseph Scarborough, C. N. Osbun, and Dr. M. T. Moorehead, of Plainfield, Ohio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by Schoenburn Grange, No. 1455, of New Philadelphia, Ohio, in opposition to Federal regulation of cold-storage products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of George W. Land, late of Company F, Hampton's battery Pennsylvania Independent Light Artillery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petitions of Weaver Merchandise Co., Jenkins-Childs Co., and others of Thomaston, Ga.; J. L. Pitts, Pierce Hammond, B. F. Reeves, J. W. Stafford & Son, and other merchants of Barnesville, Ga.; W. B. Thweatt & Bro., Forsyth Mercantile Co., and others of Forsyth, Ga.; Carmichael-Mallet Co., the Jackson Mercantile Co., and others of Jackson, Ga., against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Resolutions of Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association, Local Union No. 5, of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the opening of life-saving stations on the Great Lakes at a date not later than March 1 of each year; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petitions of West Bend Brewing Co., of West Baden, Wis., and Charles D. Storck, of Schleisingerville, Wis., in favor of the temporary removal of the tariff on barley; resolution of executive board of Wisconsin State Union of the American Society of Equity, against Canadian reciprocity and in favor of the remission of all duties on imports and exports between Canada and the United States; and petitions of O. F. Miritz, against Canadian reciprocity, and of the United States Wholesale Saddlery Association, favoring the removal of the tariff on harness and saddlery leather; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Longshoremen's Association, Local No. 35, of Green Bay, Wis., in favor of the repeal of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; and remonstrance of the Wisconsin Association of Creamery Owners and Managers, against the so-called Heyburn bill, limiting the time for the storage of butter and cheese; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, of Pasadena, Cal., and George D. Eggleston Post, No. 133, of Appleton, Wis., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of the so-called Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Henry Loehr, of Johnsburg, Wis., and citizens of Waupun, Fog Lake, Oakfield, Iron Ridge, and Ashipun, Wis., against the establishment of a parcels post; and of the citizens of Malone, Wis., in favor of the establishment of a parcels post, election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people, physical valuation of public utilities, and of the retention of the duty on barley and oleomargarine; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Local Union No. 234 of the United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, and Steam Fitters' Helpers, of Jacksonville, Fla., protesting against the sending of United States troops to the Mexican border and asking for the recognition of the revolutionists as belligerents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of citizens of eleventh district of Illinois, protesting against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of farmers of Sibley County, and farmers of Nicollet County, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of W. T. Bedford, of La Salle, Ill., for Canadian tariff agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hope Grange, Guilford, Ill., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Job Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Lasalle County, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of R. M. Neustadt and others of La Salle, Ill., in opposition to parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of John Faulkner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of 265 persons of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of Garfield E. Morrison and 55 other citizens of Madison Lake, Minn., against Canadian free trade on farm products with protection on what the farmers buy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Hastings, N. Dak., protesting against Canadian reciprocity on farm products, with protection on what farmers have to buy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Williams County, N. Dak., protesting against the use of men and money of this country for the protection of so-called American interests in Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. C. Flint, of Jamestown, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of legislation for a rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Good Will Grange, No. 127, of Glastonbury; Suffield Grange, No. 27, of Suffield; Somers Grange, No. 105, of Somers; Waugumbaug Grange, No. 85, of South Coventry; and Columbia Grange, No. 131, Patrons of Husbandry, of Columbia, all in the State of Connecticut, in behalf of an improved parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of Sagadahoc County, Pomona Grange; resolutions of Aroostook County, Pomona Grange; petition of Eureka Grange, No. 113, of Mapleton, Me.; resolutions of Presumpscot Grange, No. 15, Patrons of Husbandry; petition of Maine State Grange, by their executive committee, protesting against the proposed reciprocity measure, with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. S. Webber and 8 others, members of E. M. Billings Post, No. 74, Grand Army of the Republic, of Maine, praying for the passage of the Lincoln Memorial bill and the Lafean bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of the American Protective Tariff League, protesting against piecemeal tariff revision and against a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Marshall Post, No. 42, Grand Army of the Republic, of Maine, protesting against the defeat of the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Petition of Chamber of Commerce and Barneson-Hibberd Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the enactment of legislation which will permit the free entry from Canada of whale oil into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENROOT: Petition of farmers of Boyd, Wis., and vicinity, against Canadian reciprocity on farm products, with protection on what farmers have to buy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Union League Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Stereotypers' Union of New York, Mosaic Co., of Rochester, N. Y., and Knights of Labor of New York, against reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John F. Godfrey Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., favoring passage of Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of citizens of Brookings, S. Dak., against the mobilizing of United States troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of John M. Rowe and 47 others, relating to the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petitions of citizens of Santa Cruz, Cal., against proposed increased rate of postage on periodicals; and of citizens of Reedley, Cal., against proposed rural parcels-post delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Santa Cruz, Cal., in opposition to the attempt at suppression of magazines by arbitrary raise in postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NYE: Petition of faculty of Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., against donating lands to archbishop of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions adopted by voters of Lone Tree, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition by the following-named citizens of Montana, against the passage of any tariff legislation and reciprocity agreement with Canada at this session or until the Tariff Commission has made a report: Jacob C. Fey, A. W. Walker, John V. Carroll, Walter Brown, J. H. Evers, Andrew Fergus, Bingham & Bingham, Harold Osborne, Robert Cameron, George D. Porter, J. L. Sprinkle, A. M. Brechbill, A. S. Lohman, Henry Juhr, W. C. Blackwood, B. L. Sprinkle, J. Kuhn, B. K. Lyon, P. Hensen, John Davidson, J. E. Morse, J. M. Sawyer, G. D. Martin, C. F. Williams, Glenn Bros., A. C. Brand, Grue Bros., Stephen Cook, T. B. Cruver, H. V. Brown, T. J. Riley, Jeff Doggett, F. E. Craver, J. H. Burns, Walter Brown, John Caldwell, William Pugh, E. C. Wihlberger, B. D. Thompson, W. A. Beck, R. R. Pierce, William H. Danon, E. L. Compton, W. G. Land, A. W. Kingsburg, Chris Schmehl, Charles E. Duler, M. F. Pugsley, L. D. Pugsley, O. T. Romundstad, William Fergus & Sons, G. V. Patterson, Long Bros., B. F. White, L. B. Taylor, Miller Bros., E. Mundt, John McLaren, C. E. Sprinkle, L. N. Runyon, W. S. Young, L. Hensen, William Hensen, John D. Holliday, T. J. Jenkins, George Lyons, E. L. Shoemaker, F. V. Smart, McFarland Bros., T. S. Perkins, John Lucas, Mc. Chouard, John McGinness, Freeman Hillbrick, J. O. Berg, Lyman & Chevallier, H. J. Herrin, and O. Foreman; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of citizens of Branford and North Branford, Conn., asking for more suitable quarters for the business of the post office and a building adequate to present and future needs; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TURNBULL: Papers to accompany House bill to provide for purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Farmville, Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of M. B. Harlan and other members of Sunrise Grange, No. 1550, of Woodstock, Ohio, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. H. Bushong and other members of Eugene Reynolds Post, No. 441, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bellefontaine, Ohio, and Benjamin Kiblinger and 36 other members of W. W. Simpson Post, No. 370, Grand Army of the Republic, of Belle Center, Ohio, urging the passage of the Sulloway pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *April 12, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, there were two vacancies left on the Democratic side of two committees, and I desire to nominate and move the election of Mr. MICHAEL F. CONRY, of New York, to fill the vacancy on the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, and Mr. CHARLES C. CARLIN, of Virginia, to fill the vacancy on the Committee on Accounts. On that I ask the previous question.

Mr. MANN. I will suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the motion be reported from the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Revision of the Laws, MICHAEL F. CONRY, of New York.
Committee on Accounts, CHARLES C. CARLIN, of Virginia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that these are our vacancies.

Mr. MANN. I understand, and the gentleman makes the motion to elect these Members?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have made the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 76.

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required for the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk has just read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 75.

Resolved, That the Committee on Accounts is hereby authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will let the resolution go over. I would like to say to the gentleman, if I may be permitted, that if he is putting in this resolution for the purpose of having stationery printed for the use of the committee, that it is not necessary to have a resolution of the House to permit a committee to have stationery printed for its use at all. Every committee of the House is entitled, on the requisition or order of the chairman or the clerk, to have stationery printed. While the amount of any one order is limited, several orders a day for different kinds may be put in and followed up by orders the next day under the law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it fair for the gentleman from Illinois to assume that this resolution is introduced for the purpose he suggests. It may be that the Committee on Education will try to get busy during this extra session and that we may need some printing and binding, but I am willing to let it go over for the present.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, when the committee under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Caro-

lina gets busy, as I hope it will soon, I think they ought to have the privilege of having printing and binding done, but meanwhile I will ask the gentleman to let it go over.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not object to this matter. It is usual, it is the custom to do this, and we might as well have it done now as later on in the next session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman insists on his resolution now, I shall object.

Mr. LEVER. I will withhold the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House and during the recess of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire what the reason is for asking this permission?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that, while we do not contemplate making reports during the extra session, there are many legislative matters that the committee will wish to consider, so as to get them out of the congestion of the regular session, when we will have the appropriation bills up.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 79.

Resolved, That the Committee on Invalid Pensions be authorized to have such printing done as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that that committee ought to have the authority to have binding done as well as printing, and I notice his resolution does not include that.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be amended in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXPENDITURES IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida objects.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 78.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary for the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 80.

Resolved, That the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives is authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary for the transaction of its business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS, ETC.

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution to provide for the distribution by Members of the Sixty-second Congress of documents, reports, and other publications.

Resolved, etc., That all documents, books, reports, and other publications ordered to be printed and published by the Sixty-first Congress and not allotted prior to the 4th day of March, 1911, shall be allotted to the Members of the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Florida did object.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 1.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 81.

Resolved, That the Committee on Elections No. 1 be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned on yesterday there was pending a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) offered by myself to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] had made a point of order. I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution offered yesterday and which is now pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to withdraw a resolution which he offered on yesterday.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose he has that right without asking unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be withdrawn. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Alabama will withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. H. H. BINGHAM presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the following letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 11, 1911.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

ESTEEMED SIR: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice and respectfully ask its immediate acceptance.

Very respectfully,
R. B. MACON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of George W. Anderson, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Thursday, April 13, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Pilkington Bayou, Tex. (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of East Haven River, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Merrimac River between Haverhill and Lowell, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 9); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri, from the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2958) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. J. Res. 30) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 4414) to provide pensions for prisoners of war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4415) granting a pension to persons who have lost their hearing from causes originating in the military service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4416) granting pensions to honorably discharged volunteer soldiers who served three months or more between the 1st day of April, 1861, and the 1st day of August, 1865, in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4417) to provide for service pensions for surviving volunteer soldiers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4418) granting a pension to widows of honorably discharged volunteer soldiers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4419) providing data for the apportionment of Representatives among the States; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4420) to amend section 3244, chapter 3, title 35, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4421) to fix the compensation of rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4422) to regulate the trial of cases of contempt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 4423) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the reorganization of the Consular Service of the United States," approved April 5, 1906; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 4424) providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection and completion thereon of a public building in the Borough of the Bronx, New York City, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 4425) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, so as to place building material, earthen and glass ware, bagging and other manufactures of jute, agricultural machinery and implements, and other like manufactured products on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNBULL: A bill (H. R. 4426) to amend and reenact section 21 of an act approved March 3, 1879, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 4427) to change the name of Warder Place to that of Atlanta Street, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 4428) to protect migratory wild fowl in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4429) to amend section 2169 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4430) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4431) providing for the payment of certain claims of the State of California growing out of the Indian wars; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 4432) to provide for the erection of a public building at Daytona, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4433) to provide for the erection of a public building at West Palm Beach, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 4434) to provide an allowance for loss of distilled spirits deposited in internal-revenue warehouses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 4435) to amend sections 5136 and 5137 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, permitting national banking associations to make loans on real-estate security, and limiting amounts thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4436) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to the Hot Springs Reservation in Arkansas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4437) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Galion, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PICKETT: A bill (H. R. 4438) to provide for the erection of a public building at Cedar Falls, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 4439) to provide for the erection of a United States public building at Barnesville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 4440) to provide a mode for judicial settlement of certain suits and controversies in the Territory of New Mexico growing out of alleged unlawful sales and contracts respecting lands granted to said Territory under the act approved June 21, 1898 (30 Stats., 383); to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 4441) to provide for the erection of a public building at Maquoketa, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4442) forbidding the sale of arms of the United States and providing for their disposal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 4443) to authorize the sale of all surplus and unallotted lands embraced within the limits of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in the State of North Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 4444) providing for experimental rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4445) providing for the erection of monuments over the graves of Maj. Gen. Elijah Clark and Col. John Dooly, in Lincoln County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4446) to provide for the use of the block system for all trains engaged in interstate commerce; to provide for the examination and license of all telegraph operators engaged in handling block signals and telegraphic orders affect-

ing the movement of trains on such railroads, and to provide for the hours of labor to be required of such telegraph operators and their compensation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4447) to prohibit any person from taking, receiving, or agreeing to receive, directly or indirectly, giving or agreeing to give to any person any money or other valuable consideration, directly or indirectly, to procure, aid in procuring, or attempting to procure, appointment to Federal office, and to provide a punishment therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4448) to limit the powers of certain courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to arrange an international conference to determine the disposition of arms condemned as public property; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) proposing an amendment to the Constitution by providing that all of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment except its first sentence shall be repealed; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) proposing to amend the Constitution by repealing the fifteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4449) granting an increase of pension to William P. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4450) granting an increase of pension to John Ricksecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4451) granting an increase of pension to John C. Griggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4452) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4453) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Meyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 4454) for the relief of Frank L. Rael, heir of Francisco Rael, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4455) granting an increase of pension to George H. Hildt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4456) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4457) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Levingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 4458) granting a pension to Augusta Hartwell Macomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 4459) granting an increase of pension to Francis J. Truesdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4460) granting an increase of pension to Joe R. Pickle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4461) granting an increase of pension to John L. McMurtry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4462) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4463) granting an increase of pension to Madison White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4464) granting an increase of pension to John W. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4465) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4466) granting a pension to Mary C. Lanier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4467) granting a pension to Nathan Hirshberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4468) granting arrears of pension to William H. Willett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4469) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Hiram Binkley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4470) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Ed Pruett and grant him a pension; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4471) for the relief of John Buchler; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4472) for the relief of Pinkie West, administratrix of the estate of J. J. West, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 4473) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4474) granting an increase of pension to John W. Blockson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4475) granting an increase of pension to Marion F. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4476) granting an increase of pension to Hobart Doctor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4477) granting a pension to Alden H. Moxley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4478) granting an increase of pension to Stephen C. Selman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4479) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Hemphill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4480) granting an increase of pension to James B. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4481) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob H. Wager, alias Jacob H. Wagner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4482) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Rogers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4483) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert P. Horn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4484) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bucher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) granting an increase of pension to William Waggoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 4486) granting an increase of pension to James W. Jackson, alias William Beverly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAISON: A bill (H. R. 4487) granting a pension to Martha Ann Gillikin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) granting a pension to Elza Lawrence; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4489) granting a pension to Samuel Outlaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4490) to correct the military record of James B. Waters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4491) granting a pension to Sarah Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 4492) granting a pension to Robert L. Hester; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4493) granting a pension to William J. Whitfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4494) granting a pension to Milo Le Seur; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4495) granting a pension to J. L. Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4496) for the relief of Eugene J. O'Connor and J. B. Schweers; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4497) for the relief of the heirs of John Larr, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4498) for the relief of the heirs of Russell W. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4499) for the relief of the estate of Willis Ramsey; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4500) granting an increase of pension to Adelia Inman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) granting an increase of pension to Charles Domney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Hammetter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4503) granting an increase of pension to James Frank Sanderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4504) granting a pension to Robert F. Tietz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4505) granting a pension to Herbert H. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4506) for the relief of Marraton Upton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4507) for the relief of Andrew J. Lawrence; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) for the relief of Thomas B. Hanoum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4509) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Robert H. Peck a captain in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 4510) granting an increase of pension to Robert Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 4511) granting a pension to Thomas Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) for the relief of Mary Beal; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4513) for the relief of Mary Cornick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 4514) granting an increase of pension to James Pritchitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4515) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4516) granting an increase of pension to Edward L. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) for the relief of the heirs of Madison Turner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4518) for the relief of the heirs of W. W. Summers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) for the relief of the heirs of William Bradshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4520) for the relief of the heirs of Caswell Puckett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) for the relief of the legal heirs of Mrs. George M. Goodwin; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) for the relief of heirs or estate of W. T. Garrett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) for the relief of D. C. Manire; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) for the relief of W. J. Winsett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4525) for the relief of Joseph Thompson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4526) for the relief of Dr. J. J. Crunk, of Marshall County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4527) for the relief of Hiram B. Crowell and William H. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4528) for the relief of the estate of James D. Hays; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 4529) for the relief of John W. Terry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 4530) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Louthain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) granting an increase of pension to John Engle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4532) granting an increase of pension to Orson Simonds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) granting an increase of pension to John Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Bullard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Doty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4536) granting an increase of pension to John G. Harshberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4537) granting an increase of pension to Calvin B. Flick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4538) granting an increase of pension to Edwin B. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4539) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4540) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Dietrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of the Neptune Insurance Co., of New York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 4542) for the relief of the legal representatives of Gallus Kerchner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 4543) granting a pension to Sarah E. Turnmire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4544) granting an increase of pension to James R. Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4545) granting an increase of pension to John D. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4546) granting an increase of pension to John W. Woodside; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4547) granting an increase of pension to James Vandeventer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4548) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Richeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4549) granting an increase of pension to James R. Reece; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4550) granting an increase of pension to Levi Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4551) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Current; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4552) granting an increase of pension to William A. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to Wallace R. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to Morton B. Chrisman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4555) granting an increase of pension to David J. Matheney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4556) granting an increase of pension to George W. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4557) granting an increase of pension to David Blubaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4558) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4559) granting an increase of pension to William Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4560) granting an increase of pension to William Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4561) granting an increase of pension to George Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4562) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4563) granting an increase of pension to Oliver T. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4564) granting an increase of pension to Minnie E. Piety; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4565) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4566) granting an increase of pension to Louis Hartroth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4567) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Haylett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4568) granting a pension to George Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4569) granting a pension to Orville P. Amick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4570) granting a pension to O. C. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4571) for the relief of John W. Baggett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4572) for the relief of John B. Valira, alias James Breme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4573) for the relief of Daniel F. Ritchie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4574) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth B. Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4575) to correct the military record of James H. Carver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4576) for the relief of Christofer M. Ladd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4577) for the payment of a reward to George Foster for the capture of Bert Welty; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4578) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Osage Tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4579) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Ponca Tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4580) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Tonkawa Tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 4581) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4582) for the relief of the Pennsylvania Engineering Co., of the city of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4583) granting a pension to John H. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4584) granting an increase of pension to William N. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4585) granting an increase of pension to Jacob G. Drehmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 4586) granting a pension to Marie O. Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4587) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4588) granting an increase of pension to John Burkhard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4589) granting an increase of pension to Myron M. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4590) granting an increase of pension to Henry Meerdink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4591) granting an increase of pension to Rufus W. Rosenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4592) granting an increase of pension to William H. Zetler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4593) granting an increase of pension to William Whitmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4594) granting an increase of pension to C. F. Regnier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4595) for the relief of Elisabeth Rink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4596) for the relief of John D. Moon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4597) for the relief of Charles Christian Melchert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4598) for the relief of Charles W. Tappan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4599) for the relief of D. M. Rowland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4600) for the relief of James F. Gorman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4601) for the relief of Severin Hartman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4602) to remove the charge of desertion against John C. Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4603) granting a pension to George W. Bagley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PICKETT: A bill (H. R. 4604) granting an increase of pension to Alfred J. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4605) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sewell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4606) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4607) granting an increase of pension to Albert Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4608) granting an increase of pension to Chester B. Stilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4609) granting an increase of pension to Asa L. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4610) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry Ohlekopf, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 4611) granting an increase of pension to John Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4612) for the relief of the estate of T. J. Semmes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 4613) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4614) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4615) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Early; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4616) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4617) granting an increase of pension to Byron Lilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4618) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. McCrory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4619) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4620) granting an increase of pension to George F. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4621) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4622) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4623) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Stebbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4624) granting a pension to James Bellamy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4625) granting a pension to Mary Rischert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4626) granting a pension to Lovina Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4627) for the relief of Marcus Billstine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4628) granting an honorable discharge to James Carty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS (by request): A bill (H. R. 4629) for the relief of Thomas Kennedy, executor of the estate of Margaret Kennedy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 4630) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Whittaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 4631) granting an increase of pension to James H. Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4632) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4633) granting a pension to Sarah J. Squier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4634) granting a pension to Narcisse Minard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURNBULL: A bill (H. R. 4635) for the relief of E. A. R. Wyatt; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4636) granting an increase of pension to William H. Herrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4637) for the relief of Rebecca P. Tyus, or her heirs; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 4638) granting an increase of pension to David A. Piatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4639) granting an increase of pension to Williamson T. Tway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4640) granting an increase of pension to James F. Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Protest from sundry citizens of Mexico, Mo., against sending United States troops to Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition to accompany bill for relief of Pinkie West, administratrix of the estate of J. J. West, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition signed by George M. Casebier and other business men and citizens of McLouth, Kans., against the bill to regulate cold storage of butter, eggs, and poultry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions adopted by the Pomona Grange, Pataskala, Ohio, in opposition to proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; also, petition of J. L. Ticker & Son, of Coshocton, Ohio, against any reduction of the duty on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Resolution adopted April 9 by the Socialist Party of Cleveland, Ohio, denouncing the mobilization of United States troops in the vicinity of the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Joe R. Pickle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CATLIN: Petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., for the construction of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Resolutions of Jasper Packard Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lafayette, Ind., for dollar-a-day pension law; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Arsenal Federation of Labor Unions at Rock Island Arsenal, against installing the Taylor system of shop management; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Niagara Alkali Co., asking for a duty on caustic potash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Clifford S. Hunt, of De Kalb, Ill., in opposition to Canadian tariff agreement, and of the New York Cordage Co., urging that jute cotton bagging and russia rope be put on free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of W. Clyde Huff and 21 other citizens of Michigan and residents of St. Joseph County, urging Congress to establish a system of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Flasher, N. Dak., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Edinburg, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition from citizens of Hampden, N. Dak., urging passage of bill for additional compensation to rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Ledyard Grange, No. 167, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mystic, Conn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of farmers of Kewaunee County, Wis., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Suring, Wis., in favor of the withdrawal of United States troops from the Mexican frontier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of residents of Door County, Wis., favoring retention of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Augustus Sponsler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of residents and voters of Henrico County, Va., in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of Georgia-Florida Sawmill Association, against Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENROOT: Petition of Hugh Bell and 43 others, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of New York Cordage Co., against the duty on jute cotton bagging and russia rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNBULL: Petition of Edward Wyatt, son of E. A. R. Wyatt, asking for remuneration for property taken by and for the use of the Union Army during the Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petitions of Seward Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and Stereotypers' Union No. 1, Journeymen Stereotypers and Electrotypers' Union, of New York, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Chapter of American Institute of Architects, favoring proposed site for Lincoln memorial; to the Committee on the Library.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *April 13, 1911.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, offered the following prayer:

Our heavenly Father, whose ear is ever open to the cry of Thy children, we are sore pained because of the homes which have been devastated and the hearts which have been made desolate. Their sorrow is our sorrow, as their loss is our loss. Oh, Thou who rulest over whirlwind and tempest, comfort the stricken hearts, we pray Thee, and deepen Thy children's trust in Thee. And though Thou leadest us in ways which we can not understand, because of the frailty of our nature, help us still, we implore Thee, to pray that Thy will may be done and that Thy kingdom may come. And unto Thee, who art the God of all comfort, do we commit our bodies and our souls now and forevermore. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 43.

Whereas it appears from an investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States, and otherwise, that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States, notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under the Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and control its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the application be made, and hereby is made, to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited, and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved, That the legislatures of all other States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of the bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

Adopted February 16, 1911.

N. BAXTER, Jr.,
Speaker of the Senate.
A. M. LEACH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, February 17, 1911.
[SEAL.]
BEN W. HOOPER, *Governor.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the congregations of the Temple Lutheran Church, of Philadelphia; the Church of the Brethren, of Portis, Kans.; the Church of the Brethren, of St. Joseph, Mo.; of the Morning Star Sunday School, of McPherson, Kans.; and of the executive committee of the Laymen's Missionary Movement of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict the sale and traffic of opium, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Emerald Club, of Paterson, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of Kankakee, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation withdrawing the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Dunlap, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Minnesota Wool Growers' Association, praying for the adoption of an amendment to Schedule K of the present tariff law providing reasonable protection to the wool growers of the Mississippi Valley, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of the Morning Star Sunday School, of McPherson, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors into prohibition districts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation withdrawing the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURNHAM presented petitions of James Collins, of Manchester, N. H., and 254 other citizens of New Hampshire, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented memorials of Herman Anderson, of Milan; C. W. Farr, of North Weare; William Chesbro, of East Deering; J. W. Clark, of North Weare; William F. Colesworthy, of Canaan; Fred O. Lavene, of Winchester; Edward Flanders, of Clinton Grove; Edgar C. Breed, of Weare; Oliver C. Dimond, of West Concord; S. R. Hanscom, of Errol; Fred A. Wesson, of Lancaster; Gaun E. Gonell, of Tilton; and John D. Hutchinson, of West Chesterfield, all of the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SUTHERLAND presented a petition of the Salt Lake Socialist Party, of Salt Lake City, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation withdrawing the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES. I present a joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 6.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Washington, would respectfully represent:

The Bay of Port Townsend and Oak Bay, in the State of Washington, are now separated by a narrow strip of land from 100 to 150 feet in width, and by reason of this obstruction vessels going north from Puget Sound are compelled to pass around Marrowstone Point, exposed to the heavy swells direct from the ocean. We would further represent that light-draft and stern-wheel steamers are forbidden by the United States local inspectors from doing business between the city of Port Townsend and other cities on Puget Sound south of Marrowstone Point during the winter months. We would further represent that the removal of this obstruction would present a safe means of communication during the entire year, and also shorten the distance to be traveled by water at least 13 miles, and that said obstruction can be removed for the sum of $80,000.

The number of vessels and tonnage entering from and clearing for foreign ports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, was 5,097, with the total tonnage of 3,816,010. There is no record of vessels in the coastwise trade, as they are not required to enter or clear, but a conservative estimate would place it as nearly double the foreign tonnage, in addition to what we term the "local fleet" of Puget Sound.

Many of the foreign and coastwise vessels would use the canal, if constructed, but its importance for protection of the local sound fleet and the lumber industry is still greater, the facts concerning which are as follows: Seven vessels of the local fleet ply between the upper sound points to Port Townsend and to points by way of Port Townsend. The number of trips made by these vessels annually in both directions were 3,848, with a total tonnage of 2,323,968. During eight months ending August 31, 1910, they carried 73,233 tons of freight for local points. The average for the year would therefore be in excess of 105,000 tons. If the canal was constructed, every one of these vessels would make use of this passage.

There is an annual towage from the Straits direct to upper sound mills of 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 feet of logs, all of which would make use of this canal. It is not an unusual sight to see six or seven tugs with tows of logs from Port Townsend Bay awaiting favorable opportunity to round Marrowstone Point. During time of storm the weather conditions off Marrowstone Point and opposite the entrance to Port Townsend Bay are as bad as can be found outside of Point Wilson, which the Government designated as open ocean.

The protection which this canal would afford to the smaller vessels of Puget Sound and to the lumber industries would, in itself, be sufficient to warrant the expenditure of the money necessary for its excavation and completion.

In the interests of the industries at the head of Port Townsend Bay, such as the Western Steel Corporation plant at Irondale, the plant of the Classon Chemical Co. at Hadlock, and the Washington Mill Co. interests at the same place, this canal is even more necessary, for the constantly increasing business at these points demand a constantly increasing traffic by water, which traffic is handicapped at present not only by bad weather conditions to be found off Marrowstone Point, but by additional distance of over 12 miles, which must be traveled in order to reach these industries.

With this canal completed, traffic between Seattle and other points on Puget Sound and the various points on Port Townsend Bay would be augmented, in that it would be open to smaller vessels than those which are now required, owing to the necessity of passing at times through exceedingly rough and dangerous weather off Marrowstone Point.

We, your petitioners, would therefore respectfully request that an appropriation of said sum of $80,000 be made for the purposes herein stated, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Passed the senate February 28, 1911.

W. H. PAULHAMUS,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 4, 1911.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. JONES. I present a joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled (twelfth regular session), respectfully petition:

That the bill now before Congress providing that appeal may be taken from the decisions rendered by the Secretary of the Interior to the Circuit Court of the United States in and for the District of Columbia be modified, in that appeals from the decisions of the Secretary of the Interior be taken to the circuit court of the United States for the district in which the land under controversy is situated, and that the bill when so amended be enacted into law.

Passed the senate February 9, 1911.

W. H. PAULHAMUS,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house March 4, 1911.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 27.

Whereas the United States Immigration Commission after four years investigation and the expenditure of $1,000,000 has made a 40-volume report to Congress; and

Whereas it is being proposed that the immigration evils from which the Northeastern States are suffering be relieved by diverting and distributing the aliens now crowding into and congesting the slums, sweatshops, and city centers of the Northeast; and

Whereas the Immigration Commission clearly points out that this is the only country with any considerable net foreign immigration, our laws and administrative policy are the weakest of any new country, and that "substantial restriction is demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations," and the illiteracy test is recommended "as the most feasible single method for excluding undesirable immigration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the State Senate of Tennessee (the House concurring), That we hereby memorialize Congress to immediately enact some such illiteracy test as is recommended by the Immigration Commission as is law in Australia, New Zealand, and other new countries, pass other needed immigration legislation along the lines of the Immigration Commission's suggestions, and do not pass any legislation looking to the diversion and distribution of the kind of alien population that is now congesting the northeastern cities and causing so many evils there; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate at once to the President of the United States, to our two United States Senators, and each of our Representatives at Washington, D. C., with the request that it be presented to Congress and properly referred.

Adopted February 7, 1911.

N. BAXTER, JR.,
Speaker of the Senate.
A. M. LEACH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, February 9, 1911.

BEN W. HOOPER, *Governor.*

I, W. D. Scruggs, chief clerk of the senate, hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of senate joint resolution No. 27, adopted February 7, 1911.

W. D. SCRUGGS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR presented a petition of Local Branch Sons of the Revolution, of Memphis, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a compilation for publication of the military and naval records of the Revolutionary War, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens and business firms of Memphis, Tenn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the dealing in cotton futures, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented memorials of Cascade Grange, No. 92, of Oakland; Aroostook County Pomona Grange, No. 7; Local Grange No. 165, of Perham; Highland Grange, No. 364, of North Penobscot; Schoodic Grange, No. 420, of Franklin; and of Silver Lake Grange, No. 327, of Weeks Mills, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waterville, Me., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Gardiner, Me., praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented memorials of Rocktown Grange, No. 8, of Burlington; Millstone Valley Grange, No. 169; Rancocas Grange, No. 345; Mullica Hill Grange, No. 51; and Somerset Grange, No. 7, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale and transportation of foods in cold storage, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 169, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millstone, N. J., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of the Emerald Club, of Elizabeth; of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Elizabeth; of Robert Fischer, of Paterson; and of M. A. McMahon, of Paterson, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Maxcy Applegate, of Freehold, N. J., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Claremont Presbyterian Church, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of race-gambling bets, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millstone, N. J., and a petition of sundry citizens of Salem and Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of Johnsonburg Grange, No. 189; Monmouth Grange, No. 92; Cedarville Grange, No. 34; Burlington Grange, No. 150; Lincoln Grange, No. 136, Westwood; Towaco Grange, No. 194; Moravian Grange, Hope; Hamilton Grange, No. 79, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of sundry citizens of Jersey City, Ridgewood, Murray Hill, Paterson, Hoboken, Cranford, and Weehawken, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church, of Newark; of Mountain View Council, of Wayne; of Anthony Wayne Council, of Newark; of Friendship Council, No. 81, of New Market, of the Junior Order United American Mechanics; of Washington Camp, No. 79, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Frenchtown; and of sundry citizens of Metuchen, North Long Branch, and Plainville, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented the petition of Lieut. Col. George L. Forman and officers of the Second New Jersey Infantry, National Guard, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pay to certain officers of the National Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Columbia Heights Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the establishment of an inebriate hospital in the District, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Tilton, Errol, Mason, Milan, West Concord, Weare, Boscawen, Norwalk, Atkinson, and Canaan, and of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of New London, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of J. E. Baer, O. A. Harris, Jacob W. Metzger, Harmon S. Mosher, John W. Masher, O. B. Creager, L. C. Mosher, and J. E. Burd, of Columbia City, Ind.; of the Indianapolis Brush & Broom Manufacturing Co., of Indianapolis, Ind.; and of Local Grange No. 2142, Patrons of Husbandry, of Seymour, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. YOUNG presented a petition of the Montgomery County Medical Society, of Red Oak, Iowa, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented memorials of the Troy Agricultural Club, of Eagle Grove; of White Prairie Grange, No. 2039, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wilton Junction; and of sundry citizens of Nemaha and Corwith, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of H. & T. McCluskey & Sons, of New Haven, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of 250 citizens of Stamford, Greenwich, Norwalk, South Norwalk, and Darien, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented petitions of Good Will Grange, of Glastonbury; Local Grange of Columbia; Local Grange of Suffield; Waugumbaug Grange, of South Coventry; and Local Grange of Somers, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of sundry members of the Grand Army of the Republic, Headquarters Department of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a proposed increase in the Army and Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WARREN. I have numerous telegrams in the nature of petitions from State associations, county associations, and business associations with reference to a proposed change in tariff schedule K. They are in the nature of requests that a postponement may be had of the consideration of that subject until the Tariff Board has been heard from, with a full report on that industry. It is understood that the Tariff Board is now engaged in investigating woolgrowing and wool manufacturing, have been so engaged for some months, and will be so engaged for some little time to come.

As I do not wish unduly to encumber the RECORD I ask that one from a State association, a very short one, and one from a county association may be printed in the RECORD, and the others simply noted in the RECORD as such petitions are usually noted.

There being no objection, the petitions indicated by Mr. WARREN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *April 10, 1911.*

Hon FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

On behalf of the woolgrowers of Wyoming I vigorously protest against any change being made in schedule K until the National Tariff Commission reports in full. Reciprocal and tariff agitation has caused an irreparable injury to all industries of the West and we demand that our interest be not further unjustly assailed.

J. A. DEFELDER,
President Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

ROCK SPRINGS, WYO., *April 10, 1911.*

Senator F. E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.

Forty members of our association trust that you be given renewed strength and vigor to combat successfully any attempt to reduce the tariff on wool. The results of previous experience with tariff reduction even one cent lower than it is now has proved on trial to be insufficient to preserve the sheep industry, and that when the growing of wool cost at least one-fourth less than it does now. We pray that justice may prevail that we may live.

SWEETWATER COUNTY WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. WARREN presented memorials of Lewis Barker, Wyoming sheep commissioner, central district; Hon. F. S. King, sheep commissioner, northern district; J. J. Bentley, sheep commissioner, northern district; J. S. Atherly, secretary-treasurer, board of sheep commissioners; Boyer Bros., of Wamsutter; John Piggett, of Lander; Robert Pollock, C. H. Jenkins, George Hartman, Spalding & Soule, Chris Lkine, Joe Lane, James McGibbon Sons, A. W. Augspurgur, A. R. Peters, Flake Hall, Ashley Hall, William Spell, W. W. Bowers, J. D. Naffyiger, Albany County Sheep & Wool Growers' Association, Elmer Lapash, Ward Ash, Barin Land Cattle Co., Jane Stoddart, W. W. Owen, Frank Prager, Alex Bowie, E. J. Bell, Davis & Thomas, Otto Gramm, A. L. Hall, Charles Hull, James Atkinson, sr., William Atkinson, James Atkinson, jr., Theo V. Tregoning, Bert Hess, John Innes, F. L. King Bros. Co., Swan Land Cattle Co., Laramie Development Co., Running Water Ranch Co., Toltec Livestock Co., Riverside Land Stock Co., Milbrook Land & Live Stock Co., H. U. Small, and Oscar Sodegreen, of Laramie, all in the State of Wyoming, remonstrating against any change being made in Schedule K of the present tariff law until the Tariff Board makes its report and the report is duly considered, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a petition of the State Association of Creamery Owners and Managers, of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale and transportation of foods in cold storage, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Glen Flora, Wis., remonstrating against the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hiles, Wis., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of George D. Eggleston Post, No. 133, Department of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, of Appleton, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kaukaunee, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called parcels post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of the farmers' clubs of Sand Beach; Odessa; Berrien Center; Adrian; Harbor Beach; Ferry; Mount Pleasant; Ionia; White Pigeon; York Township, Washtenaw County; Victor Township, Clinton County; Grant; Holloway; Goodland Township, Lapeer County; Dowagiac; and Plainwell; and of Kates Bay Grange, No. 1367; Cavanaugh Lake Grange, No. 998; Lincoln Grange; Branch County Pomona Grange, No. 22; Batavia Grange, No. 95; Greenwood Grange, No. 1217; Chippewa County Grange, No. 66; Mason Grange, No. 265; Studley Grange, No. 1174; Leelanau Grange, No. 1556; Gilead Grange, No. 400; Sitka Grange, No. 861; Brady Grange, No. 61; and Liberty Grange, of the Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LORIMER presented memorials of Pomono Grange, No. 35, of Peoria County; of Charter Oak Grange, No. 1685, of Peoria; and of Alta Grange, No. 1350, of Alta, all of the Patrons of Husbandry; and of the Trades and Labor Assembly, of Quincy, and sundry citizens of McLean County, and Dunlap, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Balaton, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CRANE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. PAGE presented a memorial of Local Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Fair Haven, Vt., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Bellows Falls, Vt., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS.

Mr. GAMBLE. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 5) to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States. I call the attention of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] to the joint resolution.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution. It provides for the appointment of a special joint committee, consisting of five Senators, to be appointed by the Vice President from Members of the Sixty-second Congress, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker from the Members of the Sixty-second Congress, to examine, consider, and submit to Congress recommendations upon the revision and codification of laws reported by the Statutory Revision Commission, heretofore authorized to revise and codify the laws of the United States, including all laws of a general nature, permanent in character, passed since the submission to Congress, on December 15, 1906, of the final report of said commission; and that the joint committee be authorized to sit during the recess of Congress and to employ necessary assistants, to order such printing and binding done as may be required in the transaction of its business, and to incur such expenses as may be deemed necessary, all such expense to be paid in equal proportions from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL LABORER IN THE STATIONERY ROOM.

Mr. GAMBLE. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the following resolution (S. Res. 8) submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] on the 6th instant:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized to employ an additional laborer in the Senate stationery room at the rate of $720 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for—

to report it favorably, and I call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR:

A bill (S. 746) providing for the payment of certain land claims; to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

A bill (S. 747) to locate, map, and mark field of battle fought near Nashville, Tenn., December 15 and 16, 1864, to construct driveways, etc., and make an appropriation for same;

A bill (S. 748) granting an honorable discharge and back pay to William C. Chandler;

A bill (S. 749) to correct the military record of Thomas Y. Patton;

A bill (S. 750) to remove the charge of desertion resting against Benjamin H. Frisbie and to grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (S. 751) to remove the charge of desertion standing against William M. Cox (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 752) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stone River; and

A bill (S. 753) establishing the Franklin National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 754) for the relief of M. E. Hall and the estate of James B. Hall, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 755) granting a pension to John W. Sturm;

A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to Ollie M. Croghan;

A bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Yates;

A bill (S. 758) granting an increase of pension to James A. Russell;

A bill (S. 759) granting an increase of pension to John T. Phillips;

A bill (S. 760) granting an increase of pension to Walter Moore;

A bill (S. 761) granting a pension to Mary McCloud;

A bill (S. 762) granting a pension to Joseph Owen Dennison;

A bill (S. 763) granting a pension to Robert E. Taber;

A bill (S. 764) granting a pension to George W. Johnson;

A bill (S. 765) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Norman;

A bill (S. 766) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Laws;

A bill (S. 767) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Webster;

A bill (S. 768) granting a pension to Tide Owens;

A bill (S. 769) granting a pension to Martha A. Connor;

A bill (S. 770) granting a pension to Elihu Messer;

A bill (S. 771) granting an increase of pension to Lottie J. Lewis;

A bill (S. 772) granting a pension to Georgia B. Snapp;

A bill (S. 773) granting a pension to Israel W. Bennett;

A bill (S. 774) granting a pension to Elza Houston;

A bill (S. 775) granting a pension to William A. Hamilton;

A bill (S. 776) granting an increase of pension to Walter Moore;

A bill (S. 777) granting a pension to Thomas McCavan;

A bill (S. 778) granting a pension to Christopher H. Dippre;

A bill (S. 779) granting a pension to David C. Bowman;

A bill (S. 780) increasing the rate of pension to all soldiers and sailors of the War with Mexico and the widows of such soldiers and sailors;

A bill (S. 781) granting an increase of pension to John N. Cooter (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 782) granting a pension to Michael Grace (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 783) granting a pension to John A. Estep (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 784) to appropriate a portion of the proceeds arising from the sale of public lands in Oklahoma for the construction of public highways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 785) granting an increase of pension to Elias Cleveland; and

A bill (S. 786) granting an increase of pension to Joel Goodrick (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 787) granting a pension to Lucinda Skidmore;

A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Reed;

A bill (S. 789) granting an increase of pension to Santford Vincent;

A bill (S. 790) granting an increase of pension to W. B. Taylor;

A bill (S. 791) granting an increase of pension to Anary Toothman;

A bill (S. 792) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Spencer;

A bill (S. 793) granting an increase of pension to Eunice M. Lemley;

A bill (S. 794) granting a pension to Leslie Harding;

A bill (S. 795) granting a pension to Ebb Workman;

A bill (S. 796) granting an increase of pension to William J. Davis;

A bill (S. 797) granting an increase of pension to David Cain;

A bill (S. 798) granting an increase of pension to Amos Hoy;

A bill (S. 799) granting a pension to Rebecca Strouther;

A bill (S. 800) granting an increase of pension to John Boler;

A bill (S. 801) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Chadock;

A bill (S. 802) granting an increase of pension to Alexander W. Barnes;

A bill (S. 803) granting a pension to Andrew P. Crumley;

A bill (S. 804) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Whiteman;

A bill (S. 805) granting an increase of pension to Andy Phillips;

A bill (S. 806) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Staton;

A bill (S. 807) granting an increase of pension to James McConnell;

A bill (S. 808) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Shahan;

A bill (S. 809) granting a pension to George W. Johnson;

A bill (S. 810) granting an increase of pension to Bernard F. Morrow;

A bill (S. 811) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; and

A bill (S. 812) granting an increase of pension to John R. Tolbert; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 813) to correct the military record of David N. Kinkead; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 814) granting a pension to Georgie A. Fifield (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 815) granting a pension to Thomas Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 816) to provide for plans and specifications for two high schools in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 817) appropriating $25,000 for the repair of the wooden warship *Portsmouth;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 818) granting an increase of pension to Barlow A. McCoy;

A bill (S. 819) granting an increase of pension to William Baber; and

A bill (S. 820) granting an increase of pension to Chastina E. Hawley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 821) for the relief of Simon Bollinger; and

A bill (S. 822) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin S. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 823) granting an increase of pension to Frances Doherty;

A bill (S. 824) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Thatcher; and

A bill (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Trusty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 826) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry; and

A bill (S. 827) for the relief of Isaac L. Reese; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 828) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hunt;

A bill (S. 829) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Baker;

A bill (S. 830) granting an increase of pension to Seward Newtson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 831) granting an increase of pension to Hardy H. La Due (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 832) granting an increase of pension to Adelbert E. Bliss (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 833) for the relief of the State of Oregon;

A bill (S. 834) for the relief of the State of Oregon;

A bill (S. 835) for the relief of Thomas Coyle and Bridget Coyle and their legal representatives;

A bill (S. 836) for the relief of Joel J. Parker; and

A bill (S. 837) to reimburse the officers and crew of the lighthouse tender *Manzanita* for personal-property losses sustained by them on the foundering of that tender October 6, 1905; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 838) to correct the military record of David R. B. Winniford; and

A bill (S. 839) for the relief of Andrew Jackson Rand (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 840) granting a pension to Philip C. Elbert (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 841) granting increase of pensions to survivors of the Indian wars under the acts of July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; and

A bill (S. 842) granting a pension to Le Claire H. Evans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRIGGS:

A bill (S. 843) for the relief of the heirs of Marianne Sainte Ana Schrepper; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 844) to extend the free transmission through the mails of official mail matter of the Organized Militia of the several States;

A bill (S. 845) to increase the efficiency of the Army and the Organized Militia of the United States; and

A bill (S. 846) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William M. Carroll (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 847) concerning baggage and excess baggage carried by common carriers in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and common carriers while engaged in commerce between the States and between the States and foreign nations, and prescribing the duties of such common carriers in reference thereto while so engaged, defining certain offenses and fixing the punishment therefor, and repealing all conflicting laws; and

A bill (S. 848) to promote the safety of travelers by limiting to 14-hour shifts the service of interstate employees in train service on interstate railroads and to provide for stated periods of permitted rest for such employees; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 849) to amend section 1014 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 850) to amend an act entitled "An act to legalize and establish a pontoon railway bridge across the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, and to authorize the construction of a similar bridge at or near Clinton, Iowa," approved June 6, 1874; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 851) to change the name of Fort Place, from Seventeenth to Eighteenth Streets NE., to Irving Street; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 852) for the relief of D. M. Rowland; and

A bill (S. 853) for the relief of the estate of Silas F. Baker, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 854) to require the National Monetary Commission to make final report on or before December 4, 1911, and to repeal sections 17, 18, and 19 of the act entitled "An act to amend the national banking laws," approved May 30, 1908, the repeal to take effect December 5, 1911; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 855) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, entitled "An act to extend the provisions, limitations, and benefits of an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to the survivors of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, known as the Black Hawk War, Cherokee disturbance, and the Seminole War,' approved July 27, 1892";

A bill (S. 856) granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines confined in Confederate prisons;

A bill (S. 857) granting an increase of pension to James Y. Kennedy;

A bill (S. 858) granting an increase of pension to William E. Brown;

A bill (S. 859) granting an increase of pension to William Rider;

A bill (S. 860) granting an increase of pension to Elias Palmer;

A bill (S. 861) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Balfour;

A bill (S. 862) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Williams;

A bill (S. 863) granting an increase of pension to Miller C. Hunter;

A bill (S. 864) granting an increase of pension to James H. Firman;

A bill (S. 865) granting an increase of pension to John C. Martin;

A bill (S. 866) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Coffman;

A bill (S. 867) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Graft;

A bill (S. 868) granting an increase of pension to Joel Ames (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 869) granting a pension to Archie S. Blackmer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 870) granting an increase of pension to William Henry Cray (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 871) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Nicol (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 872) granting an increase of pension to L. W. Brattain (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 873) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Coons (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 874) providing for the allotment of lands to certain members of the Ponca Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 875) for the relief of the Mission Farm Co., Peter Volondra, and others; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 876) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Bellefourche, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 877) granting an increase of pension to Archie E. Booth;

A bill (S. 878) granting an increase of pension to William Deary;

A bill (S. 879) granting a pension to Elizabeth Epke;

A bill (S. 880) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Read;

A bill (S. 881) granting a pension to Fred M. Weeks;

A bill (S. 882) granting a pension to Catherine M. Rogers;

A bill (S. 883) granting an increase of pension to Francis Caux (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 884) granting an increase of pension to Harvey L. Rose (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 885) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Larkins (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 886) granting an increase of pension to Rodney O. Hazen (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 887) granting an increase of pension to George K. Smith (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 888) granting an increase of pension to Dorethey Wasail (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 889) providing for the manner of making payment for water rights under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 890) to create a board to correct military records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 891) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Rutter;

A bill (S. 892) granting an increase of pension to George W. Simmons; and

A bill (S. 893) granting increase of pensions to survivors of the Indian wars under the acts of July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 894) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the claims of Kentucky drafted men; and

A bill (S. 895) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Louisa, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 896) to extend the provisions of the pension laws to officers and enlisted men of State military organizations who rendered military service to the Union during the War of the Rebellion, and to their widows, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEYBURN:

A bill (S. 897) for the relief of Alfred L. Dutton (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER:

A bill (S. 898) for the relief of James W. Kingon; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 899) to correct the military record of John H. Fesenmeyer;

A bill (S. 900) to amend the military record of Carlos Baker;

A bill (S. 901) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John C. Whitten;

A bill (S. 902) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Lorenzo F. Brown;

A bill (S. 903) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Theodore Reichel; and

A bill (S. 904) to amend the military record of Andrew W. Sears; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 905) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Fisheries.

A bill (S. 906) to increase the compensation of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 907) granting an increase of pension to John Meehan;

A bill (S. 908) granting an increase of pension to Alburtus H. Walker;

A bill (S. 909) granting an increase of pension to Philo S. Bartow;

A bill (S. 910) granting an increase of pension to Mary Francis;

A bill (S. 911) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Neff;

A bill (S. 912) granting an increase of pension to Ella G. Crawford;

A bill (S. 913) granting an increase of pension to Louis Putoz;

A bill (S. 914) granting an increase of pension to Henry Worthington;

A bill (S. 915) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Hoxie;

A bill (S. 916) granting an increase of pension to Jerome A. Shirley;

A bill (S. 917) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Chappell;

A bill (S. 918) granting an increase of pension to Perry B. Johnson;

A bill (S. 919) granting an increase of pension to William F. Jones;

A bill (S. 920) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bogue;

A bill (S. 921) granting an increase of pension to Henry Frink;

A bill (S. 922) granting an increase of pension to Frederick C. Payne;

A bill (S. 923) granting an increase of pension to Jane De Graw;

A bill (S. 924) granting an increase of pension to Virginia H. Morgan;

A bill (S. 925) granting an increase of pension to James Tucker;

A bill (S. 926) granting an increase of pension to Ransford P. Williams;

A bill (S. 927) granting an increase of pension to Julia Adams;

A bill (S. 928) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Sheffield;

A bill (S. 929) granting an increase of pension to Ellen E. Payne; and

A bill (S. 930) granting an increase of pension to James N. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG:

A bill (S. 931) granting an increase of pension to James E. Houghland; and

A bill (S. 932) granting an increase of pension to Elias G. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 933) for the relief of Charles Christian Melchert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 934) granting an increase of pension to Martin Ouderkirk;

A bill (S. 935) granting an increase of pension to Minnie A. Curtis; and

A bill (S. 936) granting a pension to Sarah A. Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 937) to regulate the rank of staff officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 938) for the relief of James Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 939) granting a pension to Adele A. C. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 940) granting to the city of Los Angeles certain rights of way in, over, and through certain public lands and national forests in the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 941) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Reynolds (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 942) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A bill (S. 943) to improve navigation on Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 944) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 945) granting an increase of pension to Allen Turner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 946) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Keller;

A bill (S. 947) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Page (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 948) granting an increase of pension to John M. Perry (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 949) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dolan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 950) granting an increase of pension to Abram Ellis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 951) granting an increase of pension to William Leftrich (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 952) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay Campbell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 953) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher S. Dewey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 954) to provide for the acquisition of a site on which to erect a public building at Gilmer, Tex.; and

A bill (S. 955) to provide for the extension of the post-office and courthouse building at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 956) to require statements of facts and to provide for exceptions to rulings of courts in deportation cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 957) relating to bills of lading; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 958) to amend the public-printing law; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 959) providing for the establishment of a term of the district court for the eastern district of North Carolina at Wilson, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 960) for the relief of Peter F. Pescud, jr., John S. Pescud, Sue B. Craig, and Mollie I. Pescud, heirs at law of Peter F. Pescud, deceased;

A bill (S. 961) for the relief of the heirs at law of E. L. Shuford, deceased;

A bill (S. 962) for the relief of the State of North Carolina;

A bill (S. 963) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church in Washington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 964) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, in Washington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 965) for the relief of the Catholic Church in Washington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 966) for the relief of the Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church, of Beaufort, N. C.;

A bill (S. 967) for the relief of Grace Protestant Episcopal Church, of Plymouth, N. C.;

A bill (S. 968) for the relief of Salem Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Wayne County, N. C.;

A bill (S. 969) for the relief of Beulah Primitive Baptist Church, of Johnston County, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 970) for the relief of Spencer Etheredge, J. E. Berry, and Charles Meekins, trustees of Roanoke Island Baptist Church, of Roanoke Island, N. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 971) granting a pension to Wiley S. Roberts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 972) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Page; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

(By request.) A bill (S. 973) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to the Hot Springs Reservation in Arkansas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 974) to correct the military record of Alonza Rich; and

A bill (S. 975) to remove the charge of desertion against Elias Gibbs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 976) for the relief of the estate of Allen J. Mann, deceased;

A bill (S. 977) for the relief of the heir of Allen J. Mann, sr., deceased;

A bill (S. 978) for the relief of the heirs of Lisander Johnson, deceased;

A bill (S. 979) for the relief of Elizabeth McLaughlin, heir to William Hurley;

A bill (S. 980) for the relief of the heirs of Calep H. Stevens; and

A bill (S. 981) for the relief of the heirs of W. T. Hundley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 982) granting an increase of pension to William H. Dillingham;

A bill (S. 983) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. Chisam;

A bill (S. 984) granting a pension to Esau Walker;

A bill (S. 985) granting an increase of pension to William McClain;

A bill (S. 986) granting a pension to M. V. B. Chapman;

A bill (S. 987) granting a pension to Joseph D. Smith;

A bill (S. 988) granting a pension to Charles D. Belden;

A bill (S. 989) granting a pension to George M. Griffith;

A bill (S. 990) granting a pension to Aubrey P. Lawrence; and

A bill (S. 991) granting an increase of pension to Daniel T. Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 992) granting a pension to Francelia L. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 993) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Brooks;

A bill (S. 994) granting an increase of pension to William G. Downs;

A bill (S. 995) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Smith; and

A bill (S. 996) granting an increase of pension to Amos Potter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 997) for the relief of lock masters, lockmen, and other laborers and mechanics employed by the United States Government in the locks and dams of the Kanawha River in West Virginia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 998) for the relief of Henry G. Roetzel and Paul Chipman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAYNER:

A bill (S. 999) granting an increase of pension to Louise Schenkel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1000) for the relief of the heirs of William S. Shoemaker, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1001) to correct the military record of Andrew Floyd and grant him an honorable discharge (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Pierce O'Connell;

A bill (S. 1003) granting a pension to Evelina Sprague;

A bill (S. 1004) granting a pension to Osmond Ames (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1005) granting an increase of pension to Laura Adam (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1006) granting an increase of pension to Denis McCloskey (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1007) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Bates (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1008) granting an increase of pension to John F. Walker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1009) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Greene;

A bill (S. 1010) granting an increase of pension to Kate Miller;

A bill (S. 1011) granting an increase of pension to Angella L. Shaw;

A bill (S. 1012) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Engberg; and

A bill (S. 1013) granting an increase of pension to John McConnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAPP:

A bill (S. 1014) for the relief of the Ottawa Indian Tribe of Blanchard Fork and Rouch de Boeuf; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Sargent;

A bill (S. 1016) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Barnard;

A bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Sarah A. Perkins;

A bill (S. 1018) granting a pension to Anna L. Freeman;

A bill (S. 1019) granting an increase of pension to John Hodge;

A bill (S. 1020) granting an increase of pension to Mary White;

A bill (S. 1021) granting a pension to Mrs. John Brown;

A bill (S. 1022) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Hitt;

A bill (S. 1023) granting an increase of pension to Arthur J. Powell (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1024) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jenness (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1025) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Gunther (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1026) granting a pension to Mary E. Seeley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 1027) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Marsh, alias Joseph Wright;

A bill (S. 1028) granting an increase of pension to Edson H. Webster;

A bill (S. 1029) granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Avery;

A bill (S. 1030) granting an increase of pension to Sidney F. Sanborn;

A bill (S. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson;

A bill (S. 1032) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Covell, jr.;

A bill (S. 1033) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Young;

A bill (S. 1034) granting an increase of pension to John Murphy; and

A bill (S. 1035) granting an increase of pension to John W. Currier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER:

A bill (S. 1036) for the relief of I. C. Johnson, jr.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1037) to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act providing for an inspection of meats for exportation, prohibiting the importation of adulterated articles of food or drink, and authorizing the President to make proclamation in certain cases, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1038) for the relief of the heirs of Simeon P. Sandidge (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1039) for the relief of Samuel R. Moon (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1040) for the relief of Jason J. Jones (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1041) to correct the military record of James Tully;

A bill (S. 1042) to correct the military record of Samuel R. Moon;

A bill (S. 1043) to correct the military record of James Anderson (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1044) to correct the military record of Franklin Bannon; and

A bill (S. 1045) to correct the military record of Christopher L. Smith (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1046) granting an increase of pension to William C. Cook (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1047) granting an increase of pension to John W. Teel (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1048) granting an increase of pension to George F. Pond (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1049) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hunt;

A bill (S. 1050) granting a pension to Francis M. Hill;

A bill (S. 1051) granting an increase of pension to Hubbard D. Carr;

A bill (S. 1052) granting an increase of pension to William A. Chapman;

A bill (S. 1053) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Johnson;

A bill (S. 1054) granting an increase of pension to W. F. Hoffman; and

A bill (S. 1055) granting an increase of pension to George W. Whaley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) authorizing the appointment of a commission to adjust and settle certain claims between the United States and the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUE OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I ask may be read, and before any disposition is made of it, by reference or otherwise, I desire, with the permission of the Senate, to say a word.

The bill (S. 745) providing for the erection of a statue to Thomas Jefferson at Washington, D. C., was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created, to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, of the Sixty-second Congress, to select a site on the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson, to cost, complete, not to exceed $100,000; and, to procure plans and designs for the same, to be reported to Congress during its next session, the sum of $5,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate I desire to make a short statement in regard to this matter.

In the Fifty-eighth Congress, in pursuance of an amendment offered by myself, the sundry civil appropriation act contained the following provision:

To enable a commission, which is hereby created, to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-eighth Congress, to select a site on the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson, to cost complete not to exceed $100,000, and to procure plans and designs for the same to be reported to Congress during its next session, $5,000.

The Senate will perceive that the bill which I have introduced this morning is in those identical words, with simply the substitution of the Sixty-second Congress instead of the Fifty-eighth Congress.

The sundry civil appropriation bill of that year was passed with that provision in it, and it passed the House, and was approved by the President and became a law. The subsequent illness of the then Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, and his death a short time thereafter, caused a delay in the execution of that order of Congress, which fact was communicated to Congress in a letter by the then Secretary of State, Mr. ROOT, now a Member of this body. I will read the letter of the then Secretary of State, addressed to the Vice President, Charles W. Fairbanks:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 5, 1906.

SIR: I have been instructed by the commission created by the sundry civil appropriation act, approved April 28, 1904, "to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-eighth Congress, to select a site on the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson * * * and to procure plans and designs, to be reported to Congress during its next session," to report to the Senate that action under the statute has been delayed by the illness and death of the late Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, but that the commission has secured the consent of Mr. Augustus St. Gaudens to make the designs for the proposed statue, which will be prepared as soon as Mr. St. Gaudens's health and previous engagements permit. The designs will be transmitted to Congress without any avoidable delay thereafter.

A similar report has been made to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully submitted.

ELIHU ROOT, *Chairman.*

Hon. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,
President of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, the ill health of the artist, St. Gaudens, which is spoken of in this communication by the then Secretary of State, continued, and he died without ever having completed his work. For that reason the order of Congress, as embodied in that statute, was not carried out.

When at a subsequent time it was thought to again revive the activities of the commission, with a view to the completion of the work, it was ascertained that under a general provision of law, by reason of the lapse of time, the appropriation had lapsed and was no longer available.

In view of that fact, at the last session of Congress I offered an amendment in the Senate to be proposed to the deficiency appropriation bill, which I have before me, reviving that appropriation. It is as follows:

To carry out and make effective the provision made in the act of April 28, 1904, making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government: To enable a commission, which is hereby created, to be composed of the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, to select a site on the public grounds in the District of Columbia for a statue of Thomas Jefferson to cost complete not to exceed $100,000, and to procure plans and designs for the same to be reported to the next Congress, $5,000.

That amendment was referred to the Committee on the Library, by that committee reported back favorably to the Senate, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations; it was favorably reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and was passed by the Senate at the last session as an amendment to the deficiency bill; and was in the conference afterwards taken out of the bill. That is the present status.

The bill which I have introduced, in view of the fact that we will have no appropriation bills at the present session, is an independent bill, using the same language and making the same provision and the same appropriation as has already thus twice passed this body. I will repeat, it has been before the Appropriations Committee twice. It has passed the Senate twice. It has passed the House once. It has received the approval of the President in the past.

Mr. CULLOM rose.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will let me continue before I submit to an interruption.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that this is one man, while his fame is in no manner dependent upon it, to whose memory the Government should erect a statue in this Capital. He was the first President ever inaugurated in Washington. That, however, is a comparatively minor matter. He was the great apostle of a distinct body of governmental science and, in a measure, its author. As such he was the founder of a great political party which has continued without interruption for more than a hundred years. Aside from his great services in other regards during a long and memorable career, his name is indissolubly linked with two of the most important events in the history of the United States. The late Senator Hoar, whom it is always a pleasure for me to quote, once in the Senate said that Thomas Jefferson would forever pass through the halls and corridors of history with the Declaration of Independence in one hand and with the title deeds to the great Louisiana Purchase in the other.

Mr. President, this day is the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the birth of this great and illustrious man, and in view of that fact and the further fact that it has already been considered by committees and has twice passed this body, I ask that there may be unanimous consent that the bill be now passed to its third reading, and that action may be immediately had upon it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the request, but I will call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that in all similar bills providing for the erection of statues on the public grounds, we have excluded the grounds of the Capitol and of the Library of Congress. I ask the Senator if he has any objection to having those words inserted?

Mr. BACON. None whatever; though they were not in the previous enactments.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will move an amendment, inserting the words "excluding the Capitol Grounds and the grounds of the Library of Congress." I think it would be a misfortune to invade those grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is not yet before the Senate for the consideration of amendments. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what is the status of the bill now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has just been introduced, and unanimous consent is asked for its present consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Has it not been referred to a committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has introduced the bill and has asked unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. BACON. I want to say, with the permission of the Senator, as I do not know that he heard me, that this bill has already been considered——

Mr. LODGE. I have listened attentively to every word the Senator has said.

Mr. BACON. Very well; then I will not repeat.

Mr. LODGE. I was merely going to say, Mr. President, that I entirely approve of the erection of a statue to Jefferson; there ought to have been one erected long ago; but I am also extremely anxious that there should be, and there ought to be, erected in this Capital a statue to another great American statesman who has never had a statue erected to his memory here, and that is Alexander Hamilton. He represented different views on the Constitution than those of Mr. Jefferson, but he did very great work in the organization of the Government. I have introduced a bill for the erection in this city of a statue to Hamilton's memory, which has gone to the Committee on the Library; and it seems to me that it is only reasonable that both bills should take the same course. I have no objection, if my bill can be added to it, to having the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Massachusetts make no condition of that kind. Let unanimous consent be granted for the consideration of the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia, and then, so far as I am concerned, a similar unanimous consent may be granted in the case of the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts providing for the erection of a statue to Alexander Hamilton, but let us not impose a condition upon this unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I am not imposing any condition at all, Mr. President.

Mr. BACON. I want to echo what my friend from Texas says. I will most undoubtedly favor——

Mr. CULLOM. I wanted to say a moment ago, when I interrupted the Senator, that it seemed to me, under the circumstances, that this bill ought to pass without any delay.

Mr. BACON. It has twice passed the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. One moment. I do not wish to object, but I do wish to secure action on the Hamilton bill. If action is taken on this bill, I will then offer the Hamilton bill and ask a similar privilege for that, and I will make no objection to the consideration of the bill of the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer the amendment suggested by me a moment or two ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the words "District of Columbia," it is proposed to insert "exclusive of the Capitol Grounds and the grounds of the Library of Congress."

Mr. BACON. I accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATUE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Library be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a statue of Alexander Hamilton in Washington, D. C., and that the joint resolution be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Committee on the Library be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the joint resolution be read, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee of the Library of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the president and secretary of the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association are hereby created a commission with power to select a site upon the property belonging to the United States in the city of Washington, other than the Capitol and Library grounds, for the erection of a

statue to Alexander Hamilton, and to have charge of the erection of said statue, for which purpose $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary in addition to the funds contributed by the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BACON. With the consent of the Senator from Massachusetts, I suggest an amendment, to strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred."

Mr. LODGE. Very well, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 12, before the word "thousand," it is proposed to strike out "fifty" and insert "one hundred," so as to read:

For which purpose $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary in addition to the funds contributed by the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts to state, if he knows, what is the amount of the contribution made by the Alexander Hamilton National Memorial Association, referred to in the joint resolution?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know the amount. The association has no large amount, though it has raised a few thousand dollars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT RAPID CITY, S. DAK.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On Monday, through inadvertence, a bill got mixed up in my papers, and I introduced it. I refer to the bill (S. 363) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rapid City, in the State of South Dakota. Inasmuch as the last Congress acted upon the matter, I move that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

LANDS ALONG ANACOSTIA RIVER.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia transmitting the second report of Mr. Hugh T. Taggart, special counsel, on the ownership of lands and riparian rights along the Anacostia River, in the District of Columbia, be printed, with accompanying illustrations, as a document.

PRINTING FOR THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That authority is granted to print and bind, for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, such papers and documents as may be deemed necessary in connection with subjects heretofore considered or to be considered by said committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

HEARINGS BEFORE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

AMENDMENTS TO TARIFF BILLS.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following notice:

Notice is given that at the next session of the Senate I will offer a resolution proposing a change in the rules of the Senate as set forth in a copy of the resolution hereto attached:

"*Resolved*, That there be added as one of the standing rules of the Senate the following, to wit:

"'That no amendment to any bill passed by the House, amending or changing by general application the import duties prescribed by existing law, shall be in order or allowed in the Senate unless such proposed amendment seeks to amend or change a paragraph or item embraced in the schedule or schedules, all or a part of which is sought to be amended or changed by the House bill, or unless such proposed amendment is directly related to the subject matter of the House bill and is germane thereto.'"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The notice will be received and lie on the table.

COTTON SEIZURES.

Mr. PERCY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 14), which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That 250 copies of Senate Document No. 23, Forty-third Congress, second session, entitled "Report of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury," be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

ALASKA COAL-LAND CASES.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to ask that the opinion of the United States judge recently rendered in the Alaska coal-land cases, a copy of which I send to the desk, be printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. 8).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BAILEY. What is the document, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The opinion of the court in the Alaska coal-land cases.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is the first responsible opinion of a United States court on the Alaska coal-land laws.

Mr. BAILEY. What court, Mr. President?

Mr. HEYBURN. It is the opinion of Judge Hanford of United States district court for the western district of Washington in the ninth circuit.

Mr. BAILEY. It is a district court opinion and not a circuit court opinion?

Mr. HEYBURN. The judge was sitting in a criminal case.

Mr. BAILEY. Then he was sitting as a district judge?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not attach much importance to an opinion of that kind, but I am not going to offer any objection against printing it.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to say to the Senator, knowing the situation intimately, that Judge Hanford is one of our oldest and concededly one of our ablest lawyers on the United States bench. He is a man of long years of experience; he has gone very thoroughly into the question of the relation of coal land to the existing law. No other opinion even approaching it in value has been rendered by any court. Judge Hanford, of course, sits in the circuit court of appeals in the ninth circuit, and his opinion, I think, would commend itself to the Senator from Texas as being worthy of publication.

Mr. BAILEY. Anyway it is worth printing, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the order to print is entered.

THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that next Thursday, after the conclusion of the morning business, I will, with the permission of the Senate, submit some remarks on the initiative and referendum. If the Senate shall not be in session at that time, then I will do so on the first day thereafter when the Senate is in session.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I rise, Mr. President, to say that it will be impossible to make a report designating the committees of the Senate before some time next week, and for that reason I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

RELATIONS WITH JAPAN AND MEXICO.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, it is proper for me to state at the beginning of the remarks that I shall submit to the Senate upon the subject indicated in the resolution that it is not my purpose in any way to criticize the President in reference to the position that he has taken in connection with the troubles in Mexico. I am satisfied that whatever he does will not only be necessary and proper to be done, but will, in his opinion, be for the best interests of the country. I have arisen simply for the purpose of emphasizing what ought to be familiar to everyone who is acquainted with the institutions of the land, and that is that the doctrine known as the Monroe doctrine is not involved in the Mexican situation in any way whatever. A great many persons of intelligence, and a number of journals ably edited, are falling into the error of supposing that if there should be any disagreement between the United States and Mexico—which we all hope and believe there will not be—that the Monroe doctrine will form the basis of the controversy. I make the assertion that this is not true in any aspect of the case. I do not

suppose that there is any subject that has been discussed before Congress to a greater extent than the subject that is designated as "the Monroe doctrine," and I have upon a number of occasions, both in the House and in the Senate, contributed to the literature upon the question, so that I really feel that I ought not to inflict even upon an attentive and patient body any further comments or observations in connection therewith. What I will say, if it serves no other purpose, will at least relieve the public mind of a false impression that is rapidly gaining ground, that whenever there is any controversy between the United States and any other country upon the American continent, the Monroe doctrine immediately and mysteriously springs into existence and calls for our assertion and vindication of the principles that it enunciates.

One proposition I desire to make perfectly plain, and that is that we must not confuse or commingle in any degree the Monroe doctrine with the Roosevelt doctrine. During the reign of ex-President Roosevelt a lot of miscellaneous doctrines were launched upon the tide of time that were all called "The Monroe doctrine," but which, in point of fact, had no possible connection with it and were not related to it in any manner whatever.

The Roosevelt doctrine, properly defined, is the doctrine of the gentleman with the shillalah at Donnybrook Fair, "Whenever you see a head, hit it." The ex-president once upon a time composed a brief treatise upon the Monroe doctrine. This is not the work in which he referred to the men who helped to frame that governmental principle as "shifty doctrinaires, mediocre minds, and imbeciles." The treatise that I refer to is another publication, and it is extremely difficult to procure a copy of it. They seem to have all disappeared, either by the public taking them or owing to the fact that the President himself bought them all up, and thus withdrew them from public inspection. It is a treatise that the ex-President need not be ashamed of in any way, because he was writing about a subject that he knew all about, which was not always the case with reference to numerous other subjects to which he has upon a great many occasions devoted his great talents and ability. A few years ago, and long after this book was written, Mr. Roosevelt announced his new doctrine that I have referred to, and which at the time provoked the criticism of every lawyer at the American bar who was at all conversant with the principles of international law and amazed every statesman and diplomatic official in the civilized world. His doctrine was that in the event that any of the States upon the American Continent refused, either from wantonness or inability, to perform their contractual obligations, that foreign nations, protecting their citizens who were creditors, could enforce the payment of those obligations through the instrumentality of war.

When I came to the Senate this new doctrine struck me with such appalling terror that I could not resist the opportunity of endeavoring to controvert it to the best of my ability in an address delivered to this body. The inference that the ex-President drew, in a message that he sent to the Senate, was in connection with the affairs of Santo Domingo, and he boldly and unhesitatingly proclaimed that if Santo Domingo failed to pay her debts the Governments of Holland and of Belgium, representing their citizens who were creditors, might collect those debts through the process of war, and that therefore the Monroe doctrine came into immediate operation, and the imperative duty devolved upon us to seize the custom receipts of Santo Domingo and divide them among her creditors in order to prevent the capture and occupation of her territory by foreign nations. I venture to say that a more grotesque interpretation of the Monroe doctrine was never incorporated in any message that ever issued from the Executive chamber.

In pursuance of this mad policy—which if there had been a spark of life left in the bodies of Jefferson, or of Adams, or Monroe, would have made them tremble in their graves—Mr. Roosevelt proceeded to carry it into execution, and after he had taken possession of the customhouses of Santo Domingo and had collected their revenues and deposited them in a financial institution in New York, he gave the Senate the privilege of maintaining what he was pleased to call "the status quo" between the United States and Santo Domingo.

Mr. President, such a status quo never existed upon all the pages of civilized or uncivilized history. I will not do myself the credit of claiming that my remarks at that time—during the course of which I cited an unbroken line of diplomatic and international precedents against the proposition contained in the message—had any influence whatever in making the ex-President modify the message a week or so afterwards, in which he denied that he ever meant to say that the failure to pay contractual debts was a justification for war. Of course, my contention was that the right to commence hostilities against a country never existed in a case of this sort, but was limited to cases where an unjustifiable trespass or tort was committed against persons who were citizens of the complaining Government, or where they were in some way deprived of their liberties or international rights, and the Government that had committed the crime persistently refused to make reparation therefor or was in such a condition that reparation could not be obtained at the hands of its judicial system.

Let us look for a moment at what sort of wars we would have if the Roosevelt construction of the Monroe doctrine was to prevail and was to be incorporated into our diplomatic code. We would have an interminable succession of bondholders and stock-market wars. War, instead of being declared by Congress, could be practically declared by the banking syndicates of London, Paris, Amsterdam, and Berlin, represented by their financial agents in America, and we would become sponsors and guarantors for every bankrupt and impoverished government in Central or South America. We have never yet been informed as to what amount of money was made out of the Santo Domingo settlement nor what was the price at which their bonds were sold before our intervention, and what was the price that the holders afterwards obtained for them in settlement of their claims, nor who was in the deal, nor who were the beneficiaries of our interference.

I would like to ask, in this connection, what right have any of our citizens to engage in enterprises in these countries, charge them the most exorbitant and extortionate prices for the construction of public works, and then demand of the United States that it must nominate itself as a receiver over the revenues of the government that they have practically driven into bankruptcy and liquidate its indebtedness? Where is there an intelligent person in the United States, who has studied the history and institutions of the country, who can draw the slighest parallel between this doctrine, first proclaimed by Mr. Roosevelt, and the doctrine that bears the name of Monroe, sustained by the names of Jefferson and of Madison and of Adams? The despots of Austria and of Russia and of Prussia, when they formed the Holy Alliance, whatever else may be said of them, were not mercenaries or hirelings. When they met at Aix la Chappelle and Laybach in conference they had but one object in view and that was to put an end to the system of representative government throughout the world, to destroy the liberty of the press, and to maintain the jure divino autocracies of Europe, and when Mr. Monroe wrote to Jefferson submitting the British proposals of Mr. Canning, and when Jefferson, on October 24, 1823, answered from Monticello:

> The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a Nation. This sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us.

Did he in his prophetic mind have the remotest conception that this great charter of republican liberty which he was helping to frame was to be used by buccaneers and speculators and adventurers to oppress the commercial liberties of the very States whose personal liberties it was supposed to guarantee? I will not sit here in silence, with folded arms, and permit this revolutionary principle which was formulated and promulgated overnight by Mr. Roosevelt to be known by any other name except the name of the illustrious individual who first conceived it and put it into practical execution. I want to lift this cloud from around the brow of the rising generation. I want the students at our colleges and universities to understand that when they are discussing this proposition they are not discussing the Monroe doctrine or any corollary that flows from it in any manner whatever. They are simply discussing a doctrine that has received practical recognition at the purlieus of American brokers and speculators who deal in South and Central American securities and at the gambling dens of Amsterdam bankers and foreign stock markets, and it is a disgrace and a degradation to connect this money-making enterprise with the imperishable names that in tones that rang and reechoed throughout the world pledged forever the honor of this Republic to maintain the blessings of liberty in every quarter and section of the Western Continent where despotism had ceased to hold its sway.

We might let Mr. Roosevelt's doctrine rest where it is were it not for the fact that the ex-President has set some of the schools of this country almost deranged upon the subject. He has perverted the history of the Nation to such an extent that every day in the year, in answer to innocent communications that I receive, I am using my best efforts to relieve these young minds of the false impressions and confusion with which he has surrounded them. It is impossible for me to dictate letters to all of the attendants at all of the schools in the United States telling them not to pay any attention to this new doctrine of the ex-President, and it is principally for this reason that I have

arisen here to-day that I may say a few words that may possibly reach some of the victims whose future ambition he has imperiled by his heretic utterances upon the subject.

Let me read a few communications out of the many that I am receiving from some of these young men, for the purpose of illustrating the havoc and ruin that he has caused among the tender disciples of his school. Here is one of the letters:

Will you please tell me what stand, in your opinion, ex-President Roosevelt would take upon this Mexican question if he had a hand in it? I am in a debate upon the subject, and I would like to have any of his speeches that you can send me. I will try to work my way out of it if I can just find out how he stands and how you stand. I am so fond of reading his speeches and yours. They have the true ring in them, and they are very much alike.

Poor boy. He really thought he was paying me a compliment. I read a second communication:

Will you explain to me what connection the Monroe doctrine has with the case in Mexico? I have read Mr. Roosevelt's message on Santo Domingo, but I am mixed up about it—

No wonder.

What I would like to know is this: Suppose the Mexican people would turn their Government into a monarchy, would we have a right to interfere?

This communication came just in time, and the question was a very intelligent and pertinent one. I sent this boy an observation of Mr. Dana's in a note to Wheaton, which happened to be in direct response to his inquiry. As it is only a few lines and covers the exact point that I am discussing here to-day, I will read the extract:

It has sometimes been assumed that the Monroe doctrine contained some declarations against any other than the democratic-republican institutions of this continent, however arising or introduced. The message will be searched in vain for anything of the kind. We were the first to recognize the imperial authority of Dom Pedro in Brazil and of Iturbide in Mexico; and more than half of the northern continent was under the scepters of Great Britain and Russia; and those dependencies would certainly be free to adopt what institutions they pleased in case of successful rebellion or of peaceful separation from their parent states.

The third, and last, communication that I will read is as follows:

We have the Mexican question up for debate next week. I would like to know how does the Monroe doctrine get into it?

So would I.

Did Mr. Roosevelt pass any laws of Congress, when he was President, on the subject? I would like to have your private opinion on the following question: If Mr. Roosevelt was in charge of Mexico, what do you think he would do with the United States? I am on the affirmative.

Then there is a postscript, as follows:

Please send me Senator HEYBURN'S speech in which he said that the people who were in favor of electing United States Senators by the people could not spell his name, and most of them could not spell their own names. Also let me have Senator BOURNE'S speech, and kindly let me know whether Mr. Roosevelt is a member of the new party that is now being made up.

I have selected these few communications from among hundreds of similar ones to show how students who are trying to familiarize themselves with the political history of the country have had their minds perverted and prostrated upon some of the great and imperishable principles that underlie our institutions. I want now to announce to them in such unambiguous terms that they can not be misunderstood, and which will perhaps obviate the necessity of my answering a number of communications in the future, that our present movement or maneuvers in reference to Mexico have not the slightest relation to or bearing upon the Monroe doctrine. I will again give them an extract from President Monroe's message, from which the doctrine receives its name, which practically carries the entire subject with it:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. * * * We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintain it and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

On March 25, 1825, Mr. Clay, who was then Secretary of State, transmitted to our minister at Mexico a communication, from which I quote the following lines:

The political systems of the two continents are essentially different. Each has an exclusive right to judge for itself what is best suited to its own condition and most likely to promote its happiness, but neither has a right to enforce upon the other the establishment of its peculiar system, and you will therefore urge upon the Government of Mexico the utility and expediency of asserting this principle on every proper occasion.

On October 21, 1858, Mr. Cass, Secretary of State, sent to our minister at Spain a communication, from which I will also quote a few lines, as follows:

With respect to the causes of war between Spain and Mexico the United States have no concern and do not undertake to judge them. Nor do they claim to interpose in any hostility which may take place. Their policy of observation and interference is limited to the permanent subjugation of any portion of the territory of Mexico, or of any other American state, to any European power whatever. The American minister is authorized to say that the United States considered Mexico's freedom from foreign control to be essential to the true policy of the independent states of America, and that any attempt to subdue or hold possession of that country would be considered by the United States as an unfriendly act and would be firmly opposed by them.

We all know what occurred with Mexico a little later on; and while I do not at all depend upon our action in that controversy as a precedent for what we ought to do if a similar occasion and emergency presented itself to-day, I want to read only a few lines of an instruction sent by Mr. Cass to Mr. Robert M. McLane, who was then our minister to Mexico:

While we do not deny the right of any other power to carry on hostile operation against Mexico for the redress of its grievances, we firmly object to its holding possession of any part of that country or endeavoring by force to control its political destiny. This opposition to foreign interference is known to France, England, and Spain, as well as the determination of the United States to resist any such attempt by all the means in their power.

And I will close references upon this point by reading a resolution passed by the House of Representatives, without dissent, on April 4, 1864, as follows:

That the Congress of the United States are unwilling by silence to have the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico, and they think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge any monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America under the auspices of any European power.

Now, while volumes have been written upon the subject that I have been discussing, I have read a sufficient number of extracts to satisfy anyone who has a grain of sense or intelligence in these United States of America that whatever the Mexican situation may be, the Monroe doctrine, as such—whatever the Roosevelt doctrine may be—does not at any point come in touch or contact with it, and that there is not now the remotest danger—and there never will be, in my judgment—that any government on this earth will ever attempt to subvert the Republic of Mexico and upon her ruins erect monarchical institutions.

It is said, however, that the property of American citizens may be in jeopardy and in danger in the Republic of Mexico, and that they are entitled to the protection of the United States. In explanation of this suggestion, I would state that the Department of State, presided over by the Secretary of State, and not the Department of War, presided over by the Secretary of War, has jurisdiction and supervision over this matter. The State Department has adopted certain regulations upon this subject, and which are in the hands of our diplomatic officials, which must be strictly followed whenever a claim of a citizen of the United States for redress or indemnity may be diplomatically presented to a foreign government.

The Army of the United States is not an agency for the collection of private debts. I have no greater right, if I were a citizen of the United States living in Mexico, to call upon the Army of the United States to collect a claim either for redress or indemnity against the Government of Mexico than I would have a right to call upon the Militia of the State of Maryland to collect a sum of money that may be due me by the State upon public obligations. I am sure this is the opinion of the President. If any syndicate of mine owners, or any rubber companies, or Standard Oil interests should at any time suffer any injury to their possessions or acquisitions, they have no greater rights than the humblest individual whose property has been injured or destroyed.

And I want, in this very connection, to quote a few lines from a communication of Mr. Seward to our minister at Colombia upon this subject, sent to him in April, 1866. In this communication Mr. Seward says:

We are unfortunately too familiar with the complaints of the delay and the inefficiency of the courts in the South American Republics. We must, however, continue to repose confidence in their independence and integrity, or we must take the broad ground that these States are like those of oriental semicivilized countries—outside the pale within which the law of nations, as generally accepted by Christendom, is understood to govern. The people who go to these regions and encounter great risks in the hope of getting rewards must be regarded as taking all the circumstances into consideration, and can not with reason ask their government to complain that they stand on a common footing with native subjects in respect to the alleged wants of an able, prompt, and conscientious judiciary. We have not undertaken to supervise the arrangements of the whole world for litigation because American citizens voluntarily expose themselves to be concerned in their deficiencies.

Of course, Mr. President, I know full well that if the liberty or the personal rights of our citizens in Mexico or anywhere else are interfered with, or their property wantonly destroyed at the hands of revolutionists or other forces, and the government in which the trouble occurs is either unwilling to protect them or has not the power to do so, that we need not stand idly by, but that we have the right, and it is our duty, to resort to various methods plainly recognized by the usages of international law for the purpose of affording proper protection to the rights of our citizens.

I come now, briefly, to a subject in connection with my remarks that is of great interest to us, and that is the relation between the United States and Japan, that seems to have been brought into prominence by the Mexican situation.

I want to premise what I propose to say upon this subject by the statement that it is my own positive conviction that there is no danger, presently or remotely, of any war between Japan and the United States. The United States certainly has no idea of even preparing the way for hostilities against Japan because there is no cause for such a procedure, and Japan has no grievance against or controversy with the United States that can not be amicably settled upon the field of peace. It is true that Japan might take certain steps with Mexico that would arouse our suspicion and perhaps furnish cause for investigation. I am not an idealist or visionary in matters of this sort. But why these countries should go to war it is impossible for any one to understand outside of military circles and inflammatory journalists. What is the casus belli? The immigration question or the school question in San Francisco? It is too absurd to contemplate that such a proposition that can be settled by treaty and the good sense of the American people should ever become the occasion for war. It is, however, boldly proclaimed that Japan wants to control the Pacific Ocean from Capricorn to Cancer, and in time of war hold it against the world. How absolutely ludicrous is this proposition! I know the spirit of the Japanese people pretty well, and when I speak of the people of either country I am not speaking of the mob, but of the intelligence and patriotism of their representative elements.

The people of Japan constitute a marvelous and courageous race. They have lately concluded a war in which they were animated with a spirit of lofty heroism and daring valor and ambitious sacrifice hardly paralleled upon all the pages of history, and they emerged from this war victorious in every battle upon the land and on the sea. I am willing to admit that if Japan is entering into negotiations for coaling stations and bases for naval supplies for military purposes with Mexico that we are entitled to know what these negotiations are. Congress is, however, without any information or evidence upon the subject. This country would not ordinarily be entitled to know the secret treaties or alliances that other countries may make, but upon the part of Mexico we would unquestionably be entitled to an explanation.

I have no fear that history will repeat itself, or that any Government would attempt to imitate the example of Napoleon III, who thr ugh false pretenses and subterfuges sent an Austrian archduke to a Mexican throne simply to abandon him afterwards to despair and death.

It is also stated that the situation at Guam is threatening and gives evidence of an intention on the part of Japan to prepare for hostilities. Guam is one of our princely volcanic possessions in the Pacific bequeathed to us by the Spanish War. It is one of the Ladrone Islands, or "islands of thieves," thus named because when they were discovered the art of stealing from each other was the principal industry and delightful occupation of their inhabitants. Guam is about 5,000 miles west of San Francisco and about 1,342 miles from Yokohama. It was brought into captivity as a maritime prize by the American cruiser *Charleston*, which, with a single shot, leveled its formidable battlements and took possession of this volcanic eruption in the name of the United States. The old Spanish governor, who had been there from time immemorial, was under the impression that the Americans were saluting him and appeared upon the deck of the ship to tender his apologies for not having any powder with which to return the compliment. He never discovered the terrible state of affairs until the Spanish colors were lowered from the parapet and the colors of the Union floated in triumph over this priceless gem of the sea.

Guam is a charming spot, and one of the most lustrous and brilliant jewels in our oriental galaxy. Its principal products are vipers, snakes, lizards, wild swine, rats, and castor oil, and if the island were put up at auction to-day, with all of the inhabitants in it, beyond its value as a military post, it would not bring a dollar and a half in any of the markets of the world. It must not be lost sight of, however, that Guam is the key to communication upon the Pacific Ocean and the relay point for cables to Manila, Tokio, and San Francisco. It is necessary to relay messages to Guam, because of the resistance which the submarine current encounters in its journey from Honolulu, and if Japan ever came into possession of Guam we could be cut off from communication with the Philippines, except by way of the Azores and the Suez route, and thence to the Indian Ocean.

So far as I am concerned, I would not care, if we could bring our own citizens home, whether we would be cut off to all eternity from any further communication with the Philippines. I would have permitted them to go long ago. Those of her inhabitants who are civilized, I would permit them to remain civilized; those who are uncivilized, I would permit them to remain uncivilized. Perhaps they are happier when they are uncivilized than when they are civilized. I do not believe this Government is an institution for the feeble-minded nations of the earth.

I shall not refer to the dreadful mistake we made in reference to the Philippines. All the pages of history, ancient, medieval, and modern, do not record such a stupid and stupendous blunder. It is said that Japan wanted these islands. Never on the face of the earth in the way that we wanted them. What Japan might have desired was what we ought to have been satisfied with, and that is a military base for war vessels and naval supplies and for coaling stations, and what we ought to have done was to have made the terms for such an occupation and then sailed away in triumph, satisfied with the victory we had won. Does anyone believe that Japan would have burdened herself with the government of the entire Philippine group or would have been willing to incur the outlay necessary for that purpose? Our victory has been turned into a policy of disaster and sacrifice. It is said that we can not part with them now. Why not? Could we not reserve sufficient space upon this territory to give us a landing place for this great war that is looming up upon the horizon and illuminating the waters of the Pacific and the lurid imagination of some of our great sea captains who, if this war is not hastened, may be upon the retired list before they will be afforded an opportunity of practicing their profession upon their fellow man? The only person that I know of who will perhaps object to this arrangement is the Sultan of Sulu, who is our principal subject in the Orient. It will be a national calamity for us to lose this loyal liegeman. He might some day be a Senator of the United States; in fact, I think he ought to be one now. The question is whether he would be willing to exchange his gilded manacles and his salary for liberty. It is true that we have civilized him to some extent. When he became our captive he was a very pious and devout person, who spent all day Thursday praying in the mosque and the balance of the week he devoted to piracy, murder, and other gentle and respectable amusements. He was then in possession of three kinds of wives—the first-class ones lived in his palace, the second schedule abided with their mother-in-law, and the third, indulging in a fluid decoction that forms one of the delightful beverages of that charming region, spent most of their festive and hilarious hours in jail.

Mr. President, I shall be glad when we can ring down the curtain upon this comedy and tragedy and when the whole performance shall end and this Government shall divest itself of a possession that has been a curse and affliction to us from the day that we tasted this forbidden fruit.

As it is, I suppose we must defend the Philippines as a matter of sentiment, and therefore it is of some importance to us to find out whether the Government of Japan has undertaken to lay its own cable to Guam, because if it did so it simply had no right to take this step without our consent. The law of submarine cables between foreign Governments and the United States has been well established, and I desire to read just a few lines, to show what the law is upon the subject. On May 11, 1897, there was an application by "The French Company of Telegraphic Cables" for permission to lay a cable between Brest and Cape Cod, and in answer to this request the State Department replied as follows:

> It is the expectation of the Federal Government that the French cable company will take no steps toward laying its proposed cable from Cape Cod without express authorization of the President or of Congress, before which a bill was introduced which has not yet been enacted into law. If that company should, however, take action in the manner proposed, it is proper to say that it would do so at its peril.

And the Attorney General, sustaining the State Department, decided—

> That the President has the power, in the absence of legislative enactment, to control the landing of foreign submarine cables. He may either prevent the landing or permit it, if the rights entrusted to his care so demand or permit it. If a landing has been effected without the consent or against the protest of this Government, respect for its

rights and compliance with its terms may be enforced by applying the prohibition to the operation of the line unless the necessary conditions are accepted and observed.

Under the usages and principles of international law Japan would clearly have no right to lay a cable to Guam or to any other possession or territory of the United States without our consent. I do not believe that Japan has been guilty of this act, because its advisers and counsellors are men who are too well informed upon the principles of international usages to permit such an intrusion and violation to occur.

I am therefore of the opinion, from what I have said, that there will be no war—no war with Japan, no war with Mexico, and no war with any other nation that I know of. Of course, agitation will create uneasiness and alarm. Before the commencement of the Spanish War the proprietor of one of the most prominent newspapers in this country received a message from his correspondent in Cuba, "There will be no war." He telegraphed back to his representative, "You furnish the news, and I will furnish the war." There was cause, however, for the Spanish War. That war had to come, and Spain had to be driven from the shores of the Western Continent.

I have observed within the last few days that the German Chancellor in the Reichstag, following his earlier utterances upon the same subject, gave expression to this sentiment in connection with the general subject of peace and war that I have been discussing to-day. He said that—

> The difficulty in a disarmament agreement is the impossibility of supervision of individual States. The control over these I regard as absolutely impracticable. The mere attempt to control would have no other result than continual mutual distrust and universal turmoil. It will remain true that the weak will be the prey of the strong. If any nation feels that it is unable longer to spend certain sums for defensive purposes, it will inevitably drop to the second rank. There will always be a strong one ready to take its place. General disarmament is an unsolvable problem as long as men are men.

I would change this by saying that "general disarmament is an unsolvable problem as long as men are savages." Of course Germany is a great military power, and its history has been one of war and conflict and strife, and its people, besides their historic deeds of valor, are intellectually and morally as great a race as there is on earth, either in the arts of war or in the arts of peace, and this sentiment of the chancellor would, I apprehend, have met with universal recognition during all the centuries, from the time the Cimbri and the Teutons came out of their northern forests to ravage the fields of Italy until the time that the German hosts made their triumphant entry upon the streets of Paris. I doubt, however, whether this declaration at this hour meets with the approval of a vast number of the Emperor's subjects, and I know it does not reflect the wishes and the hopes of an advanced civilization. Of course there can not be a general disarmament if Germany declines to enter the list. I believe, however, the day is bound to come when Germany will yield if all the races of the civilized world consent to the adoption of such a policy and the action taken in the Reichstag gives promise in that direction.

I believe the time will come when war will no longer be indulged in, but will only be read of as one of the crimes of a barbarous age. Nations can be civilized in some respects and barbarians in others. History affords us numerous examples of this sort, and while we are gradually becoming more and more enlightened and advanced, we still cling to this brutal method of adjusting our differences. If an individual offers an insult to another, no matter how atrocious it may be, and the insulted party calls for a retraction, which is refused, and then declares war upon the offender and punishes him in fair and open combat, it is an offense that society condemns, and it inflicts its penalties lightly or severely, according to the degree of injury sustained; but if a nation—that is to say, a multitude of individuals—offers an indignity, no matter how slight it is, to another nation and does not make reparation therefor, the nation that is offended, according to our present code of international morals, has the right to open hostilities, and slaughter and violence upon the enemy are not only justified, but become acts that every true patriot who loves his country should take a hand in and be proud of, as a heritage to transmit to his descendants. If two individuals enter into a contract and afterwards disagree about its proper interpretation, we have appointed tribunals to settle the controversy between them, and it would be rather a novel sight to witness one of them attempting to enforce his construction of the agreement upon the other at the point of the bayonet; but if two enlightened, God-fearing governments enter into a treaty and the one should happen, according to the judgment of the other, to violate it, society has concluded that the only cure is to sacrifice human life and to keep on sacrificing it until one party or the other, through sheer exhaustion of its resources and vital energies, is compelled to admit that it has made an error in its version of the compact. If an individual happens to appropriate property that belongs to another, we have ordained a method by which the wrong can be speedily redressed; but if a great nation, by a stroke of diplomacy or statesmanship, as it is called, steals a country thousands of miles away from its borders, that some other nation claims to have stolen years before, there is nothing except bloodshed that can determine who is the lawful thief, and in the settlement of this contention it is highly proper and commendable for both sides to massacre and exterminate the unfortunate natives whom Providence has planted there as the rightful possessors of the disputed territory.

Of course, under existing conditions it may be proper, Mr. President, in time of peace to prepare for war. A number of intelligent persons are of the impression that ex-President Roosevelt was the first one who ever gave this advice. They forget that Washington, in his address to both Houses of Congress in 1790, said:

> To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

It was perfectly proper to give this advice at that time. Washington, however, was not the first one who made this suggestion. Upon the armories of Venice there is this inscription:

> Happy is that State which in time of peace thinks of war.

Long before this, in the Satires of Horace, there is found the expression:

> In peace a wise man should make suitable provision for war.

This barbarian motto, therefore, is not original with Mr. Roosevelt. I would like to reverse it. Instead of saying, "In time of peace prepare for war," I would say, "In time of threatened war prepare for peace."

Speaking for myself, I am for peace and not for war. I believe the time is approaching when the science of war and standing armies, and navies patrolling the waters of the world, and death-dealing projectiles, and human sacrifice, and cities ruined and fertile plains made barren by the marauder's torch will rank among the dark deeds of the past. I look for the advent of that day and feel with all my fervent hopes and aspirations that it can not be long delayed. "Man's inhumanity to man" has made the "countless thousands mourn," and broken hearts and homes made desolate and agony and anguish and despair can not forever plead in vain. This inhuman and sanguinary method of settling international controversies must cease, and murder, though clad in martial pomp, must call a halt. Nations must no longer be brutes and savages, and the worshiping world must realize that it is profaning the altars of its faith when it not only sanctions but commends and exalts and participates in the practice of a policy which, heading the whole calendar of crimes and embracing every single one of them, is "an utter mockery of religion's holiest offices and bids defiance to the providence of God."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I want merely to say a word in support of the view which the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] has given us in regard to the Japanese in connection with the difficulties now existing in Mexico. I have examined with some care the correspondence, which, of course, it would not be proper to make public at this time, relating to affairs in Mexico for the last few months. I have been unable to discover in any letter from our ambassador or any of our consuls the slightest allusion or suggestion of any Japanese interference or appearance in Mexico. So far as I am able to judge, all that has been published and republished on that subject in the newspaper press is a fabrication, for what object I shall not undertake to determine. Some strong force is behind it—some great interest, perhaps, or some country—but that the matter is a fabrication I have no doubt.

Our relations with Japan are very friendly. We have just concluded a treaty which has been gratifying to both countries. The attitude of Japan in regard to Mexico has been entirely correct, so far as I am aware, and I wanted to take this opportunity, in support of what the Senator from Maryland has said, simply to make this brief statement in regard to the relation of Japan to the present difficulties in Mexico.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I want to say a word in confirmation of the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I also have looked into the question of the alleged interference of the Japanese Government, and, so far as I can learn, there is not a scintilla of truth in it.

RETURN OF STATE BONDS—CORRECTION OF RECORD.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I notice, Mr. President, that in the RECORD of March 4, 1911, the following appears under the heading "Return of State bonds":

> Mr. FOSTER. I call up the bill (S. 7180) authorizing the Secretary of War to return to the governor of Louisiana certain bonds of the

State of Louisiana and city of New Orleans, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, that is an error, so far as the mention of my name in connection therewith is concerned. I know nothing about the bill; I did not object to it; and if objection was made it must have been made by some other Senator than myself, and the reference to me must be an error of the stenographer or clerk who made up the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suppose it is too late to correct the RECORD in that respect, as it appears to have been bound. If, however, it is possible to correct the permanent RECORD, I should like to have it done; or, if not, at any rate I should like this statement of mine to go into the RECORD, as of course it will.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I objected. So objection was made, and it is merely a question as to who made it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. President, with reference to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], I wish to say that upon the day mentioned in the RECORD I did call up the bill and ask unanimous consent for its consideration, and objection was made. The objection, however, was not made by the Senator from Connecticut, who has just spoken, but the objection was made by his former colleague, Mr. Bulkeley.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 13, 1911.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS.

Roland P. Falkner, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Director of the Thirteenth Decennial Census, in the Department of Commerce and Labor, vice W. F. Willoughby.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Walter L. Fisher, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Interior, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Richard A. Ballinger, resigned.

MEMBER OF CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Maj. Sherwood A. Cheney, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Capt. Thomas H. Jackson, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be relieved.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 6, 1911.

Edward Sinnet Bowman, of Iowa.
Marion Sunsari Lombard, of Nebraska.
Ralph Charles Matson, of Oregon.
Warren Pearl Morrill, of Maryland.
Lewis Beers Porter, of Rhode Island.
Thomas Houston Dow Griffitts, of Illinois.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 10, 1911.

Charles Spencer Williamson, of Illinois.
Maurice Rubel, of Illinois.
Albert Hurlbut Roler, of Illinois.
Frank Worthington Lynch, of Illinois.
Philip Pietersen Schuyler Doane, of Illinois.
James Alexander Harvey, of Illinois.
Junius Clarkson Hoag, of Illinois.
Jacob Frank, of Illinois.
Carey Culbertson, of Illinois.
Carl Wagner, of Illinois.
William Cuthbertson, of Illinois.
Rufus Winfield Bishop, of Illinois.
William Louis Baum, of Illinois.
Joseph Grindon, of Missouri.
William Paul Glennon, of Missouri.
Frederick Charles Esselbruegge, of Missouri.
Edward Lee Dorsett, of Missouri.
William Sidney Deutsch, of Missouri.
Russell Daniel Carman, of Missouri.
Holdsworth Wheeler Bond, of Missouri.
Charles Wyche, of Missouri.
Frederick Eno Woodruff, of Missouri.
William Otto Winter, of Missouri.
Carroll Smith, of Missouri.
Nathaniel Meacon Semple, of Missouri.
Henry Joseph Scherck, of Missouri.
Francis Le Sirelle Reder, of Missouri.
Amand Nicholas Ravold, of Missouri.
Harry Morgan Moore, of Missouri.
George Elmer Lyon, of Missouri.
William Henry Luedde, of Missouri.
Clarence Loeb, of Missouri.
Abram Chittenden Leggat, of Missouri.
Frederick Carl Emil Kuhlmann, of Missouri.
Arthur Campbell Kimball, of Missouri.
Walter Charles George Kirchner, of Missouri.
Downey Lamar Harris, of Missouri.
William Augustus Hardaway, of Missouri.
Henry Skillman Atkins, of Missouri.
Frederick Bagby Hall, of Missouri.
Conrad Weil, of California.
Alanson Weeks, of California.
Stanley Stillman, of California.
William Parsons Read, of California.
William Evelyn Hopkins, of California.
Samuel Johns Hunkin, of California.
George Herbert Evans, of California.
James Alexander Black, of California.
John Henry Barbat, of California.
Charles Andrew Powers, of Colorado.
Henry Richardson McGraw, of Colorado.
Clarence Bancroft Ingraham, jr., of Colorado.
Thomas Edward Carmody, of Colorado.
Alpha John Campbell, of Colorado.
Frederic Wolcott Bancroft, of Colorado.
John William Amesse, of Colorado.
John Edgar Welch, of New York.
Prince Albert Morrow, of New York.
James Ewing, of New York.
John Augustus Hartwell, of New York.
Julius Carl Bierwirth, of New York.
Edward Quintard, of New York.
George Norton Miller, of New York.
Max Ballin, of Michigan.
Guy Leartus Connor, of Michigan.
Arthur David Holmes, of Michigan.
Louis Jacob Hirschman, of Michigan.
William Edward Keane, of Michigan.
George Edwin McKean, of Michigan.
William Albert Spitzley, of Michigan.
Henry Rockwell Varney, of Michigan.
John Walter Vaughan, of Michigan.
William Stevenson Baer, of Maryland.
Julius Friedenwald, of Maryland.
Cary Breckinridge Gamble, jr., of Maryland.
Duncan MacCalman, of Maryland.
Rupert Norton, of Maryland.
Isaac Rosenbaum Pels, of Maryland.
Arthur Marriott Shipley, of Maryland.
Martillus Louis Todd, of Maryland.
Walter Dent Wise, of Maryland.
Randolph Winslow, of Maryland.
Hubert Clement Knapp, of Maryland.
Frank Martin, of Maryland.
Charles Edmund Simon, of Maryland.
Louis Hamman, of Maryland.
Marshall Langton Price, of Maryland.
John Almy Tompkins, jr., of Maryland.
Joseph Albert Chatard, of Maryland.
Thomas Rodney Chambers, of Maryland.
Charles French Blake, of Maryland.
Harvey Grant Beck, of Maryland.
Standish McCleary, of Maryland.
Charles Woodward Riley, of Maryland.
Alexius McGlannan, of Maryland.
Edgar Bar Friedenwald, of Maryland.
Charles Alfred Dukes, of California.
Arnold Schwyzer, of Minnesota.
Anton Shimonek, of Minnesota.
Edward Avery Newton, of Oregon.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Hugh Rodman to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Guy W. Brown to be a captain in the Navy from the 8th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1910, to fill vacancies:

George E. Brandt,
Cary W. Magruder,
Joseph S. Hulings,
James G. Stevens,
William A. Hodgman, and
Carleton M. Dolan.

Lieut. Charles E. Courtney, an additional number in grade, to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, with the officer next above him.

Lieut. Edward C. Kalbfus to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Capt. Randolph C. Berkeley to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of October, 1910, to fill a vacancy.

AUDITOR FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Elton A. Gongwer, of Ohio, to be Auditor for the War Department, in place of Benjamin F. Harper, resigned.

ASSAYER AND MELTER UNITED STATES ASSAY OFFICE, CHARLOTTE, N. C.

Frank P. Drane, of North Carolina, to be assayer and melter of the United States assay office at Charlotte, N. C., under the provision of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 4, 1911.

AMBASSADORS.

William Woodville Rockhill, of the District of Columbia, now ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Russia, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey, vice Oscar S. Straus, resigned.

Curtis Guild, of Massachusetts, to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Russia, vice William Woodville Rockhill, nominated to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Turkey.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Bertram N. Stump, of Maryland, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Baltimore, Md., in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

PENSION AGENT.

Abram W. Smith, of McPherson, Kans., who was appointed March 4, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be pension agent at Topeka, Kans., vice Wilder S. Metcalf, term expired.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John J. Deane, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at San Francisco for the unexpired part of his term of four years from February 4, 1910, when appointed receiver at Oakland. Land office transferred from Oakland to San Francisco May 1, 1911.

Ira L. Bare, of North Platte, Nebr., who was appointed March 9, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at North Platte, vice William H. C. Woodhurst, term expired.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Truman G. Daniells, of California, to be register of the land office at San Francisco for the unexpired part of his term of four years from May 17, 1910, when appointed register at Oakland. Land office transferred from Oakland to San Francisco May 1, 1911.

John E. Evans, of Nebraska, to be register of the land office at North Platte, Nebr., his term having expired February 11, 1911. (Reappointment.)

Albert Kircher, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Miles City, Mont., his term having expired February 25, 1911. (Reappointment.)

Reuben N. Stevens, of Bismarck, N. Dak., who was appointed March 9, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Bismarck, vice Marshall H. Jewell, deceased.

James G. Quinlivan, of Dickinson, N. Dak., who was appointed March 9, 1911, during the recess of the Senate, to be register of the land office at Dickinson, vice Sylvanus M. Ferris, term expired.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

W. E. Walker to be postmaster at Biggs, Cal., in place of Virgil Bunnell, deceased.

FLORIDA.

Susie M. Bryan to be postmaster at Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

IDAHO.

William S. Brainard to be postmaster at Wardner, Idaho, in place of William S. Brainard. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1910.

Fred F. Evans to be postmaster at Burke, Idaho, in place of Fred F. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1910.

ILLINOIS.

William Knigge to be postmaster at Rockefeller, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

IOWA.

James D. Hicklin to be postmaster at Wapello, Iowa, in place of Edwin Hicklin, resigned.

L. H. Hinkley to be postmaster at Sigourney, Iowa, in place of William H. Needham. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

Erastus T. Roland to be postmaster at Eldon, Iowa, in place of Erastus T. Roland. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

C. E. Wallace to be postmaster at New Sharon, Iowa, in place of Hervey J. Vail. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

KANSAS.

James A. Schilling to be postmaster at Sylvan Grove, Kans., in place of John P. Lang, removed.

KENTUCKY.

Thomas Sympson to be postmaster at Franklin, Ky., in place of Thomas Sympson. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1910.

LOUISIANA.

Richard E. Hodges to be postmaster at Jena, La. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

MAINE.

Whitfield B. Hallett to be postmaster at Ashland, Me. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

MISSOURI.

Joseph H. Harris to be postmaster at Kansas City, Mo., in place of Joseph H. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

NEW YORK.

Edith Wallace to be postmaster at Lisbon, N. Y., in place of Charles G. Wallace, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA.

George E. Childs to be postmaster at Kenmare, N. Dak., in place of Victor A. Corbett. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1910.

OHIO.

John Shaw to be postmaster at Leroy, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

OREGON.

E. R. Ware to be postmaster at Echo, Oreg., in place of John Dorn, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James H. Wells to be postmaster at Wilcox, Pa., in place of James H. Wells. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1911.

TENNESSEE.

Albert L. Scott to be postmaster at Dickson, Tenn., in place of Albert L. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired March 21, 1910.

TEXAS.

J. F. Henry to be postmaster at Stratford, Tex., in place of Robert B. Kerr, resigned.

Wilson I. Lawler to be postmaster at Deport, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

Frank E. Osborn to be postmaster at McAllen, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

WASHINGTON.

Thomas Bollman to be postmaster at Cashmere, Wash., in place of Thomas Bollman. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

James Cadzow to be postmaster at Malden, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

Walter W. Cloud to be postmaster at Conconully, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

Elliott S. Moore to be postmaster at Ione, Wash. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Edward O. Harwood to be postmaster at Moorefield, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

WISCONSIN.

Frank A. Everhard to be postmaster at Ripon, Wis., in place of John T. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1910.

George R. Hall to be postmaster at Oconto, Wis., in place of George R. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1910.

Albert B. Leyse to be postmaster at Kewaunee, Wis., in place of Joseph J. Schultz. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1910.

Edward S. Minor to be postmaster at Sturgeon Bay, Wis., in place of F. J. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1910.

Earle S. Welch to be postmaster at Eau Claire, Wis., in place of Earle S. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 13, 1911.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Maurice Maschke to be collector of customs for the district of Cuyahoga, Ohio.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. Cecil Maunsell Gabbett to be first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Third Lieut. Roy Percival Munro to be second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

PROMOTIONS IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surg. Leland E. Cofer to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

Passed Asst. Surg. Hugh S. Cumming to be surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

George Parcher to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

POSTMASTERS.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Benjamin Apple, Sunbury.
Mary J. Ensign, Ardmore.
Daniel J. Gensemer, Pine Grove.
Charles L. Ferrebee, St. Clair.
Isaac N. Lightner, Ephrata.

VIRGINIA.

Joel W. Hortenstine, Abingdon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 13, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. KAHN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Francis M. Comba, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. GREENE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William S. Green, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, which was read the first and second times and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 3), ordered to be printed.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have consent to file the views of the minority (H. Rept. 3, pt. 2) on the bill just reported.

The SPEAKER. How long a time does the gentleman ask?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I agreed with the gentleman from Pennsylvania this morning that he should have unanimous consent to file the views of the minority any time up to the time the bill is disposed of in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF SENATORS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees.

The Clerk proceeded with the call.

When the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress was called:

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress I desire to call up House joint resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That in lieu of the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States, and in lieu of so much of paragraph 2 of the same section as relates to the filling of vacancies, and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] what arrangement he is willing to make as to time to debate this most important question?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes, sir. I presume it is on the same question.

Mr. MANN. I would ask the gentleman if he would not be willing to let this matter go over for a day or two. There will be plenty of opportunity to take it up. The gentleman knows that one resolution was reported into the House on this subject at the last session, and the gentleman himself introduced a resolution on the first day of the session. Now another resolution is reported in. All of these differ. Inasmuch as this is a proposed amendment to the Constitution, it seems to me that we ought to have full opportunity to consider the verbiage of it, at least.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, answering first the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], I say that, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to agree on a reasonable time for debate.

In answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], while it is true, Mr. Speaker, that various resolutions, all looking in the same direction, have from time to time been introduced and from time to time have passed the House, it seems to me that there is no reason for delaying this matter, because if the Representatives here have convictions on any great public question, they have them on this.

Mr. MANN. But, if the gentleman will pardon me, I do not ask for delay so far as the general principle is concerned and is involved, and would not do so. Members are prepared to vote upon that. But as to the language which is to be employed in amending the Constitution, where different language may be subject to different constructions, it seems to me that the House ought to be given full opportunity for consideration. I will suggest to the gentleman that there are some provisions in the joint resolution as reported which seem to me susceptible of different constructions. I think the gentleman himself would desire to have it perfectly clear and beyond question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the trouble about it is, I say, in answer to the gentleman, there are some people in the United States who want to be so perfectly clear about every question pertaining to this great and important piece of legislation that it is almost impossible to reach a time when we will have absolute unanimity of agreement, and therefore I think we ought to proceed to-day.

Mr. MANN. That is true, but ought not we to have a fair opportunity to make suggestions in reference to it in time to consider these suggestions?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will try to secure all the time necessary or desired for deliberate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. You can not do that unless you give us time to examine it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will give ample time to debate it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody over here who can hear a word that is said by the gentlemen who have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will cease conversation so that the Members can hear this discussion. The Chair would like to hear it himself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see why any Member of the House is not just as much interested in the discussion as the Members who have the floor.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will keep still there will be no difficulty in hearing.

Mr. MADDEN. I can hear as well as any other Member of the House. If the gentleman who has the floor will raise his voice high enough, all the Members can hear.

The SPEAKER. The point of order made by the gentleman is already sustained. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire when this bill was introduced?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on the 4th day of April, 1911. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield for a moment?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will yield for a question.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman stated that the resolution was introduced on the 4th day of April. The gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman's resolution was not introduced on the 4th day of April. He introduced a resolution on the 4th day of April on this subject, but that resolution is not the one that was reported to the House.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. When was the resolution reported?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yesterday.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will permit, I would like to say a word about the parliamentary situation.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman for a question with reference to the division of time. If gentlemen will indicate how much time is desired for debate on that side, we will try to give it to them.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman if he thinks the House has had a fair opportunity to become acquainted with this measure, in view of the fact that the committee which reported it was appointed only day before yesterday in the afternoon, and that only late that evening were the notices sent out for the committee meeting.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield to the gentleman for a speech. I yielded to him for a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question which contains but one sentence. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will answer it.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The notices were sent out that night and did not reach the Republican members of the committee until after this meeting was held, with but one exception.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The call for a meeting of the committee was sent out in ample time. And not only that, but the notice reached every gentleman's office and was on his desk, and if gentlemen did not go to their offices until after the committee's meeting, it is no fault of mine.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I have not made any reflection on the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not see what else it can be.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. But those notices reached nobody, because nobody expected them. This is a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, and nobody has had opportunity to study it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield further to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. For a question of one sentence. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman when the report was printed and ready for distribution in this case?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The Clerk can inform the gentleman. I do not know.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I ask if it was not within the last 30 minutes?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It is likely so. Now, Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said about gentlemen who are determined to give us Democrats a whole lot of trouble during this extra session, and I, for one, invite them now to do their worst, and, in the language of Shakespeare, I say to them:

Lay on, Macduff;
And damn'd be him that first cries, "Hold, enough!"

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not intend to allow this matter to be sidetracked to gratify the desire of gentlemen who think they may want days or weeks in which to consider it. We have been considering it for years. This identical measure was before the Senate last winter, nearly all winter, and every gentleman here has convictions upon it.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will indicate how much time he wants for debate, I will try and agree. Otherwise I am going to demand the previous question on the passage of this resolution.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman going to give any opportunity for amendment?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, I will, if gentlemen want to debate the question. If not, I want to pass the resolution.

Mr. MANN. We desire a chance to consider, debate, and amend it, and the gentleman ought to afford us that opportunity.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that if there is any responsibility for passing this measure at this time—a measure that the American people have been demanding for four decades—the responsibility rests here, and we are going to pass a resolution to-day to elect United States Senators by the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If gentlemen on that side want a reasonable opportunity for debate and amendment, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has indicated that he is ready to come to an agreement. If you do not want it, say so, and we will proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MANN. In the last Congress the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] introduced a joint resolution on the subject, which was reported to the House favorably. It came up for consideration by unanimous consent. I objected to the unanimous consent for the consideration of the joint resolution at that time, and was very severely criticised by that side of the House. Now, this resolution is very different from that joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the gentleman from Illinois is not responsible for it if he does not vote for it. We assume the responsibility if we vote for it.

Mr. MANN. That is true; but does the gentleman mean to say that in amending the Constitution both sides of the House should not have the fullest opportunity for consideration?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I have just stated, the gentleman from Missouri has proposed to give that to you.

Mr. MANN. At the last session of Congress gentlemen on that side of the House favored a certain joint resolution on this subject. They now have an entirely different joint resolution on the same subject, and yet do not desire to give, as it seems to me, a full opportunity for consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that the entire resolution does not embrace 12 lines of reading matter; that any Member of this House can read it in one minute, that this question has been thrashed out and considered for years in this House, and if the gentleman wants a reasonable time for debate, or a

reasonable time to offer amendments, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has stated that he would like to have you make a proposition, and say what time you want.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course it is unnecessary to discuss the question as to whether it is to go over or not. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has stated that he did not propose to let the bill go over. He intends to proceed with its immediate consideration. The question now is as to whether or not gentlemen on that side of the House desire to agree to a reasonable time, within the limitations of to-day's debate.

Mr. MANN. There is no necessity for an agreement about time. The gentleman has the power at any time to move the previous question on the passage of the resolution, and undoubtedly has the power to carry it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Missouri will have to move the previous question at the end of an hour. I understand he does not desire to take advantage of that right, if there is a desire for more debate and opportunity for amendment on that side of the House. If that side of the House want more time they can get it. If not, the gentleman from Missouri can go ahead and use his hour and yield such time as is requested on that side of the House, and at the end of the hour move the previous question, but we do not desire to do that if you will indicate a reasonable time.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Missouri can reserve a minute or more of his hour and take the floor and move the previous question at any time. Does the gentleman from Missouri propose to give any opportunity for amendment?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Is the gentleman addressing his question to me?

Mr. MANN. To either gentleman; I suppose the gentleman from Missouri is the one to answer.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will answer the gentleman if his inquiry is addressed to me. A colloquy has been going on for some time and the gentleman has been using my name frequently, and if he desires to ask a question I will answer it.

Mr. MANN. I asked the gentleman from Missouri the same question a while ago.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And the gentleman from Missouri said yes. The trouble about it is that some gentlemen have objected to things here so long and so often that they have become chronic objectors, and are never quite ready to vote on any question supposed to confer a power or respond to a demand of the people.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have heard that so often that it is not new to me.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And the gentleman will hear it again unless he reforms.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Missouri is not likely to reform my methods.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman from Michigan if he wants two hours of debate on that side, or three, or four, or a day?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have had so little opportunity to consult with gentlemen upon this side that it is difficult to know how much time will be consumed; but in view of the importance of the matter, and in view of the statements made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who I suppose spoke by authority, that this matter is going to be concluded to-night, anyway——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was speaking with the authority of the gentleman from Missouri, who has the bill in charge.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan (continuing). I will ask for at least four hours' general debate—two hours upon a side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if I correctly understood the gentleman, I will ask unanimous consent that general debate may proceed on this resolution for four hours—two hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan and two hours by myself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to know whether amendments to the resolution will be in order at any time during the general debate or whether amendments must be offered while the bill is being read under the five-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. Amendments are not in order during general debate.

Mr. NORRIS rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will not include in his request some provision about amendments? I am not anxious to extend the time of debate, but he can just as well include in his request that amendments shall be in order during general debate or at the close of general debate.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have no objection to gentlemen offering such amendments as in their judgment they think proper during the two hours of debate.

Mr. NORRIS. Suppose the gentleman includes that in his request.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not think it is necessary to include it in the request.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is, from the statement just made by the Speaker, as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Missouri think, in view of the statement made by the Speaker to the effect that amendments will not be in order during general debate, that we ought to have some understanding that amendments can be presented and have them pending, even though they may not be considered until the end of the general debate and during the reading of the bill?

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman can read any amepdments he desires to offer in his own time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I desire to say to the gentleman from Illinois that he, or any other Member, can read any amendment he desires to offer in his own time. That is all that should be required.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not suggest that I wanted to read an amendment, but that I wanted some method suggested by which amendments could be introduced and have them pending for consideration while the bill was being read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. JAMES. I would like to ask a question, if the gentleman will yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois seems to be quite anxious to amend this resolution, and I would like to ask him if it is his purpose to support the resolution for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I do intend to support the resolution, and I am not sure that I want to offer an amendment to it, but I may, and I desire to have that opportunity——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. But, Mr. Speaker, I am answering the question of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I understood the Speaker to state, in answer to a parliamentary inquiry of my colleague, that amendments would not be in order by a gentleman who obtained the floor in so-called general debate. That rule is undoubtedly true of course as to debate in Committee of the Whole, but this is a House bill on the House Calendar, and any Member obtaining the floor, as I recall the rules and precedents, may offer an amendment and have it voted upon unless a different arrangement is made.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman making a point of order or propounding a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I simply call that to the attention of the Chair. I think the Chair was in error in the statement, evidently having in mind general debate in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to repeat the request for unanimous consent which I made a moment ago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his request.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may proceed for four hours, two hours of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and two hours by myself, and that during the general debate any gentleman having the floor for the purpose of discussing the matter may offer amendments in his own time, and those amendments will be considered as pending; and at the expiration of four hours the previous question to be considered as ordered on the resolution and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that general debate proceed on this resolution for four hours, half the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG]; that during that debate any Member shall be permitted in his own time to offer an amendment and have it considered as pending, and that at the end of the four hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and pending amendments.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Of course, I suppose it is understood that my request is that the previous question shall be considered as ordered when the general debate ceases, even if it does not run for four hours.

The SPEAKER. Certainly. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Missouri begins—I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman after he begins—I desire to say that I voted for a similar resolution some time ago, and have voted for it two or three times; and I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will not, for my benefit and the benefit of others here who have thus voted, kindly explain the difference between this resolution and the resolution that was passed in the House the last time the subject was before the House.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am going to consume but a few minutes' time in the discussion of this question. Some criticism has been made here that we are proceeding with undue haste, and suggestions have also been heard that the report accompanying this resolution was printed within the last hour or two; that the resolution itself was only introduced during this session of Congress and within the last 10 days.

Mr. Speaker, charged with responsibility to faithfully serve a great constituency, on the first day that this House convened, the first hour it was possible to do so, I introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. On the second day of this session this resolution was introduced. Just as soon as the committees of this House were formed I sought to advise members of the committee that this measure would be considered, and invited their attendance upon a meeting of the committee.

If there is blame to attach because members of the committee which reported this resolution have not had more time for consideration, it is not due to any fault of the committee on committees, which announced the make-up of the Democratic side of all the committees of this House even before the House met, but it is due to the committee on committees on the minority side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who took until last Tuesday, day before yesterday, as I understand, to announce his committees.

But I am not going to discuss that; neither will I be drawn into a discussion of the fact that various changes from time to time have appeared in the language employed in these several resolutions which have been introduced. Let me say in a general way all of those resolutions present a similar thought and had a common purpose. They all respond to a sentiment in this Nation which is as wide as the Republic, a sentiment which permeates our country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a sentiment which is compelling Representatives to respond to public will. The deliberate judgment of the people of the United States, of the great mass of the people, demands that we reform the method of electing Senators by changing from a system which has sullied the fair names of States and traduced the character of gentlemen who have sought and won high political honors. The people demand that Senators of the United States who serve them in the highest legislative tribunal in the world shall be elected by a direct vote and shall respond to the will of the people. Gentlemen dilate upon the great constitutional questions involved—and they are great questions—and who admonish us to prudence and deliberation, forget that for 20 years or more the people of the United States have compelled obedience to their will in this Chamber and secured the passage of innumerable resolutions through this House.

There has been grave difficulty, I grant, for the people to reach the ear of all public servants. Just as you remove in point of distance a man charged with great responsibilities from the source which gave him power, just to that extent you diminish the opportunity of those who confer the power to get a response to popular appeal to that public servant. We stand with the great rank and file of the American people, and demand that this very day the House shall again go on record in favor of this great reform measure, pledged in platforms and advocated by leading spirits in all political parties. I trust the House of Representatives will again, and on this day, send greetings to the American people that we yield to their desires and cheerfully respond to their demands by sending to the Senate of the United States a resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by which the people will be able to vote directly for United States Senators. As to the form of the resolution, I desire to state that according to my information the pending resolution has received more consideration in another body, has been more deliberately, dispassionately, and intelligently discussed there than any other resolution on this subject ever submitted to either House of Congress, and that by reason of and on account of the fact that this identical resolution was fully and ably discussed in that body during the last session, and because it secured such a large support there, a support which will be augmented, I believe, by others who are now Members of that body, thus making the passage of this resolution an assured fact, your committee has accepted it and recommended its adoption by the House.

For these reasons largely, and because of its own merits, we have seen fit to report here in identical words the resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Judiciary during the last session of Congress. Mr. Speaker, the last time this resolution, or a similar resolution, passed this House——

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether there is any possibility of gentlemen on this side having an opportunity to hear what is going on in this Hall?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of order that the House is not in order. The point is well taken. Gentlemen upon this side of the Hall have a right to hear the debate, and those who desire to converse will please retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Missouri begins, I want to say this——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The speech the gentleman is going to make is a good one, but I can not yield right now.

Mr. RAKER. I am not going to take up any time, but it seems this part of the Hall here——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is not in order.

Mr. RAKER. But the gentleman yielded.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman refused to yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the last time a resolution similar to this passed this House it passed under suspension of the rules and was declared to have received two-thirds of all the votes cast, but, as a matter of fact, it received about seven-eighths of all the votes.

Before that, and only a few years ago, a similar resolution passed the House, and my recollection is that on a viva voce vote there was not a single vote cast against its passage. In other words, I believe that for the last 15 or 20 years public sentiment has been crystallizing around this great question, a question so important, I think, to the future of this great Republic that gentlemen here will gladly respond to public will and to their conception of duty and vote this resolution up to the other end of this Capitol.

Believing that this measure will receive practically unanimous support, and believing that every gentleman here on both sides of this Hall who is really in favor of this great reform, who really wants to see the Constitution amended as proposed, will vote down every amendment offered, either by gentlemen on that side or by gentlemen on this, I now ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] to consume a part of his time, and I reserve the balance of my own.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to consume very much of the time of the House upon this proposition. This House has on several occasions passed joint resolutions in favor of the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. I take it that the sentiment upon that question is overwhelmingly in favor of the proposition on both sides of this Chamber. And it is not any part of my purpose to oppose that feature of this resolution.

At the last session of Congress, as I recollect it, a resolution in favor of election of Members of the Senate by the direct vote of the people was passed in this body without a division. But, sir, this resolution goes much further than that, and I wish the House to know exactly what they are doing when they vote upon this resolution. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has said that this resolution is the same as that which was reported to the Senate by Senator BORAH last winter, but he has omitted to say that it is a very different proposition from that which was finally submitted to the Senate and upon which the final vote was taken. This resolution provides for an amendment of section 4 of Article I, paragraph 1, of the Constitution. That has nothing to do directly with the question

of whether the people should themselves vote for Members of the Senate or whether they should be chosen by the State legislatures.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman has stated that this resolution as now proposed is not the same one that was voted upon in the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAMES. Now, that is true; but is not this the same resolution that was reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate before it was amended there?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has already said that, and I have said that.

Mr. JAMES. I thought you ought to put that in your remarks so that your side might know that their own party reported this proposition in the Senate, which is identical to the one here offered now.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. If the gentleman had been giving his usual attention, he would have heard me say it.

Mr. JAMES. I do not think the gentleman was as clear as he usually is or I would not have drawn the deduction I did.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Section 4 of Article I of the Constitution, paragraph 1, which it is proposed to amend, is in the following language:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The effect of this amendment now proposed is to strike out the portion of the Constitution which gives to the Congress of the United States if it desires the right to regulate the election of Senators in the States, a power which has been held by the Congress of the United States since the formation of the Constitution and which at some future time it may be extremely necessary that it should exercise.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN]?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The effect of the adoption of the amendment in the form proposed in this resolution would be to create the condition by which Congress would still have power to regulate the election pertaining to Members of the House and not of the Senate, would it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I wish to say that I do not know. And I have studied the language as far as I have had opportunity to do so. I think it was undoubtedly the intention of the men who framed this provision to leave that power over the election of Representatives. But I do not know whether they have done it or not.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It would certainly leave no power as to the election of Senators with Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Absolutely none. If the words of the amendment to the Constitution which it is proposed to adopt are approved by a sufficient number of States, it would in terms take away the power even to regulate the election of Members of this House, and I am not sure whether that is cured by the words of the resolution, which are as follows:

> That in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the time of holding elections for Senators—

And so forth.

That is in the resolution. It is not in the amendment. The language of the amendment would apply to both, and it is attempted to cure that by this ambiguous language.

Now, sir, nobody can foresee the future. Nobody can tell how necessary it may be in the future in some State or States of this Union for Congress to have the power of regulating the election of Senators of the United States.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman if he has prepared an amendment to cure this apparent defect?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I shall offer an amendment, now that the gentleman has suggested it. I will do it at this point, and I will ask that it be read at the Clerk's desk and be considered as pending.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amend by striking out, on page 1, line 7, all after the word "vacancies" up to and including the word "Senators," in line 10, and, on page 2, by striking out all of lines 9, 10, and 11.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will mark that as "Amendment No. 1."

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KENDALL. Before the gentleman proceeds further, I want to inquire whether, if his amendment were adopted, it would restore this resolution to the condition it was in when it was voted upon in the Senate?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Absolutely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask leave to withdraw the amendment just offered and submit it in a little different form, reciting the language. But it is of the same effect.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his first amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I ask that the modified amendment be read at the desk and considered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amend as follows:
> Strike out on page 1 the language beginning in line 7, as follows: "And in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators."
> And strike out on page 2 the language beginning in line 9, as follows:
> "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

Mr. CALDER. That makes it clear.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Michigan if that is substantially what is known as the Sutherland amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It is absolutely the same as the Sutherland amendment.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. That would preserve to the people the right to vote directly for a Senator, but it would retain in the Congress the authority to fix the time, place, and manner of election?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Not the place, I should say. The time is excepted.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think that the amendment affects the right of the States to prescribe the qualifications of voters who vote for United States Senators, and the administration of the laws relative to such elections, and the power to appoint officers to superintend the election of United States Senators; and will it not authorize Congress to authorize and control the officers of the election of United States Senators, such as clerks, United States marshals, and other officers to supervise them?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I would not attempt, in the little time that I have for the consideration of this matter, to say just how far the authority of Congress would go under that amendment, but I will say this to the gentleman, that it would be just exactly the same as it is to-day, that there would be no difference; that it simply leaves in the Constitution a provision that is there now.

Mr. BARTLETT. With reference to what—with reference to Representatives?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. No; Representatives and Senators.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then, it is the purpose of this amendment, as I understand it, whether expressed in so many words or not, to vest in Congress, or, as the gentleman has put it, to leave in Congress, as he now construes the Constitution to mean, the full, exclusive, plenary power to regulate everything with reference to the election of United States Senators.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It leaves the same power that we have at present, no more and no less; the power under which this Government has existed ever since the Constitution was adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit another question——

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am sorry my friend is not a little more frank about the matter. I do not charge him with not being sincere, but——

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Oh, if the gentleman's party friends had given us a little more time to consider this matter I might have been able to give a more complete answer to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to say that I favor this resolution as it has been introduced; and I am sorry that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and his party associates on the committee and in the House have not all the time that they deem reasonably necessary. If I had it in my power, on every important question I would give you full opportunity to amend and discuss; but I want to say to the House and to the gentleman, that if that amendment is adopted I think there are many of us who will under no circumstances vote for this resolution with that amendment upon it.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I am not surprised at the statement of the gentleman. It discloses a state of affairs which I had suspected, that there are some gentlemen in this House who are not in favor of the election of Senators by the people, and yet, who will vote for this proposition if they can have combined with it the other proposition, to leave it absolutely in the power of a corrupt State to defeat the will of the people and to defeat the will of this body, while the American Congress stands by utterly helpless. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say——

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I should like to inquire where, in the opinion of the gentleman, these corrupt States are?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Many States at times have been corrupt.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Shake not your gory locks at us. You can not find them in the South.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It has been charged by southern gentlemen at times.

Mr. CLAYTON. Some of the Southern States were corruptly governed during the reconstruction period by the Republican Party and carpetbaggers and scalawags put in charge of the State governments of the South by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I do not care to be drawn into all of these side issues, but I wish to say just one word about the manner in which this resolution appears here; and I want to say, in the first place, that I do not cast any reflection of unfairness upon the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], the chairman of this committee, or his party colleagues, but I do think they have acted with undue haste in forcing this important matter before this body with so little chance to consider it. Of course I do not think that this body needs much time to consider the principal proposition, the election of Senators by the people, but it does need time to consider the language which shall be written into the Constitution of the United States to endure, perhaps, for ages. This Committee on the Election of President and Vice President was appointed day before yesterday in the afternoon. That evening the gentleman from Missouri sent out notices for a meeting the next morning at 10 o'clock. Many gentlemen, like myself, had public business in the departments that morning, and we did not reach our committee room until after this meeting had been held. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DANFORTH], a member of the minority, reached there a few minutes before the committee concluded its proceedings.

I charge no bad faith, I charge no attempt to prevent the minority's being present, but the effect of it all was that the matter was not considered by either side of the House with any degree of care, and if it had been, I do not believe the resolution would have come in here with such crudities of language in it as appear in many instances. I hope that the gentlemen on the other side of the House will forego their desire to take from the Congress of the United States the power, in any event, to regulate the election of Senators, that they will permit this amendment to be adopted and the resolution, substantially as introduced except in that respect, to pass. [Applause.] I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as long as I have a voice and vote in this House I shall stand for all reforms demanded by the patriotic and intelligent voters of the country. During my four years of service in this body I have consistently and persistently fought all forms of special privilege intended to benefit the few at the expense of the many. I have vigorously opposed all propositions to raid the Government Treasury by the granting of subsidies and have insisted upon an economical administration of the affairs of government to the end that the burdens of the people may be lightened.

The country is to be congratulated upon the fact that the present Democratic membership of the House stands as a unit against the evils I have enumerated and has already shown its good intentions and devotion to the people and to the country by cutting down the expenses of the House over $182,000 per year; and this is but a drop in the bucket as compared with what we will save the people when the various departments of government are placed on a business basis. We are going to practice what we preach by reducing the cost of government to its actual needs.

And now we come to another great reform—the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a joint resolution in the Sixtieth Congress, reintroduced it in the Sixty-first Congress, and again introduced it on the first day of this session proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States by a direct vote of the people. The resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendments be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely: In lieu of the first and second paragraphs of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America the following shall be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution:

"SEC. 3. That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by a direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years, and each Senator shall have one vote; a plurality of the votes cast for candidates for Senator shall elect, and the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"When vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, in the representation of any State in the Senate the same shall be filled for the unexpired term thereof in the same manner as is provided for the election of Senators in paragraph one: *Provided*, That the executive thereof shall make temporary appointment until the next general or special election, held in accordance with the statutes or constitution of such State.

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution shows where I have stood for several years on this great and important question. I am one of those who believe the people can be trusted, and the closer the relationship between the Government and the people the better it will be for all concerned. In my judgment the nearer a governmental agency is to the source of power the greater will be its value, probity, and efficiency. Direct responsibility results in honesty, and good faith sustains the wavering, lends encouragement to the timid, and exposes and defeats the unworthy, incompetent, and corrupt. The tendency of government the world over is toward the people. The movement is gradual, but continuous and persistent; there has been no backward step; no retrogression or recession. Without haste or thought of retracing our steps we have moved forward in the direction of liberty and the closer relationship between the people and the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House is one of great importance. It is a long step in the right direction, and when enacted into law the will of the people will be supreme in the United States Senate. Wealth, plutocracy, and subserviency to the interests will no longer be the qualifications necessary for a Senator, but rugged honesty, recognized ability, admitted capacity, and wide experience will be required of those who occupy a seat in the highest lawmaking body of the land. I know, Mr. Speaker, there are some who style themselves as "watch dogs" of the Constitution, who come forward with a storm of condemnation whenever it is proposed to amend that document. I am free to confess that in my humble judgment no instrument in the history of the world compares with the Constitution of the United States, but Article V of the Constitution gives Congress the power of amendment, and this right has been exercised time and again as the exigencies demanded.

Both time and experience have shown that as a whole the Constitution is good and wise and the people have given it their heartiest approval; but devotion to the instrument itself should prompt us to make such changes as will insure to the people

the greatest degree of liberty. When those who formed this Government looked over the world they saw nothing but arbitrary governments; a monarchial form of government prevailed everywhere. Their experiment was great and grand, yet it was hazardous. They were determined, however, to form a government of the people. Some of them, realizing the splendid ability and the vast capacity of the American people for self-government, were willing to lay aside all of the shackles and forms of arbitrary government, but there were others who had less faith in the people for self-government and insisted on retaining some of the influences and agencies peculiar to a monarchical form of government. I believe experience has taught us that such agencies can safely be dispensed with and that we can with perfect safety bring the Government closer to the people by allowing them to vote direct for United States Senators.

Mr. Speaker, the present method of electing Senators has made the United States Senate the home of many men of great wealth, whose hearts do not beat in sympathy with the interests of the plain people and who never would have occupied a seat in that body, if their election had been left to a direct vote of the people. We have reached a time in the history of the country when the Senate is no longer looked upon as the safe, conservative body, the so-called balance wheel, but is looked upon with dread and apprehension by the average American citizen, while the House, with all its faults and uncertainties, is regarded as the representative body of the American people, where can be heard the voice of the average citizen and where his rights will be protected and enforced. This condition is due to the fact that legislatures are frequently invaded by men of great wealth, shrewdness, and audacity, and the rights of the people give way to the exactions of corporate power; and he who can serve the corporations by controlling a legislature, through intrigue or persuasion, is regarded as fully equipped for service as a Senator, in which position he can guard and protect the interests of the corporation he serves. In this way the standard for the exalted position of United States Senator is debased by corporate influence. The wire-puller and the schemer are frequently preferred to the statesman and the patriot, and the proud title of United States Senator has lost much of its power in the suspicions which rest in the public mind as to the manner and conditions of their selection.

Mr. Speaker, when Senators are elected by the people there will be no legislative deadlocks, which in the past have not only resulted in scandal, but have frequently deprived certain States of an equal representation in this body. The Constitution provides that each State shall be entitled to two Senators, but during the past 20 years there has scarcely been a time when one or more States were not tied up in a deadlock over the election of a Senator, and therefore were deprived of their fair and equal representation. This was an injustice to the State and unfair to the whole country.

The present system has had an evil effect on the election of members of the legislatures. The two seats in the United States Senate for each State are highly coveted prizes in American public life, and as long as legislatures choose our Senators, those who covet these prizes will make it their business to choose members of the legislatures, and in this way much corruption and fraud will creep into our public life.

It has been said by another that the United States Senate of to-day may be likened unto the Roman senate of old. Rome, at the zenith of her power, boasted of the learning of her senators, which has been handed down to posterity and forms to-day the masterwork of the Latin tongue. But her senate became the goal of those who bought their seats with their gold, thus driving out the men whose brilliancy shone in brains alone; their laws began to decline; the people lost their virility; they lost their manhood and they lost Rome. Money is forever the same. Its one inherent quality in the social universe is cohesion. Its power wherever exercised is proportionate to its mass. Separated from the individuality of its owner it becomes a menace to the body politic, the destroyer of social equality and the creator of caste. The immortal Lincoln, with keen insight, foresaw the future of the United States Senate when he prophetically admonished his countrymen to "beware of the money power which seeks to perpetuate its reign until the wealth of the country has passed into the hands of the few and the Nation is lost."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the only way to remedy these evils is to so change the Constitution that the people may vote direct for Senators the same as they now vote for Members of the House. Every Member of Congress who believes in a republican form of government, a government by the people and for the people, and who is in favor of preserving the sovereignty in the hands of the citizens will vote for this resolution. Its adoption will bring the Government closer to the people, will prevent corruption and scandal in State legislatures, will lessen the temptation of political parties to gerrymander legislative districts for partisan purposes, and will make United States Senators directly responsible to the individual citizen. We have recently passed a resolution providing for a great exposition to be held in the city of San Francisco to celebrate the completion of the Panama Canal, to which we have invited the nations of the world. How fitting it would be to signalize it by the submission and adoption of this amendment to the Constitution, thus publishing to the world that the greatest Republic on earth has given to its people direct control of the legislative department of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will pass without a dissenting voice.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I now yield 15 minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], who has just spoken, and to his criticism of haste on the part of the committee, I wish, as a member of the committee, to state, as doubtless the chairman will later state at some length, that the question of consideration of this measure was taken up by the committee, and it was the unanimous view of the members present at yesterday's meeting, including members of the minority, that there would be no prejudice, no undue haste, in its consideration at yesterday's meeting, and in taking a vote at the same meeting. In view of the absence of several members, including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], it was agreed by unanimous consent that though the vote of absent members would not affect the vote of the committee, they would be given the right to vote on the question and be so recorded by the committee.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT EVOLVED FROM MILITARY ORGANIZATION.

Mr. Speaker, this question involves the organic law of this land. America is the only country where there is, strictly speaking, constitutional or organic law. History shows that governments grew out of military organizations that were created primarily for the purpose of a better self-defense. They started when families in the face of common enemies stopped their own quarrels and organized clans. Out of these military organizations clan governments were formed. When clans, confronted by a common danger, submerged their differences and formed tribes, the larger military organization gave birth to tribal government. When great warring tribes, confronted by a common danger, united and formed nations, the still larger military organizations gave birth to the great monarchical governments of to-day.

Growing out of military systems the older governments of the world are patterned on military lines.

Anyone familiar with a military organization knows that power to be effective must be concentrated, must be lodged in a supreme head, whose authority is transmitted downward in gradual stages until it reaches the rank and file of the army. In this way every government of history, including the government from which ours sprang, originally lodged authority in a supreme head and in a hierarchy of nobility, practically excluding the masses of the people from civil as from military authority. The rulers, being human, and holding the power, naturally adopted the hereditary principle for its transmission and perpetuation.

EVOLUTIONARY TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY FROM RULERS TO THE PEOPLE.

When self-defense and war came to occupy not all but only a part of the thought of the Nation, the military principle in government began to yield to a growing demand of the people for a share in civil authority. As the normal condition of society steadily became more one of peace and less one of war the necessity for centralization of power steadily declined, and the demand of the people for participation in government steadily grew and gradually overcame the opposition of hereditary rulers, reluctant to part with power. It can be stated broadly that the progress of civil government has been a steady evolution of decentralization—the slow but steady passing down of authority from rulers to the people.

The fact of fundamental importance for us to remember at this juncture is that, in spite of setbacks due to revolutionary excesses in particular cases, the results have been beneficent, tending toward the progress of the world. The question for us to determine in passing upon this resolution is simply whether its provisions are revolutionary or evolutionary. If they are evolutionary, then the light of all history shows that they are wise and should be adopted.

THE CONSTITUTION AN EVOLUTION.

The fastest evolution has taken place in Anglo-Saxon lands, where the monarch and the nobility have been shorn of most of their power. At the time that our Government was founded a conviction had crystallized in the Anglo-Saxon world that the supreme civil power could be lodged safely in the hands of the people themselves [applause]; and when this Union was established, the supreme power of the land was lodged in the people and expressed in their organic law. As great as was the forward step in the adoption of the Constitution, it was evolutionary and not revolutionary, for our fathers in their wisdom fully realized the limitations and weaknesses of human nature, and the difficulties and dangers that naturally beset the practical operations of decentralized, popular government. The very organic instrument that lodged supreme power in the hands of the people provided in its practical operation for a double system of restraints, the restraints of subdivision, and the restraints of representative agents.

OURS A GOVERNMENT OF RESTRAINTS.

The two great divisions of authority are the individual States and the United States. The authority lodged in the people of individual States and in their governments constitutes a fundamental balance and check upon the exercise of the powers lodged in the Federal Government.

The powers of the Federal Government and, indeed, of all the State governments are further subdivided into three coordinate branches—legislative, judicial, executive. The legislative branch is still further divided into two houses, an upper and a lower house.

Restraint through the employment of representative agents is as largely developed as restraints through subdivision. All of the actual operations of government, as provided in the Constitution, are carried on through representative agents, and most of the operations are in the hands of agents chosen by agents. In only one house of one branch, the lower house of the legislative branch, are the agents chosen by the people themselves. Under the Constitution the upper house of the legislative branch and the executive branch are two degrees removed from the people, while the judicial branch is three degrees removed from the people.

With such a combined system of checks and restraints the Constitution of the United States in vesting the supreme power in the people and even permitting universal or manhood suffrage was only a step in evolution, and not a matter of revolution in Anglo-Saxon institutions.

REVOLUTION IMPOSSIBLE IN AMERICA.

In providing for changes or amendments the Constitution contemplated further evolution, and in the method of amending, the restraints and safeguards are so developed that violent and revolutionary changes are practically impossible.

In the evolutionary development of nearly a century and a quarter there has been no fundamental change in the system of subdivision of powers either between the Federal Government and the State governments or between the branches of the Federal Government or the branches of government in any State. The Federal Government is exercising its powers more and more and is entering fields that appear new, but in reality no new powers have been assumed. There is at times talk of usurpation of power on the part of one branch of the Government, but in reality no organic change or practice has taken place.

EVOLUTION RESTRICTED.

Evolutionary development has been confined and is now confined to extending the control of the people over representative agents. The first development was in the assumption of power to vote for the Executive, bringing this branch of government down to one degree instead of two degrees removed. It must be remembered, however, that though the people vote substantially for Presidents, the candidates are still chosen by conventions, or are two degrees removed, though individual States, Alabama first, and now Oregon, are giving the people opportunity to vote on their choice of candidates for the Presidency. This evolutionary development has been long in use, though without formal amendment to the Constitution, and its effects have been beneficial. The right to vote directly on candidates for the Presidency will doubtless be extended to all the States. The proposition now is to bring down the election of Senators to a direct vote, making these representative agents one degree instead of two degrees removed from the people.

DIRECT ELECTION OF SENATORS OVERDUE.

The power to do this has already been assumed by the people in many of the individual States, and the experience in each case has confirmed the conviction, which is now almost universal, that it should be extended in a formal way to all the States. Such an amendment is clearly a step in the evolution of government; the time is clearly more than ripe for the step to be taken. There is no tinge of revolution in the proposition. The results could only be advantageous. It would be the part of wisdom for this amendment to be adopted and the people to be given this added control of elections.

I realize that men have always differed as to the part that the people should take in the affairs of government, and that this difference lies at the foundation of all party governments. One temperament, one type of mind, has more confidence in the masses of the people than the other type of mind. One type wants the Government conserved more as it has been, and that type forms the basis for the conservative party in every nation. The other type of mind wants the Government brought down more rapidly to the people; it is more liberal in its confidence in the people, and that type forms the basis for the liberal party in every government. There may be changes of the names, there may be many parties springing up for particular purposes at particular times, but in the long evolution of government in all countries where there is a conception of popular government this will be the fundamental dividing line between the two great parties.

ONLY REACTIONARIES CAN OPPOSE MEASURE.

The time is so ripe for this step—the election of Senators by direct vote of the people—it has been so thoroughly considered and so widely tried out in individual States; it is such a comparatively short step and so in keeping with the manifest evolution of our institutions that even the conservative element in our midst can freely accept it without misgiving. Only men of reactionary temperament can harbor misgivings.

It should be borne in mind that the amendment would have no effect upon the division of powers between the Federal Government and the individual States. It takes from the Federal Government no power granted by the Constitution; it takes from the States no power reserved by the Constitution. It alters not the balance of power as between large and small States, maintaining the equality of suffrage in the Senate, nor does it tend to any such disturbance, for Article V of the Constitution puts it beyond the reach of any amendment to reduce this equal suffrage for any State, large or small, without the consent of the State. Furthermore, the amendment does not alter the division of powers between the three coordinate branches of the Government. It only affects one form of the legislative branch, and the whole change in the legislative branch would not relatively be as great as the change in the executive branch by the direct voting of the people for the Presidents, which change has proved beneficial. The powers of the Senate remain unchanged; the term of office of Senators remains unchanged.

Some timid minds may have misgivings that the amendment would remove restraint upon the action of the lower House, needed to prevent hasty or revolutionary legislation in times of popular passion or enthusiasm.

PRACTICAL EFFECT.

Now, follow the course of a measure considered revolutionary, originating in this House in the midst of a great wave of popular enthusiasm. After passing this House it would go to the Senate. Two-thirds, at least, of the Senators would have been elected at times prior to the election of the Representatives, one-third two years prior, and one-third four years prior, which would antedate the wave of enthusiasm; moreover, one-third of the Senators would have terms extending two years beyond the terms of the Representatives, and one-third four years beyond. The Senate would still exercise the restraining function of a second branch and would still be a conservative second branch.

But even if such a measure passed both Houses of the legislative branch it would promptly come upon the check of the executive branch, with the veto power. If it should get beyond this obstacle and be placed on the statute books it would be subject to review by the Supreme Court, whose members are farthest removed from the influence of public clamor, holding their offices for life, and appointed by Presidents extending back over a long period. This Supreme Court would put the statute up to the test of the Constitution, and since this amendment does not affect the methods of amending the Constitution, and since these methods make hasty and revolutionary amendments almost impossible, it may be said that the proposed amendment still leaves it almost impossible to adopt revolutionary measures in our country. In fact, measures clearly in line with public policy, conservative changes recognized almost universally as advisable, find the inherent impediments in the way of constitutional amendment almost insurmountable. But for these impediments, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people would have been in operation for the last twenty years.

EVOLUTION PREVENTS REVOLUTION.

The difficulties, obstacles, checks, and restraints upon progressive changes in our Government are many fold greater than in the English Government. It is the slowness of response of the various representative agents, one and two degrees removed from the people, to the justified demands for progressive measures, that is causing the rapid growth of the movement for the initiative, referendum, and recall. Further failure to meet the growing demand for this movement will cause an inevitable growth of socialism. When evolutionary changes overdue are long withheld, then revolutionary measures grow in strength. Let not those who believe in representative government think they should oppose all changes. Further postponing the legitimate evolutionary step in the development of representative government as proposed in this resolution must inevitably discredit all representative government——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri if I may have five minutes more?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman five minutes additional.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN SENATE SHAKEN.

Mr. HOBSON. It is no partisan spirit that constrains me to point out that the holding of power so long by one party has dammed up the stream of evolution until the waters of reform are overflowing. It is wiser to open the gate than to endanger the mill. In the blocking of legitimate reform, no agent has been more effective than the United States Senate. This very resolution is a good illustration. Thirty-one State legislatures have acted favorably, the House of Representatives has passed a similar resolution time and again, both great political parties have made it a part of their platforms, and yet the Senate still blocks the way. It is not overstating the situation to say that public confidence in the Senate has been seriously shaken and the most serious blows to public confidence have come through the present method of choosing Senators by the legislatures.

PRESENT METHOD INVITES CORRUPTION.

It can not be denied that the method of election by the small number who compose a legislature invites corruption from great moneyed interests seeking to secure or to hold unmolested the power to tax the American people by controlling the United States Senate, and invites corruption from men of great wealth seeking a similar power or seeking the honor and prestige of the office.

Nothing would so restore public confidence in the Senate as the adoption of this resolution, giving the election over into the hands of the people. It is high time to restore this confidence of the people if we would check the formidable growth of socialism in the land.

WOULD PROMOTE EFFICIENCY OF STATE LEGISLATURES.

It must be further admitted that the present method of election of Senators has been accompanied by an ever increasing frequency of demoralization in the State legislatures. Placing the election of Senators in the hands of the people would really restore to the people of the States a better control over their own legislatures; it would raise the standard of State legislators and turn the attention of the legislatures to the needs of the States. The passage of this resolution would thus profoundly promote the highest efficiency of both the Federal and the State Governments.

WOULD PROMOTE POLITICAL EDUCATION OF PEOPLE.

But even promoting efficiency in both of our divisions of Government, State and national, does not measure the full benefits of this reform. The greatest benefit of all lies in the fact that it would contribute fundamentally to the political and patriotic development of the people themselves. The great law of development is recurring exercise of the activities. The glory of free institutions and self-government is the development of the people through the exercise of the functions of government. It is wise even to go faster than the highest efficiency of the machinery of government would dictate, so that the people in making mistakes would learn from them and rise to higher planes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Would it be imposing to ask the chairman for three minutes more, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not believe I can give the gentleman that much time, but I will yield him one minute more.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, the action called for by this resolution is evolution. If we are wise we will not dam it up. The current of evolution dammed up too long brings the flood of revolution. This reform is now overdue. Its delay has contributed to abuses and has shaken the confidence of the American people. The passage of this resolution is demanded by the highest considerations of efficiency of government, by the highest considerations of the welfare of the people, by the highest considerations of the orderly evolution of free institutions. The people realize this. They want this reform. They are entitled to it. I am heartily in favor of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair asks the indulgence of the House for a minute. On the question arising this morning, whether an amendment was in order in general debate in the House, the Chair mixed up the rule in the House with the one in the Committee of the Whole, and the Chair asks leave to change the ruling in conformity with the rule, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Whenever the present occupant of the chair makes a mistake and it is called to his notice, he will correct it as swiftly as he made the mistake. [Applause.] Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the popular election of United States Senators, and so I shall vote for this resolution submitting to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing therefor. I wish we might have had a larger opportunity to consider whether some amendment could not wisely be made to it. It seems to me, for instance, that the proposed amendment should provide that the regular election of Senators shall occur at the regular State election to be held next before the vacancy occurs which is to be filled.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman let me interrupt him?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Under the language of this amendment the legislature could do that if it wanted to do so.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Under the terms of this proposed amendment the legislature can regulate the time for such elections. It is a question, however, whether the provision should not be in the organic law.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think the gentleman is right about it.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I certainly hope that such an amendment may be adopted before the resolution passes.

There are those who are strongly opposed to the resolution because under its provisions Congress is deprived of its present power to regulate the time and place and manner of electing United States Senators. Personally, I would be glad to see that power retained in Congress. But, in my judgment, this is not a vital defect in the proposed amendment. The Constitution leaves to the legislatures of the several States the authority to determine how the presidential electors shall be appointed. For more than a hundred years, under this provision, the electors have been chosen by the people. The results have been satisfactory. If the States can be trusted in all matters relating to the election of presidential electors, they can surely be trusted in all matters relating to the election of United States Senators.

Our fathers in framing the Constitution undertook to safeguard the Republic by removing the selection of the Chief Executive from the excitement of popular elections. They believed that on election day the people in the several States would gather at the polls and elect their presidential electors, and that then these presidential electors would meet on the proper day and, away from the tumult and excitement of the populace, would select for the Chief Executive the one man in all the country whom they believed to be best qualified for the position. Their scheme was an utter failure. Nothing but the letter of the constitutional provision remains. To all intents and purposes the people of the several States register their will on election day, and the presidential electors whom they elect merely convey to the United States Senate the results of the election.

In a similar manner, they deemed it wise to remove the selection of United States Senators from the excitement of popular elections. They provided that they should be elected by the legislatures of the several States. This provision has already been nullified in many of the States, and the number of States nullifying it is rapidly increasing. The whole trend of public sentiment is in favor of the election of Senators by the people. If the several legislatures could be selected upon the sole issue of the election of such Senators, the situation would be very different. But such is not the fact. The legislatures are not selected for this purpose primarily. Many local issues, not infrequently burning questions, are involved in the election of these legislatures. For this reason, and for many reasons

which might be given, it has come to pass that too often the man selected by the legislature is not the choice of the people. It is desirable that there should be a uniform rule as to the time of electing these Senators, and I hope to see this resolution so amended as to provide for the date of such elections.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion there?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. FOSTER] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. The constitution of my State provides that elections for State officers shall be held in years other than those in which Federal elections are held, the idea being to divorce the consideration of State and National questions that the people might vote more directly on the fitness of men for the positions which they seek; and I simply suggest that idea to the gentleman as contrary to the one he suggested a few moments ago.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. My suggestion is that provision be made for the election of Senators at the last general election, whether for Federal officers or simply for State officers, prior to the vacancy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the people thought when they framed the Constitution of the United States that they were forming and providing for a system of government through which and by which the people could rule, with such checks and balances as would prevent hasty, ill-considered, and revolutionary movements. No one at that time perhaps dreamed that United States Senators would be virtually elected by the people by being selected in a dominant party primary election held one, two, three, and in some instances four years before the term of office was to begin, and seven, eight, nine, and in some cases ten or eleven years before the expiration of the term of service of the United States Senator so selected. Political revolutions and political changes that are not revolutionary can and do take place in much less time than that. When a United States Senator is elected for this long time he has the power and the right under the Constitution to remain there and vote in all legislative matters in the Congress of the United States as he sees proper, although his action may be the very opposite to the then existing political sentiment of his State. From the fact that the agencies and instrumentalities of government, both legislative and executive, have not, in the opinion of the people, fully lived up to and abided by the popular will have grown up the doctrines of the initiative, referendum, and recall. These doctrines to a great extent have grown out of the failure of the instrumentalities of government, as provided by the Constitution, to carry out and duly reflect the will of the people, as the people themselves judge of that conduct.

But I want to say that the doctrine of the recall of a legislator is not new, is not recent. It is older than the Constitution itself. It was actually applied to the delegates in the provisional Congress of the colonies, before the Federal Congress under our present form of government was established, when the delegates held their offices for only one year. I want to read here Article V of the old Articles of Confederation:

ARTICLE V. For the more convenient management of the general interests of the United States Delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its Delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year.

That is a part of the legislation in the nature itself of a constitutional provision older than the Constitution and older than the Populist Party, many times over. It is not a new doctrine. It was an idea so prevalent among the people of the Colonies that they provided for it in the Articles of Confederation as applicable to a legislative office that existed only for one year.

Mr. Speaker, I did not know that the committee was considering this resolution or I should have conferred with the chairman and members of the committee with reference to offering an amendment. But the chairman just stated a few moments ago that he was so anxious to get through this resolution in its present form, inasmuch as it had already been considered in another body, where it must pass if passed at all, that he did not want any amendment offered to it, and would ask that every amendment be voted down. Had it not been for that request I should have offered an amendment to this joint resolution, beginning with line 5, on page 2, after the word "years." I will read first the resolution and then the amendment which I expected to offer and which I would offer now if it were not for the fact that I do not propose to attempt to change the resolution in any way by any kind of amendment offered here, however proper and however much I would like to support it, by a provision that does not meet with the approval of the gentlemen who have this matter in charge and who have looked over and surveyed the whole situation. The resolution reads:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Now, just following the words "six years" I intended to offer this amendment:

With a power reserved to each State to recall its Senators, or either of them, at any time within the period of their service and to send another or others in their stead for the remainder of such period, and the legislatures of the various States shall by appropriate legislation carry into effect this provision.

I think, in order to retain the confidence of the people in their legislators, their agents, their United States Senators, or even Members of this House, if necessary, whether elected by direct vote of the people or otherwise, they should have the power to dismiss their agents or other servants whenever in their judgment, properly and deliberately ascertained, they no longer represent the people who elected them. I think such a provision would tend to perpetuate our Government in strength; that it would not be an element of weakness. If revolution ever comes in this country, it will come, not because the people have not confidence in the form of government itself, in the principles upon which it is founded, but because they have lost confidence in those who are selected to execute their will in the method and manner as now provided. Who of you as a business man would without power of revocation authorize an agent to do business for 6 years, 8 or 10 years in advance of the finality of that business, with no power to dismiss that agent for misconduct or other cause? A State which is rock-ribbed in its democracy or in its republicanism may change, slowly, quietly, but decisively, after a United States Senator has been elected and before his term of office expires, and yet that Senator will continue there to misrepresent the people, not at the time he was elected, but at the time the act of representation must take place. I do not believe such a provision for recall will be otherwise than in accord with public sentiment. But I realize that this resolution must go through another body, and I appreciate the sincerity and honesty of statement by the chairman of this committee [Mr. RUCKER of Missouri] in not wanting to do anything that will give anybody an excuse to vote against the resolution in its main purposes and objects, that United States Senators shall be elected by a direct vote of the people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, unless the chairman of the committee changes his mind, I will not offer this amendment and ask for a vote upon it; but it is time to think about these things.

Revolution can nearly always be prevented if we will only yield to proper public sentiment, even in a conservative way. If you think that this kind of sentiment is going backward, you are mistaken. It is coming. Call it populistic or what you please, the doctrine of initiative, referendum, and recall is coming, and it is coming to stay. It is going to be a part of the national, State, and municipal legislation of this country; if not in the form now demanded, then in some way by which the same result will be reached.

The Constitution did not provide for direct election of the President of the United States, but we have it. It has been amended by the action of the people in the method of selecting party nominees and party candidates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SULZER). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] prepared to use some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think five minutes are quite as much time as I desire in which to discuss this House joint resolution. Heretofore I have voted for a resolution in some respects similar to this—two and perhaps three times. I am inclined to the opinion that the people voting directly for Senators would give as good results as are obtained when they are chosen by the legislatures under the provisions of the present Constitution, and perhaps better results. If I understand this joint resolution, however, I shall vote against it, for this reason: After providing the proposed amendment for the election

of Senators by the people, it proceeds further and amends section 4 of Article I of the Constitution. That section now reads:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

As I understand it, the last clause in that section is stricken out.

Mr. MANN. So far as Senators are concerned.

Mr. CANNON. So far as Senators are concerned. I am not so sure but what it is also stricken out so far as Representatives are concerned. But let that be as it may, I will not vote for such an amendment, containing such a provision.

You take my house when you do take the prop
That doth sustain my house.

The Federal Government of the United States, a Government of limited power, but supreme where power is granted under the Constitution, should always have the power to perpetuate itself without regard to what any State or any States may do in failing to perform their duty.

Let me put an extreme case, and what may happen in the future I do not know. Suppose a State secedes; suppose the man comes on horseback and tries to take the State out of the Union, and the State does secede in fact without regard to what might be the desire of the majority of the people. Is the United States powerless under the proposed amendment in that case to say that a Senator can not be chosen by an election authorized by Congress?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. If so, then the Government of the United States, so far as Congress is concerned, exists at the mercy of the States in the exercise of supreme power where supreme power is granted. I say again that I think this amendment applies to the House as well as to the Senate, but the Senate is a coordinate branch of Congress, and Congress can not exist under our Constitution without a Senate. Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for such a resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, it would be manifestly impossible for me to enter upon any extended discussion as to the merits of this resolution in the short space of five minutes allotted to me; but this question is not a new one; it has been discussed time and again, ever since and before the adoption of the Federal Constitution. It therefore needs no great amount of time now for any gentleman to make up his mind how he should vote on the proposition. For myself, I have long been in favor of the direct election of United States Senators by the people themselves. I am on record in favor of that proposition. More than 30 years ago, in 1879, in the Legislature of the State of Illinois, I introduced a resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives in Congress from that State to support a proposed constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of Senators by the people. I have more than once introduced such a resolution in this House, and at the time I was first nominated for Congress I announced that as one of the planks in my platform and as a measure which I should advocate at every opportunity. I believe in the people and am willing to trust them at all times. I believe the people are and of right ought to be supreme in this Government, and that when they have fully studied and digested any question they are almost universally right. I know, and every man in this House and in this Congress knows, without any shadow of doubt whatever, that the great mass of the people of the United States are desirous of having adopted an amendment to the Federal Constitution that shall give them the right to say directly who their representatives in the Senate of the United States shall be. As a member of the Illinois General Assembly and State Senate it has been my fortune to have participated in six different elections for United States Senator, and at each time I have become more and more convinced that the election should rest with the people and not with the legislature. At one time in the legislature of that State, the two political parties being a tie, we balloted for more than four long months before a Senator was elected, and then his election was made possible by the fact that a member belonging to one party died and was succeeded by a member of the other party, thereby giving that party a majority. Of course, such a condition of affairs is not desirable, and could not by any possibility occur if the election was directly in the hands of the people.

At another senatorial election in which I participated, where two or three men held the balance of power, they were able to dictate the election of a Senator, and after a deadlock lasting several weeks the will of the majority was trampled under foot and these two or three independent members were able to dictate the election of a United States Senator, although they represented only the smallest kind of a minority of the people of that State. True or false, justly or unjustly, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, or the great majority of them, have come to believe that it has occurred in not only one case, but in many cases, that great interests, great financial institutions combined, have dictated and corruptly controlled the election of United States Senators by the legislatures of more than one State. The people are now asking and demanding, regardless of party, all over this country that they shall have the right to say by direct vote who shall represent them in the Senate of the United States. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is our duty to give them that privilege, if it is their right; and if this country is to continue to be "the land of the free and the home of the brave," if it is to continue to be a government "of and by and for the people," if it is to continue to be the foremost leader in the civilization and progress of the world, we must see to it that in reality, as well as in theory, the people are supreme; that their wishes must be heeded, and public servants in the Senate and in all departments of the Government must be responsive to the will of the people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great privilege to appear as an advocate of this bill on the floor of this House following the distinguished ex-Speaker, Mr. CANNON, who has just taken his seat. I consider it a great honor to appear on the floor of this House to speak on the first bill reported to the House; I consider it a great honor to be on the committee that reported the first bill to a Democratic House in 16 years; but, sir, I consider it a still greater honor to stand on the floor, representing the people of the old red hills of the eighth congressional district of Georgia, delivering their message of almost unanimous demand that the United States Senators be elected by the people and calling on you to heed their demand.

Mr. Speaker, I would not rise to speak to-day, being a new Member of the House, except for the fact that an error has crept into this discussion in regard to the action of the committee. Being a member of that committee, I am familiar with what occurred in the committee room. I would correct the statement that only one of the minority side of the House was present, because there were two present who cast their votes, as the record will show, in the committee room. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee went to the telephone and tried to secure all the members of this committee, and did all in his power to secure full attendance, and it was the sense of the committee, after he had laid the matter before them, that we proceed at once, by reason of the fact that everybody throughout the Union is familiar with this bill, it having been oftentimes introduced in almost the same language in which it is here to-day and discussed in this House. Therefore I can see no reason why anybody could raise complaint of hasty action.

It seems to me that recent performances of the different legislatures in many States of the Union should convince any man that we have reached the stage in our national history when we should no longer allow legislatures to elect United States Senators. It is a well-known fact, although it is denied, that the interests, corporate interests, enter the floor of the house of the different legislatures frequently; that they influence the election of Senators. When men are elected to office it makes no difference whether they are Senators or ordinaries, or what position they occupy, when they get into office and come to discharge their duties they are naturally influenced by and sympathize with the people and the interests who elect them.

When you go to the farms and seek a vote for United States Senator, or for any other office, you find an unprejudiced voter generally. Most of the people are interested only in good government, and when they walk up and cast their votes they cast them for the man they think will represent the mass of the people and the interests of the people, and not the interests of a corporation or any other interest that may have secured his election on the floor of the legislature. As I said, I know it is denied that the interests and the corporations enter upon the floor of the houses of the legislatures of the different States, but there is no use to deny the truth. I can remember when I was a boy of hearing it charged in the State of Georgia, my own State, that good old pious State, that the general assembly in the eighties was tied up for weeks and months, and I can remember that it was asserted then that certain corporate interests tied up that legislature. That was denied, of course. One of the men who then participated and undertook to go to the

Senate against whom the charge was made that he had entered the floor of the house with his corporate interests and corruption fund backing him, afterwards moved to the State of California, and it was charged in recent years that he brought together the greatest corruption fund that was ever put up in the interest of legislation in this Union. Whether or not that is true I do not know; but these things were brought into the courts and criminal charges were made against him and he was tried. This history is well known of all men. [Applause.]

Sir, it was my privilege to introduce on the first day a similar bill to the one under consideration, which when enacted into law would read as follows:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be chosen by a direct vote of the people of the several States, for six years, and the electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and each Senator shall have one vote.

When vacancies occur in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: *Provided*, That the executive authority thereof shall make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election, as the legislature may direct.

This amendment has no application to Senators chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution of the United States, and shall not be considered to affect the term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution.

The legislature in each State shall prescribe the manner, place, and time of holding the election by the people for Senator in the several States.

This bill is in substance the same as the one now under consideration, and I cheerfully adopt the chairman's bill. The people of this Union have demanded this legislation for a time the memory of we young men runneth not. It is no new question. It has been strengthened in the public demand by years of thought, sober and earnest deliberation. Resolutions by the legislatures favoring this bill have been sent here by 31 States. Extra sessions of the legislatures are often called in States to transact the State's business, the time of the regular session having been consumed by senatorial scrambles, and often the whole State is humiliated and demoralized by scenes in legislative halls. The strongest argument used against the bill is reluctance to change the framework of our Government. Our fathers in making the framework of the Government were confronted with the European forms of government and long precedents of centralized power. It was considered dangerous to load the new Republic with too many experiments, and there were many advocates of a monarchy.

The evolution of free government by the people demanded many changes from the old landmarks of the mother country. All men in those days were not prepared for a government by the people. Strong minds like Hamilton were battling for centralized government and feared the voice of the people expressed at the polls. Suffrage was almost unknown. Not one man in five hundred voted in the mother country. Time has proven that the people can be more surely trusted with the elective franchise than legislative bodies with the various interests camping on the floors of the Capitol. No one would charge corruption to legislative bodies as a whole. The report expresses clearly the thought I would here convey, it reads as follows:

No one contends for a moment that it is the universal practice or the general rule that legislatures are thus corrupted, but it must be admitted by all that if those who desire to corrupt enter the field at all, it is after the legislature has convened.

How often is it true that no taint of wrongdoing or corruption attaches to the election until the legislature has convened? The small number of parties to be controlled, the possibility of logrolling with different local interests, of trading this or that for votes, is tempting indeed to those who seek a senatorship, not upon merit, but through sinister means. In the early days of the Republic very few of the important offices, National or State, were filled by direct vote of the people. The President was named by an electoral college. Jefferson was elected both governor and Member of Congress by the State Legislature of Virginia. Many statehouse officers and all judicial officers were elected in the various States by the legislature. This era of our history is now relegated to the past, and almost the last remnant for legislative lobbying is the election of United States Senators. All officers are elected by direct vote of the people in all the States with a very few exceptions. The rule of the people, as exemplified in this Republic, has swept across the ocean; monarchies have crumbled before the demand of the people for freedom and suffrage, and even in countries where the throne was law the voice of the people is now heard in the land. Have gentlemen contemplated the fact that this office is oftentimes no longer a reward to men of true worth, true patriotism, and great ability? How many Senators come to this Senate on account of the influence exerted by their wealth and the wealth of their associates—the giant corporations? Our forefathers did not confront this situation. We will act wise to grapple the situation that confronts us, they could not foresee our present needs. They did well for their country, what will we do? So, sir, I say, let every man, I do not care if he uses his pick and shovel to make his daily bread, be as free to cast his vote as the president of a steel trust in the election of the highest official of his State. We can no longer turn a deaf ear to the demands of the people.

The Democratic side of this House would do well to learn a lesson by the vacant seats on the Republican side. The Republicans have been warned time after time on the floor of this House that they were straying too far from the people. To this and other warnings they have paid no heed, and now, sir, I call you to witness how their ranks have been thinned and that many new Democrats are here from districts that have never sent Democratic Representatives here before. You can not ignore the just demands of the people. Fellow Democrats, the country will commend us in the organization of this House for heeding the general demand for retrenchment and reform in Government extravagance. The official force of the House was reduced to the extent in money total the sum of $186,000. On the question of extravagance the people have appealed to this House, just as they have long been knocking at this door for the election of Senators by the people. What relief has the Republican Party offered to a tax-burdened people? Only 10 years have expired since the billion-dollar Congress was ushered upon the people. The country was stirred with indignation and alarm at such an enormous expenditure. In 1910 Congress appropriated $2,206,774,016.01. This shows an increase of more than 50 per cent in 10 years. The increase since 1896 has been over 75 per cent. In this estimate the increased population is considered. The per capita tax in 1890 was about $6, and it is now over $12. It is estimated that there is one Government employee for every 21 voters. In the year 1850 the expense of the Government was $60,407,019; population was 23,191,876; per capita, $2.60. In 1910, expense of one year, $1,103,387,508.01; population, 91,972,267; and per capita tax, $12.60. The comparison staggers comprehension. I realize the fact that it takes an enormous amount of money to run the Government, and I am willing to appropriate the people's money if it serves the great mass of people. As an illustration of what is being appropriated. I refer you to the appropriation for Government detectives. In the Sixtieth Congress the gigantic sum of $7,126,000 was appropriated for this purpose alone. Forestry is a question of no great magnitude, and yet $4,000,000 was appropriated for forestry at last session. Such appropriations are conducive of little good. On the other hand, farming is and has ever been the backbone of this country, and yet the appropriation for agriculture in all the departments is only five million more than these two appropriations of spoil and plunder. The Republican Party was warned, even at the other end of the Capitol last year, and even by that great apostle of high tariff, Senator Aldrich, that the people would not always strive with the Republicans for economy. He said the Government could be run on a saving of $300,000,000 every year. Taking this estimate as true, you are wasting more of the people's money than was required to run the Government 10 years after the Civil War.

For a decade the Republican Party has been under the lash of a few multimillionaires, arrayed like Solomon in all his glory, who toil not and neither do they spin, but have their toilers and spinners in the Republican Party. In serving that master the party has ignored the people. Now, sir, I warn the Democratic side of this House that the people have spoken at the polls and said, by leaving Republicans at home, that their demands shall be heard, and we must heed their demand by speedily passing this bill.

FEDERAL CONTROL.

The amendment looking to placing the election under Federal control is here for the purpose of frightening southern Representatives in States having legislative qualifications for electors. In this you propose to extend Federal authority, thus crushing forever the constitutional right the States have enjoyed from the foundation of the Government. We passed through the Civil War, the days of reconstruction, with no authority in the Federal Constitution to interfere with the manner of electing United States Senators, and yet in this day of peace and harmony you undertake to force upon the people of the South a new constitutional provision whereby Federal soldiers can be sent to camp around our election precincts. To make myself clear, the people elect members of the legislature with no Federal interference and none is provided under the provisions of the Constitution. These legislators so elected elect Senators

with no Federal interference and none is provided. Now, you propose to extend the provisions of the Constitution and throw around the elections of Senators Federal control. You are seeking to take from the States their constitutional right and centralize the power of the Federal Government. The Supreme Court has decided that the States can determine who should be registered and who should not be registered in the several States. This is a settled constitutional question. What man among you ever expects to see the day when Federal office-holders gather around election precincts in the South or any other State to say who shall and who shall not vote? Time after time the force bill has been here threatening the South, but long years ago it was driven from this House disfigured, disgraced, disowned, and denounced as infamous; no one to rise up and call its author blessed. Thus it sleeps in the potter's field a peaceful desertion. Is there a man in this House that desires to see the days of reconstruction repeated in the South? No; not one. No part of this Union outranks the South on the floor of this House, evidenced by the fact that you have given us an equal share of the honors and responsibilities in the Sixty-second Congress. Will the opening of our wounds never cease to be an agreeable performance to some of the Republicans from the other side of the House? From wrecks of fortunes and burning homes we have fought and regained our former prestige, and to-day the South is the garden spot of this Union. I can not believe any man in this House is sincere in pressing this amendment.

The day has been when such an amendment would have received strong and aggressive support, but that day is gone forever in this end of the Capitol, thank God. You men who injected this sectional issue in this question will feel the sting of repudiation when this vote is counted. This House has long since ceased to be a forum for an exhibition of skill in trampling upon the South. I warn you that instead of stirring up bitterness and hate in the hearts of your brethren from North, East, and West you have insulted their intelligence and brought down upon your own heads their just condemnation. If you be men, then rise up like patriots and strike down this amendment, which would destroy rights of a State and again carry back to the days of reconstruction our peaceful southern homes. Let us dwell together in union, forgetting that there is a North, South, East, or West, sympathizing with each other in the problems that confront us in the several sections.

We of the South have patiently and faithfully borne the burden of an inferior race; that we have borne it well is known throughout the civilized world. Other sections are being confronted with serious problems. To solve them you need our help and you will have it. No section can truthfully boast of more genuine loyalty to our Government or more pride in her achievements. Standing here on this floor, the home of the Union, where Hamilton and Jefferson, Webster and Calhoun, Stevens and Lincoln stood battling for what each honestly conceived to be a common heritage of freedom, I thank God the day has come when men who rise to the magnitude of statesmanship, even on the Republican side, despise any effort to gain public notice by attempting to inject sectional animosities into any question in this House. Sir, let us strike down the staff that waves this sectional banner, and let us banish even its shades forever from this House and bar eternally the doors to future reproach on the honor and integrity of the South. The defeat of the amendment to this joint resolution will send a thrill of joy to every southern home and return southern Representatives to their people to be greeted, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." [Applause and congratulations.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] in his speech a moment ago stated that he was not so certain but what this amendment repealed the right now existing in the Congress of the United States to regulate the elections of Representatives in Congress. I submit that the gentleman had not read with much care the amendment, or he could not have made that statement with a very great deal of confidence, because the amendment reads as follows:

> And in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators, the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

Not so far as it relates to the election of Members of the House of Representatives, but refers only to "Senators." This amendment in no way affects whatever authority or right Congress has to regulate that, and how the gentleman from Illinois could predicate his opposition upon the theory that it did affect the power of Congress to regulate the election of Members of this House is not very apparent to me, nor, I do believe, to any one who will examine it with care.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. JAMES. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The part of the resolution which the gentleman has read would form no part of the Constitution, would it, if this resolution should be adopted and the amendment adopted by the people?

Mr. JAMES. Oh, but that part of the amendment which I will read does control it, and that is this:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

Does the gentleman see anything in that which affects the right which Congress now has to control the election of Representatives in Congress, if it has any such right? There is no part of this amendment which refers in any way to Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Ah, but it is said that is in lieu of certain provisions in the Constitution.

Mr. JAMES. But it nowhere uses any language that according to a fair construction of it would be a foundation for a statement that this amendment undertakes to affect in any way the election of Representatives of this House.

I am for this amendment to the Constitution, and I regret to see in this House an effort made to try to bring up that old scare that has too long affected the affairs of political parties of this country. Let me warn you gentlemen of the other side of one thing. The southern people are handling now the subject of election of Senators and Members of Congress to the satisfaction of this House and to the approval of you yourselves, because you have never unseated a single Member by reason of the laws under which he was elected. The Supreme Court of the United States has approved the election laws under which they are now acting, and to try to place upon this amendment a provision that would mean its defeat—because it was placed upon it in the Senate and it meant its defeat there—almost forces me to question the good faith of those who propose it and to believe that the amendment is offered for no other purpose except to try to defeat the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. [Applause.]

I am in favor of the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people because experience has proved its wisdom. In the days when our Constitution was formed Gouverneur Morris was the spokesman of those who doubted the wisdom of the people to control themselves. Gouverneur Morris used this language, that the Senate should be made up of men of "*great and established wealth*," and that thus they might keep down the "*turbulency of the democracy*."

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to deny but that what Gouverneur Morris wished to do has been accomplished. The Senate has been made up of men of great and established wealth, but the rules of this House deny me the right to discuss its personnel, and I shall not violate them. But the one reason that spurs the people on in their advocacy of this amendment for the direct election of Senators by the people is to keep out of the Senate men of great and established wealth and allow the voice of the people to control and the reforms desired by them to be enacted into law.

I am one of those who do not fear the people. Gentlemen, the men who bear the guns that defend this Republic must bear the ballots that preserve it. [Applause.] I do not belong to that class in this country which says to the great populace, "You can shed your blood to keep the flag of the Republic in the skies, but you can not name the men who make the laws for you." [Applause.] I share the opinion expressed by the master mind of Thomas Jefferson when he uttered these words:

> *I would rather be exposed to the inconveniences attending too much liberty than those attending too slight a degree of it.*

This is the ground rock upon which republics rest, and when maintained can not be shaken.

Mr. Speaker, some people seem to believe the Constitution of the United States should not be amended, and was not made to be amended; but in this they are grievously in error. One of the greatest speeches ever made in the Constitutional Convention was that one uttered by Patrick Henry in opposition to the Constitution, based upon the theory that it was too hard to amend and that it would be practically impossible to do so. And for more than a hundred years of our history the Constitution has not been amended except by the sword. But the men who made the Constitution themselves gave the people two modes by which they might amend it. They made it hard, exceeding hard, to amend it. For the day in which they lived it met every requirement, but they could not peer through the centuries of the future and see the requirements that advanced

civilization would make necessary. Thomas Jefferson himself used these words:

Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. I knew that age well. I belonged to it and labored with it. It deserved well of its country. It was very like the present, but lacked the experience of the present—and 40 years of experience in government is worth a century of book reading—and this they would say themselves were they to rise from the dead. I am certainly not an advocate of frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with, because when once known we accommodate ourselves to them and find practical means of correcting they evil effects. But I know also that laws and institutions must go hand and hand with the progress of the human mind. * * * We might as well require a man to wear the coat that fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the régime of their ancestors. It is this preposterous idea which has lately deluged Europe in blood. Their monarchs, instead of wisely yielding to the gradual change of circumstances, of favoring progressive accommodation to progressive improvement, have clung to old abuses, entrenched themselves behind steady habits, and obliged their subjects to seek through blood and violence rash and ruinous innovations, which, had they been referred to the peaceful deliberations and collected wisdom of the nation, would have been put into acceptable and salutary forms. Let us follow no such examples, nor weakly believe that one generation is not as capable as another of taking care of itself and of ordering its own affairs. * * * Each generation is as independent of the one preceding as that was of all that had gone before. It has, like them, the right to choose for itself the form of government it believes most promotive of its own happiness; consequently, to accommodate to the circumstances in which it finds itself that received from its predecessors; and it is for the peace and good of mankind that a solemn opportunity of doing this every 19 or 20 years should be provided by the Constitution, so that it may be handed on with periodical repairs from generation to the end of time, if anything human can so long endure.

These words are prophetic; they are almost inspired. They come from the one unmatched champion of the liberty of men, who battled in the twilight of the Republic's existence for the greatest liberty to the people. He has been vindicated by the events that have followed as no statesman who lived before him and, as I believe, by none who will come after him. No one doubts, Mr. Speaker, that if the honest, patriotic men who made the Constitution could have looked down the long vista that has followed them that they would have provided for the election of Senators by the State legislatures. No millionaires lived in that heroic age, no trusts, monopolies, and lawless combinations banded themselves together with bags of gold to control one of the lawmaking branches of this Republic. Bribery and corruption of members of the legislature had not been heard of. It was the purest and best age of our American life. But even then Jefferson thought, and Wilson, of Pennsylvania, thought, that the Members of the Senate should be elected by the direct vote of the people. This amendment, that gives to the people the right to elect their Senators by a direct vote, will make unnecessary, after its adoption, costly investigating committees, holding long-drawn-out sessions at great governmental expense, investigating how many members of the legislature were bribed, or whether a man really confessed he was bribed when he was not. They will no longer have to investigate how great a corruption fund was collected by the trusts and monopolies to control and buy up members of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, it will, in my judgment, make unnecessary hereafter the use of so much whitewash in making reports upon bribery charges, and the people may have whitewash for their fences throughout the country in which we live at a reduced price. [Applause.] When the Constitution was formed we had just gained our independence from the mother country. The people were divided between democracy and monarchy. A republic to them was an experiment, never having been blessed by a free government, and many of them yearned for it; others feared it. These two contending forces were represented in the constitutional convention. England had a House of Lords, and that was the idea that actuated those who desired that the Senate should be made up of ambassadors, as some called them, from the various States, and should be as nearly as possible like the House of Lords. Yet England, in the few months recently passed, has been in a terrific political upheaval in order to try to abolish that body, after which this very provision in our Constitution was patterned. [Applause.] The people of the various States—30 of them—have approached as nearly as they could, by primary-election laws, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. The Democratic national platform for many years has urged this great reform and has declared that it is the gateway to all other reforms. [Applause.] And I am delighted now, Mr. Speaker to know that this reform for which the Democratic Party was the pioneer in its advocacy meets to-day practically the unanimous approval of all Americans.

Who is prepared to say that it was a mistake to lodge in the hands of the people the right to elect Members of Congress. The great reforms that have blessed this country have originated in this body at the hands of men sent fresh from the people, men who had listened to the heartbeats of those whose votes they asked and received at the polls, those who had been trusted by the people, and who were willing to trust those who had trusted them. [Applause.] This amendment, Mr. Speaker, will reduce to a minimum the opportunity for corruption in the election of Senators to the Senate of the United States. One of the most favored means of corrupting men under the system as it now exists in the election of Senators by the State legislatures is by the candidate for the Senate going into the various counties in a legislative district and saying to John Jones, "You are a candidate for the Democratic nomination," or the Republican nomination, as the case may be; "I want to contribute to your campaign fund to aid you in getting your nomination," and then going to another one in another county and saying the same thing, and thus spreading his money around in the various legislative and senatorial districts under the pretense of aiding the candidate to secure the nomination, when his real purpose was to secure the vote of that candidate in his race for the United States Senate. And when the candidate had been successful and was commissioned by his people as their representative, he felt that he was obliged to vote for the man who had helped him to secure his election. This amendment to the Constitution will give to the poor men of this country a chance to go before the people and submit their claims. It will make hereafter, Mr. Speaker, unnecessary the monotonous reading in the daily newspapers that the legislature of such and such a State cast the eleven thousand nine hundred and ninety-eighth ballot and the result was no election. It will result in sending men fresh from the people, men who truly and really represent them. It will give the people confidence in their Government.

Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this amendment to the Constitution do so because they really believe that a few men are wiser than all the rest. This was the argument upon which thrones were builded and dynasties perpetuated, but it has no place in a Republic like this. [Applause.] That government will live longest which is best loved, and that one will be best loved that gives the greatest liberty to the people. Adopt this amendment; meet the desires of the American people; give the States of the Union an opportunity to make it a part of our Constitution; make the Senate what it ought to be, a body in which the representatives of the people, elected by the people, represent truly the people; and I sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, the day is not far distant when the Senators in every State in this Union will be, under this amendment to our Federal Constitution, elected by the direct vote of the people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes, or 10 if he desires it, to my colleague from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

[Mr. CLAYTON addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution as it is drawn and as it comes from the committee.

When the United States Constitution was formed, democracy itself was on trial. There were not lacking those in the Federal Convention who desired to see a constitutional monarchy or an aristocracy clothed with permanent political power. A leader who has since been adopted as the patron saint of a political party of these days believed in the election of United States Senators for life. Unquestionably out of that conflict of opinion grew the compromise that the choice of Senators should be removed one step from election by the people. It was honestly believed by many that democracy could not secure absolute safety of life and property; but a hundred years of test have proven that democracy is no longer on trial. Democracy has shown that it can secure the safety of life and property; that there is no need for the checks and balances between the will of an intelligent people and the power of those to whom they delegate their political rights. It is not from the people that corruption comes, and that has been the lesson of the century of American history. The man who takes his dinner pail in the morning and leaves his humble home to perform eight hours' honest work in creating the wealth of the Nation; in adding to comfort and civilization; in making the world a better place to live in, and goes back to his home to sleep the sleep of honest toil, is not hanging around the State legislature with a design to corrupt it, to send men to the Senate. [Applause.]

The man who feeds his team before daylight, and at the first streak of dawn is in the field tilling the soil or garnering the golden harvests that shall be sent abroad or bless the homes and fill the dinner pails of countless thousands of his fellow citizens has no time to corrupt the State legislature to send men in his interest to the United States Senate, but these are the men upon whose broad shoulders rests the perpetuity of the Republic. [Applause.] This amendment is designed to place the power of choosing Senators where the right to choose them belongs—in the common, everyday, intelligent, honest, patriotic voters of the country. [Applause.] A hundred years have proven that the corruption incident to free government does not come from the homes of the average voters, but does come from special interests so equipped as to make their influence predominant in the choosing of select bodies. It is to cure that evil that the American people are now demanding the right to the direct election of United States Senators. And now, on this 13th day of April, on the day that over 7,000,000 American freemen are glad to celebrate as the birthday of him whose influence has echoed down through all the corridors of time in the forming of the American Republic; on the natal day of the Sage of Monticello, this House of Representatives can do no better than to perform its part to crystallize into law the will of the American people and the expressed belief of Thomas Jefferson by passing this amendment to the Constitution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] use some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss that part of the resolution relative to the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. I do not regard that part of the resolution as being in controversy here. There is little, if any, division of opinion in this body on that question. If the resolution was confined to that proposition alone, it would have been passed before this, and this debate would not now be in progress.

The resolution, however, contains another proposition separate and distinct from the proposed change in the method of electing Senators. It is proposed to withdraw from Congress its control over the time and manner of holding elections for United States Senators, as prescribed in paragraph 1, section 4, Article I, of the Constitution.

The framers of our Constitution vested in Congress under said section 4 the power to review and to make or change the regulations of the States with respect to the time and manner of holding elections both for Senators and Representatives in Congress. That this was a proper grant of power seems clear. It can not be urged that thus far in our history it has been improperly used. It is unlikely that it may ever be necessary to use it. On the other hand, some occasion or exigency may arise, which we can not now foresee, when it would be quite necessary for Congress to have such power. The fact that the power exists will have the effect to prevent the occasion for its use. It is now proposed to withdraw that power in so far only as it applies to the election of United States Senators. While I am not familiar with the debates of this body in past years when resolutions relative to changing the method of electing Senators were under consideration, I am informed by those older in the service that the proposition involving the withdrawal from Congress of its power over regulations as to the time and manner of elections for Senators has never been embodied in any of the resolutions heretofore presented, and that the question has never been considered in this House. It is before us for the first time. It involves a change in our fundamental law without any apparent or stated reason for doing so. It is concededly not necessary to give effect to the proposed amendment for the election of Senators by a direct vote. No such contention is even made. In fact, the author of and sponsors for the proposition advance no argument in support of it. I am not prepared at this time to discuss the question either as to the wisdom of the change from a governmental point of view or as to the construction that may be given to it in the form in which it is presented, with the care and preparation which a question of so much importance demands.

Serious controversy has already arisen as to its effect. On the one side it is urged that it will withdraw from Congress the control granted under section 4 of Article I, both as to Senators and Representatives. On the other side it is claimed that it applies only to Senators. It is to be regretted that the propositions are not presented in separate resolutions, as they ought to be. The people have a right to pass on these questions separately. Why encumber the proposition to change the method of electing Senators by another proposition, separate and distinct from it and on which there is already serious controversy and the effect of which on the general resolution we can not foresee?

When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], a few moments ago, in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], was urging that the amendment would only apply to the power of Congress over election of Senators and not as to Representatives, it occurred to me to be a most peculiar and anomalous position to say that Congress, composed of both Senate and House—one legislative body—should have control over the election of the Members of one of its branches and not of the other. If the power should exist as to one, why not as to the other? If the grant of power is proper in one case, why not in the other case? The analogy is complete. The principle is the same. There is and can be no distinction.

The gentleman from Kentucky, turning to this side of the House, expressed regret that we should raise this question, and charged that we were trying to bring up and revive sectional differences. I want to say to the gentleman that we have not revived that issue. You yourselves have presented the issue. The resolutions heretofore presented to this House for submission to the people of an amendment to the Constitution providing for election of Senators by direct vote did not contain the further proposition now presented, and when the committee composed of and controlled by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle brought in the resolution before us containing for the first time in this body the proposition in controversy, they themselves raised the question and are responsible for it.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, composed of a majority of Republicans, reported this identical amendment in the very language we propose it, and that the author of it was Senator BORAH, a Republican?

Mr. PICKETT. It has been stated a dozen times during this debate that such is the fact.

Mr. JAMES. Then why does the gentleman say that we brought up and precipitated the issue? Why do you not put it on your own party?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. PICKETT. There is no point in the observation of the gentleman from Kentucky. I was referring to the history of the proceedings in this House. He pointed his finger over here and observed that we had raised this question. I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that your committee raised this question so far as this House is concerned.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman from Iowa dodges the issue. One of his own party raised the issue in the Senate report.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield unless the gentleman from Kentucky wishes to ask a question. This side of the House is not responsible for what any Senator may or may not do or for what any committee of the Senate may or may not do. This House is governed by its own precedents, its own acts. I was speaking of this body and not of another body; but I will say that if we are to look for precedents, as the gentleman insists, then we should take the action of the Senate when it struck from the resolution the part now in controversy and left the resolution as a simple and direct proposition to amend the Constitution with respect to the method of electing United States Senators.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. PICKETT. I will.

Mr. COOPER. I heard the gentleman say that Congress retained the power by virtue of the Constitution as to the time and place and manner of electing Representatives in Congress. I would like to ask what section that is.

Mr. PICKETT. Paragraph 1, section 4, of Article I of the Constitution. In conclusion, I wish to emphasize the importance of due deliberation in passing on a question of so much importance as the withdrawal from Congress of its power over the election of its own Members, and I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] to the resolution may prevail. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time has been consumed on the one side and on the other?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 hour and 5 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Missouri 46 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I now yield, Mr. Speaker, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no question of the wisdom of the fathers in making the provision they did in regard to the election of United States Senators. They had not learned, as we have learned, how dependable and safe is an educated democracy. Furthermore, they did not have in those days the widespread opportunities of education, the high average of intelligence, and the widely diffused knowledge of governmental affairs that the people have at this time. Furthermore, times have changed, and conditions confronting and surrounding us are vastly different from what they were at the time the Constitution was adopted.

The people generally throughout the country have come to the conclusion that it is better to elect Senators by direct vote. So widespread is this feeling that in at least 27 States provisions have been made intending, so far as it is possible to do so under the Constitution, to provide for a direct expression of the people in the election of Senators. Even though I did not believe, as I do believe, that the Senators should be elected by a direct vote of the people, I should believe it and hold it my duty to vote for a resolution to give the people of the States an opportunity to express their opinion on that question; but, Mr. Speaker, we are unfortunate in the form of the resolution now before us. It is, in my opinion, faulty in two essential respects. The demand has been for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people.

The resolution before us does not contain a provision specifically providing for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people, and I am not certain that the courts might not hold that the language used in the resolution would authorize the election of Senators through some intermediary body. Second, there has been interjected into this resolution a provision amending section 4 of Article I, entirely foreign to the question which has been so widely agitated among the people, taking from the Congress of the United States supervision and control over the election of Senators, and probably over the election of Representatives in Congress. There has been no demand at any time among the people of the country for a constitutional change of this character. No party platform has ever demanded it, and, in my opinion, it is not desired by the people. In order to meet these objections I shall offer in my time a substitute for the resolution now before the House, said substitute being in the form of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] in the last Congress and reported to the House. That resolution provides clearly and specifically for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. That resolution does not relate or refer to section 4 of Article I, and it presents in a concrete form and in simple language for the consideration of the people of the country the great question which has been so widely discussed for such a length of time, to wit, Shall Senators of the United States be elected by a direct vote of the people?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. POWERS. Section 4 of Article I of the Constitution now provides that—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. POWERS. I had not completed my question.

Mr. MONDELL. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. POWERS. I would like to know in what instance Congress has ever felt it necessary to interfere with the time, manner, and so forth, of holding elections as prescribed by the Constitution?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it does not occur to me that it is important to inquire whether Congress has ever thought it necessary to exercise this authority, though, in fact, it has done so. The important thing about it is that it is a part of the fundamental law of the land. There has been no general demand for its repeal or its amendment. There has been no debate anywhere or discussion by the people in favor of a change or amendment to that provision of the Constitution. The time may come when it is of the utmost importance that Congress shall exercise this power, and certainly the majority, if it is acting in good faith, ought not, in presenting this proposition on which we are generally agreed, insist on coupling it with another and entirely different matter, in regard to which there is a wide difference of opinion. I shall vote for the substitute I have offered; if that is defeated, I shall vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG]; and if that is defeated, I shall vote for the resolution; not that I think it should pass in that form, but because I expect it to be amended in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I offer as a substitute this resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the substitute.

The Clerk proceeded to read the resolution.

Mr. JAMES (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that if the amendment is to be read it must be read in the time of the gentleman who offered it, or in the time of that side of the House.

The SPEAKER. It is being read in that time.

Mr. JAMES. I thought the time of the gentleman had expired?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman had expired, but the gentleman had the resolution in his hand ready to send to the Clerk's desk, and I thought it was only fair to have it read.

Mr. JAMES. I agree with the Chair that it is fair; but it is equally fair that it should be taken out of somebody's time.

The SPEAKER. It will be taken out of the time of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. If the gentleman insists, I will yield more time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded with and concluded the reading of the substitute, as follows:

> Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:
> "That the following amendment be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely: In lieu of the first and second paragraphs of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America, the following shall be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution:
> "'SEC. 3. That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by a direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years, and each Senator shall have one vote; a plurality of the votes cast for candidates for Senator shall elect, and the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.
> "'When vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, in the representation of any State in the Senate, the same shall be filled for the unexpired term thereof in the same manner as is provided for the election of Senators in paragraph 1: *Provided*, That the executive thereof shall make temporary appointment until the next general or special election, held in accordance with the statutes or constitution of such State.'
> "This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, it is no light thing to amend the Constitution of the United States. That is legislative work which no body of men is capable of performing offhand. I do not think that we should try to improvise substitutes for the different articles now contained in our organic law. Gentlemen will remember the amendment that was hastily put through the two Houses of Congress less than two years ago to impose an income tax, and there is one thing about that amendment, about its form, that has given better ground for opposition than everything pertaining to its substance, and that is that the amendment was so sweeping in character that it gave to the Federal Government in terms the power to tax the incomes derived from State bonds and from municipal bonds and from the other instrumentalities of local government, and, as we know, it has been held that the power to tax is the power to destroy, we conferred by that amendment in terms the power to the National Government to wipe out of existence any local government of the country. I regret, therefore, that this amendment should not have been more carefully considered and that there should not have been time given to the Members of the House to read the report and to study the form in which it is presented and to determine whether they should vote for it or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not see any objection to having the people of the different States elect their representatives in the Senate precisely in the same way as they elect their governors or as they elect their Members of this House. I am in favor of that proposition, notwithstanding the fact that the old system has generally worked well, and notwithstanding that the application of the new system in some States has not invariably worked well. For years the legislatures performed their functions a good deal in the way it was intended the electors for President should perform their functions, and they

sent a fine body of men to the United States Senate; but, under the pressure of modern conditions, after men had accumulated great wealth, a new era was brought in and the system did not work uniformly so well. We elect a legislature; that legislature is chosen for the purpose of enacting laws to govern the State.

It is not chosen primarily for the purpose of electing the men to represent the State in the Senate, and the result is that the members of that legislature are turned over to intrigue and earboring, and nobody knows what other arts in order to influence their judgment. I believe it would be more open, it would be better, that we should have better popular government if the people should vote directly for their Senators. Now, that that system has not worked well in some of the States, in my opinion, is due to the conditions of some of the States' primary laws. State primary laws may be good things, but a State primary law that permits the members of one party to enter the caucus of the other party and dictate its nominees is nothing but a low swindle upon representative party government. [Applause.] Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one part of this proposed amendment that I very much object to, and I object to it so strongly that I shall vote against the whole proposition if it remains in the resolution. It is proposed to take from the National Government the supervisory power that the framers of the Constitution put there and that it should have. No matter if it has been a sleeping power up to this time, it may sometime be a power that is vital to the preservation almost of the Republic. It proposes to take away from the National Government the supervisory power that it has over the electing of the members of the great political department of the Government. You destroy the symmetry of the instrument by permitting that, and providing, or permitting it may provide, that these regulations concerning the Members of this House——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCALL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will have to content myself.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] will use some of his time now.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has more time than I have.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Then I will yield——

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the argument of the gifted gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. STANLEY. Although I do not entirely agree with him, I will yield him two minutes of the time that has been allotted to me. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Kentucky for yielding to me and for the kindly terms in which he has done so. I had about finished my argument, and I do not think that I care to resume it now. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, but will return the time to him.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as has been said repeatedly, this has not been and is not now a partisan question. I do not think there is much diversity of opinion to be found in the membership of this House upon the general proposition of electing United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. I do think, however, that there has been injected into this general discussion a feature that might properly be considered more at length than the one on which we are practically agreed. I refer, of course, to that paragraph which purports to assign and give to the States the absolute power to decide the time, manner, and place for the selection of United States Senators. It seems to me, notwithstanding the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], that one great branch of the Government is hereby surrendering its power to perpetuate and maintain itself. It is giving to the States a right which the symmetry of the Constitution, which our scheme of government, nationally conceived, requires should rest with the Federal power.

The proponents of this feature of the resolution have overlooked the great necessity our Government is under to protect and maintain the respective sovereignties of State and Nation. As all the world knows, the great principles contained in our Constitution were not the invention of the framers of that document, but the result of centuries of political evolution on the part of the Anglo-Saxon race. That feature which is perhaps most original is the division of sovereignty between State and Nation. The distribution of sovereignty, agreed upon in the constitutional convention, has been materially changed during the decades that have passed, due to the unfolding of political and economic forces.

It is natural that both the States and the Federal Government should be jealous of their rights, and each particularly jealous of any encroachment of power on the part of the other. The very system of our Government, and therefore the perpetuity of our institutions, depend upon the proper distribution of sovereign power between State and nation. By this section of the proposed amendment the Federal Government places the control and perpetuity of an important element of its sovereignty in the possession of the States. If States have exclusive control of the time, manner, and place of electing United States Senators they can, if it pleases them to usurp the function, control the most important part of the legislative branch of the Government. By refusing to elect at all, the legislative arm of the Federal Government would be paralyzed. Many men now live who witnessed almost one-half of the States withdraw from the Union and refuse to send Members to Congress. That which happened once may happen again, and under such conditions the Federal Government should be able to exercise supreme control over the election of those who are to exercise Federal legislative power.

If, perchance, State legislatures should give to Congress the right to select members of the State legislatures, to prescribe the time, manner, and place, how ridiculous it would be. Equally ridiculous is it for the National Government thus to surrender its power.

We are frankly told by gentlemen from the other side of the Chamber that the main purpose of this section is to prevent, on the part of the Federal Government, interference with disfranchisement of the negro, now practically complete, in all the Southern States. Such a statement condemns the section and gives emphatic reason why it should not become a part of the Constitution. If this passes, we have a Constitution presenting the ridiculous spectacle of guaranteeing the right of franchise to the negro in one section and effectually taking it away in another. But apart from this inconsistency and incongruity, I do not believe we should indorse or permit any act looking to the disfranchisement of this great multitude that is making such great progress in political ability and industrial life.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose any academic discussion can or will change a vote on this question. The majority are for this section, and they do not propose to give us an opportunity to eliminate it. Indulgently they permit us to talk about it for a little time, but amend it—never! A few days ago, at the beginning of this Congress, we were led to believe the halcyon days had come. Then the leaders on that side, with words that fell with sweet cadence upon our ears, promised that during this Congress full freedom of debate should be extended and every opportunity for amendment granted. Here we have the measure of their performance. A proposition as important as any that will come before this Congress is suddenly thrust upon us, no opportunity given to investigate or consider the far-reaching effect of its imperfectly understood provisions, and we are told to swallow it whole, instantly, keeping from choking if we can.

While I am reluctant to vote for that feature of the resolution I have just mentioned, the importance of the resolution as a whole is so great that I am heartily in its support. This proposed amendment to the Constitution illustrates and effectuates political evolution in the United States. The wisdom of the fathers has often been commented upon because they gave to the country a great Constitution. This credit is their due. They were somewhat skeptical of the ability of the general mass of people to act intelligently and patriotically in things political, but this was due largely to the fact that Anglo-Saxon democracy had not been given a trial and historical precedent was lacking. But political evolution in this country has corrected the errors, in this regard, committed by the fathers. They thought the average man could not vote intelligently for President, so they introduced the college of electors. But for many decades the electoral college has been a pure fiction, and in effect each citizen now votes directly for President. Those fathers also thought it wise to take the selecting of Senators from the people and place that power in the hands of the legislatures of the several States. In recent years we find the legislatures of many States bound by law to carry out the will of the people as expressed in a primary election to choose a United States Senator. This evolution indicates that all political power belongs to the people; that our people can exercise it; and, what is more, propose to exercise it. You can no more change this great law of political evolution than you can change a law of nature.

This evolution of 130 years has shown that the power of election of all representatives of the people in each and every department of the Government should remain with the people who are to be served. If they make a mistake, the mistake is theirs, and they have a right to make it. The election by direct

vote of the people tends to effectuate what we may term a pure republican form of government of the representative character conceived many hundred years ago and first brought forth and perfected on the American continent.

I hope that we will pass this by as large and nearly a unanimous vote as possible, to show to the country that the Members of this body on each side of the aisle are advocates of a progressive political theory that shall preserve and keep to the people, where it belongs, every fundamental power of a political nature. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate but two objections have been suggested to the passage of this resolution. The first is a puny plea in abatement. It is claimed by some gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber that there is an undue haste in presenting and considering this measure.

The answer to that statement is found in the fact that every Member of this body understands fully the provision now under consideration. It was thoroughly threshed out and discussed by the Judiciary Committee of the body at the other end of the Capitol, and discussed at great length in that body. Every Member here understands its true import, and there is no necessity or excuse for delay.

I must confess, gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, that it is somewhat gratifying to me to know that the chairman of this committee and the committee having this joint resolution in charge have so promptly and so speedily responded to the demand of the public, which the Republican Party has been dilatory in responding to and has refused to recognize for many years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The other objection urged to this measure on that side by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] and the gentleman from Illinois, the ex-Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. CANNON], namely, that the Federal Government in the adoption of the amendment now proposed is abrogating the power of self-perpetuation and encouraging a spirit of secession, is equally unfounded. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois, in his efforts to maintain the power of State legislatures to elect Members of the United States Senate, recalls the fact that every State that ever attempted to go out of the Union did so through the passage of an ordinance of secession by its legislature?

Each House will still be the judge of the election returns and qualifications of its own Members if this amendment is finally ratified. That provision of the Constitution is not affected directly by this joint resolution. The manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives can not fairly be said to involve the perpetuity of the Federal Government, nor can any action of the States in that regard diminish the fundamental powers delegated in the Constitution to the Federal Government. This objection seems to be far-fetched, and from a practical standpoint is of no great importance. If the people of the various States are to exercise the power of electing their Senators, no reason appears why the Congress should reserve the right to make or alter the regulations prescribed by the people themselves for the exercise of that power. The power of Congress to make or alter regulations by the States for the election of Members of Congress, if sought to be eliminated by the proposed amendment, has never appeared to be necessary for the preservation of the National Government nor indispensable to the exercise of its powers. "Force" bills, Federal election laws, in the light of history, have contributed nothing of value to the administration of the Government and have always proved distasteful. If the people can be trusted to elect their Senators by popular vote, as appears to be the consensus of opinion, it would seem not improper to provide that they may determine the manner of the election.

I want to suggest to gentlemen that the day for "force" bills has passed; that there is in no part of this Republic the possibility of the development of any spirit of secession; that issue has long been settled. For the sake of consistency it is well to write into the Constitution with respect to the election of Senators a provision similar to that which exists concerning the election of the President of the United States. The Constitution gives to the legislatures of the States the power to fix the manner of selecting presidential electors, and the only limitation upon that power is that—

> The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes, which day shall be the same throughout the United States.
>
> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress—

And so forth.

You can trust the people to elect a President. Every one concedes the fact that the election of presidential electors is practically an election of the President by the people. Do you want to deny to the people of the States full power to choose their Senators?

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I believe that this resolution ought to be adopted for four general reasons.

First. It will increase the power of the people. This, to me, is of primary and paramount importance. If any reason ever existed for requiring that United States Senators be elected by legislatures and not by popular vote that reason has long since disappeared. If our political history demonstrates one fact more clearly than any other, it is the conclusion that abuses are more certainly averted and good government more surely promoted by the recognition in practice of the principle that the people are the source of all political power and may be trusted to exercise it.

Second. The adoption of this resolution, and the consequent election of United States Senators by popular vote, will make the legislative branch of the Government, including the body at the other end of the Capitol, fairly responsive to the public will. When any question of legislative policy has been agitated and the voters of a State have reached a conclusion and expressed that conclusion it will no longer be difficult or impossible to induce Members of the body at the other end of this Capitol to yield to the public demand for reforms in legislation.

Third. The deadlocks which have so often occurred during recent years in the selection of United States Senators, and the consequent detriment to the public, can not happen if this resolution is passed and ratified by the States. I need not recount the many instances that emphasize the importance of this suggestion. That a State may be denied representation in the Senate by reason of the failure of its legislature to elect a Senator has long discredited the prevailing system of electing Senators.

Fourth. The shameful and disgraceful practices occurring in some of the State legislatures in the selection of United States Senators will be terminated if the power to choose Senators is exercised directly by the voters. That bribery and various forms of corruption should have become frequent, not to say common, in the present method of electing Senators is of itself sufficient to discredit the prevailing method and to encourage us to seek and adopt a system which, it is hoped, will be free from such abuses.

The time has come when this amendment will receive the hearty approval of nearly all the States. It will not, of course, relieve the election of Senators from all corrupt influences, but it will place it directly in the power of the voters to choose Senators who are in accord with the spirit of the times and who will give emphasis to the recognized and enlightened view of the voters.

The day of "government by superior people" has passed. Every public citizen will still have and exercise the power of asserting his views and of seeking to mold sentiment on political questions. The passage of this amendment will no more deprive Senators of the privilege of leading in reforms or of opposing improvident and ill-considered measures than does the election of Congressmen deprive Members of this body of that right and power. It will, however, diminish obstinacy and prevent the obstruction of needed legislation, and thus bring the Senate closer to the people.

If the voters are to have the power of governing the country, if legislative policies are to be fixed by an enlightened public opinion and not by selfish interests, it is necessary that both branches of Congress be fairly responsive to the public will and directly responsible to the people. The passage of legislation, however much desired by one body, results in nothing if defeated in the other. This frequently occurs now, but it will not happen so often if this amendment is ratified.

In this great Republic, employing many thousands of persons, Members of this body, the Members of the House of Representatives, are the only elective officers. In the course of progress the people of the United States have reached the conclusion that Members of the other legislative body ought also to be elected.

I, for one, am in favor of giving the people that power, and in favor of giving them the power without reservation, because they can exercise it much more skillfully and much better for the Government than it is now exercised. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, stripped of all its verbiage and all its frills this joint resolution amending the United States Constitution, as we are all aware, allows the people to elect their Senators by the popular vote rather than have the various legislatures select them. No gentleman on the opposite side, and no one disposed to oppose this measure, has said that it would not accomplish that purpose. Until such a charge is made we must assume that the opposition is but fanciful rather than real. The opponents of this reform have objected to this particular verbiage and to that, but no opponent of the measure and no one who has even partially favored it has said that it would not accomplish election of Senators by the people. The venerable ex-Speaker CANNON, who announced that he would not support this resolution, did not say it would not accomplish the purpose, but he objected to something relative to the particular language used. I for one am heartily in favor of this resolution as it stands, because it accomplishes what 90 per cent, nay, I believe, 99 per cent, of the people desire. I congratulate the chairman of the committee and the committee itself that they have caused this to be the first bill reported by a Democratic committee. I will wait until the adjournment today to congratulate this Democratic House on this being the first bill that it passed. I think it is a beautiful tribute to the House of Representatives, I think it is a beautiful tribute to the American people, I believe it is a beautiful compliment to the Democratic Party to pass as their first bill a bill so universally desired. [Applause.]

My friends, in looking over the report I am sorry to find a minority report signed by a Republican Member of this House from the thirty-second district of New York. I am sorry that he assigns only the insufficient reason, which in substance is that he is opposed to it fundamentally. I can not consistently attribute that same view to all of the minority of this House, because many of them have asserted their fealty and their willingness to support it; but I can not but pause for a moment to suggest that it is but a continuation of their 16 years of dilatory tactics in refusing to give this legislation to the American people. I can not but call attention to the fact that for 16 long years the Republican Party have been in full control of both the House, the Senate, and the Chief Executive, and through all those years, with full power invested in them, they have refused to enact it into law. Each of them on the stump and each of them in person can assign reasons, but to the absolute failure to act there can be no valid reason that the people will accept. Men are known better by what they do than by what they say. Political parties are likewise known better by what they do than by what they say. And I might be severe enough to suggest that men sometimes walk one way and look the other. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They sometimes assert they are in favor of the principle involved, but are always found opposing, by reason of some minor detail unworthy and insufficient, to defeat a great principle. And when we observe the bickerings and parliamentary tactics of the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber we can not but think this is such a case.

The question of right to select Senators by a popular vote is not a new one. Strong men advocate that they be so elected in the Constitutional Convention of 1789. At that time such a group of States as this was not dreamed of, and no one with the most exuberant expectations could have dreamed that such ever would be the case. In 1789 a handful of poor, struggling settlers, to-day a Republic of whom the whole world points with pride and esteem. To-day 92,000,000 of liberty-loving American citizens asking for this right. To-day I am proud to find a Democratic House, charged with power to act for the people and in their interests, passing this as their first bill.

We stand before the people at election time and solicit their support and at the same time their confidence. We are elected only after both have been acquired. Then, why should not it be a matter indeed refreshing to find a Congress willing to do the things that they promised the people they would do? For 16 long years the Republicans have trifled with the people's confidence and esteem. For 16 years, with full power to act, they have swept aside the people's wishes as heresies and vagaries, until to-day the party of Lincoln and McKinley has become a by-word in the streets, and their retirement at the recent election is but evidence that the people longer refuse to be trifled with.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] complains of corrupt States and the evil effects that would follow if this bill passed in its present form. Can it be that any State in all this Republic is more corrupt than the legislature elected by a corrupt State? Is he not mistaken in his premises when he predicates an argument on so flimsy a foundation? Is he even misleading himself with any argument so flimsy and so unfounded? Corruption is found less often among American homes than it is around legislatures, and none can gainsay the truth of this assertion.

Recent disclosures in the legislatures have been appalling to us all. Recent disclosures have not alone blighted the names of the corrupt participants, but have reached out and blasted the fair names of whole States in which they conduct their nefarious deals, made possible only by a system so antequated and so unworthy as the election of Senators by the legislatures of the States as distinguished by the patriotic people of the several States.

I can never think this Republic will long stand after we fail to trust the people who pay the taxes in time of peace and shoulder their muskets in time of pestilence and war. I can never think it less safe to trust all the people of any State than it is to trust a few of the same people of the same State. I shall never subscribe to such a theory, in office or out. I shall never be a party to any dilatory tactics practiced by the Republicans in this House to delay action on a question so fundamentally correct. I shall never quibble over details when the accomplishment of a great principle is at stake.

The Democratic Party has repeatedly declared for this principle in convention assembled, and each platform since my early youth has borne pledges to the people of its enactment into law.

I rejoice and rejoice thrice and thrice again that this Congress during the very first days of its interesting session is going to make this much-needed reform a reality. It is but the keeping of faith with the people, and they are entitled to it. It will purify elections. It will bring wholesome results to State and Nation. There are other features of legislation that we have promised the people, and they will follow. It may be asserted that it will fail in the Republican Senate, and it may; but behind it all the people will know who their friends are, and will also know where the trouble has been these long years. It is my belief, if the Senators were elected by the people so that at each returning campaign the candidates for Senator would have to return to their people and get the indorsement and acquaintance of their people, there would be less unwillingness to enact laws that all of the people want. Close contact with the people can only be acquired by forcing the candidate to consult them. Close acquaintance can not be exacted unless the power is vested in the people to punish or reward. When the power is vested in the legislatures of the States, the candidate does not have to proceed further than to acquaint himself with the few members of the legislature to further hold his seat, and the people receive little or, at least, inferior consideration from him. I rejoice to see the people coming into their own, and they are eminently entitled to it. It is not more than they should ask. It is but common justice. It will result in nought but good.

It is charged by opponents of the measure that it is revolutionary and socialistic. I deny it, and it is not borne out by the facts. It is common justice and common sense. It is but the doing of exact justice to a people who have long been denied that right to select their Members of Congress in both branches.

Since I came to Congress I have each session introduced a joint resolution for the election of Senators by the popular vote. I have a bill pending now, and if this bill fails in a Republican Senate, I shall reintroduce each session as long as I am here, and at each occasion, like "Banquo's ghost," I will appear on the scene until it becomes the law of the land and a part of the American Constitution.

The American people have said you shall not barter away their rights by men they did not elect, and you shall not defeat this legislation without the protest and the knowledge of the people who are wronged by the defeat.

It is charged that none but the rich can afford to run for the Senate if popular election is exacted of them by the people. It is not so. Senators are elected for six years, three times the length of the time for which the House Members are chosen, and there is no occasion for the application of such a rule or such a statement. Again it may be said that it is of equal importance that Senators be as near to the people as the more numerous branch of Congress, for each bill and each resolution has to pass both bodies before it becomes a law. I submit for one branch to be responsive and the other inactive and irresponsive to the will of the people is almost as deplorable as if both branches were selected otherwise than by the people.

Power begets respect. The absence of power without exception makes respect at best more tardy and usually totally absent. The people should have the power in the abstract, but surely they should have it when it begets for them the respect the Constitution intended them to have.

Pass this joint resolution and you make no mistake. Pass the resolution and the States will act at their first sitting.

Pass this resolution and the American people will see we intend to keep the faith when in power that we advocated when not in power. Pass this resolution and make responsive that body which is too far removed from the aches and pains of the people. Pass it and endear yourselves to the people of all political faiths and enact a reform from which no ill effects can emanate. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. I should like to have unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman allow me to make a statement?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to state that at this time I will not object, but I put the House on notice that hereafter no speeches not delivered and no extension of remarks will be printed in the RECORD in the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Florida if this rule is to be applied to everyone hereafter?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman from Florida proposes to object to all requests hereafter.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. After to-day; yes.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will begin now. I will object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this question is important and a great many gentlemen on both sides, I am informed, desire to express their views briefly who will not have a chance to consume time on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of this House, whether they have been recognized or not, who desire to express their views on this great question may be permitted to do so within five legislative days, their remarks to be confined to the subject matter of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that all Members desiring to print remarks in the RECORD on this question may have five legislative days in which to do so. Is there objection?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I hope no gentleman will object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that his request be modified by the statement that the RECORD shall show that the speech is printed under leave.

Mr. KENDALL. I hope the gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that there has been an abuse in the past in regard to leave-to-print speeches in the RECORD. Now, it is manifest that we must either have much more discussion, or else relief must be given through leave to print in the RECORD; but it seems to me proper that there should be something in the RECORD to indicate that the speech is printed under leave.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, let me say, I believe it would be well to enforce the rule with rigor as applicable to mere political essays written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but this is not that. But it is not that. This is a great question, not partisan, and it affects all people alike. It has its ardent advocates on one side of the Chamber as well as the other. I do not believe anybody in reference to this particular question ought to have the rule enforced against it.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I shall insist that the speeches shall be germane to the resolution.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That was my request, and I so stated.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have made every effort possible to get sufficient time for actual discussion upon the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Now, is it the purpose to insert a lot of speeches in the RECORD to make it appear that we had full discussion on the subject?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not forgotten that, standing quite close to him and making some demonstration, I asked if they wanted two hours or four hours or a day for general debate on that side.

Mr. MANN. Four hours is a day, and we took all the time we could get.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I am speaking of a day from the standpoint of 12 hours.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but the gentleman said that he proposed to close general debate and pass this bill to-day.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen will bear me witness that I said we were going to pass the bill to-day, and I should ask for the previous question if we could not agree on a time for general debate.

Mr. MANN. Well, I am not going to object, and I will withdraw the objection that I heretofore made, because I think it will look better for us even if we fake in the RECORD an apparent consideration of an amendment to the Constitution which was actually refused in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to what has been denominated fake speeches, I desire to suggest to the gentleman from Missouri to amend his request for unanimous consent to this effect—that the time for this debate be extended one hour on each side, and if at the expiration of that time all gentlemen have not been heard on this side or that, the request can be renewed. On this side gentlemen are only taking five minutes. That is as much time as I desire to have, and I do not desire to put any fake speech in the RECORD.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the time was agreed upon for general debate at the suggestion, as I understood it, of the gentleman from Michigan. Now, I say to him that if he desires to extend the debate for one hour or two hours, if he will indicate it, I will ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I should be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to agree with the gentleman to extend the time of debate two hours, if satisfactory to him and the House.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Two hours on each side?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. One hour on each side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Let me understand, there is a good deal of confusion. I ask the gentleman from Michigan how much time does he ask to extend general debate?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. In view of the general demand for debate about me, I will ask for two hours on each side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on this resolution be extended two hours on each side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all Members have the privilege of printing speeches in the RECORD on this proposed amendment for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri what is the objection to the suggestion advanced by the gentleman from Kentucky designating the fact in the speech that it was not delivered, but inserted in the RECORD by leave?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatever, but I understood from audible utterances all around me that there was objection.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say that I do not believe it is a proper thing to inject that sort of system in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. KENDALL. Does the gentleman think it is a proper thing to inject a speech in the RECORD without having made it on the floor?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. If it is proposed to put that statement in the RECORD I shall object myself.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pending this matter, objection having been made to extending the general debate for two hours on a side, I would ask the gentleman from Missouri to ask unanimous consent to extend the debate one hour on each side.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend general debate one hour on each side, the time to be divided equally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend general debate one hour on each side, one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri and the other by the gentleman from Michigan. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my request that all gentlemen have five legislative days in which to print remarks on this proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that five legislative days be allowed in which Members may print remarks in the RECORD upon this proposed amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not at this time object, because it has been a custom long indulged in, but I think the House can well afford to make the RECORD a real journal of the proceedings here, and I shall undertake in some proper way to have such a rule adopted.

It is proper that men who do not have an opportunity to express their views on the floor should have a medium of presenting them to the country, but it is not proper that they should be presented under false pretenses. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CARY].

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the amendment to elect the United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, and I am heartily in favor of another amendment which I believe is just as important, and perhaps more important, at least of as much importance, as the election of the United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, and for that reason I ask in my time to present the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

That there be, and there is hereby, proposed the following amendment to the Constitution, which, when ratified as the Constitution prescribes, shall become and be effective as part of the Constitution, as follows:

"SEC. 1. Members and Delegates to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States shall be elected, after the passage of this bill, for a term of four years.

"SEC. 2. Said election shall take place at the time and on the day prescribed by law for the casting of the popular vote for President of the United States, and in the manner prescribed by law by the different States and Territories."

Mr. CARY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce this because I think it is as important as a direct vote for United States Senators. I believe that the fewer elections we have for Congressmen the better for all concerned. You can not sit in Congress and every two years run for office and do justice to the people who send you here. The fact of the matter is, you are in politics all of the time, and you do not have time enough to do justice in two-year terms. For that reason I offer this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, it must be very apparent to gentlemen on the other side of the House by this time that a great many Members who are sincerely in favor of the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people have some objection to the resolution in the form in which it is presented. If you gentlemen on the other side of the House are earnestly, honestly, and sincerely in favor of bringing about this great reform, to wit, the election of the United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, it behooves you to assert your independence upon the roll call upon the issue that is now presented, and send this resolution to the legislatures of the several States in such form that it will be adopted. It is plain to everyone that a great majority of the Members in this House favor the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people. We all know that a great majority of the citizens of this country are in favor of that reform, and would so express themselves if they had an opportunity to vote upon it, but I do not believe that a majority of the people of the United States would vote for the Federal Congress to surrender absolutely the power that it now has and has always maintained, to prescribe, if needs be, how Members of the lower and upper Houses of Congress should be elected.

I come from the State of Oregon, a State that stands out preeminently in favor of the direct election of the Senators. In fact, we are so strongly impressed with this belief and so strongly in favor of this reform that we have adopted in our State a direct primary, whereby we have provided that each party shall nominate a candidate for United States Senator at the primary, and that the candidate so nominated shall be placed upon the ballot at the general election and voted for by the people.

The primary law of Oregon further provides that candidates for the legislature may, if they choose, subscribe to either statement No. 1 or statement No. 2, statement No. 1 being that the candidate pledges himself to the people of his district and the people of his State that if elected he will always vote in the election for Senator for that candidate who shall have received the highest number of the people's votes at the last preceding election. It has come to pass, after six years of trial of that system, that no man can be elected to the legislature who does not sign statement No. 1.

Therefore I am not only personally favorable to this resolution, which has been under the peculiar circumstances presented by a Democratic House, but my constituents are in favor of it. I want to see it become a part of the Constitution of the United States. I am not here playing politics upon the Republican side of this Hall. I am here acting independently. I am here, as some have said, as an insurgent Republican. I am against machine rule. [Applause.] I shall vote for every proposed law that I believe ought to be passed during my service here, whether it comes from a Democratic or a Republican source. The Oregon system of electing all officers by the people and nominating all candidates for office by the people breeds independence, and it breeds insurgents. The reason why the people of the United States want the direct election of Senators is that it makes United States Senators accountable directly to the public for their election, the same as Representatives here are accountable to the public for their election. When the time comes that Senators are elected by the people, the people will get the legislation that they are entitled to, that they are demanding; and if you gentlemen over there want the legislatures of the several States to approve this amendment, then vote to cut out this part of your proposed amendment which takes away from the Federal Government the power of supervision.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I shall not discuss the main proposition involved in this resolution, because I hope and believe it will receive the unanimous vote of this House. [Applause.] I do wish to discuss for a moment, however, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG]. The resolution as reported from the committee deprives the Federal Government of any power to regulate the time and manner of holding elections. It does more than that. Through the insertion of a word of two letters, the word "as," it also changes the present Constitution, so that there is no duty laid upon any State to prescribe the time and manner of holding elections. Under the Constitution as it exists to-day it provides that the legislature shall prescribe the time and manner and places of holding elections, and also reserves to the Federal Government the power to alter and amend such regulations. This amendment, however, as reported from the committee, contains this language: "The time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be," not prescribed, but "as prescribed," therefore imposing no duty upon the legislature to prescribe the time and manner at all. Now, I am in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan for this reason: The right to elect Senators by the people will be of little value to any State unless there shall also accompany that the right to nominate the men who are voted for at the polls. There are many States in this Union to-day—I need not undertake to mention them—where this amendment to the Constitution will be of little value, because special interests will nominate in both political parties the candidates for the United States Senate, and the people will be compelled to choose between two, neither of whom will be representative of them. If this right was reserved to control the elections by the Federal Government, if this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan shall be adopted, that right can be guaranteed to the people of every State—the right to nominate as well as elect.

It would be entirely practicable and feasible for this Congress to pass a primary law providing for the nomination of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives providing that that law shall be operative only in States where direct nominations have not been provided for by their State legislatures, and, further, that it shall cease to be operative whenever any State by its legislature provides for the direct nomination of these officials. But under this resolution as it comes from the committee and as you propose to adopt it to-day it will be absolutely impossible for the Federal Government or this Congress to ever pass such a law in the future, and is there any gentleman upon that side of the House who would not be in favor of that kind of a law, who would not be in favor of direct nomination of Senators and Representatives in Congress as well as their election; and yet you are deliberately depriving the Congress of the power to secure to the people that right of directly nominating as well as directly electing. I understand, of course, the fear upon the part of the gentlemen upon that side of the House of the Federal Government controlling the elections in certain portions of our country, perhaps interfering with the legislative restrictions that would be cast around the ballot, but I wish to remind you that that is fully safeguarded in the resolution as it comes from your committee and is not touched in any way by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan. The resolution provides that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite

for electors in the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and that will remain as it is, and if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan is adopted Congress will have no power to change in any way these State laws with reference to who shall be entitled to vote for United States Senators.

Are you asking anything more than that, and are you afraid of anything else than that? I believe that if this committee that has reported this bill had considered the matter fully, and especially had considered the suggestion that I make as to the nomination of Senators by the different political parties, as well as their election, they, too, and this House, would have been in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. I think the time has come when the Senators should be as responsive to the public will as the Members of the House are. The people of the United States justly believe that the Senators are not now responsive to the public will. The resolution, as reported from the committee over which the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] presides, is not complete, and I regret very much to discover in the reading of it that it excludes the Congress of the United States from the privilege of regulating the method of electing United States Senators. It seems to me that the Congress should retain the power to regulate the election of the men to this office. It should control the power to perpetuate itself. It should not leave to the States the right to make such laws as they choose on a question that involves the integrity of the country. States may have different interests than the country may have as a whole, and the Congress should always be in control. I regret that we are not to be able to vote for a bill which gives that right to the Congress.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. As I understand the gentleman, he is in favor of the resolution but opposed to that feature of it which takes away from Congress the power to regulate.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. This Constitution has been in operation for more than a century. Has the Federal Government ever attempted to control or regulate the election of Senators by reason of that power?

Mr. MADDEN. That is no reason, however, why the Government should have the power to control taken away from it, and the very fact that it has not exercised it should not be a reason why it should not have the power to exercise it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Does not the gentleman believe that, in view of what we know, historically at least—and none of us know anything about it personally—and what we know of the methods by which Senators are sometimes elected, and of deadlocks existing all over the country, and that the Federal Government has not in a hundred years exercised its powers, it is about time the people should begin to exercise it?

Mr. MADDEN. I believe the people should exercise the power. I believe that delegating to the people the power to elect Senators in Congress would prevent deadlocks. I believe the power should be taken away from the legislatures to elect Senators. The people are best qualified to elect the men to represent them, and the men representing them in any legislative branch of the Government, whether in the Senate or in the House, or in the legislatures of the various States, ought to be responsive to the public will; and the time has come when the people of the United States are going to insist upon the enactment of a law which will give them jurisdiction over their own servants.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE].

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln, the greatest man Illinois ever gave to the Nation or to the world, said: "This is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people." He implicitly trusted in the plain people of this country. We on this side of the House, who believe in him and in his utterances, can safely trust this question to the people of this country. True it is that the fathers saw fit to put the provision in the Constitution as it now exists. That constitutional convention which finally adopted this great instrument was presided over by the greatest man this country ever gave to the world, George Washington, who acted as president of the constitutional convention, and deputies, representing 12 States of the Union, signed and approved this Constitution.

Here is a provision to amend that Constitution. I am in favor of the election of Senators by the people. I so voted years ago as a member of the Illinois Legislature. Every time that question has been presented in this body I have so voted.

I regret exceedingly that the movers of this amendment have seen fit to strike out these words:

> But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators.

They leave in this resolution these words:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

There are to-day 46 States in the Union. Two more are knocking at the door, making 48. This provision allows 48 States to provide 48 different times, 48 different places, and 48 different manners of holding elections for Senators of the United States, without limiting in the slightest degree any power vested in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. PRINCE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman says this will permit elections at 48 different times in 48 different places. How will he help that?

Mr. PRINCE. We can control it by limiting the manner, by limiting it except as to the places of choosing Senators. As to that we are forbidden. As to the time and place, this modifies it.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. PRINCE. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I hardly have the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. PRINCE. What have we? This body here, made up of 392 men, comes from the body of the people. Yonder body comes from the body of the people through the selectmen. We propose to have the other body selected by the same class of people as that which selects this body.

Where do they come from? From the people. Why should we say that this body and another body coming from the body of the people shall not have the right by law to make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators? The power comes from the people. The power of this House comes from the people. We are amenable to them. We go back to them. The other body will also be amenable to the people of the United States, and I am frank to say that I believe the people will make fewer mistakes in the selection of Senators than perhaps the interests of this country have made in the selection of Senators. For that reason I favor the amendment, and if I can not get that, I will favor the resolution.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that gentlemen are unnecessarily alarmed about the provisions of this bill. In the first place, I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that under the present Constitution it is utterly impossible——

A MEMBER. Louder!

Mr. SISSON. That is the first time that request was ever made of me in my life. [Laughter.] I call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that under the present Constitution Congress has no right to regulate who shall vote for the various members of the State legislature or the State senate. Therefore the States have under the present Constitution the right to provide for the election of their own legislatures in their own way, provided they do not violate any provision of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution. That power is sacred, and ought to be sacred to all the States. That power is necessary to the small States like Rhode Island. It is necessary to all the States, like Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, because in yonder body they can protect and defend themselves from the strong representation that comes from the more populous and larger States. It was upon that idea that this power should live and be a vital thing and have a vital force in these smaller States that the Constitution was framed. Otherwise you never could have formed this great Government. The smaller States would never have consented to the compact. Why? Because in the House of Representatives as the large States increased in population their power correspondingly increased in the House, and relatively the smaller States would have less power. As new States are carved out of the vast territory west of the small States the

power of the small State would be less effective in the Senate to control Federal legislation. It was therefore not only put in the Constitution at the instance of the small States—the provision that no State should be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate without its own consent—but it was nowhere permitted in the Constitution that Congress could regulate the election of State officers; and since the power to elect Senators is placed in the various State legislatures Congress could not in any way reach the State elector or his right to vote for a State senator or representative.

Now, under this provision in this amendment it does just exactly that thing. It does no more than that. It is intended to do no more than that. It is intended that the qualifications of the State electors, when they go to vote directly for a Senator, shall be exactly what their qualifications would be if they voted for a State legislator, who, as the constitution now is, votes for a Senator because he is in the legislature of the State. Now, if you permit the authority in Article I, section 4, of the Constitution to be extended to the power that elects United States Senators, and if that power is the people, then, to leave Article I, section 4, as it is, you take away from the electors of the small States the right to send their Senators to the United States Senate with the State integrity absolutely secure from congressional interference. Senator LODGE—I believe it is against a rule of the House to call the name of a Senator—made a very strong speech, the strongest that has been made upon that proposition, that this was a direct blow at the doctrine of State sovereignty and the integrity of the State. Now, the amendment under consideration was intended to meet that objection and for the purpose of preserving the integrity of the State, and enabling each and every State to elect its own Senators by those who are qualified under their own State laws and constitutions. But if election laws could be written and prescribed by Congress, it would deprive the smaller States of that protection which they now enjoy and the safeguard which is now thrown around them. For example:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

Under the present law it does not matter what sort of regulations this Congress may make in referring to the manner of electing the Senators by the legislatures of the States. They do not and can not under the Constitution interfere with the present election laws of the States, which prescribe the qualifications of the electors for the various branches of the State legislature.

But if this clause is permitted to remain in the Constitution just as it is now, and Senators are elected by the people, then you would extend the power of Congress so that it could do with the Senators what it now does with the House of Representatives, to wit, it might prescribe election laws that differ with the election laws of the various States, and might enlarge or reduce the suffrage in each State in accordance with the wisdom of Congress. It is for that very reason that Article I, section 4, was modified by the distinguished Senator who prepared the proposed amendment. A Republican Senator of distinction prepared this bill with a great deal of care, in order that it might maintain the Government of the United States in its exact form, reserving to all the States the equal power which they now have, and not depriving the States of that power.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Even if the amendment which I have proposed should be adopted, would not the resolution contain this language?—

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

And if that be true, how can the United States interfere with the qualifications of electors of the State and reduce the number?

Mr. SISSON. That is the Constitution as it now is; but if you leave section 4 of Article I just as it is—

> But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators—

That can only affect the body which now has the power to elect, which is the State legislature. The sovereign State now has the sole right to determine who shall vote for the Members of the various branches of the legislature.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. And they would still have it.

Mr. SISSON. No; they would not. The power of election of United States Senators is now lodged in a delegated body in the State, the State legislature, and that delegated body in the State having the power to elect is the only thing that could be regulated by Congress under the present Constitution. The power to regulate does not reach back to the suffrage that elects the members of the various branches of the legislature of the several States.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps a reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] may be found in this fact, that the amendment would give to the Congress of the United States control over the manner of holding elections, and while it could not determine what were the qualifications of electors, could not fix the qualifications of electors in regulating the manner of holding the election, it could pass upon the question as to who came within the qualifications as fixed by the State; and by having the power to determine whether a given individual did or did not come within the State qualifications, the Federal law might be able to override the State law; and that position was admitted by Senator ROOT.

Mr. SISSON. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, who states the position that I take more clearly than I can state it, because he is always clear on every proposition.

Now, I want to call your attention to another thing. No member of any State delegation here ought to be afraid to trust the people of his State.

This Government is no better than the States. You can not make this Government any better than the States. You can not make a good government out of States that are themselves corrupt and bad. You can not make out of it any better Government than the States make themselves. Now, under the present law the great trouble is that the election of a United States Senator overshadows the State election. The qualifications of the various candidates for the State legislatures are lost sight of, and we vote for or against a man because he favors or does not favor a certain man for the United States Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. SISSON. I thank the gentleman. Now, in those States where they have no primary election law, but have nominating conventions, the nominating convention in the county and senatorial districts will be controlled in the interest of a certain candidate for a United States Senator. Therefore we would, if we could, have election laws so that a man would vote for a State legislator or for a member of the State senate upon his qualifications for that particular office, and not because he has a preference for a certain candidate for the United States Senate. Each State must have the right, which it now has, of electing its own State officers in its own way, without disturbing in the least the integrity of the State in its own election laws. How much better it would be if, in addition to this, we could elect Senators directly, so that our State legislators would be elected on their merit, and not because they are for or against a certain candidate for the Senate. But any resolution that receives my support must be one which will not permit Congress to pass a law to supervise elections in a State.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. The power now resides in Congress to have a general supervision over the membership, and it has never been abused in the history of the country, has it?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want my distinguished friend to put it up to me to answer that question.

Mr. KENDALL. I thought that the gentleman would not want to answer it.

Mr. SISSON. If I had time, I would like to tell my distinguished friend from Iowa some facts that would cause him to be uneasy sometimes about partisan control, when passion runs high; but I thank God that that time is passed. This is no time or place to reopen the wounds of the past; they are healed. Let us not even refer to our differences of the past while discussing this great question, which means so much to our great Republic. The day is long since passed when we should inject these questions into our discussions on this floor. My distinguished young friend should not try to do this, and I will not at this time allow him to lead me into a discussion that would tend to revive the old feeling. I thank God that it has gone; and may He never send any more fratricidal strife, but may the dove of peace forever hover around this Capitol, and may we be permitted to discuss these questions apart from those recollections. [Applause.]

I come from that section which has sometimes been charged with being without patriotism and without love for the common country, but I yield to no man in my love and devotion to this Government. I can point with pride to the devotion of the noble people of the South whose faith and love for this Government have been tried in the fires of persecution and the crucible of oppression, and who have been found to be pure gold. We will defend with pride our common country with our lives, and I pledge that every able-bodied man who lives in my section of the country, if need be, will die in defense of our Federal Government. [Applause.]

So let us not go back and dig up any embers of the past in discussing this matter; let us discuss it on its merits. I have confidence in the people of Maine, in the God-fearing, honest people of Vermont and Massachusetts, California and Oregon. I believe these people may be trusted in their integrity and patriotism to do the right thing for the common country, and that our flag will not have a star dimmed in its beauty unless the Federal Government should lay violent hands upon the sovereignty of these States and deprive them of the right to handle their own local questions in their own local way. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of this House—going on 17 years—I have advocated and worked faithfully to bring about the election of Senators in Congress by the direct vote of the people. In every Congress in which I have served I have introduced a joint resolution—substantially similar to the joint resolution now under consideration—to amend the Constitution to accomplish this most desirable reform, and the record will show that I have done everything in my power, in Congress and out of Congress, to secure its accomplishment.

Without any vanity I can justly say that I am the author of this reform. On several occasions my resolution has passed the House, only to fail in the Senate, but it is just as sure to be written into our Constitution, sooner or later, as the sun is to rise to-morrow.

I am opposed to delegating away the rights of the people, and where they have been delegated away I would restore them to the people. I trust the people, and I believe in the people. With Jefferson I believe that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and hence I want to restore to the people the right now delegated to the legislatures by the framers of the Constitution, so that the Senators as well as Members of Congress shall be elected directly by the people, and the Government thus become more and more a representative democracy, where brains, fitness, honesty, ability, experience, and capacity, and not wealth and subserviency, shall be the true qualifications for both branches of the Federal Legislature.

The people all over this country now demand this much-needed change in the Federal Constitution, so that they can vote directly for Senators in Congress, and they appeal to us to enact this law to give them that right. It is not a partisan question, neither is it a sectional issue. The demand reaches us from all parts of the land and from men in all political parties with a degree of unanimity that is quite surprising. It is our duty to respect the wishes of the people and to give them a uniform law allowing them to vote for Senators in Congress just the same as they now vote for Representatives in Congress.

The United States Senate is the last bulwark of the predatory trusts. Here is the citadel of every unscrupulous monopoly. And more and more the special interests of the country, realizing the importance of the Senate, are combining their forces to control the election of Federal Senators through their sinister influence in State legislatures. Forty-six United States Senators can prevent the enactment of a good law or the repeal of a bad law. The United States Senate is the most powerful legislative body in the world, and its Members should be elected by the people of the country just the same as the Representatives in Congress are elected. This is of the utmost importance to every man in the Republic, because when the Senate is directly responsible to the people they will control it; and then, and not till then, will that important legislative body respond to the will of the people.

The right to elect United States Senators by a direct vote of the people is a step in advance and in the right direction. I hope it will speedily be brought about. It is the right kind of reform, and I hope it will be succeeded by others, until this Government becomes indeed the greatest and the best and the freest Government the world has ever seen, where the will of the people shall be, as it ought to be, the supreme law of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply impressed by what has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] and by other gentlemen on that side of the Chamber about the sacredness of the Constitution of the United States; about the care and the hesitancy with which we should approach it in any attempt to alter it in any material respect. I am firmly convinced that as eras have produced great explorers or poets or soldiers, so there are times in the affairs of men when great jurists and great statesmen execute an immortal work, not for a single generation, but for all their children and their children's children who are to follow them in the succeeding centuries. I believe that Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton and Washington erected an edifice so perfect in all its details, so beautiful in its structure, so firm and immutable in its foundations, that it shall live through the centuries, and that when nations and languages and empires shall have perished, the Constitution of the United States, still intact and still preserving these institutions under the flag, shall be the wonder and the admiration of all men a thousand years from now. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman in his eulogy of Washington and Jefferson and Hamilton and Madison and those other great men, to found it largely upon their magnificent work in making the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the question.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman when he spoke with such splendor of language and imagery of Washington, of Jefferson, of Hamilton, and Madison, and other great men, that he was at the same time eulogizing or speaking in complimentary terms of their master product, the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. STANLEY. In my feeble way I intended to do so.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman please tell me what Thomas Jefferson had to do with the Constitution? He was not in the convention at all. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I will take pleasure in doing so. The Declaration of Independence itself was the spirit of which the Constitution is the letter. [Applause.] I happen to have here in my desk a letter from Thomas Jefferson to Mr. Madison, and I thought I could lay my hands on it, discussing this very question. It is true that the Sage of Monticello throughout that discussion before the Constitution was written, and after it was written, was consulted by the men who wrote it as an oracle and as a guide. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is true that to Thomas Jefferson more than to any other we owe the Bill of Rights, now in the Constitution, which is in verity the shield and sword to the oppressed of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would commend to the gentleman to study the life, the writings, and the achievements of Thomas Jefferson. With his splendid intellect, with his broad statesmanship, could he get out of the bog, cease to follow the narrow politicians, and stand for a few months under the effulgence of Jefferson's eloquence and his wisdom, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin would surely adorn this side of the Chamber. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. With pleasure.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I want the gentleman to understand that my query proceeds from a friendly motive.

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LAFFERTY. In an endeavor to arrive at a compromise that will be approved by the people and by the legislatures, if possible, I desire to ask if we who are opposed to the surrender of the supervisory power of the Federal Government which has never been exercised, in our opinion, to the detriment of the South, are asking the gentlemen on the other side to surrender or give up anything that they are now entitled to under the Constitution when we ask them to simply be satisfied with a constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of Senators without going further and asking for an additional amendment to the Constitution which destroys its symmetry, which destroys section 4, splits it in twain, and leaves the anomalous condition of the Federal Congress having the authority, if it should ever come to pass that it was proper for it to exercise that authority, to supervise the election of Representatives, and no longer having authority to amend any regu-

lations that may be made in regard to Senators? And I would desire the gentleman now to answer—and I am friendly to the resolution—whether or not it would not be better for the gentlemen on the other side to be satisfied——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Kentucky, and forbid anybody interfering with him in that time. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would answer the question of my friend from Oregon had he propounded a question. [Laughter.] Now, if all that the gentleman says is true, the only thing that this amendment does is to give to the States the power that it has never exercised in a hundred years and will probably never exercise in the next hundred years.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, why gentlemen on the other side——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LAFFERTY. In the same friendly motive, I would ask why gentlemen on the other side object to leaving the Constitution in that regard stand just where it is and be satisfied with an amendment for the direct election of Senators.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not object to leaving the Constitution stay just where it is, and I am of the opinion it will be found in the same locality whether we pass this amendment or not.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit.

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps the answer to the gentleman from Oregon might be found in the fact that when you provide for the direct election of Senators by the people, you do then enlarge the power that the Federal Government will have over the power that it now possesses when they are elected by the legislatures of the various States, and it is not possible, as stated by the gentleman, to offer simply an amendment for the direct election of Senators and leave the situation in that particular in statu quo.

Mr. STANLEY. Now, speaking in all seriousness to my friend from Oregon, the founders of the Constitution discussed at great length the wisdom of allowing the States to be represented according to their population in this body and in another body according to their autonomy. Thomas Jefferson, immediately after the passage of the Constitution, wrote to Madison and said that he was delighted with the compromise made between the large and the small States at that time. The manner of the election of United States Senators was a detail which was almost entirely overlooked by the makers of the Constitution. This amendment does not take any power from the Constitution which it now possesses, because over the method of election of United States Senators by the legislatures the Federal Government was absolutely prevented from interfering with their election, not in hæc verba, but from the very nature of things. It is not contended that the Federal Government ever has or ever can interfere——

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I desire to ask the necessity, if there be any necessity, in submitting this constitutional amendment or making any provision for the amending of section 4, which reads:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

Mr. STANLEY. I am speaking to that point right now. The Congress never has and never will interfere with the time, the manner, or the places of selecting Senators under the law as it now exists. Will this Congress ever think of interfering——

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. STANLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAFFERTY. In order to arrive at a decision it is necessary to ask the question—I do not desire to interfere or to be presumptuous in the matter——

Mr. STANLEY. I know it.

Mr. LAFFERTY. I want to ask this question: If Congress has never interfered, there ought not, it seems to me, to be any fear that it ever will; but in the very nature of things it shocks the conscience or the intelligence of a lawyer, as suggested by the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], that Congress should surrender the power of providing for its own perpetuity.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman that in different language he has asked me the same question four different times.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] declines to yield further.

Mr. STANLEY. I will let the gentleman finish that question.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Since it does appear that there is a division upon that material point between the North and the South, as you understand, as to the surrender of this power, which is not material according to the gentleman's own statement——

Mr. STANLEY. I wish to be patient with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAFFERTY (continuing). Why burden the amendment with it?

Mr. STANLEY. I desire to be courteous, but I hope to finish this sentence, and I will not have any more time than is necessary to do that. Now, in effect, we are not depriving the Federal Government of any actual power which it now possesses. It could not in the nature of things interfere with the election, by the very wording of the Constitution, of members of the legislature or of Senators. The States have the sole and the absolute right to choose the members of both bodies of the legislature without any interference by the Federal Government. Those members, when elected, in the very nature of things, have the right to fix the manner of the election of United States Senators. The reasons which have led the Federal Government to interfere with the election of Members of this body, being founded upon representation, upon population, there has come, and there may come, a clash between the Federal and the State Governments.

The number of Senators being absolutely fixed by the Constitution, the details of their election being arranged under the Constitution, as it now exists, the Federal Government never could, never has, and never can successfully interfere with a State in the selection of her Senators.

The whole purpose of this amendment is simply to allow the people, acting directly, to exercise their power just as they do now when acting through the members of the legislature.

I favor this amendment because it is a mere detail that the framers of the Constitution could not anticipate. The personnel of the Senate for 50 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States shows that Senators then were responsive to and were named by the people. Conditions have changed, both social and industrial, so that it becomes necessary that we should now change the method of electing United States Senators in order that they may be directly responsive to the people and be named by them, as they were in the days when the Constitution was first adopted.

Your fears are unfounded for another reason. You must remember that when the Constitution of the United States was adopted there were two mooted questions, one of which was whether a State was absolutely sovereign, clothed with the right to retire peacefully from this bond of sisterhood.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. STANLEY. I would like one minute more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman the time he desires in which to finish the sentence.

Mr. STANLEY. The other position was that the States were indestructible. The question of the right of a State to secede has been settled by the arbitrament of war. From that hour until this the indestructibility of the State is the thing that has been in danger. If this Government is ever destroyed, it will be because of the fact that we have become a compact Federal Union, an empire, and not because the States have encroached upon the rights of the Federal Government. Those who would preserve the Union as founded by the fathers need not look with a jealous eye upon the authority of the States as such, but we owe it to ourselves to preserve and encourage the States in exercising to the utmost all of their local authority and preserving inviolate their local autonomy. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am most heartily in favor of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and there can be no question but that the people of the United States are in favor of electing United States Senators by direct vote of the people. The Democratic Party has stood for this for many years. The Democratic Party in the last three national conventions has passed a resolution declaring that its members were in favor of the election of United States

Senators by direct vote of the people. The people of the State of California for the last 20 years have been studying and trying in every way possible how they might secure a representation in the United States Senate of their choice, selected by the people and not by the system, and I have presented here a resolution that passed the State Legislature of California in favor of electing Senators of the United States by the people. We in California passed a constitutional amendment giving the State legislature the power to adopt a law so that we may designate our choice by a direct vote of the people, and at the last legislature we succeeded in passing a bill which is, in substance, the law of Oregon, providing that the people might express their will and might put up to their State senators and representatives the question as to how they stand upon that subject of election of United States Senators in order that the voters might vote intelligently and in order that the great body of the people might be represented and know where their representatives stood on this subject before they were elected.

But I want to ask my friends on this side of the House, In what Democratic convention, or at what time, or at what place it has ever been discussed, it has ever been determined as a question of Democratic principle, that we should amend paragraph 1 of section 4 of Article I of the Constitution? [Applause on the Republican side.] At what time have we ever gone before the American people telling them that while we were in favor of electing United States Senators by direct vote of the people, we were in favor of changing that wise provision of the law which gives this Congress the power to supervise the election of Representatives and the election of Senators? [Applause on the Republican side.]

And now I appeal to you, my Democratic friends, and I want you to think before you vote on this side. If we are in good faith, if we are in earnest, if we are determined that this proposed constitutional amendment to the first paragraph of section 3 of Article I shall go to the several States and be adopted, and thereby give the people the right to elect the United States Senators by direct vote, let us put the amendment in the form that has been discussed for the last 20 years by the American people and the form that they stand for. Do not have a rider to it. Do not put something to it that they have never discussed. You know that State after State in this Union may defeat this proposed constitutional amendment that we are so ardent for, that we have prayed so long for, that we have deserved—that we might have it for the purpose of rectifying the wrongs that have been committed, that we might have it for the purpose of giving the people a chance in the United States Senate and dragging from that body the moneybags, and putting men in there who will represent the people and not the system, if we burden it with too many riders. [Applause.] I ask my Democratic friends now——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] use some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to let this opportunity pass without expressing my approval of the principle of the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people. I believe now, as I have believed for years, that the Constitution of the United States should be amended so as to permit the electors of the several States to elect the United States Senators by direct vote as they now elect Representatives in Congress. It is unfortunate that the proposed amendment is made objectionable by the provision which takes from Congress the authority, as provided in Article I, section 4, of the Constitution, to control the times and manner of electing Senators, but leaves Congress the authority to control the manner of electing Representatives in Congress. This injects a new question into the proposition, which in the end may defeat the amendment itself. If so, the Democratic majority in this House will be responsible for the defeat of the legislation that is so universally demanded by the people. I shall vote to amend the resolution so as to present the one proposition, allowing the people to vote directly in the election of Senators; but if this amendment shall be lost, I shall then vote for the proposed amendment to the Constitution as it comes from the committee, trusting to the other branch of the Congress to properly amend the proposition so as to make it unobjectionable.

I shall vote for the amendment to the Constitution for the following reasons:

First. Because I believe in so doing I express the will of the great majority of my constituents, and while I remain a Member of this House I shall always feel it my duty to represent my constituents in every vote I cast. I represent a district very evenly divided in politics, and in casting my vote for this measure I believe I express the will of my constituents—Democrats, Socialists, and Republicans alike.

Second. I am in favor of this amendment, because my own judgment approves it. In affairs of our National Government, and especially in legislative matters, I am in favor of the distribution rather than in the concentration of power. I believe it is safer to let all the electors vote on the election of Senators than to limit the number to the very few who may happen to be elected members of the various legislatures.

Third. I believe, on the average, better men will be elected to the United States Senate. By this I do not mean to reflect upon those who have been elected to the Senate under our present system. But under the present system unknown men are often elected to the Senate as so-called "dark horses." If the people elect directly, the men elected will be more apt to be men who have attained great prominence in the State, who have a wide reputation for ability, and who are known for their integrity and high character.

Fourth. In my opinion, the change in the manner of election of Senators will give us, on the whole, better laws and wiser legislation. If we get better men, we will have better laws, because the ability, patriotism, and character of legislators will always be reflected in the laws which they enact.

Fifth. I believe, when elected by a direct vote of the people, Senators will be more responsive to the will of the people. A Senator is elected for a term of six years. To my mind, it seems wise that after six years of service he should go back to his State and submit his record to the electors of his State.

Sixth. In my judgment this change in the manner of electing Senators will tend, at least, toward the purity of the election of Senators. Corrupt methods may be used even when the people shall vote directly, but the danger is not so great, and it is more difficult to corrupt the people constituting the many than to corrupt the legislators constituting the few. There are other reasons that I might give, if I had the time, but my time is limited.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. I should like to have one minute more.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe my colleague [Mr. FERRIS] is not in the Hall of the House at this time. I regret he is not here. In his remarks a few minutes ago he criticized the Republican Party for not enacting this legislation during its long lease of power. I wish to remind the gentleman that it was the Republican State of Oregon that first adopted the legislation that in practice permitted the people to elect their Senators by direct vote, even without any constitutional authority therefor. And that, notwithstanding this example set by the Republican State of Oregon, the Democratic leaders of Oklahoma who controlled the constitutional convention which framed the constitution of the State of Oklahoma, and have controlled by large majorities the legislatures of our State, have failed to give the people of Oklahoma any opportunity to express, at the general election, their choice for United States Senators. This, too, in face of the fact that Republicans have been demanding that the people be given this right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, in the time at my disposal I can not hope to add anything to the broad question of the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people. Personally I am in favor of that proposition. It would be academic for me to refer to the principles that were advocated by the framers of the Constitution when the provision which we are considering was drafted into it. The words of Roger Sherman and of Gerry and others of that time indicate that some of them were imbued with the idea that the Senate should be a body that would represent the wealth of this country; that would represent the interests as against the masses of the people; that should be elected by a few because the people dare not be trusted. I shall not argue this point, because I take it that the majority of the Members of this body believe, as I believe, in the intelligence and the responsibility of the people.

I do, however, want to call attention to one or two matters that have arisen this afternoon with respect to the amendments that have been proposed and the substitute that was offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The gentleman in addressing himself to his substitute, as I understand it, indicated that he was fearful that the language of the proposed

constitutional amendment, if adopted, would give to the States the power to provide in any way they might choose for the election of Senators, taking away from the people that which we seek to give to them, the power of electing Senators.

Only a word with respect to that. It seems to me the language in lines 6, 7, and 8 nullifies his argument, because that language is to the effect that the qualifications of electors of Senators shall be those requisite for the "electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

And more than that, lines 15, 16, and 17 indicate that that is the meaning of this whole amendment, when the language reads, with respect to the filling of vacancies, that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments "until the people fill the vacancy by election." Words could hardly be plainer, and I am opposed to the substitute, and pass from its discussion to another point that has been raised, namely, to the question whether or not we shall delegate to the States the power to elect the Senators without the United States Congress exercising control over the manner of the election.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the amendment that has been proposed. I believe in passing the amendment to the Constitution, however, in such a manner as will appeal to the most of the States of the Union. If the one manner will appeal to most of them, I am for that manner; if the other manner, I am for that manner, because I believe the reservation to the Congress of the right to control election of Senators is not a vital principle that we need to stumble over. As I see it, the essence of the question is the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

I find myself in favor of that proposition, even without congressional control, for two reasons. In the first place, I believe that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution provide an adequate safeguard of the citizenship of this country, and that in addition to this a sufficient safeguard of our form of government is found in the constitutional guaranty of a republican form of government. In the second place, I find myself in accord with it when I reflect that the people of this country to-day, the people of the several States, have already as great a responsibility upon them as is involved in the election of Senators, and they have proven themselves worthy of the responsibility. For more than a century our people have full well assumed the responsibility involved in the election of governors, the election of supreme courts, the election of Members of this great body, and the determining of the great policies and problems confronting the different Commonwealths, and for that reason I am for the amendment to the Constitution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, it is well and generally known that this is the most important question concerning our organic law that has come up for consideration and decision since the adoption of the Constitution, and I agree that there is much force in the argument that in so important a matter as destroying the principle upon which the Constitution was founded we should deliberate long and well. The only other amendments to the Constitution have been to secure human rights or to change the mechanism for the election of a President. This amendment changes the Constitution in one of its important principles.

When the Constitution was framed and adopted, its makers were composed of our most able and learned statesmen. They believed at that time that the best plan was to have United States Senators elected by the legislatures of the several States forming the Union. They did not believe that the people at that time should be intrusted with the direct election of Senators. We are all well acquainted with the arguments and reasons given at that time for their action. In favoring this amendment to-day we are not questioning their judgment of that day. Experience and time are the best teachers, however, and from them and from long consideration by the American people I am thoroughly convinced that the best interests of this Government and of its people lies in the adoption of this amendment; thereby giving to the people the right to elect their Senators by direct vote and not by the State legislatures. The judgment of the people, when formed after long and serious intelligent consideration, is the best criterion for those to go by who have been intrusted with making the laws. The people want to elect by direct vote United States Senators—their minds are made up on that proposition. They have had some splendid lessons in the necessity of taking away from State legislatures this right. We all know that it is best that this amendment should pass. There is no division of this House as regards this amendment on partisan lines. Upon this side, as well as upon the other, we are all in favor of the principle involved in this resolution. The American people are in favor of it, and it is proper and right that they should be; so I will not dwell at length upon this proposition, because there is practically no contention regarding it.

To me there is one thing to be seriously considered, and that is the part of the resolution which provides for an amendment of section 4 of Article I, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, which is in the following language:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators.

It is proposed in this resolution to amend and strike out that portion of the Constitution which gives to Congress the right to regulate the election of Senators in the States, and to give this power over entirely to the State legislatures, so that it would read as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

I am opposed to that proposition; I am opposed to Congress giving up its powers of regulating and having a supervisory power over the election of United States Senators. Not that this power will probably be exercised, but the fact that it is known to exist would have a tendency to cause corrupt legislatures, such as has been known to exist in many States in recent years, to honestly and fairly provide for holding elections for United States Senators.

I therefore shall vote in favor of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], to retain to the Congress of the United States the power to regulate the manner and time of holding elections for Senators. If you gentlemen of the majority by your votes transfer this power from Congress to the State legislatures, you will be held to account by the American people. We are amending the Constitution so as to take away from State legislatures the power of choosing Senators because they have in many cases abused their power. Now, the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] proposes to give the legislatures additional power as to the time, manner, and place of electing Senators and to deprive the Congress of the United States of a rightful supervision over this matter, a supervision which Congress never has and never would abuse. You make a serious mistake, in my judgment, to vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], thereby depriving Congress of the rights it is now given in this regard by the Constitution. However, I am for the resolution. I prefer it be amended as above indicated, but, whether amended or not, I intend voting for it and thus give to the people the right and power that they demand—rightfully demand—being proud indeed of the honor to cast my first vote in this House in favor of so important a matter, one that is so universally demanded and so universally needed. This Government will never suffer by listening to and granting the demands of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE].

Mr. NYE. Mr. Speaker, there is but one question which seems to be an issue. I believe that history is a record of persistent human advance, and that the movement of the American people toward the exercise of more direct and more complete regulation of legislation and of the election of their officers is coming and will come to stay. I believe in this, I believe in the essential thing in this resolution, the election of United States Senators by the people. If the people make mistakes, let them make mistakes. The world is full of mistakes. We learn by making mistakes.

But we do touch upon a question which seems to me to be sacred, the one that eliminates from the Constitution the power given to Congress to legislate as to the manner and time of the election of Federal officers. Under that clause of the Constitution Congress has passed legislation. Back, I think, in 1872 such legislation was passed. I call attention of the House to some of the statements or language of the Supreme Court of the United States while passing upon this legislation.

It is impossible in the time that I have to give any thorough consideration to these cases. The first one that I have in mind is reported in 100 United States Reports, and is the case of Ex Parte Siebold, a habeas corpus case. The other is reported in 110 United States, and is the case of Ex Parte Yarbrough. These cases involve the laws which were passed regulating elections of Federal officers, Representatives, and Federal officials. I call attention to some of the language used by Mr. Justice Miller in the case which I last mentioned, and I can, of course, only read a small portion of the opinion:

> That a government whose essential character is republican, whose executive head and legislative body are both elective, whose most numerous and powerful branch of the legislature is elected by the people directly has no power by appropriate laws to secure this election

from the influence of violence, of corruption, and of fraud is a proposition so startling as to arrest attention and demand the gravest consideration.

If this Government is anything more than a mere aggregation of delegated agents of other States and governments, each of which is superior to the General Government, it must have the power to protect the elections on which its existence depends from violence and corruption.

If it has not this power, it is left helpless before the two great natural and historical enemies of all republics—open violence and insidious corruption * * *

Will it be denied that it is in the power of that body [the Congress] to provide laws for the proper conduct of those elections? To provide, if necessary, the officers who shall conduct them and make return of the result? And especially to provide, in an election held under its own authority, for security of life and limb to the voter while in the exercise of this function? Can it be doubted that Congress can by law protect the act of voting, the place where it is done, and the man who votes, from personal violence or intimidation and the election itself from corruption and fraud?

If this be so, and it is not doubted, are such powers annulled because an election for State officers is held at the same time and place? Is it any less important that the election of Members of Congress should be the free choice of all the electors because State officers are to be elected at the same time?

These questions answer themselves; and it is only because the Congress of the United States, through long habit and long years of forbearance, has, in deference and respect to the States, refrained from the exercise of these powers that they are now doubted.

But when in pursuance of a new demand for action that body, as it did in the cases just enumerated, finds it necessary to make additional laws for the free, the pure, and the safe exercise of this right of voting, they stand upon the same ground and are to be upheld for the same reasons. * * *

If this were conceded, the importance to the General Government of having the actual election—the voting for those members—free from force and fraud is not diminished by the circumstance that the qualification of the voter is determined by the law of the State where he votes. It equally affects the Government, it is as indispensable to the proper discharge of the great function of legislating for that Government, that those who are to control this legislation shall not owe their election to bribery or violence, whether the class of persons who shall vote is determined by the law of the State or by law of the United States or by their united result. * * *

In conclusion the court says:

If the Government of the United States has within its constitutional domain no authority to provide against these evils, if the very sources of power may be poisoned by corruption or controlled by violence and outrage, without legal restraint, then, indeed, is the country in danger, and its best powers, its highest purposes, the hopes which it inspires, and the love which enshrines it, are at the mercy of the combinations of those who respect no right but brute force, on the one hand, and unprincipled corruptionists on the other.

Mr. Speaker, this case and the other that I referred to deals with legislation which was passed pursuant to this clause of the Constitution which we have debated here this afternoon and from both cases it would seem that the legislation rested wholly and purely upon that clause, a clause which seems to me to be sacred. I do not understand why gentlemen in the House want to take this out of the Constitution, at least upon so hasty consideration.

Can we afford to divest Congress of a constitutional power which in its very nature is essential to the preservation of the Nation? What emergencies may arise in the future we can not tell, nor in what State or section nor at what time. But the provision is a wise one and was designed to provide against any condition of lawlessness or corruption that might defeat or tend to defeat honest elections of Federal officers.

We do not distrust the people of any State, as intimated by gentlemen on the other side, but in matters of Federal supremacy our trust should be in all the people rather than a part. I regard the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan as essential, because it leaves, as the framers of the Constitution intended, this necessary power with the whole people. The amendment should be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, there are involved in this proposed amendment two propositions. The one providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people is the first one. That, I think, practically every Member of the House is in favor of. I regret that anyone should undertake to gain, or to try to gain, any partisan advantage in the discussion of this particular proposition. I have no desire to discuss it in any partisan way whatever, but I want briefly to call the attention of my friends on the other side—those who undertook to make political capital out of it when they were boasting of the fact that the Republican Party had not seen fit to place this amendment in the Constitution when they were in power in both branches of the National Legislature—to the fact that when the Democratic Party was likewise in power in both branches of the Congress it likewise failed to put it in the Constitution or to submit the amendment.

As I have said, this resolution to amend the Constitution contains two separate and independent propositions. The first one, as I have mentioned, is the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people. The other one is to change section 4 of Article I of the Constitution by taking away from Congress the power and the right to legislate in regard to the election of United States Senators and give such control entirely and exclusively to the several States. These two changes in the Constitution are combined in this one resolution to amend. Unless the resolution can be amended, we must accept both of these amendments or reject them both. They have no connection with each other; they refer to separate parts of the Constitution, and I can see no logical reason why they should be combined in this way. The proposed amendment to take this power to legislate in regard to senatorial elections away from Congress and give it to the States has never received, so far as I know, the approval of any political party, and has never been favored by any considerable portion of our people. If we adopt the amendment to this resolution proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, the effect of such amendment will be to take out of the resolution that part which proposes to take this jurisdiction and power of legislation in regard to senatorial elections away from Congress. It will leave intact the proposition to elect Senators by a direct vote of the people. It is, in my judgment, to be very seriously regretted that the gentlemen who have charge of this resolution have seen fit to combine these two propositions into one. I am extremely anxious, and I believe the country is extremely anxious, to change the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people themselves; but there are many citizens all over the country who, while they favor the election of Senators by direct vote, are conscientiously and unalterably opposed to the proposition of taking away from Congress the right to control congressional elections.

While, personally, I think it would be unwise to take this power away from Congress, yet I do not regard it myself as a serious proposition, and the greatest objection I have to incorporating these two propositions together is that there is great danger of defeating the main proposition by so doing. You will give to some of the special interests throughout the country who are opposed to electing Senators by a direct vote an opportunity to get behind this other objection and thus defeat what we are really trying to accomplish. Other men who seriously object to this other change but yet honestly think we ought to elect Senators by direct vote will be inclined to oppose the adoption of the amendment because you have coupled on to the proposition which they favor another proposition which they condemn, and it will therefore lose many votes and much of its force.

This resolution to become effective must be approved by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. If we are in earnest, if we want to give the people of the country the right and the opportunity to change the Constitution and provide for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, then let us in good faith amend this resolution so that it will provide only for the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people. There would be no doubt, in my judgment, of the approval of this amendment by a sufficient number of the legislatures if we would submit it in this simple form and not couple it up with something that many people honestly and conscientiously oppose. If you desire to submit an amendment on this additional change, then let it be a separate amendment. Let each one stand on its own merits and then the legislatures can choose both if they want to, but they will have the right to reject one and accept the other. The danger is that this amendment in its present form will fail because you have coupled on with a popular and desirable proposition one that is not demanded by the people and is condemned by a large number of people all through the country.

I want also to call his attention to the fact that at the present time, had the Democratic provision contained in the Democratic national platform been complied with by the Members of the United States Senate belonging to the Democratic Party, we would have the question now submitted to the legislatures of the several States.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I did not exactly understand, Mr. Speaker. Is the gentleman making some assault on some Democratic Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I am not; I am simply answering a couple of gentlemen over on that side of the House who undertook to lay all the blame on the Republican Party because we had not before had the election of United States Senators by direct vote, and I want to say that, as a matter of fact, the men who are against the election of United States Senators by direct vote are in my party and they are in yours, and those who are in favor of it are likewise in both parties.

Under no circumstances do I want to impugn the motives of any man regardless of his politics on this question, and yet I heard the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] say in this debate that he was almost brought to the conclusion that there

was something ulterior in the motives of men who wanted to amend this proposition, this resolution to change the Constitution, and I thought a complete answer to that would be that for the same reason it might be said that we should be ready to impugn your motives because you have two propositions to amend in this resolution. You have coupled with one that everybody favors another one about which there is a serious dispute as to whether it ought to be adopted or not. Everybody here is in favor, as far as I know, of the amendment providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. In a moment. Why, then, for God's sake, should you couple that proposition with another proposition that men are divided on and that is going to control the votes of many men on this proposition, not only here but before the legislatures of the different States, and which may defeat the whole thing? This amendment will have to be approved by three-fourths of the legislatures, and you have coupled two propositions together, one that is popular and everybody wants, as I take it, and——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. Can I have a little more time?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I can yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. And you have coupled it with another proposition which to me does not mean very much. I will favor the resolution whether the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is adopted or not, but there are men all over the United States, conscientious and honest, who are going to oppose in the legislatures of the States the approval of this amendment unless you take out of it everything except the simple election of United States Senators by the people.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman states that all on that side favor the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

Mr. NORRIS. If I said that, I will say all as far as I know. I do not know of any man who is against it on either side of this House.

Mr. JAMES. Is not it true that the gentleman's own political party has never yet had the courage in national convention to declare for it in any form?

Mr. NORRIS. That is true, but while your own political party had the courage to put that in your platform, yet when you had an opportunity in the United States Senate to redeem that pledge to the people you failed to do it.

Mr. JAMES. No; that is not true.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is a long time ago, before they commenced buying up legislatures.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I say it has been a long time since we had power in the United States Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. No; in the last Congress you had votes enough on the Democratic side to submit this proposition if they had all voted for it.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, no.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say I have not looked the record up, but I think that is true. If the Democrats had voted solidly for this platform pledge, of which you boast, this proposition would have passed last Congress.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why, certainly; of course.

Mr. NORRIS. I have favored the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people during all my public life. The evils of the present system are so great and so apparent that it seems to me this change ought to appeal to every reasonable thinking citizen. Within the observation of us all there has always been whenever the time comes for the election of United States Senators several State legislatures that have devoted their entire session to the consideration of this one subject alone, and very often without results. The State legislatures have duties to perform to their own States, and should be able to give their undivided attention to the discussion and the consideration of laws pertaining to their respective States. Wherever, however, a United States Senator is to be elected this question overshadows all other questions, and very often prevents the legislature from giving consideration to and passing the necessary bills of which the States sometimes are sorely in need. It is not an uncommon thing for an entire session of the legislature to be frittered away because of a deadlock on the question of the election of a United States Senator. Needed legislation is forgotten. The real duties pertaining to the membership are unperformed and not given proper consideration on account of the election of the United States Senator. The State laws are just as important to the people as national legislation, and often of more importance. Moreover, the present system is not fair to the individual voter. He often finds it impossible for him to express his choice at the ballot box as between a candidate for United States Senator and a candidate who represents his own ideas as to State laws and State regulation who is running for the State legislature.

The voter often is compelled to vote against a man for the State legislature who agrees with him absolutely and entirely as to his views regarding what laws should be enacted and put upon the statute books in his State, because only by so voting can he vote for a man who does agree with him as to who should represent the State in the United States Senate. The citizen must often surrender one conviction or the other and in such case, if he would work and vote for the candidate who would stand for his ideas of State government and State laws, he must surrender his conviction and not only give up his choice as to United States Senator, but he must vote for a man whom he knows will vote against his preference for United States Senator.

We have reached a stage in the development of political and social problems where great combinations of wealth have often too much influence in the framing of laws and in the selection of public officials. Too often it has been disclosed, in the history of the last 15 or 20 years, that money has taken too important a part in the control of the legislature when it comes to the election of a United States Senator, until it had almost become common knowledge among our people that no poor man need apply. In other cases men have been elected to the Senate through the legislature by trading patronage for legislative votes. Members of the legislature who give their votes for the successful candidate have been rewarded by having dealt out to them some fat political job, or if not to them directly, to some of their closest friends. It is a question in my mind whether an election controlled by patronage is not a greater evil than one which is controlled directly by money. Both are wrong; both ought to be eradicated, and both ought to be made impossible. The purchasing of an office directly by money in some respects at least is not as bad and not as much evil follows from it as though the bargain and sale were made for a consideration of official place and patronage. When the deal is made with money, the contract is ended when the votes are delivered and the person elected, but when the office is purchased by the giving of patronage or position, then the Government very likely secures the appointment of incompetent, if not dishonest, men and so the taxpayers must pay in the end for the unholy alliance.

I do not charge that these things have occurred often or frequently, but there are none of us who can not call to mind in recent years or in recent days many illustrations of this kind. During the present winter several legislatures frittered away the entire legislative session in senatorial deadlock. In some instances there has been no charge, either direct or indirect, of any dishonesty or anything wrong. Men simply disagreed as to who should be their Senator. In other cases the newspapers have been filled with charges of all kinds, where it has been openly charged that money has been offered and refused, and in other cases where positions of honor, profit, and trust in official place have been offered in return for political votes, and in one of the great States of the Union the disclosures have been so remarkable and have shown such a disgraceful and dishonorable condition of barter and sale that it must bring the blush of shame to the countenance of every honest, patriotic citizen.

If Senators were elected by a direct vote of the people, these things could not occur. In a government founded upon the consent of the governed the largest possible participation in governmental affairs on the part of the people themselves is to be desired. It has been argued in the past by those who have opposed this amendment that the people themselves are not as well qualified to elect a Senator as are the members of the State legislatures. I am confident that the past history of our senatorial elections has demonstrated that this is an error. I do not expect the change to bring about perfection; that can not come to any government composed of mortal men. Mistakes will be made by the people, but if it is the people's government and they desire to select their officials and make mistakes, they themselves will be responsible. They will undoubtedly profit by whatever mistakes they may make. In addition to this, this new responsibility placed upon the shoulders of the citizens will have a tendency to increase the intelligence and the interest that people generally will take in these elections. When you place a new responsibility upon an intelligent and honest man, he does the best he can to prepare himself for the proper performance of his new duty, to intelligently inform himself as to the best way he can perform his additional responsibility. There is no doubt but what the citizenship of our country generally are dissatisfied with the present

method of selecting United States Senators. They have seen too many cases where the will of the people has been absolutely nullified and where special interests and wealthy combinations have succeeded in absolutely naming the United States Senator.

The Senate of the United States is one of the highest and most honorable tribunals in the civilized world. I have great respect for its membership. It has to-day upon its roll some of our greatest statesmen, our ablest men, our most patriotic citizens. The history of our country shows that liberty and freedom have had many able defenders in this forum. This change of electing them by the people will not detract from the ability of the Senate. It will relieve it, however, of all suspicion of being too far removed from the people themselves and of all charge of its Members being too often elected by the illegal use of money and political patronage. It will prevent the election to the United States Senate of some Members who have not honored it in the past and who could under no circumstances be elected to the Senate if the entire citizenship had a voice in the settlement of the question.

This change is demanded by almost a unanimous sentiment of well-meaning and patriotic people. Our forefathers, in framing the Constitution, were not confronted with many of the great questions that confront us to-day. They were not called upon then to make any laws in regard to great railroads and transportation companies, because in those days there were no railroads. Neither were they called upon to consider the question of great combinations of capital and wealth, because in that day there was nothing similar to the great combinations that have grown up under modern conditions. A great many other dissimilarities between the conditions then and now might be mentioned. It is but reasonable for us to recognize what is recognized by all the people—that these great corporations and combinations have too much of a voice in modern legislation. Their activities in politics and in legislation have created prejudice against them that, in some instances perhaps, goes too far. But there can be no doubt but what their activities in legislation in many cases have resulted in laws that gave them an unfair advantage over the ordinary person.

This is a step toward placing the real government in the hands of the people themselves. It is upon the citizens that we depend for stability as a government. It is upon the patriotic, common, industrious people of our country that our Government must always lean in time of danger and distress. To this class of people, then, we should give the right to control by direct election the selection of our public officials and to permit each citizen who is a part of the sinew and backbone of our Government in time of danger to exercise his influence by direct vote in time of peace.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Missouri use a little of his time now?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say to-day that I represented the Legislature of Rhode Island, but I feel confident in saying that I represent the people of Rhode Island in giving my advocacy and vote to the proposed amendment directing the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. It may seem strange for me to say that I do not represent the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, but to you it will be made very plain when I state that the legislature of that State does not represent the people of the State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Rhode Island unfortunately is one of those distinct cases to which we can point unerringly as a victim of archaic laws and a moribund constitution. And I am gratified that the Democracy is in power in this House, in order that we may take a short cut across lots in Rhode Island and give to the people the power to vote for United States Senators, and in that way help them materially to an enjoyment of liberties which have been suppressed by moth-eaten charters. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To-day in the State of Rhode Island they are battling for an enlarged franchise, which is to my mind a convertible term for an enlarged freedom. I can better illustrate it by telling you that the city of Providence, with a population of 225,000 people and a qualified electorate of 29,030, is represented in the State senate of Rhode Island by one member, and that another section of the population, containing 40,398 people and 5,620 qualified voters, is represented in the same senate by 20 senators. You can easily see the disproportion; and you can easily recognize how derelict I would be in my duty if I did not say something for poor, downtrodden Rhode Island to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And it is that condition, and it is that frightful misrepresentation, a minority of the people, a fraction, practically, of the people, represented in the legislature through a rotten borough system, that sent for so many years to the United States the gentleman who gave the Democratic Party its great opportunity when he wrote into the laws the odius and malodorous Payne-Aldrich tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We can take virtue from that condition, and we can exercise a little joy in the thought that the gentleman misrepresenting the State of Rhode Island in the United States Senate did not represent the people of the State of Rhode Island, but did represent only a poor fraction or minority of them.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I will.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The gentleman has spoken of the inequality of representation in the Rhode Island Legislature. Would the gentleman favor an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would only give Rhode Island a representation in the Senate of the United States to which it is entitled by its population? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would not; and I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that that is a sort of threadbare argument down my way and they have been harping on it for a century. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much, profoundly, in fact, in favor of this amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I believe that it will do away with the contest of moneybags. I believe it will restore the representation of the people to where it belongs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I want but one minute more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. In the opportunity given to me to-day I wish to emphasize my thorough accord with an enlarged franchise. I wish to emphasize my thorough accord with the principle that the people should rule; and if there is any place in this whole country where that opportunity is awaited more impatiently than in another it is in the little State of Rhode Island. I can say, possibly with some sorrow for my brethren on the Republican side of the House, that once we get this amendment to the Constitution and once we have the popular election of Senators in the State of Rhode Island I believe firmly, just as sure as I am standing here, that we shall have two Democratic Senators representing that State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, the most interesting feature of this debate is the evidence which it affords of the growth of a democratic idea whose evolution has been continuously and pertinaciously opposed, by the reactionary thought of this country.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to undertake to discuss at this time the conditions, and underlying reasons which have brought about the great change in the popular attitude toward the election of Senators by the people. It is well understood that the country favors this principle. Hence the unanimity with which the gentlemen on the minority side have come forward to commit themselves to its support. But after declaring themselves in favor of the principle, they find a stumbling block in the way of supporting the pending bill, in the fact that the proposed amendment does not contain the present provision of the Constitution relating to the time, the place, and the manner of holding elections. They seem to apprehend danger in that portion of the joint resolution which gives to the respective States the right to control the time, place, and manner of holding the elections contemplated by the amendment.

I wish to discuss briefly this ground of objection, and to show why in my judgment the power to control the time, place, and manner of holding these elections should be given to the States. Some gentlemen say that when you take away this power from the Congress, you will impair the symmetry of the Constitution. Whenever you engraft upon the Constitution the principle of electing Senators by the people, you will thereby so impair the symmetry of the instrument as it came from the craftsmen who provided with such care against the popular selection of these officials that the additional impairment involved in extending to the States the right to control their election may well be overlooked. But why do I contend that this feature of the Constitution relative to the control of Congress over the time and manner of holding elections should be eliminated from that instrument? For this very sufficient reason, Mr. Speaker, that no one has ever been able to ascertain the extent of the

power conferred by the present language upon the Congress of the United States.

It has been suggested that this language was inserted to enable the Congress of the United States—that is the Federal Government—to preserve itself in time of emergency. But, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, that in time of stress, when the existence of a nation is at stake, the people of that nation do those things that are necessary and vital to protect themselves, and to preserve their integrity as a nation, without regard to the limitations of a written constitution.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do.

Mr. KOPP. Does the gentleman know of any reason why the Senate should release the supervisory control of elections and the House of Representatives should retain it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. None whatever.

Mr. KOPP. Then why is this not made at least symmetrical in that respect, and why not strike out the whole provision?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Simply because it would not be appropriate in this connection. We are now dealing with the popular election of Senators only, but there is no reason why in the proper manner and at the proper time the same power of control should not be extended to the States in respect of the election of Members of the House of Representatives.

But, Mr. Speaker, if there is no occasion to retain the present language of the Constitution, on the ground that it is necessary for the vital existence of the Republic, then we ought not to retain in our organic law any language which is not susceptible of definite ascertainment and positive meaning.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If we do not know what the language means, and the purpose is to correct the Constitution in that respect, why not at the same time strike out the same provision in reference to the election of Members of this House?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Inasmuch as this amendment relates to the election of Senators, the language used is pertinent and germane, but it would be inappropriate in this connection to undertake to strike out the provision of the Constitution relating to the control of Congress over the election of Members of the House. Personally I have no objection to such action being taken, and would be glad to see it done at the proper time. I hope this answers the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I will ask two minutes more of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. So many gentlemen are asking for time, Mr. Speaker, that I will have to limit the gentleman to one minute.

Mr. SAUNDERS. So many questions have been asked me, that the answers have consumed a large portion of my time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will give the gentleman from Virginia two minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish to say that that which is unknown is always terrifying, and to retain in a written instrument language which does not convey a precise and definite authority is to retain that which will be a lurking element of danger. In the history of our Government, in all our times of stress, the time has never yet arrived when the statesmen of the country have been able to ascertain what this language means, or to enact any legislation under its authority. Looking down the vista of time, I can not see that the retention of this provision in the organic law in relation to the election of Senators is in any wise necessary for the preservation of our liberties, or rights, or for the promotion of the national safety.

For what purpose, may I ask those gentlemen who insist upon its retention—for what purpose should this vague and indefinite power of control over State elections, be retained in the hands of Congress? There is no question of partisan politics involved. If the Constitution, is changed in this respect, the change will enlarge the power of all the States alike. It will not afford an exclusive, or dangerous power to any section of the United States.

There is no portion of our common country that is interested in the retention of this indefinite power by Congress. This fact I call to the attention of the gentlemen who profess to favor the general principle of popular election of Senators but oppose the present bill, merely because one of its provisions gives to the States a power which they should have had from the beginning. They are ready to imperil the principle which they profess to be willing to support, on a ground which is palpably flimsy and unsubstantial. No gentleman in this debate has undertaken to define, or to declare the extent of the power which it is supposed that Congress now enjoys over the time and manner of holding elections to elect the Members of this House. The Congress of the United States to-day enjoys no control over the place of holding the elections. It possesses a power, over the time and manner only, which no expositor of the Constitution has ever been able to fix in any precise terms. This bill should pass in the form in which it was reported. The people have demanded this reform, and the enactment of this law in terms that can not be misunderstood, and the response to that demand should be its passage by a unanimous vote of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I think gentlemen on that side of the aisle are alarming themselves unduly over the effect of the modification of the paragraph of the Constitution to which so much reference has been made. I frankly state that I should not vote against this proposition if the proposed modification was not contained in the resolution; but I do prefer that it should be contained therein. And what, in common reason, may I ask, Mr. Speaker, can be the objection to retaining it? What is this resolution itself? It is but the expression of a confidence in the judgment, the wisdom, and the patriotism of the people of the States. If the people can be trusted to elect their Senators, may they not be trusted to regulate the manner and the time of choosing the Senators?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], in addressing the Chamber this morning, referred to what he himself declared to be an extreme case, that of a State seceding, and asked how the Federal Government could preserve and perpetuate its organization under such a condition as that. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when many States seceded. The Federal Government at that time possessed this power. Did it preserve its power and its prestige by regulating the election of Senators in the States under the power that it then possessed? Oh, no; it preserved its power and its prestige by force and arms, just as it will have to do again should such a condition arise. The leaving of that power in the Congress of the United States will not aid in preserving the power of the Government under such conditions as that. It is consistent with the thought that underlies this amendment, in that it is adding to the power of the people of the States; and, as I have said, being not only willing but anxious to give to the people of the States the power which they demand, of acting directly upon those who shall represent the States in the coordinate legislative branch of the Government, I am willing to go still further and say that if they are capable of doing that they certainly are capable of dealing patriotically and wisely with the question of the manner and the time of choosing those officers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Michigan if he will consume the balance of his time? As far as I know, there will be only one more speaker on this side.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the Chair state how much time we have left on each side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 47 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. UTTER].

Mr. UTTER. Mr. Speaker, I hardly expected that the necessity would arise to-day to defend Rhode Island, and I am glad to say that Rhode Island does not need any defense. When the opportunity arises for this House to consider Rhode Island under the state of the Union, Rhode Island will be found making a favorable report. [Applause.] I do think it is proper for me to say, however, that though I have been a resident of the State of Rhode Island for half a century, and my colleague from that State [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] has been a resident of the State for a little less than four years, I doubt if he is any more ready to leave the State to-day than I am. Indeed, both of us intend to stay. [Applause.]

The resolution which we have before us to-day provides for two things. This Congress has put upon it two duties. The first is the duty of providing a way by which the people can express their opinions in amending their Constitution; the second is the duty of doing that in such a form that the people can pass upon that amendment in a clear and understanding manner.

This resolution proposes two things: The first is open and frank; it proposes to give to the people of the various States

the right to elect their Senators by direct vote. It proposes, in the second place, a thing that is not open, a thing that is not frank, and that is to change the Constitution in such a way as to rob Congress of the right to protect itself. [Applause.]

I have heard nothing here on either side of criticism of the first open and frank proposition. Members on both sides, almost unanimously, have stated that they believed in the election of United States Senators by the people. The only criticism that has come has been criticism of submitting to the people so important a change in such a manner that they can not pass upon one change without also passing upon another.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening as a new Member, and I have been pleased by the remarks made by members of the majority that they wanted to play fair. If you want to play fair as a body, play fair by placing before the people the resolution of amendment in such a form that they can understand it and vote on the prime purpose, and not be held back by a secondary amendment. I therefore ask you to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], and having accepted the amendment to ratify the resolution and ratify it practically unanimously. As the gentleman from Illinois has well said, while the people of the United States have plainly asked for the privilege of electing Senators by the votes of the people of the several States, they have not and will not demand that the Senate and the House of Representatives yield their power to protect themselves. Therefore, in order to protect ourselves as we legislate for the great American people, we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and then unanimously pass the constitutional amendment asked for by the people. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the gentleman from Michigan understands that there is but one more speech to be made on this side?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I so understood the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I expected to yield to a gentleman whom I supposed had changed his mind. I now understand differently, and I will yield to him now.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Very well.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I can not hope to add anything to this discussion. I am in favor of the resolution as it comes from the committee. It is the same resolution that has been passed by this House and which for three times the House has almost unanimously voted, both Republican and Democratic, when the House was overwhelmingly Republican. It is the same resolution that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate reported, word for word, unanimously at the last session. It is the same resolution—in fact, it contains the same language—that would have passed the Senate and been now the law upon the statute book—submitting to the people of the United States the great change in our Constitution which the people have demanded, which the Democratic Party in its platform and pledges have for years demanded—had not the enemies of the resolution in the United States Senate injected into the resolution an amendment which is now offered on the floor of this House to accomplish the same purpose, the defeat of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if we can submit to the people of the States of this Union this resolution, amended as is proposed, we take away from them the right to prescribe the qualifications of voters in the election of Senators and destroy the form of government that was intended by the fathers—a union of States, and not a consolidated confederate empire, simply an empire with provinces. Those of us who believe in local self-government ought not to be asked to give into the hands of Congress expressly the power to invade the States and regulate the franchises of their citizens and the manner of holding their elections.

While I heartily approve of the election of United States Senators by the people, I can not support the proposition that Congress shall have the power to regulate and supervise these elections in the States; and if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan shall be adopted I can not support the resolution.

I have stated that the amendment offered here is the same as that proposed in the Senate. I find it is the exact amendment which, being adopted in the Senate, accomplished the defeat of the resolution in the Senate at the last session, which was as follows:

Senate joint resolution 134.

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. SUTHERLAND to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States, viz:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "vacancy," strike out the words "and in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senator."

And on page 2 strike out, in lines 9, 10, and 11, the words "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

I recall that there have been times, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress of the United States has endeavored, with reference to the election of Representatives in Congress and other matters that affected certain sections of this country, to pass stringent, violent, and forceful laws. In many cases it took the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to decide that those laws were unconstitutional, and the question as to whether Congress can invade the States and regulate the election even of Representatives is one of some doubt, because the cases decided by the Supreme Court were not decided by a unanimous court, but by a bare majority of the court. In a case to which I desire to allude, and which I hold in my hand, the Supreme Court decided that the State of Michigan had a right to prescribe the manner of holding the election for electors for President. The State of Michigan prescribed for this election of electors for President by congressional districts.

That was the case of McPherson *v.* Blocker (146 U. S. Repts., p. 1), in which the court decided:

Under the Constitution the legislatures of the several States have exclusive power to direct the manner in which the electors of President and Vice President shall be appointed.

Such appointment may be made by the legislatures directly or by popular vote in districts or by general ticket, as may be provided by the legislatures.

In the same case, and in many others, cited in this case, the court decides that the right to vote in the States comes from the States; and that the right to vote intended to be protected by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitutions of the States.

Surely, if we can leave to the States the right to determine who shall vote for the Chief Executive, we can and should not depart from that safe and sound constitutional rule in the election of Senators. The great end in view sought to be obtained by this resolution, and which has been so constantly demanded by the people, is not that the Congress shall regulate the election of Senators by invading the rights of the States and local self-government, but that the qualified voters of the States, qualified as such by the laws and requirements prescribed by the State legislatures, shall have the right to choose directly United States Senators, and that power shall be no longer lodged in the legislatures of the States.

Quoting from Mr. Jefferson:

The Senate was intended as a check on the will of the Representatives when too hasty; they are not only that, but completely so on the will of the people also; and in my opinion are heaping coals of fire not only on their persons, but on their body as a branch of the legislature. It seems that the opinion is fairly launched into public that they should be placed under the control of a more frequent recurrence to the will of their constituents. This seems requisite to complete the experiment, whether they do more harm or good. Mischief may be done negatively as well as positively. Of this the Senate has furnished many proofs.

I do not know whether this was true at the time when Mr. Jefferson wrote these words, but we do know that in more recent years the action of the Senate on many important questions has been such that the demand has constantly grown that the manner of electing United States Senators shall be changed. And I trust that the day is not far distant when this demand of the people shall be complied with. The passage of this resolution by Congress will bring to the people a realization of their hopes, so long deferred. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, it was my purpose to offer an amendment to line 4, page 2, to insert after the word "the" the following words, "direct vote of the"; but I yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who contemplates offering some amendments, one of which will cover the point I have in view. I shall take this opportunity, however, to say that the people of the district I have the honor to represent—Scranton, Pa., and Lackawanna County—are very generally in favor of United States Senators being elected by the direct votes of the people, and, in accordance with their wishes and my own convictions, I shall cheerfully vote in favor of an amendment to the Constitution to give the people that privilege.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me from the discussion this afternoon that there is here more or less misapprehension as to the law; and, with due deference to the distinguished gentlemen who entertain views different from my own, I desire to state the law as I understand it. The right to vote is not a Federal right. It does not come from the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution each State has always had the sole power to prescribe the qualifications of

its electors. The pending amendment leaves this power unchanged, and under it the States would still have the right to say what shall be the qualifications of those who are to vote for United States Senators. Those qualifications this amendment prescribes shall be the qualifications of electors for the lower branch of the respective State legislatures.

All that the Federal Constitution does by the fifteenth amendment, to which reference has been frequently made, is to guarantee that a certain kind of discrimination therein specified shall not be practiced by the States. The right of suffrage itself, the qualifications of electors, comes from the State statute. Here is the fifteenth amendment:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
> The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Now, if the proposed amendment shall become a part of the Constitution, then when a State has fixed the qualifications of the citizens who can vote for members of the lower branch of the State legislature, those citizens will be the persons who can vote for United States Senators. If any State should pass a law declaring that white citizens could vote for United States Senators, but that colored citizens could not, the Supreme Court, of course, would pronounce such a law unconstitutional.

While I would prefer that this amendment, in order that it might have been insured passage by the requisite number of States, should not contain the provision it does contain nullifying part of paragraph 4 of section 1, nevertheless I am unable to see such possible harm to come as has been talked about so frequently and so forcefully here to-day. There is now a Federal statute which would punish any conspiracy of election commissioners or other persons in a State who should undertake, in violation of the fifteenth amendment, to deprive qualified electors of the State of their right to vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not time to amplify this.

There is another phase of the question about which I wish to say a word. I hope gentlemen appreciate my pleasure on hearing distinguished Republicans rise on this floor to-day and in exultant tones proclaim that there is unanimity among Republicans everywhere as to the wisdom of having United States Senators elected by the people. But, Mr. Speaker, it was not always so. I had the honor on behalf of the State of Wisconsin in the Republican national convention of 1908 to present a plank calling for the election of United States Senators by the people. It received 114 votes out of a total of more than 900. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I remember that a distinguished Republican, the chairman of the committee on resolutions, Mr. Hopkins, then United States Senator from the State of Illinois, denounced that plank and rejoiced when Republicans repudiated it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I cite this at this time only to remind the House that, in the language of the Rev. John Jasper, of Richmond, Va., "The world do move." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. COOPER. I would like a minute more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. In order to have this matter fully, fairly, and freely discussed, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes additional.

Mr. COOPER. I am under very great obligations to the gentleman from Missouri. I appreciate the disinterestedness of his motives. [Laughter and applause.] Not for the world would he see any trouble on this side of the Chamber! [Laughter and applause.] But I shall not say another word about the Chicago convention. [Laughter.] Nor shall I proceed any further to elaborate upon the law——

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I do.

Mr. HAYES. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the resolution as proposed by the majority, if it should be submitted to the people of the several States and receive their approval, would not nullify a portion of the fifteenth amendment to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. COOPER. I do not at all think so.

Mr. HAYES. The last expression of the popular will, the gentleman thinks, would not control?

Mr. COOPER. It would not nullify any part of the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. HAYES. I think it would.

Mr. COOPER. Just a moment. My contention is this: That the right guaranteed to every voter in the United States by the Constitution of the United States is that the State of which he is a citizen shall not discriminate against him as a voter on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. There is nothing in the Federal Constitution to prevent a State from fixing a property qualification for the suffrage and saying that no man not possessed of $50,000 worth of property should have the right to vote. No State ought to pass a law of that kind; but any State might pass such a law unless its own State constitution would prevent. The Federal Constitution would permit the State of the distinguished gentleman from California to enact a statute providing that only citizens worth $50,000 might vote, but thereupon the fifteenth amendment would guarantee every citizen of that State worth $50,000 the right to vote whether he were white or colored.

The qualifications of electors are fixed by the State statutes, and the Constitution guarantees, let me repeat, that there shall be no discrimination between citizen voters because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This right being guaranteed by the Constitution, the United States, as a sovereign Nation, has the power to pass a law which shall protect that right and punish those who violate it. Congress has already enacted such a law—section 5508 of the Revised Statutes:

> If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise and enjoyment of any right or privilege granted to him by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, etc., * * * he shall be punished, etc.

That is broad enough to cover violations of the provisions of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendments. It could be made specifically to cover cases coming under the fifteenth amendment. And it could be amended——

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. COOPER. In just a moment. Now, there is in this connection another subject to which we as Republicans ought to direct our attention. As a Republican born and bred, reared in a Republican atmosphere, coming from among a people who conducted stations of the underground railroad to help men and women to liberty, I greatly deplore the fact that in certain portions of the Republic citizens are disfranchised by statute practically, and only because of their color. Every disfranchisement, as I understand it, is under a statute.

Mr. BARTLETT. Under the constitution of the State.

Mr. COOPER. Under the constitution of the State, and those statutes have been taken—the "grandfather" statute and others—to the Supreme Court of the United States and declared to be constitutional.

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. There are a good many phases of this question. But I do not believe——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES]?

Mr. COOPER. In just a moment. As I said, this resolution would have been more certain of receiving the support of the requisite number of States if it had been drawn somewhat differently, but if it should pass in this form I do not believe that the rights of any citizen would be jeopardized. And the men who believe in the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people ought not to jeopardize the necessary two-thirds vote by voting against the resolution in its original form if it becomes necessary to vote upon that naked proposition. There are good men here who believe the resolution as presented is dangerous; but there are bad men, cunning men throughout the country who want this resolution defeated at all hazards. [Applause.] No mere technicality conjured up here should suffice to defeat a thing so vital to the welfare of the Republic.

One of the gentlemen said that when our forefathers enacted the Constitution conditions were not as they are to-day. That is true. There is to-day such a concentration of wealth and power—often of dangerously corrupting influences—around State legislatures as our forefathers never dreamed of, as the world never imagined until within the last 40 years. Therefore this amendment ought to pass, and will pass, in some form or other, I sincerely hope. I shall vote for the amendment proposed, and if that does not pass then I shall vote for the original resolution.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. I wish to ask the gentleman if he has not failed to discriminate between the amendment to the Constitution which controls the Congress of the United States and the

statute passed by Congress which a majority of both Houses may repeal at any time?

Mr. COOPER. Not at all. And the gentleman fails to see the point which I attempted to make, which is, that this amendment leaves with the States the right to fix the qualifications of the electors.

Mr. HAYES. Surely; but it takes away from the Congress of the United States the right to supervise the election of Senators and to regulate the manner in which they shall be elected, which it has at present under the Constitution.

Mr. COOPER. We have not the right to-day to fix the qualifications of electors. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. We have never had that right under the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Congress never had the right to fix the qualifications of the electors of the States. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, line 4, by inserting after the word "by" the following: "A direct vote of."

Amend page 2, lines 7 and 8, by striking out the word "legislatures" and inserting the word "legislature."

Amend page 2, line 15, by striking out the words "that the legislature of any State may empower," and on line 16, by striking out the word "to" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall."

Amend on page 2, line 18, by striking out the words "so" and "as."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this House has on a number of occasions in the past passed a joint resolution providing for a direct vote on the election of Senators. So far as I remember, I have never voted for that resolution. I shall not vote for this resolution.

I am not prepared to say whether, in my own judgment, Senators should be elected by a direct vote or by the method now provided by the Constitution. But I think I am able to see far enough into the future to see that if it shall be provided that Senators shall be elected by a direct vote of the people of the various States it is but the beginning of the end of State sovereignty, of the sovereign rights of a State, or the powers of a State, as they now exist, over local matters.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] a moment ago complained of the constitution and laws of his State, which give to one district with a small population the same representation in the senate of that State that the city of Providence has, with a population of more than 200,000. So long as we have maintained the principle that the Senators were delegates of the State, elected by the legislatures of the State, we could well claim that each State should have the same representation.

But the very reason that causes the gentleman from Rhode Island to refer with invective to the laws of his State which take away equal representation will, in the course of a few years, when the Senators are elected by the States by direct vote of the people, cause the great State of New York, the great State of Illinois, aye, the people of the great country in which we live, to say, "There is no reason why a man in Rhode Island voting for a United States Senator should be the equal of 20 men in the State of New York."

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will not yield at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. MANN. It is the logic of events, Mr. Speaker, which controls us in the long run. And there is nothing so inexorable as the logic of events. We think now that if we change the method of electing Senators and provide that they shall be elected by a direct vote of the people we do not change the theory of the Constitution. Aye, but we do, and when but a short time goes on—it may be shorter or longer—the people will say that it is unfair to have rotten boroughs in States, as the gentleman from Rhode Island would say they have rotten boroughs in Rhode Island. For many years in England members of Parliament were elected from rotten boroughs, without population to speak of, but having the same power and the same influence that those members had who came from great centers of population, representing great numbers of people.

Now, so far as I am concerned, I am yet undecided in my own mind as to how far the present tendency of events ought to proceed in the abolition of the powers and the rights of the States.

Under the commerce clause of the Constitution we have already largely deprived the States of their powers, and as in business we meet the commercial affairs of the country we are constantly importuned on every side to add to the powers of the General Government and to take away the powers of the local governments. I do not undertake to say which is the proper course, but so long as I have been in this legislative body I have endeavored to maintain the rights of the States as originally contemplated, believing that if the time came when State lines should be practically abolished, it ought to be done with knowledge and by the direct representation and mandate of the people, instead of being done indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest benefits which the citizens of our country enjoy is the right of local self-government. I do not wish to be a party in any degree to the taking away from the people of the right of local self-government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to discuss the merits of this proposition to any extent, forced upon us in the way that it has been, without a fair chance to consider it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me at present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. MANN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman later. When I say that this proposition has been forced upon us in the way that it has been, without a fair chance to consider it, I do not mean merely the opportunity to talk about it on the floor of the House. I mean the opportunity to offer amendments, the chance to really consider the proposition. In the last Congress the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], the colleague of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], introduced a resolution on this subject. There had been many resolutions passed before it. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, in the Fifty-fifth Congress, in the Fifty-sixth Congress, in the Fifty-seventh Congress a resolution had been passed providing for the direct election of Senators. A resolution similar to those four which had previously passed was introduced in the last Congress by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] and reported favorably from the committee, though never passed through the House. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] introduced on April 4, the first day of this session, a resolution quite similar to the one which had been four times passed and which, one other time, had been introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] and reported into the House; but the resolution as it comes before us for action, without a chance to give it consideration, is an entirely different one.

I propose to call attention to some of the particular things in the resolution now pending. Gentlemen may say that the criticism I make is a carping criticism. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed to me that the Constitution of the United States was sufficiently important to consider both the merits and the form of the amendments which might be adopted to it. It has always seemed to me that Congress might even consider rhetoric and grammar when adding an amendment to the Constitution.

When we remember that there have been so few amendments added in all the many years of the existence of our Constitution, it has seemed to me that we might take sufficient time at least to put an amendment in proper grammatical and rhetorical shape. Considering the fact that there have been only three amendments added to the Constitution in more than 100 years, I think we might take sufficient time to say what we mean in proper grammatical form, so that one who runs may read and understand.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit me to say——

Mr. MANN. I will permit the gentleman to say anything in the way of a question. Otherwise I hope he will wait until I get further along.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will not ask the gentleman a question if he does not want me to, but will reserve it until later.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman from Illinois to say that if we were to elect Senators by the people there would be great danger of the large States overriding the smaller States?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I suppose the gentleman proposes to read me a constitutional provision that that can not be done.

Mr. COOPER. I wish simply to remind——

Mr. MANN. I am familiar with the Constitution on the subject.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me that there is a sufficient answer to the gentleman. I ask him if he does not think this answers it?—

No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and that provision of the Constitution is subject to amendment; and when the tendency runs, as it will run, so strong against the gross injustice of permitting——

Mr. COOPER. That particular provision is not subject to amendment, and it is the only one in the Constitution that is not. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken; that provision of the Constitution is subject to amendment. Every provision of the Constitution is subject to amendment. That provision itself must first be amended before you can deprive a State of its equal rights in the Senate; but when that provision has been amended, as it will be some day, then they will make the division among the States equitable, because in the end it is absolutely unfair that the State of Delaware should have 2 Senators in the United States Senate and 1 Representative on the floor of the House and the great State of New York should have, as it is now proposed, 40 Members of the House and only 2 Senators.

What is there in that to carry out the will of the people? Gentlemen talk about obeying the will of the people. If the will of the people is to be executed, then the people must have the chance to elect their Representatives upon equal terms, and the logic is as inevitable as that the sun will rise to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCALL. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MANN. I will yield.

Mr. McCALL. In reference to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] has said, if the States refuse to yield their representation, would it be possible to amend the Constitution, taking all the power away from the Senate?

Mr. MANN. You can amend the Constitution in any way. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the amusing things, it seems to me, in reference to this amendment is, in the first place, the whole theory of the proposed amendment is that the legislatures of the States can not be trusted. That is the whole theory of the amendment—that the legislatures of the different States can not be trusted. The Constitution provides that an amendment may be ratified by the legislatures or by conventions called in the States. And yet the distinguished gentleman from Missouri seeks to cast odium, as it would be by the amendment, on the legislatures, rejecting the right of a State to determine whether it shall ratify this amendment by convention, but requires that it shall be left wholly to the legislature. If he has such a wonderful belief in the rights of the people as expressed by direct vote, why has it not been left in a way that the State may elect conventions to pass upon this resolution?

It provides further, in reference to legislatures, that the legislature may or it may not empower the executive to fill vacancies temporarily. No requirement has been carried in all resolutions heretofore that the executive shall make an appointment to fill vacancies. It proposes to leave to the legislature that authority. In addition to that, stating on the one hand that the legislature is unworthy of trust to elect United States Senators, it proposes to say that the legislature is so worthy that it shall determine as to the time and places and manner of holding elections, and placing the legislature above Congress. On the one side this resolution says that the legislature is unworthy of confidence, and on the other that it is worthy of more confidence than Congress itself. That is logic for you. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen all the afternoon have been talking about election of Senators by direct vote of the people. The resolutions which have heretofore passed this body, the resolution which was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] in the last Congress, provided—

> That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by the direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years.

"Elected by the direct vote of the people thereof." Anybody can understand what that means. Anybody knows what that says, and it says that they shall be elected by a direct vote of the people. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] this morning announced that there would be no amendments to this resolution of his—no dotting of "i's" or crossing of "t's"; he had perfected it and did not propose to have it amended.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I want to say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Missouri said nothing of the kind, but said just the contrary, and stated that opportunity would be permitted to offer amendments.

Mr. MANN. To present amendments; yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And I did say that I wanted to vote every one of them down.

Mr. MANN. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. This resolution——

Mr. MANN. Oh, do not take so much of my time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, the gentleman ought not to refer to me unless he talks the facts.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the time. I am not the one who limited it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But the gentleman's friend did.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. The gentleman from Missouri limited the time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not want to get into a controversy with the gentleman; but that is not correct, because debate was limited by consent of the House.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is true.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Did I not ask for the longest limit of time desired on that side?

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I suggested that we have more than one day's debate on the proposition.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But the gentleman has always been opposed to this measure, and I did not pay very much respect to his wishes in the matter.

Mr. MANN. That is all right; but do not take my time or bother me now.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I am not going to bother the gentleman. I want only to express my opinion.

Mr. MANN. I do not wonder that the gentleman gets restive when his resolution is under consideration.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. A Republican resolution, as I have already told the gentleman a hundred times, but I am supporting it.

Mr. MANN. Well, it is quite likely that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the great Committee on the Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, seeking for an opportunity to make fame for himself—running around and hunting for a form—it is very likely that he has picked up some Republican thunder. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] We have learned before this that that which we have discarded that side of the House joyfully embraces as something good and new. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I prefer to discuss the resolution. The gentleman has plenty of time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will give the gentleman as much time as I consume of his.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will wait until I finish, I will be very much obliged.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If the gentleman does not want me to ask him a question when it is proper——

Mr. MANN. Oh, I would be very glad to let the gentleman ask me a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly; I always yield in the end, though I prefer to get through.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has consumed more time now than it would take to ask the question. He does not want me to ask him any question.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I will permit the gentleman to ask me a question. What is it?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. No; I will not ask any question. I am getting tired of that display, and I will get along without it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I learned long ago when I was in control of a bill to keep my temper. Gentlemen on that side of the House will have that lesson to learn in the course of time.

The gentleman has left out the direct vote of the people. What more? The resolution provides:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Plural! How many legislatures does a State have, for God's sake? [Laughter and applause on Republican side.] Oh, no; that is not the fault of the printer, as some gentleman near me suggests. That is the fault of the gentleman who introduced the resolution. The resolution which formerly passed the House had the correct expression, providing that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of

the most numerous branch of the legislature thereof, or of that State, but the gentleman from Missouri—I will apologize to the gentleman—I do not think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] is the one who made the discovery, for it is quite likely, and I agree with him, that that was in the bill as it was presented in the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol. But if my friend from Missouri had watched that distinguished body as closely as I have, he would have learned before this that it is not safe to rely on other legislative bodies either as to substance or as to form.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It depends on who composed the body.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman has this side of the House now. Who composed the body I do not undertake to say. It is a fine-looking body of men, I will say, whom I see upon that side of the House, but their grammar is a little off. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.]

Then it says:

When vacancies happen—

When "vacancies" happen—

in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such States shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MANN. I would ask for five minutes more.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman whatever time I have.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. I will not want to take so much time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield whatever of that time the gentleman desires.

Mr. MANN. If I were writing that language I should have written—

When a vacancy happens in the representation of any State in the Senate the executive authority of such State shall issue a writ of election to fill such vacancy.

The statutes of the United States provide that when the plural or singular number is used in the statutes it shall apply to the other when applicable, and that often corrects mistakes like this of using the plural instead of the singular, but the statutes do not govern in the construction of the Constitution of the United States, and one would think that after being out, as they say, for 16 years they would discover that when they wished to say a vacancy they would say a vacancy instead of vacancies. There is vacancy enough now on that side without making it plural. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I prefer not; the gentleman has time. Now, I do not wish to be carping, but here is a constitutional amendment, and the last provision is—

This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

The first principle of language is to reduce the number of words to express the thought to as few as possible. That is a principle which I know, though I do not always follow it.

Mr. JAMES. It does not apply to speeches, does it?

Mr. MANN. The provision ought to be—

This amendment shall not be construed to affect the election or term of any Senator.

And if my friend from Missouri was writing it and had his attention called to it, he would agree to it; but, of course, now he will feel compelled to stand by the provision. Mr. Speaker, but a few words more. In the first part the joint resolution provides, among other things, that—

In lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators.

Think for a moment of the rhetorical expression of stating that it shall be "in lieu of all" of the paragraph, but really in lieu of only a part of it; but coming to the gist of it, what authority has Congress to say what part of the Constitution an amendment is "in lieu of"? The amendment, when it is agreed to by three-fourths of the States and becomes a part of the Constitution, is for the courts to determine as to its meaning. This part of the resolution is no part of the amendment. We may legislate here and say that a certain amendment is in place of the whole Constitution, but that is not before the legislatures of the States which ratify the amendment; but when the amendment is ratified it speaks for itself, and the courts, not Congress, will construe the part of the Constitution it is in lieu of. But the purpose of that, and that is the first time the provision in that form has appeared in any of these resolutions, the purpose of that resolution is to take out of the Constitution the power which Congress would otherwise have when it so desired to regulate the time and manner of holding elections for Senators. Ever since the Government was organized Congress has had the power to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

We have had the power to regulate the time and manner of conducting the election of Senators, not the place, because the place was supposed to be within the power of the State to fix as being the capital of the State, and it was not designed to give Congress the power to fix the capital of the State.

Now, under this amendment, as I read it, though there is some doubt, Congress will still have the power to regulate the time, and place, and manner, for holding elections for Members of Congress. Why is it proposed that Congress shall not have the same power over the election of Senators by the same electorate—probably at the same time? It ought to be. We have so provided in course of time that we have required, in effect, the election of electors at a fixed time, in fact, and their meeting at the same time. Through the power of Congress to regulate the election of Representatives, and the fear that that power might be exercised in course of time, most of the States have fixed their fall elections for Members of Congress at the same time. Senators ought to be elected at the same election that Members of the House are, and yet it is proposed to take away from Congress the power to control these elections and to place it absolutely in the hands of the States.

It is true that Congress has not exercised the power, but it often happens that when a superior body possesses a power it is not necessary to exercise it, because the inferior body acts with fairness and justice. Under this provision of the Constitution, if made as it stands in the resolution, Utah, Delaware, Rhode Island, Illinois, or Indiana, or New York, or any State in the Union, may make provisions which have never yet been heard of as to the election of Senators. I contend that under the wording of the amendment, as it now stands, the election of Senators by the people, that it does not require a direct vote of the people. If we had a central body to be composed of delegates to be elected from various subordinate bodies, it would often be the case that those delegates would be appointed by the executive committee of the lower body. No one would suppose from reading the rules of this House that it meant that the committees were to be elected, possibly, by ballot.

There is no provision here that Senators shall be elected by a ballot or by a vote even. We elect committees by resolution, not by ballot, and under this provision, if it should be put into the Constitution, there will come a time when some of the States will find other methods of electing Senators than by a direct vote of the people; and, if history should repeat itself, there would come times when from some of the Southern States Senators would be elected without a direct vote. Under this provision, in the carpetbag days of the South, some of the gentlemen in control of those States would have claimed that they had elected a Senator by the people if the governor issued a commission, without anything further. And remember that, under this, Congress has no control. I appeal to the gentlemen in power on that side of the House, that if you propose to amend the Constitution in this regard now before it comes up for construction, make it plain, so that those who come after may know what it means without court, judicial, or war proceedings.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] to yield me two minutes in which to reply to one question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I stated a while ago to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] that after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] delivered his speech there would be only one other speech on this side.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think I have a little time remaining.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan, and to the gentleman from Missouri also, that I do not intend to make a speech, but I do think that the provision of the Constitution of the United States, one construction of which I gave, and which was contradicted point-blank by the gentleman from Illinois, ought to be read to the House, and I just ask for two minutes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; certainly, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois prophesied that the large States would force an amendment depriving the smaller States of their equal rights in the Senate. I said that the large States could not force upon a smaller State a constitutional amendment to deprive it of its equal suffrage in the Senate except with the consent of the smaller State. With this the gentleman from Illinois did not agree.

Here is Article V of the Constitution:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article, and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

[Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I read that very carefully before I made my remarks. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there will be only one more speech made on this side in concluding this debate. I desire to use three or four minutes, if I may do so with propriety, in order to answer some things which were said here, about which I was not permitted to interrogate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] while he was on the floor.

It is a great misfortune, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman who delivered that magnificent lecture to the House this evening had not lived in olden times and in his own happy style of English framed the Constitution of the United States in language so perfect that even a genius like himself would not dare attack it. [Laughter.] But he did not, and therefore we have got to try to get along in some old way with the Constitution which was handed down to us by those distinguished men who did frame it as best they could. [Laughter.]

The gentleman here this evening makes a great speech in behalf of the rights of the people and the rights of the States and the rights of the Constitution, and would lead us to believe that he is probably reluctant in opposing this measure because of the numerous and clerical grammatical errors to which he has called the attention of the House in a jocular and very instructive speech. [Laughter.]

The gentleman lauds and presents as practically perfect and free from criticism, even at his hands, the resolution offered in the last Congress by my distinguished colleague, Mr. LLOYD. But the gentleman will bear with me when I say this, that when the committee, at that time presided over by a distinguished Republican from West Virginia, Mr. Gaines, brought in a report and recommended to this House that that resolution should pass the gentleman from Illinois arose in his place and objected to the passage of the resolution which he to-day tells us is absolutely perfect, because of a misprint in the Government Printing Office of one word—the addition of an "s." Is not that true? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I did not say it was perfect.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. But the gentleman objected to it for the reason that it contained an "s" when there ought not to have been one, and that was the only objection made.

Mr. MANN. I objected to it when I discovered an "s" on the word "amendment," and that was enough to put me on guard as to the rest of the language.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; and the gentleman is "on guard" and has been for some time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. And will be for some time. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will not discuss that. Of course what I am now going to say has no application on earth, Mr. Speaker, but I read a long time ago in some poetry—I think Pope's incomparable poems; no; it was in Cowper—a couplet that sometimes forces itself into my mind. When I see a gentleman laboring so arduously and earnestly, apparently, for public welfare and yet one who is never able to find anything on earth quite good enough for him to take at the command of the people, sometimes I can not help, to save my soul, having that couplet flash through my mind. The poet wrote:

> With smooth dissimulation skilled, to grace
> A devil's purpose with an angel's face.

[Laughter.]

It has no application here, and I would not have quoted the language if it had not been that the gentleman has criticized my grammar, and I wanted him to understand that if I do not know all about grammar, I do know some things about the application of poetry. [Laughter.]

But the gentleman said that this resolution is woefully bad because it reads:

When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies—

And he criticizes that word "happen" as an error.

But the gentleman forgets that this old Constitution which he is guarding so sacredly from the amendments which the people have been pleading for for 40 years uses that identical language:

When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies—

Word for word the language in the resolution now pending before the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He forgets also that in the second clause of the second paragraph in the Constitution the identical language is found which is found in this resolution, where it says:

And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—

Exactly what we have here, except——

Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Oh, I know you find a surplus "s," and as long as the gentleman is on guard he will always find the "s's" in all reform measures, and an "s" is such an obstacle that that great leader of Republicanism in the city of Chicago can not get over it.

But let me say to you, sir, if conditions had existed 130 years ago that exist to-day those distinguished patriots of this country never would have written into the Constitution some of its yet cherished provisions. At that time the human mind had never been traduced by a thought so foul as that a great people would ever stoop to such practices as we learn are sometimes found in great States and in the legislatures of those States. I heard the gentleman mention the State of Illinois awhile ago, and I thought, "What a great State it is; in fact, it has made more history in the last six months than the Southern Confederacy made in four years." [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Illinois made more history in the four years of the Civil War than the Southern Confederacy did.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I hope I will have no interruptions. I did not intend to consume any time. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of embarrassment that I undertake to close this debate on this very important subject, for I speak without any preparation and without previous determination. I shall not waste much of the 15 minutes allowed me in answer to the criticisms of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the phraseology of this bill. Some of these criticisms have already been answered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]; but it may not be amiss to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois again to the fact that an accurate and careful reading of the Constitution itself might have saved him from the mistake of one of his criticisms. He complained that while much has been said here of the direct vote of the people, yet when we framed the terms of the resolution we provided only that "the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof." Had he remembered—because he has undoubtedly read—the second section of Article I of the Constitution, he would have remembered that it is in this language:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

Nothing is said there of the direct vote, though Representatives are thus elected, and there is no more necessity for it here than there.

But I desire to come to the real propositions that are here involved. It is perhaps unnecessary at this late day to say anything as to the merits of the major proposition; and yet it may not be amiss to note with reference to the eulogy of the gentleman's party that the only voices that have been raised against the major proposition to elect Senators by direct vote of the people have been Republican. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No Democrat on this floor has criticised that proposition. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is peculiarly solicitous for State sovereignty and State rights, and he assumes that because you provide a different method of electing Senators you have struck a deathblow to State sovereignty. I have never been able to follow that logic. As pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], you can not change, without the consent of each State, the equal representation of the States in the Senate, and simply changing the method of electing Senators does not in the slightest degree do away with the power of the States themselves as sovereignties.

Of course, if you accept the gentleman's premise, that one amendment of the Constitution necessarily means untold amendments to the Constitution, why, then, that conclusion of his, or any other conclusion, would be entirely logical. But that has not been the history of amendments to the Constitution, and there is nothing now to warrant the assumption.

But the question that is really interesting this House, and the question that I desire to come to, is not the major proposition, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, but it is that proposition involved in the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan, as to whether we should not have in the Constitution, as it is proposed to be amended, the power in the Federal Government to control the election of United States Senators. That is the real question at issue here.

Now, if it were possible, as suggested repeatedly by the gentlemen on this side, to provide for direct vote of Senators by the people without changing the present power that exists in the Congress of the United States relative to the election of Senators, I would agree that it was highly improper to bring into this question another question about which there is such a division of opinion. But bear in mind this basic fact, that the very moment that you provide by constitutional amendment that Senators shall be elected by direct vote of the people instead of by the legislatures of the States, that moment, unless you make further provision, you have enlarged the power of the Government of the United States over the election of Senators of the United States.

I repeat, that the moment you change the form of the election from that by the legislature to that by direct vote of the people, that moment you have enlarged the power of the Federal Government over such elections. The power that exists to-day under the Constitution as to the election of Senators and Representatives, while in the same language, is not, in a practical real sense, the same power.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question only.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will recollect that the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] in the last Congress, and which was reported and which I have offered as a substitute, contains no reference to section 4, Article I. Would the gentleman hold that that resolution extended the power of the Federal Government?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply answer that it is not material as to what was provided in any former resolution. The material thing is what we shall provide in this amendment. I have not time in the 15 minutes to discuss the various bills that have been introduced. I say to you, in my judgment, that if you are not to enlarge the power of the Federal Government you must add something besides the simple provision as to the method of electing Senators.

The power of Congress over elections for Representatives in Congress is practically complete. While Congress may not prescribe the qualification of voters, and while that right is left entirely with the States, subject only to the provisions of the fifteenth amendment, yet Congress can, by regulating the "manner" of holding these elections, give to the Federal Government complete control, as it actually did during the reconstruction period. As to election of Senators, Congress can now give to the Federal Government no such powers. Practically speaking, its power over their election is so slight as to be negligible. But the sole change from election of Senators by the legislatures to an election by direct vote carries with it an enlargement of power. This it is that brings us face to face with the two propositions. The proposition on that side of the House is that we shall enlarge that power by limiting the amendment to the change to direct vote of the people so as to make it coequal and coextensive with the power of the Federal Government now as to the election of Members of Congress. The proposition on this side is that we should not give to the National Government the power over the election of Senators. That is the real issue clean-cut, and there can be no doubt about it.

What is the history? The history of the provision of the Constitution in regard to both Members of the House and the Senate is that it was put in there not with the idea that the Federal Government should actually supervise the manner and method of holding the election of Members of Congress or of the Senate, but that in the event of the State failing to provide the machinery and method for election, a fear that was then prominent and warranted, then the United States should exercise that power. But when the matter came to be construed as to the power in regard to Members of Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the Congress of the United States had the power, without regard to the failure of the State, to regulate the method of electing Representatives to the Congress of the United States.

We in the South have had confronting us a very grave and very serious problem—a problem that, according to the best judgment of the southern people, involved the supremacy of the white race in those States. Out of much of turmoil, out of much that might not be defended in the cold forum of law, has come now a solution that has been upheld by the courts, and that to-day is making for the future prosperity and safety of the entire land. We are not willing, many of us, to endanger that status, believing it to be most vital, by giving a power as to elections more extensive than now belongs to the Federal Government.

I am one of those men who believe that the day has gone by when we will ever see the power of the National Government enforced as it was enforced during reconstruction days; but we do not believe that it is essential to this question to augment that power and to give additional opportunity for its wrong use.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks what reason in logic can be given why a different rule should apply to the election of Members of the House and Members of the Senate. I might answer him by saying that to-day there exists a different rule in regard to the power of the Federal Government as to electors who elect a President and Members of the House of Representatives.

According to cold logic and theory, if the Federal Government should have power to control the election of Members of this House, which is necessary to its continued existence, it ought also to have power to control the election of electors who select a President of the United States, also necessary to the continuance of its existence. There is also a reason why the States in the election of Senators should not be subject to the same control that the individual election of Members is subject to. The States in selecting Senators do act in a sovereign capacity. They send Senators not simply as Members of the National Legislature, but they send them, in a sense, as ambassadors of a sovereign State, and to my mind it seems utterly foolish to say that you are willing to trust the people of the States to select these Senators, to have power to select them in the broad sense, and yet you are not willing to trust them with the arrangement of the manner and method of holding the election. Either the one position is not warranted or the other is not.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Suppose the time should come when any State should become dissatisfied with the way the Federal Government was being carried on and should refuse to provide for the election of a Senator?

Mr. SHERLEY. Frankly I say that if you gentlemen are dealing with it from that single position, men on this side of the House ought not to have, and I believe would not have, any objection to a provision that gave to the Federal Government control, predicated upon the basic fact only of the State having failed to act; but I say to you that there is no more danger to-day of the States failing to act than of any other unheard-of event.

At the time that that fear was entertained, and at the time when that fear was potent enough to put into the Constitution the provision we find there, there were many who believed the Constitution would never be ratified by the States; there were many who believed it would not last even if ratified; that the States, with their jealousy of each other, would undermine its powers; but no man to-day, after a hundred years of national existence, but realizes that the Nation as a nation is here to stay; that it will never die for failure of the component parts of it to elect Senators to the Congress of the United States. [Applause.] Such a proposition is unthinkable.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman a question, purely for information. Does he agree with his colleague that this resolution will not be approved by the legislatures of the Southern States if this provision limiting the power of the Federal Government is not placed in it?

Mr. SHERLEY. Why, I have no opinion to express. In my own State we have a suffrage without limitation of any sort, and the question would not be vital there except as public opinion is influenced by public opinion in sister Southern States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have still a few minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Then, I yield the remaining five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no right to speak for these States, but gentlemen have argued that we were imperiling the amendment by putting in it the provisions that we have.

I say to you that, in my judgment, it is more likely to receive the approval of the necessary States in the present form than in the form proposed in the substitute of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG]. That is simply my opinion for what it may be worth.

Mr. JACKSON. One question more, Is it fair, either to the minority party in this House or the success of this great principle for which the gentleman has been contending, to impose upon the Northern States the burden of explaining to the hundreds of thousands of colored men who do really vote the great principle which the gentleman has been endeavoring to debate here to-day? [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. My answer to the gentleman is simply this: We have on this side presented a proposition that we believe ought to be adopted. We force no man here, and can force no man, to accept our view. If a majority of the membership of this House see fit to amend this bill as the gentleman would like, well and good. I am still sufficiently in favor of the principle to vote for the constitutional amendment even in the changed form, but it is certainly as fair for us to present our proposition as it is for that side to present theirs, and I further say to the gentleman that we are not making necessary any explanation on the part of the gentleman to any person, white or black, in the North. We do not by this amendment change in one single particular the rights of the negro as a citizen of the United States. We do not in any sense interfere with the protection of those rights under the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments, and I would say——

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. SHERLEY. I decline to yield—but we do say this, that we believe it to be unwise to give to the Federal Government an enlarged grant of power touching the manner of holding elections in the States. We do not believe that such grant of power is necessary, and we are not willing, not believing it to be necessary, to give it. There has been nothing in the history of the country that warrants the belief that it is necessary in order to preserve the Government, and that, to my mind, is the only valid reason that it should be granted.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Kentucky does not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky declines to yield.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have, as I stated, made this speech without preparation, with the consequent confusion of thought that results therefrom.

In conclusion, let me say to the membership of this House that I believe it easy for men to find excuses to vote against this amendment, but to the man who actually, sincerely, fundamentally believes that you will improve the conditions of service to be had in the Senate of the United States by putting the power of electing Senators directly in the hands of the people, to such a man I say there is nothing in the form of the amendment as offered here to-day that ought to make him pause for one moment, and to the Members on that side of the aisle, as well as on this, who actually believe, not nominally believe, in the principles of government by the people, I appeal for a support of the amendment. [Loud and continued applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement the previous question operates on the resolution and on all of the amendments. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan:

Amend as follows: Strike out, on page 1, the language beginning in line 7, as follows: "And in lieu of all of paragraph 1 of section 4 of said Article I, in so far as the same relates to any authority in Congress to make or alter regulations as to the times or manner of holding elections for Senators."

And strike out, on page 2, the language beginning in line 9, as follows:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at this point, in order to save time, I will call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not in order to vote on the substitute?

The SPEAKER. The vote will be taken on the substitute last. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the amendment will answer "aye," and those opposed will answer "no"; those present and not voting will answer "present."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 123, nays 189, answered "present" 2, not voting 75, as follows:

YEAS—123.

Akin, N. Y.	Greene	Lenroot	Prince
Anderson, Minn.	Guernsey	Lindbergh	Prouty
Austin	Hamilton, Mich.	Loud	Rees
Barchfeld	Hanna	McCall	Roberts, Mass.
Bartholdt	Harris	McDermott	Roberts, Nev.
Berger	Hartman	McKinley	Rodenberg
Bowman	Haugen	McKinney	Sloan
Burke, S. Dak.	Hawley	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Butler	Hayes	McMorran	Smith, Saml. W.
Calder	Helgesen	Madden	Speer
Cannon	Henry, Conn.	Madison	Steenerson
Catlin	Hill	Malby	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper	Hinds	Mann	Sterling
Copley	Howell	Martin, S. Dak.	Stevens, Minn.
Crago	Howland	Matthews	Sulloway
Dalzell	Hubbard	Miller	Switzer
Danforth	Humphrey, Wash.	Mondell	Taylor, Ohio
Davidson	Jackson	Moore, Pa.	Thistlewood
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Morgan	Towner
Dodds	Kendall	Mott	Utter
Dwight	Kennedy	Murdock	Volstead
Dyer	Kent	Needham	Warburton
Esch	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Nelson	Wedemeyer
Farr	Knowland	Norris	Wilder
Fordney	Kopp	Nye	Willis
Foss	Lafean	Parran	Wilson, Ill.
Foster, Vt.	Lafferty	Patton, Pa.	Wood, N. J.
French	La Follette	Pickett	Woods, Iowa.
Fuller	Langham	Porter	Young, Kans.
Gillett	Langley	Powers	Young, Mich.
Good	Lawrence	Pray	

NAYS—189.

Adair	Dies	Jones	Roddenbery
Adamson	Difenderfer	Kindred	Rothermel
Aiken, S. C.	Dixon, Ind.	Kipp	Rubey
Alexander	Donohoe	Kitchin	Rucker, Colo.
Allen	Doremus	Konig	Rucker, Mo.
Anderson, Ohio	Doughton	Konop	Russell
Ansberry	Dupre	Korbly	Sabath
Ashbrook	Edwards	Lamb	Saunders
Ayres	Faison	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Barnhart	Ferris	Lee, Pa.	Shackleford
Bartlett	Fitzgerald	Legare	Sharp
Bathrick	Flood, Va.	Lever	Sheppard
Beall, Tex.	Floyd, Ark.	Levy	Sherley
Bell, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Lewis	Sherwood
Blackmon	Francis	Linthicum	Sims
Booher	Garner	Littlepage	Sisson
Borland	Garrett	Littleton	Slayden
Brantley	Glass	Lloyd	Small
Brown	Godwin, N. C.	Lobeck	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan	Goeke	McCoy	Sparkman
Bulkley	Goodwin, Ark.	McGillicuddy	Stanley
Burke, Wis.	Gordon	Macon	Stedman
Burleson	Gould	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Gray	Maher	Stephens, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gregg, Pa.	Martin, Colo.	Stone
Byrns, Tenn.	Gregg, Tex.	Mays	Sulzer
Callaway	Gudger	Moon, Tenn.	Sweet
Candler	Hamill	Moore, Tex.	Talbott, Md.
Cantrill	Hamlin	Morrison	Taylor, Ala.
Carlin	Hammond	Moss, Ind.	Thayer
Carter	Hardwick	Murray	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Hardy	Oldfield	Townsend
Claypool	Harrison, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Tribble
Clayton	Harrison, N. Y.	Padgett	Turnbull
Cline	Hay	Page	Tuttle
Collier	Helm	Patten, N. Y.	Underhill
Connell	Henry, Tex.	Pepper	Underwood
Covington	Holland	Peters	Watkins
Cox, Ind.	Houston	Post	Whitacre
Cox, Ohio	Howard	Pou	Wickliffe
Cravens	Hughes, Ga.	Pujo	Wilson, N. Y.
Cullop	Hughes, N. J.	Rainey	Wilson, Pa.
Daugherty	Hull	Raker	Witherspoon
Davis, W. Va.	Humphreys, Miss.	Randell, Tex.	Young, Tex.
Dent	Jacoway	Rauch	The Speaker
Denver	James	Reilly	
Dickinson	Johnson, Ky.	Richardson	
Dickson, Miss.	Johnson, S. C.	Robinson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Cary	Kinkead, N. J.

NOT VOTING—75.

Ames	Burke, Pa.	Driscoll, D. A.	Fornes
Andrus	Campbell	Driscoll, M. E.	Fowler
Anthony	Conry	Ellerbe	Gallagher
Bates	Crumpacker	Estopinal	Gardner, Mass.
Bingham	Curley	Evans	Gardner, N. J.
Boehne	Currier	Fairchild	George
Bradley	Davenport	Fields	Goldfogle
Broussard	De Forest	Finley	Graham
Burgess	Draper	Focht	Griest

Hamilton, W. Va.	Loudenslager	Payne	Smith, N. Y.
Heald	McCreary	Plumley	Stack
Heflin	McGuire, Okla.	Ransdell, La.	Talcott, N. Y.
Hensley	McHenry	Redfield	Taylor, Colo.
Higgins	McKenzie	Riordan	Tilson
Hobson	Mitchell	Rouse	Vreeland
Hughes, W. Va.	Moon, Pa.	Sells	Webb
Lafta	Morse, Wis.	Simmons	Weeks
Lindsay	Olmsted	Slemp	White
Longworth	Palmer	Smith, Cal.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Until further notice:

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. MCHENRY with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. STACK with Mr. SIMMONS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. HIGGINS.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. HEALD.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. DRAPER.

From April 6 to April 14, inclusive:

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. WEEKS.

From April 11 to April 14, noon:

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. MCCREARY.

Until Monday, April 17:

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. BATES.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

For this vote:

Mr. CURLEY (against) with Mr. DE FOREST (in favor).

Mr. GEORGE (against) with Mr. ANTHONY (in favor).

Mr. ROUSE (against) with Mr. GRIEST (in favor).

Mr. CONRY (against) with Mr. SELLS (in favor).

Mr. ELLERBE (against) with Mr. CAMPBELL (in favor).

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. CARY:

On page 8 add: "That there be and there is hereby proposed the following amendment to the Constitution, which, when ratified as the Constitution prescribes, shall become effective as a part of the Constitution, as follows:

"That there be, and there is hereby, proposed the following amendment to the Constitution, which, when ratified as the Constitution prescribes, shall become and be effective as part of the Constitution, as follows:

"'SEC. 1. Members and Delegates to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States shall be elected after the passage of this bill for a term of four years.

"'SEC. 2. Said election shall take place at the time and on the day prescribed by law for the casting of the popular vote for President of the United States, and in the manner prescribed by law by the different States and Territories.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. MANN:

Amend page 2, line 4, by inserting after the word "by" the following, "a direct vote of."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, also offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, lines 7 and 8, by striking out the word "legislatures" and inserting the word "legislature."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe I would like to see the gentleman from Illinois gain one victory in this contest, and I therefore hope this amendment will be accepted. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, line 15, by striking out the words "that the legislature of any State may empower," and, in line 16, by striking out the word "to" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, also by Mr. MANN.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 2, line 18, by striking out the words "so" and "as."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the following amendment be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely: In lieu of the first and second paragraphs of section 3 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America, the following shall be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution:

"'SEC. 3. That the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be elected by a direct vote of the people thereof for a term of six years, and each Senator shall have one vote; a plurality of the votes cast for candidates for Senator shall elect, and the electors shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"'When vacancies happen, by resignation or otherwise, in the representation of any State in the Senate, the same shall be filled for the unexpired term thereof in the same manner as is provided for the election of Senators in paragraph 1: *Provided*, That the executive thereof shall make temporary appointment until the next general or special election, held in accordance with the statutes or constitution of such State.'

"This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the joint resolution.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. The yeas and nays!

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain the membership of this House here by calling for the yeas and nays, because I believe the House is practically a unit on this measure. But if gentlemen want a yea-and-nay vote, there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 296, nays 16, answered "present" 0, not voting 77, as follows:

YEAS—296.

Adair	Burleson	Davis, Minn.	Glass
Adamson	Burnett	Davis, W. Va.	Godwin, N. C.
Aiken, S. C.	Butler	Dent	Goeke
Akin, N. Y.	Byrnes, S. C.	Denver	Good
Alexander	Byrns, Tenn.	Dickinson	Goodwin, Ark.
Allen	Calder	Dickson, Miss.	Gordon
Anderson, Minn.	Callaway	Dies	Gould
Anderson, Ohio	Candler	Difenderfer	Gray
Ansberry	Cantrill	Dixon, Ind.	Greene
Ashbrook	Carlin	Donohoe	Gregg, Pa.
Austin	Carter	Doremus	Gregg, Tex.
Ayres	Cary	Doughton	Gudger
Barchfeld	Catlin	Dupre	Guernsey
Barnhart	Clark, Fla.	Dyer	Hamill
Bartholdt	Claypool	Edwards	Hamilton, Mich.
Bartlett	Clayton	Esch	Hamlin
Bathrick	Cline	Faison	Hammond
Beall, Tex.	Collier	Farr	Hanna
Bell, Ga.	Connell	Ferris	Hardwick
Berger	Cooper	Fitzgerald	Hardy
Blackmon	Copley	Flood, Va.	Harrison, Miss.
Booher	Covington	Floyd, Ark.	Harrison, N. Y.
Borland	Cox, Ind.	Foss	Hartman
Bowman	Cox, Ohio	Foster, Ill.	Haugen
Brantley	Crago	Foster, Vt.	Hawley
Brown	Cravens	Francis	Hay
Buchanan	Cullop	French	Hayes
Bulkley	Dalzell	Fuller	Helgesen
Burke, S. Dak.	Daugherty	Garner	Helm
Burke, Wis.	Davidson	Garrett	Henry, Conn.

Henry, Tex.	Levy	Patton, Pa.	Smith, Tex.
Hill	Lewis	Pepper	Sparkman
Holland	Lindbergh	Peters	Speer
Houston	Linthicum	Pickett	Stanley
Howard	Littlepage	Porter	Stedman
Howell	Littleton	Post	Steenerson
Howland	Lloyd	Pou	Stephens, Cal.
Hubbard	Lobeck	Powers	Stephens, Miss.
Hughes, Ga.	Loud	Pray	Stephens, Tex.
Hughes, N. J.	McCoy	Prince	Sterling
Hull	McGillicuddy	Prouty	Stone
Humphrey, Wash.	McKinley	Pujo	Sulzer
Humphreys, Miss.	McKinney	Rainey	Sweet
Jackson	McLaughlin	Raker	Switzer
Jacoway	Macon	Randell, Tex.	Talbott, Md.
James	Madden	Rauch	Taylor, Ala.
Johnson, Ky.	Madison	Rees	Taylor, Ohio
Johnson, S. C.	Maguire, Nebr.	Reilly	Thayer
Jones	Maher	Richardson	Thomas
Kahn	Martin, Colo.	Roberts, Mass.	Towner
Kendall	Martin, S. Dak.	Roberts, Nev.	Townsend
Kennedy	Matthews	Robinson	Tribble
Kent	Mays	Roddenbery	Turnbull
Kindred	Miller	Rodenberg	Tuttle
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Mondell	Rothermel	Underhill
Kinkead, N. J.	Moon, Tenn.	Rubey	Underwood
Kipp	Moore, Pa.	Rucker, Colo.	Volstead
Kitchin	Moore, Tex.	Rucker, Mo.	Warburton
Knowland	Morgan	Russell	Watkins
Konig	Morrison	Sabath	Wedemeyer
Konop	Moss, Ind.	Saunders	Whitacre
Kopp	Mott	Scully	White
Korbly	Murdock	Shackleford	Wickliffe
Lafean	Murray	Sharp	Willis
Lafferty	Needham	Sheppard	Wilson, Ill.
La Follette	Nelson	Sherley	Wilson, N. Y.
Lamb	Norris	Sherwood	Wilson, Pa.
Langham	Nye	Sims	Witherspoon
Langley	Oldfield	Sisson	Wood, N. J.
Lee, Ga.	O'Shaunessy	Slayden	Woods, Iowa
Lee, Pa.	Padgett	Sloan	Young, Kans.
Legare	Page	Small	Young, Mich.
Lenroot	Parran	Smith, J. M. C.	Young, Tex.
Lever	Patten, N. Y.	Smith, Saml. W.	The Speaker

NAYS—16.

Cannon	Fordney	McCall	Mann
Danforth	Harris	McDermott	Sulloway
Dodds	Hinds	McMorran	Utter
Dwight	Lawrence	Malby	Wilder

NOT VOTING—77.

Ames	Ellerbe	Hensley	Redfield
Andrus	Estopinal	Higgins	Riordan
Anthony	Evans	Hobson	Rouse
Bates	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Sells
Bingham	Fields	Latta	Simmons
Boehne	Finley	Lindsay	Slemp
Bradley	Focht	Longworth	Smith, Cal.
Broussard	Fornes	Loudenslager	Smith, N. Y.
Burgess	Fowler	McCreary	Stack
Burke, Pa.	Gallagher	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, Minn.
Campbell	Gardner, Mass.	McHenry	Talcott, N. Y.
Conry	Gardner, N. J.	McKenzie	Taylor, Colo.
Crumpacker	George	Mitchell	Thistlewood
Curley	Gillett	Moon, Pa.	Tilson
Currier	Goldfogle	Morse	Vreeland
Davenport	Graham	Olmsted	Webb
De Forest	Griest	Palmer	Weeks
Draper	Hamilton, W. Va.	Payne	
Driscoll, D. A.	Heald	Plumley	
Driscoll, M. E.	Heflin	Ransdell, La.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So (two-thirds voting in the affirmative) the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. DE FOREST.

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. GILLETT.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. RUCKER of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LATTA, for three weeks, on account of illness.

To Mr. RUSSELL, for three days, on account of illness.

To Mr. HENSLEY, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. LONGWORTH, for three days, on account of important business.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is half past 7 o'clock, and I will object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 14, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examinations of channel connecting Red and Sulphur Rivers, Arkansas and Texas (H. Doc. No. 12), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska. A bill (H. R. 4641) to make immediately available the $25,000 appropriation authorized by the sundry civil act of the third session, Sixty-first Congress, for additional office work in the office of the surveyors general; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4642), to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee and loyal Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4643) to establish a mussel hatchery and fish-cultural station on the Wabash River in the fifth congressional district of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4644) to pay the balance due depositors in the Freedman's Savings and Trust Co.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4645) to make it unlawful for certain Federal officeholders to serve as delegates in a convention called to nominate a President of the United States or other elective United States officers; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4646) for the purpose of exempting lime nitrogen, an agricultural fertilizer, from import duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4647) for the erection of a monumental statue in the city of Florence, Ala., to Gen. John Coffee; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 4648) to amend section 108, chapter 5, of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4649) to amend section 108, chapter 5, of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4650) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey to the city of Providence, State of Rhode Island, the building formerly used as United States post office, courthouse, and customhouse; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4651) in relation to restraining orders and injunctions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4652) to make October 12 in each year a public holiday, to be called "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4653) to repeal the duty on coal and coal slack or culm; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4654) to repeal the duty on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4655) to repeal the duty on bitumen and asphaltum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4656) to provide for the erection of an Army and Navy hospital at Marlin, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4657) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4658) to amend section 5278 of the Revised Statutes of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4659) for the erection of a Federal building for the United States post office at Belton, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4660), to restore the merchant marine in the foreign trade, to regulate commerce with foreign nations, to overcome the disadvantages of American navigation, to make preference for American ships in export trade, to put the postal service by sea under general regulations, to put an end to foreign monopoly of our over-sea commerce, and to secure American independence on the ocean; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 4661) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 4662) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4663) to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to adopt uniform rules for the operation of railroad trains and to use a uniform system of signals for authorizing the movement of railroad trains; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 4664) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of automobiles engaged in interstate commerce and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 4665) to provide for the erection of a Federal building at Elyria, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4666) to establish a national memorial home for aged and infirm colored people and working girls in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4667) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4668) to amend the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4669) relating to the naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4670) to further regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4671) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Palo Alto, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4672) for the enlargement of the Federal building at San Jose, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4673) to further regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4674) extending the limits of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4675) to amend the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4676) to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4677) to regulate the coming into and the residence within the United States of Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Tartars, Malays, Afghans, East Indians, Lascars, Hindoos, and other persons of the Mongolian or Asiatic race, and persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tartar, Malayan, Afghan, East Indian, Hindoo, or other Mongolian extraction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4678) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4679) to provide for the erection of a lighthouse on Pilar Point, at the entrance to Half Moon Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4680) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 4681) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of New York; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4682) authorizing the construction of a railroad, tramroad, conveyor, wagon, or foot bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Glenhayes Station, in Wayne County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 4683) to authorize the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Crow Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands therein, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4684) to provide an additional district judge for the district of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4685) to amend section 1 of the act of May 30, 1908, entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment"; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 4686) for the preservation of the 29 Doric columns taken from the east side of the United States Treasury Building, and their erection in the form of a colonnade, stadium, or amphitheater for the ornamentation of Potomac Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEVY (by request): A bill (H. R. 4687) to amend the act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4688) in relation to contempts of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 4689) to provide for the erection of a public building at Montgomery, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4690) to provide for the erection of a public building at Beckley, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4691) to provide for the erection of a public building at St. Albans, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4692) to provide for the erection of a public building at Ronceverte, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4693) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 4694) to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the children's bureau; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 4695) to authorize the sale of burnt timber on the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4696) granting pensions to widows of soldiers and sailors who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the late War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4697) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served more than 90 days in the military or naval service of the United States in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4698) authorizing States and Territories to select lands in lieu of lands included within forest reserves; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4699) providing for the compensation of States and Territories for lands included within forest reserves; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 4700) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannon or mortars to the State armory, Pittston, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4701) to provide for the erection of a public building at New Braunfels, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4702) to provide for the erection of a monument on the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate the services of the United States Signal Corps during the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 4703) to establish a department in the Congressional Library for the purpose of gathering and indexing statute-law material and legal material of a comparative nature, and to provide for draftsmen for congressional measures, and to otherwise assist and aid Members of Congress and public officials; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 4704) making appropriations and providing for a continuing contract for the construction, repair, and preservation of public work on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4705) to establish a National Memorial Home for aged and infirm colored people and for working girls; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 4706) granting to the city of Los Angeles certain rights of way in, over, and through certain public lands and national forests in the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 4707) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Chariton, in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4708) to regulate the rank of staff officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4709) to repeal the appropriation for the reconstruction of certain improvements at the Edgemoor Lighthouse Depot, Del., $30,000, found on page 77 of the act of March 4, 1911, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4710) to increase the compensation of rural letter carriers to $90 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4711) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of West Point, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4712) to construct a road from Fort McPherson, Ga., to the rifle range and military reservation near Waco, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4713) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase part of the McIntosh Reservation, in Carroll County, Ga., and erect a monument thereon; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4714) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 4715) to amend "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909, so as to place certain necessaries of life on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 4716) for the relief of certain counties in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 4717) authorizing an investigation with a view to securing allotments for the Choctaws of Mississippi and Seminoles of Florida; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4718) to authorize the use of certain unclaimed moneys now in the registry of the United States circuit court for the northern district of Ohio for the improvement of the libraries of the United States courts for said district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 4719) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to allot and assign a space in the chapel of the United States Naval Academy for a memorial window; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4720) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Fostoria, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4721) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Crestline, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 4722) to provide for the building of a public avenue on the south side of the Potomac River from the city of Washington to Mount Vernon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4723) to provide the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and National Guard with a suitable rifle range for small-arms practice near Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4724) to provide for a new superstructure for the Aqueduct Bridge across the Potomac River and to lay thereon a concrete floor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4725) to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from Washington to the Arlington estate property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 4726) relating to bills of lading; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 4727) providing for the protection of the interests of the United States in lands and waters comprising any part of the Anacostia River, or Eastern Branch, and lands adjacent thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4728) authorizing a resurvey of township 11 north, range 8, west of the fifth principal meridian, in Arkansas; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4729) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of churches, lodges, and educational or eleemosynary institutions arising from the late Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4730) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Beaufort, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4731) to increase the salaries of rural free-delivery carriers of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4732) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station at Canyon City, Randall County, Tex.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4733) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4734) for acquiring national forests at the headwaters of Red River, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 82) to amend Rule X of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolution (H. Res. 83) to amend paragraph 4 of Rule XXVI; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 84) requesting certain data from the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: Resolution (H. Res. 85) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish certain information as to places as to which authorization or appropriation has been made for a public building or a site for a public building, by legislation of the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, or Sixty-first Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) to create and creating a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) directing the Secretary of War to sell certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) to provide for the transportation by sea of men, material, stores, and equipment for account of the United States, and of material, stores, and equipment for use in the construction or maintenance of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) to amend joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission in relation to universal peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 67) to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Memorial of the Legislature of Tennessee, urging return of direct cotton tax, etc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Tennessee, urging a constitutional amendment prohibiting practice of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 4735) granting an increase of pension to William J. Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4736) granting an increase of pension to Conrad C. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4737) for the relief of Mary Perkinson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4738) for the relief of H. T. Cunningham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4739) for the relief of the heirs of Willis Miller, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4740) for the relief of the estate of Dolly Jones; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4741) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry Callier, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4742) for the relief of the legal representatives of W. L. Gordon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4743) to compensate P. K. Leathers for services rendered the United States in the prosecution of William T. Head and others in the Circuit Court for the Northern District of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4744) to compensate the legal representatives of Henry S. Castellaw for stock and provisions taken for the use of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4745) to compensate W. T. Godwin for transportation, rent, and supplies furnished United States authorities engaged in suppressing a riot in Harris County, Ga., in 1867; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4746) granting an increase of pension to George H. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4747) granting an increase of pension to Michael McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) granting a pension to Oliver Milroy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) granting a pension to Lewis Kingseed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4750) granting a pension to Isaac K. Bingaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) granting a pension to William Bensinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 4752) granting an increase of pension to George Coffet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4753) granting an increase of pension to Curtis C. Griffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Westhafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) granting an increase of pension to John Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 4756) granting an increase of pension to John S. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4758) granting an increase of pension to Amelia Grosscup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4759) granting an increase of pension to William Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 4760) for the relief of Nancy E. Latimer, executrix of the estate of D. E. Knoles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4761) for the relief of the heirs of Solomon Cohen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 4762) for the relief of Hiram Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of Hiram Smith and John R. W. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4764) for the relief of John H. Chapman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4765) granting an increase of pension to James Uphold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4766) granting a pension to Dora Dee Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4767) granting a pension to Ernest E. Pearsall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4768) for the relief of the estate of Simon Brown, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph G. Thorpe, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4770) for the relief of Michael De Loach; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4771) for the relief of heirs of Elizabeth T. Davis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4772) for the relief of John H. Ruddell, administrator of the estate of Reuben R. Turner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4773) for the relief of W. W. Weekley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4774) for the relief of A. R. Speaks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of the heirs of T. B. Fripp, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4776) for the relief of James T. Dowling; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4777) for the relief of Pierson Peeples; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4778) for the relief of the heirs of Allen Fanning, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) for the relief of the trustees of Columbia Baptist Church; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) for the relief of Harmony Lodge, No. 17, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, at Barnwell, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) for the relief of Great Salkehatchie Baptist Church, of Barnwell County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) for the relief of Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4783) for the relief of Mount Pleasant Baptist Church, of Barnwell County, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4784) for the relief of the estate of John Fripp, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) for the relief of the estate of Stephen A. Kittles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4786) for the relief of the estate of Richard N. Kittles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) for the relief of Miss Evalina A. E. Fripp; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4788) granting an increase of pension to George R. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4789) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to pay arrearage to Thomas F. Haywood, Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 4790) granting a pension to Dora E. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 4791) for the relief of the heirs of David R. Hubbard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4792) for relief of estate of Marcus Cook, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Church of Kossuth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Christian Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4795) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Presbyterian Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Baptist Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) to carry into effect findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Corinth, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 4798) granting a pension to William A. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4799) granting a pension to Elmer E. Dickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4800) for the relief of estate of Amos Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4801) for the relief of the trustees of Back Lick Church, now known as the Beulah Baptist Church, of Franconia, Fairfax County, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4802) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Second Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4803) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Harry V. Hoes, administrator of Theodore Hoes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 4804) granting an increase of pension to George W. Van De Bogert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 4805) granting an increase of pension to Palmer Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4806) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hamacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) granting an increase of pension to John Jeffries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) granting an increase of pension to John H. Leasure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) granting an increase of pension to John Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4810) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Edington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) granting an increase of pension to Richard T. Stott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 4814) granting an increase of pension to Albert Shaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) granting an increase of pension to John J. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4816) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Dalzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) granting an increase of pension to Harvey McCracken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) granting an increase of pension to Almon G. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) granting an increase of pension to William Petrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) granting an increase of pension to John Snay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 4822) granting an increase of pension to George Claxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) granting an increase of pension to Florida Kennerly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Hepps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4825) granting a pension to William L. Woestendiek; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4826) for the relief of the heirs of Jackson Grooms; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4827) for the relief of Bartholomew Buckley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4828) for the relief of John H. Drosselmeier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4829) to correct the military record of Allen Barnes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 4830) for the relief of Dr. C. D. Royall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4831) for the relief of the heirs of Francis M. Stone; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4832) for the relief of the heirs of Francis H. McLeod; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4833) for the relief of the estate of C. Royal, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 4834) granting a pension to Sarah J. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 4835) granting pension to James E. Whipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 4836) granting an increase of pension to George H. Ruth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 4837) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Fones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 4838) granting an increase of pension to Leonidas Leathers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Lawry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4840) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) granting an increase of pension to Eliakiam Byard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4843) granting an increase of pension to Adna T. Cushman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) granting an increase of pension to James R. Eaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) granting an increase of pension to Boardman C. Friend; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) granting a pension to George N. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 4847) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Rutter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) granting a pension to I. G. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4849) granting an increase of pension to Philip Ehresman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 4850) for the relief of Mrs. Mary W. Bailey, W. A. Jordon, Mrs. M. E. Turlington, and Ephram J. Jordan, heirs of Ephram J. Jordan, sr., deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 4851) granting a pension to Charles A. Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) granting a pension to Charles A. Lyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) for the relief of Jeremiah C. Conkling; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) for the relief of Thomas P. Curren; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) for the relief of Jasper J. Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) for the relief of Elizabeth J. Bishop; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) for the relief of certain officers of the Second Regiment Louisiana Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4858) granting an increase of pension to William E. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) granting a pension to Morinthia Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) granting a pension to Sophronia Beverly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) for the relief of Nancy E. Wright, heir of Melvil Wilkerson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) for the relief of Nancy Pierson, widow, and the heirs of John Hogue Pierson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) for the relief of W. A. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) for the relief of the heirs of James Tandy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Senter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel F. Ryan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4867) granting an increase of pension to Sue E. Madden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Plybon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4869) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) granting an increase of pension to Andy Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4871) granting a pension to Henderson Branham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4872) granting a pension to Emily Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) granting a pension to Electra Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) for the relief of James Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4875) granting an increase of pension to Charles Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) granting an increase of pension to Clark Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 4877) granting a pension to Mary A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4878) granting a pension to James A. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 4879) granting an increase of pension to Thomas KeChittigo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) granting an increase of pension to Joshua B. Hartzog; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) granting an increase of pension to Frank La Flame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4884) granting a pension to Anna Meilstrup; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 4885) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4886) granting an increase of pension to Byron F. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 4887) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Hugg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) granting a pension to James Murray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: a bill (H. R. 4889) granting an increase of pension to James Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) granting an increase of pension to Michael Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4892) for the relief of Frederick Leser, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 4893) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Claypool; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4894) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4895) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4896) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4897) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) granting an increase of pension to Gustav Lenau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) granting a pension to William T. Bowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 4900) granting an increase of pension to Munson M. Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 4901) granting a pension to George W. Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4902) granting a pension to Francis M. Wall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 4903) for the relief of heirs or estate of Thomas Washington Tompkins, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4904) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Burk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) granting an increase of pension to George P. McKee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) granting an increase of pension to Felix G. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4907) granting an increase of pension to William C. Armor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4908) granting an increase of pension to Warren G. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4909) granting an increase of pension to James Chaplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4910) granting an increase of pension to John A. Kersey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4911) granting an increase of pension to James W. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) granting an increase of pension to Cealon Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Levsay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4914) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4915) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan K. Rollins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gulliford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4917) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Beshore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4918) granting an increase of pension to Cicero Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4919) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. La Boyteaux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4921) granting a pension to Clement Holderman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) granting a pension to Etta Cronin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) granting a pension to Fillmore Pettyford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) granting a pension to Mary J. Brophy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) granting a pension to Robert A. Talbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4926) granting a pension to Gertrude Ballou; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4927) granting a pension to Edward F. Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) for the relief of Frank Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) to correct the military record of Joseph Elshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) authorizing the payment of a claim to Tolivar B. Clark; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 4931) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Mullens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4932) granting an increase of pension to August Brockmyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4933) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Chick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4934) granting an increase of pension to George D. Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4935) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Klammer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Layman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4938) granting an increase of pension to William Redus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4939) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 4940) granting an increase of pension to Robert Barbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan B. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4942) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4943) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) granting an increase of pension to E. G. Falkner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) granting an increase of pension to William Carroll McKinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4947) granting a pension to Mary T. Parrish; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) granting a pension to J. L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) granting a pension to Bettie Brock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) granting a pension to Albert M. Geiger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) granting a pension to John E. Sanford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting a pension to Sandy G. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4953) granting a pension to Doc L. Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) granting a pension to John S. Edmonds; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4955) granting a pension to Joseph Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4956) granting a pension to John Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4957) granting a pension to Julia Cartwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4958) granting a pension to Louisa Margaret Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4959) granting a pension to James Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4960) granting a pension to James M. Hankins and William M. Hankins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4961) granting a pension to Robert Whittaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) granting a pension to Moses A. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) granting a pension to John Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4964) granting a pension to David R. Bellomy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4965) granting a pension to Isaac N. Bynum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) granting a pension to James A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4967) granting a pension to James Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to John Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) granting a pension to Louisa Margaret Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4970) granting a pension to Julia Cartwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4971) granting a pension to Levi P. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4972) granting a pension to Samuel Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4973) granting a pension to Nancy Shelton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4974) granting a pension to Mary A. Precise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4975) granting a pension to S. F. Kennamer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4976) granting a pension to Henry Pullam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4977) granting a pension to Elizabeth McKinn Friar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4978) for the relief of William M. Underwood; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4979) for the relief of Amanda M. Warren; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4980) for the relief of Mary B. Dancy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4981) for the relief of Mrs. H. H. Cribbs; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4982) for the relief of James Eli Schrimsher; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4983) for the relief of Bettie Linder, administratrix of B. Franks, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4984) for the relief of B. G. Chandler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4985) for the relief of B. F. Ludwig; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4986) for the relief of Sallie C. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4987) for the relief of Stephen Fanning; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4988) for the relief of William M. Hilliard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4989) for the relief of William C. Bragg; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4990) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Raney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4991) for the relief of Elisha Stogsdill; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4992) for the relief of Mary J. Bailey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4993) for the relief of Samuel H. Yarbrough and estate of John Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4994) for the relief of Bathsheba Gordon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4995) for the relief of William W. Callahan, administrator of the estate of Thomas Gibbs; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Parks S. Townsend; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4997) for the relief of John Smaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4998) for the relief of John W. McAfee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4999) for the relief of John T. Lehman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Pleasant Springs, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5001) for the relief of James A. Allen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5002) for the relief of Amanda M. Warren; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5003) for the relief of James Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5004) for the relief of Samuel H. Yarbrough and heirs of John Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5005) for the relief of Jonathan Morris, executor of Jonathan Morris, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5006) for the relief of R. D. Crosthwaite, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5007) for the relief of Mary Tullis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5008) for the relief of Littleton McCloud and Bill Mull; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5009) for the relief of James T. Dowdy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5010) for the relief of Martha J. Sibley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5011) for the relief of Thomas W. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5012) for the relief of John T. Graves; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5013) for the relief of James Henry and Porter Henry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5014) for the relief of George M. Harraway; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5015) for the relief of Mattie P. Barnard, Katharine Caldwell, and Henry M. Rhett, heirs of Harriett M. Barnard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5016) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Trousdale; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5017) for the relief of Nancy M. Weaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5018) for the relief of Samuel W. Shackelford, trustee of Susan A. Shackelford; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5019) for the relief of Dan Walden; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5020) for the relief of Mattie H. Ligon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5021) for the relief of J. W. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5022) for the relief of Parks S. Townsend; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5023) for the relief of the trustees of the Chestnut Grove Church, in Morgan County, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5024) for the relief of the estate of Jesse Vann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5025) for the relief of the executor or administrator of the estate of C. C. Spiller, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5026) for the relief of William Moseley, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5027) for the relief of W. C. Tipton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5028) for the relief of John C. Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5029) for the relief of Houston L. Bell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5030) for the relief of Nancy Coffey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5031) for the relief of John T. Graves; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5032) for the relief of Griffin Callahan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5033) for the relief of Dr. Ira G. Wood; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5034) for the relief of Francis Wilkes; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5035) for the relief of J. W. Smart; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5036) for the relief of Phillip D. Wright; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5037) for the relief of Mrs. Casea Simpson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5038) for the relief of William J. Wilcoxson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5039) for the relief of William Cunningham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5040) for the relief of B. F. Hembree; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5041) for the relief of Alfred O. Williamson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5042) for the relief of James G. Porter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5043) for the relief of Boling King; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5044) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Robert Herstein, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5045) for the relief of heirs of J. P. McGaha, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5046) for the relief of heirs of Lemuel Hannah, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5047) for the relief of heirs of Josian White, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5048) for the relief of heirs of Andrew C. Legg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5049) for the relief of heirs of Mathew N. Grimmett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5050) for the relief of heirs of Elizabeth Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of heirs of Benjamin Lawler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5052) for the relief of heirs of J. R. B. Eldridge, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5053) for the relief of the heirs of Kennon H. Steger, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5054) for the relief of heirs of Thomas Knight, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5055) for the relief of the heirs of James H. Ware, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5056) for the relief of heirs of Enoch R. and Louisa J. Kennedy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5057) for the relief of heirs of Preston Smith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5058) for the relief of heirs of Andrew J. Peacock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5059) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Logan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) for the relief of heirs of Sidney Tate, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5060) for the relief of Sidney Tate, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5061) for the relief of heirs of Alfred Hambrick, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5062) for the relief of heirs of Alexander F. Perryman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5063) for the relief of heirs of William Wann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5064) for the relief of heirs of W. J. Langston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5065) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah Schrimsher; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5066) for the relief of heirs of Mary McCaa, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5067) for the relief of the heirs of A. E. Mills, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5068) for the relief of the heirs of Eliah Matheny; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5069) for the relief of the heirs of Jane McCartney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of heirs or estates of Elbert H. and Melinda Ellett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5071) for the relief of the estate of Joseph A. Martin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5072) for the relief of the estate of Enoch R. Kennedy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5073) for the relief of the estate of John Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5074) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin Snodgrass; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5075) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5076) for the relief of the estate of W. W. McCrary; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5077) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Melissa Gathright, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of the estate of Marius B. Cawthon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of the estate of Alfred Hambrick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5081) for the relief of the estate of James Williams, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of the estate of Peter S. Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5083) for the relief of the estate of Bradford Hambrick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5084) for the relief of the estate of John Sibley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5085) for the relief of the estate of James H. Ware, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5086) for the relief of the estate of A. L. Logan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5087) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Knight, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5088) for the relief of the estate of John Walston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5089) for the relief of the estate of Mathew N. Grimmett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5090) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin B. Coffey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5091) for the relief of the estate of William P. Tanner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ingram, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5093) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. G. Mason, administrator of estates of Glorvinia Mason, and John O. Mason, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5094) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of David B. Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of the legal heirs of James I. Donegan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5096) to refer the claim of Nancy Taylor against the United States to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5097) to refer the claim against the United States of the heirs of Fabian Varin to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5098) granting an increase of pension to Alford J. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5099) granting an increase of pension to John J. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5100) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5101) granting a pension to James Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5102) granting a pension to Richard A. Gamble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5103) granting a pension to John Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 5104) granting an increase of pension to Conrad Hamman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5105) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McQuate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5106) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5107) granting an increase of pension to Charles Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5108) granting a pension to Estella M. Manville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5109) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5110) granting a pension to Lydia L. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5111) granting a pension to Hannah M. Seeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5112) granting a pension to Delilah Worley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5113) granting a pension to Austin L. Straub; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5114) granting a pension to Charles J. Pfahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 5115) granting a pension to Jerry R. Daniel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5116) for the relief of R. R. Russell, Irve W. Ellis, J. L. Borroum, N. H. Corder, and Wooten & Vasbinder; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5117) to pay the claim of Mrs. Charles H. Benson, of San Antonio, Tex., for damages done to her phaeton by a caisson of the Third Regiment United States Field Artillery; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5118) to pay Henry Fink for the loss of a horse killed by United States soldiers while at target practice; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5119) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Harris L. Roberts, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 5120) granting an increase of pension to Archibald McLain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5121) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Blades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5122) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Manchester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5123) granting an increase of pension to Philip Gavin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 5124) granting an increase of pension to William H. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 5125) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 5126) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Clement Lamoureaux; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 5127) granting an increase of pension to John Tidball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5128) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Lusk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5129) granting a pension to Clara S. Ickis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 5130) granting a pension to Teresa Mindermann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 5131) granting an increase of pension to Moses M. Crants; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5132) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Fogarty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5133) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 5134) granting a pension to Henry D. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5135) to correct the military record of John J. Troxell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5136) granting an increase of pension to Peter Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Paper to accompany bill for increase of pension for George H. Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of E. D. Rutledge & Co. and 7 other business men of Minerva, Ohio, in opposition to the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BROWN: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Hiram Smith and John R. W. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Petition of Dr. G. Caruso and other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the tariff on Italian lemons, and requesting that they be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of citizens of Upper Uwchlan, East Nautmeal, West Vincent, and Wallace Townships, of Pennsylvania, relative to cold storage of food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill to increase pension of George R. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: Protest by the Auxiliary of the Postal Clerks of Kendallville, Ind., relative to the condition of men employed in the postal service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of Niagara Alkali Co. for imposition of an import duty on caustic potash, and of the New York Cordage Co. as to duty on cotton bagging; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Petition of R. G. Dakan, A. H. Gray, and others, with reference to the duty on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of J. F. Ligman and others, of Independence, Wis., favoring election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and in favor of retention of present duty on barley and on oleomargarine colored in imitation of butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Homer G. Sell, of Hillsdale, Ill., in opposition to Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., for a general old-age pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of La Salle, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in Interior Department.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of Congregational and Baptist Churches of Merrimac, Mass., for the passage of the bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquor in all Government buildings; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Congregational and Baptist Churches of Merrimac, Mass., for passage of Burkett-Sims bill to forbid interstate transmission of race-gambling odds and bets; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Amherst Grange, No. 16, Patrons of Husbandry, of Amherst, Mass., opposing passage of tariff agreement bill with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of residents of Lancaster, Pa., favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Resolutions of Highland Grange, No. 364, Patrons of Husbandry, of Penobscot, Me., protesting against the passage of the reciprocity measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Bolton Grange, No. 47, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bolton, Conn., in behalf of an improved parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of West Hartford Grange, No. 69, Patrons of Husbandry, of West Hartford, Conn., against the enactment of the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: Protest of H. J. Bishop and 52 other citizens of Jasper County, Iowa, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of numerous citizens of Appleton, Wis., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of E. L. Phillips and others, of New Bethlehem, Pa., in opposition to the reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petitions of numerous citizens of Cokato, Minn., and farmers and business men of Brandon, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Crow Wing County, Minn.; against Anglo-American alliance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles M. Kuhr, against sending troops to Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petitions of the Seward Republican Club, of New York; the Union League Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; and the New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Springfield, Pa., to withdraw the troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Resolutions of the electors of Sand Beach Township, Huron County, Mich., in opposition to Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of citizens of Moreland and citizens of Ames, Okla., requesting withdrawal of United States troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolutions of Three Mile Bay Grange, No. 128, of Three Mile Bay; Port Leyden Grange, No. 1037; Lower Oswego Falls Grange, of Fulton, N. Y.; River Bank Grange, No. 534, of River Bank; Granby Grange, of Granby; Mount Pleasant Grange, No. 349, of Mount Pleasant; Depauville Grange, No. 59; and Denmark Grange, No. 535, of Denmark, Patrons of Husbandry, all of the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of George W. Burgess and other citizens of the town of Granby, Oswego County; the Dilts Machine Works, of Fulton; Oxbow Grange, No. 691, of Oxbow; Orwell Grange, No. 66, of Orwell; Point Peninsula Grange, No. 1030, of Point Peninsula; Pamelia Grange, No. 68, of Pamelia; Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127, of Sandy Creek; Redwood Grange, No. 684, of Redwood; Phœnix Grange, No. 9, of Phœnix; West Monroe Grange, of West Monroe; and of Glenfield Grange, No. 548, of Glenfield, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity (H. R. 4412); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Eureka Paper Co., of Fulton, N. Y.; Albion Center Grange, No. 270, of Albion, N. Y.; and Chaumont Grange, No. 855, of Chaumont, N. Y., Patrons of Husbandry; Carthage Board of Trade, of Carthage, N. Y.; B. W. Bennett, of Fulton, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of The Gleaners, a Sunday-school class of the Methodist Episcopal Society; the Women's Missionary Society and the Progressive Men's Class of the Methodist Episcopal Society, of Rockingham and other towns; the combined Women's Missionary Societies of the churches of Bellows Falls, constituting about 500 persons in said Rockingham, favoring the Miller-Curtis bill, so called, prohibiting saloons in Hawaii, and the McCumber-Terrell bill, so called, concerning the opium trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Groton Grange, No. 443, of Groton, Vt., protesting against the proposed reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Groton Grange, No. 443, of Groton, Vt., protesting against increase of magazine postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. POST: Petition of the Empire Company, No. 68, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Fletcher, Miami County, Ohio, to pass more stringent laws for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of citizens of Hunt County, Tex., requesting immediate withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Petition of citizens of Sheffield, Pa., for the immediate recall of United States troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Toledo Lodge, International Association of Machinists, of Toledo, Ohio, urging illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of Greenwood Grange; Highland Grange, No. 22, of Catharine, Schuyler County; Stephens Mills, Fremont; Woodhull Grange, of Woodhull; Canisteo Grange, No. 460, of Canisteo; Pleasant Valley Grange, No. 408, of Urbana; Oak Hill Grange, No. 574, of South Dansville; Bath Grange, No. 294, of Bath; Romulus Grange, No. 1181, of Romulus; Caton Grange, No. 248, of Caton; Jasper Grange, No. 619; Avoca Grange, No. 176, of Avoca; Howard Grange, No. 976, of Howell; Chemung Valley Grange, No. 51, of Elmira; Lodi Grange, No. 213, of Lodi; Hornellsville Grange, No. 846, of Hornell; and Towlesville Grange, No. 430, all of the State of New York, against proposed reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Union League Club of New York, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Resolutions of Leopold Zung Lodge, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, located at Goldsboro, N. C., asking that all Senators and Members of Congress aid in the passage of any resolutions which call for the modification or abrogation of all treaty relations with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Resolutions adopted by board of officers of Second Regiment, National Guard of New Jersey, urging passage of bill providing for pay for the Organized Militia of United States; to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Somerset Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, of Middlebush, N. J., against passage of any measure restricting to a period of three months the maximum time for the cold storage of staple foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of S. T. McDonald and other veterans of the Civil War, of Rosewood, Ohio, asking for the passage of the Sherwood pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *April 14, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

During the reading the following occurred:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is so much confusion I am unable to hear what the Clerk is reading. It is not the fault of the Clerk. What is he reading?

The SPEAKER. He is supposed to be reading the Journal. The point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois is sustained, and the House will be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Has there been a demand made that the Journal shall be read in full, rather than a statement? If so, does that include the reading of the names of Members who voted?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk was not reading the names of Members who voted.

Mr. CANNON. I do not care at this time to demand the reading of the names. Of course I could, but it seems to me an exceedingly long Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk was reading the Journal in the usual way and will proceed.

The Clerk completed the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER announced the following change of reference:

A bill (H. R. 2900) to authorize the acceptance by the United States of the gift of the Nathan Straus Pasteurized Milk Laboratory; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Resolution (H. Res. 70) providing for a committee to investigate the method of enforcement of the antitrust act and other matters; Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice discharged, and referred to the Committee on Rules.

PRINTING RESOLUTIONS IN THE RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print the following resolution in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a certain memorial, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution asking for an investigation of the Taylor system of shop management.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. HARDWICK. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa, one of the able new Members of the House, is probably not familiar with the practice of the House, which is not to print memorials in the RECORD. If it is once begun there is no limit, and if once begun the RECORD becomes so bulky that we never can find the thing we want on account of the number of memorials.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if this is a memorial or a resolution?

Mr. PEPPER. It is a resolution.

The SPEAKER. A resolution with a preamble.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that it requires unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print it in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Has it been introduced?

The SPEAKER. It has not.

Mr. PEPPER. It is being introduced now.

Mr. MANN. I object; the proper method of introducing it is to put it in the basket.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 88.

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor be authorized to have such printing and binding done for the use of the committee as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 89.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the use of the committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 87.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House and during the recess of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 86.

Resolved, That the right of debate be extended to the two Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is during this Congress.

Mr. GARRETT. This Congress could not bind another. The language is the language used in the resolution that passed before.

Mr. MANN. They obtained the right to debate in two Congresses on that, yet I have no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. They got the right to debate in the second Congress merely because objection was not made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 745. An act providing for the erection of a statue to Thomas Jefferson at Washington, D. C.;

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a statue of Alexander Hamilton in Washington, D. C.; and

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States.

PUBLICITY OF ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 29585) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," approved June 25, 1910, be, and the same is hereby, amended by repealing all of sections 5 and 6 of said act and enacting the following new sections in lieu thereof, so that said act as amended shall read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That the treasurer of every such political committee shall, not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days next before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States, file in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., with said Clerk an itemized detailed statement; and on each sixth day thereafter until such election said treasurer shall file with said Clerk a supplemental itemized detailed statement. Each of said statements shall conform to the requirements of the following section of this act, except that the supplemental statement herein required need not contain any item of which publicity is given in a previous statement. Each of said statements shall be full and complete, and shall be signed and sworn to by said treasurer.

"It shall also be the duty of said treasurer to file a similar statement with the Clerk within 30 days after such election, such final statement also to be signed and sworn to by said treasurer and to conform to the requirements of the following section of this act. The statement so filed with the Clerk of the House shall be preserved by him for 15 months and shall be a part of the public records of his office and shall be open to public inspection.

"SEC. 6. That the statements required by the preceding section of this act shall state:

"First. The name and address of each person, firm, association, or committee who or which has contributed, promised, loaned, or advanced to such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof, either in one or more items, money or its equivalent of the aggregate amount or value of $100 or more, and the amount or sum contributed, promised, loaned, or advanced by each.

"Second. The aggregate sum contributed, promised, loaned, or advanced to such political committee, or to any officer, member, or agent thereof, in amounts of less than $100.

"Third. The total sum of all contributions, promises, loans, and advances received by such political committee or any officer, member, or agent thereof.

"Fourth. The name and address of each person, firm, association, or committee to whom such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof, has distributed, disbursed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised any sum of money or its equivalent of the amount or value of $100 or more, stating the amount or sum distributed, disbursed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised to each, and the purpose thereof.

"Fifth. The aggregate sum distributed, disbursed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised by such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof, where the amount or value of such distribution, disbursement, loan, advance, or promise to any one person, firm, association, or committee in one or more items is less than $100.

"Sixth. The total sum disbursed, distributed, contributed, loaned, advanced, or promised by such political committee, or any officer, member, or agent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just reported?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he has consulted the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] in reference to debate and amendment of the bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman, I will say that I had a brief conversation with the gentleman from Michigan yesterday, and it was my purpose to appeal to him before this request was made to know what arrangement, if any, we could make about debate. My understanding with the gentleman was that there would be no objection to this course, although he did not expressly say so.

Mr. AUSTIN. How about amendments to the bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Of course opportunity will be given to amend.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What, if any, opportunity will be allowed for debate?

Mr. MANN. That is what we are trying to ascertain.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I wanted to agree with the gentleman from Michigan as to the length of time for debate.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me ask the gentleman why he does not put this bill upon the Unanimous Consent Calendar? If this request be granted, will it not practically overthrow or destroy the practice under the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me to make a suggestion in reference to that, I will state that this is the only bill now on the calendar except the reciprocity bill. This is on the House Calendar. A call of committees will bring this bill before the House at once; so it is in a little different situation than it would be if there were a number of bills on the calendar and unanimous consent were being asked for its consideration.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Under the call of committees, perhaps, the question of right to debate might enter into consideration.

Mr. MANN. Under a call of committee, of course, this being on the House Calendar, the gentleman from Missouri would have the right at any time to move the previous question, which, if carried, would cut off debate and amendments. I understood that the gentleman from Missouri had or would agree to some arrangement for a proper time for debate on the bill, giving the time on this side to the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and on that side to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is my purpose, and no other purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I do not know how much time is required on this side. If gentlemen would indicate what they want, my impression is it will be found there will not be very much demand for time.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest that there be an hour on a side, with the right to offer amendments during that time, and either have the amendments pending then or else by unanimous consent read the bill under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. On our side that will be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to modify my request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill by adding to it that general debate proceed for two hours, and during that time any gentleman having the floor may offer amendment, the amendment to be considered as pending, and at the expiration of general debate the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to passage, one-half of the time of debate to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and one-half by myself, and I will say to him in that connection, we can yield more than one-half of the time if he has demand for it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the bill be considered by unanimous consent; that general debate proceed for two hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] and one-half by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], during which time any gentleman who speaks shall have the right to offer amendment, and that they shall all be considered as pending, and at the end of two hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending that request, I desire to give notice that as soon as this bill is disposed of I intend to call up the bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama gives notice that as soon as this corrupt-practices bill be disposed of he will call up for consideration the Canadian reciprocity bill. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress this House passed a publicity bill which was approved by the President of the United States on the 25th day of last June. The bill which passed the House, by practically a unanimous vote, carried a provision requiring publicity of campaign contributions and disbursements to be made before elections, as well as after elections. After the bill passed the House it was amended in another body by striking out the provisions requiring publicity before elections. The purpose of the bill now pending is to restore to the law the provisions of publicity before elections as well as after elections. The changes proposed in existing law by this bill, in addition to restoring the feature of publicity before elections, enlarges somewhat the requirements of publicity before elections. As the bill passed the House in the last Congress, it required the first statement to be made by political committees to be made not more than 15 nor less than 10 days next preceding the day of election. This bill goes a little further and requires a like statement, a supplemental statement, to be made each 6 days after the filing of the first statement until the day of election. These are the changes proposed in section 5 of the law. The other section proposed to be amended is section 6. As the law now stands, while committees are required to give publicity of the names and addresses of every person, firm, or association who contributed $100 or more, the amount contributed is not required by express language to be shown. It was the intention of the committee, and I believe the House so understood it, that the bill as it passed the House covers that point, but I do not think it does. In order to make it clear at least, the amendment proposed to section 6 of the existing law requires, in all cases where the amount contributed is $100 or more, that the committee shall give the names and places of residence of such contributors, together with a statement of the amount contributed by each, and another clause of the section requires similar publicity in reference to disbursements where the amount distributed to one person or committee is as much as $100. The amended law, if this bill should pass, would require the name and address of each person or committee to be stated in all instances where the amount contributed or received is $100 or more. These are the changes proposed. They do not change the general character of the law, but they seek to make it clearer and more efficient.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. In this bill is provision made for the publicity of accounts from a congressional committee in a single district? As the gentleman knows, we have in this country the large congressional committee, and in addition we have smaller congressional committees. Now, does this bill provide for publicity of accounts in the smaller congressional districts in a single district?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Answering the gentleman from Kansas, I will say that the bill does not contain provisions relating to the matters suggested by him.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why is that provision omitted?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman we are trying to draft and enact into law a measure of national scope and importance. We doubt the propriety and the legality of congressional action which would deal purely with a State matter. I believe that if this bill is passed the State of Kansas and the State of Missouri will adopt laws fashioned after it, requiring publicity from the committee, which the gentleman speaks of, before and after election. We deem it a matter of purely State control and not of national control, and therefore no legislation along the line suggested is attempted in this proposed amendment to our national publicity law.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do.

Mr. KENDALL. The operation of this law, then, when enacted would be confined entirely to the national congressional committees of the respective parties?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It would be confined entirely to committees which seek to influence elections in two or more States. It would be limited to the two principal committees of the two great parties.

Mr. KENDALL. Or the three great parties.

Mr. MANN. And the national committee, and every newspaper that circulates in more than one State.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. There is some question about that; we do not think so.

Mr. KENDALL. May I make this suggestion to the gentleman from Missouri? I did not understand the distinction which the gentleman deduced between the national congressional committee and the control of committees organized in the various congressional districts. I think there is not any differentiation between the two so far as respects their duties to report to the public as to contributions made and as to disbursements.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree with the gentleman. I think there is a doubt as to the power to compel them to do it. We have the power, I think, to compel a committee operating in more than one State, but I do not think that we have the power to provide for such publicity by committees whose operations are confined wholly to one State or one district.

Mr. KENDALL. Has the Congress any power to compel a Representative in Congress to make a report of disbursements in his campaign?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have not given special consideration to that question; but, conceding the power, I doubt the wisdom of such congressional interference with matters wholly within the jurisdiction and the power of the States to regulate and control.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri why it was that the amount of publication was fixed at $100?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not contain any such limitation.

Mr. CULLOP. It says $100 or more.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that where the amount contributed is $100 or more the committee shall give the name, address, and amount contributed by such contributor.

Mr. CULLOP. Why was it fixed, then, at any sum?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The reason is obvious, and I am sure my good friend from Indiana will agree with me. To require publicity as to each item might require such an endless amount of bookkeeping as would become cumbersome and destroy the very purpose of publicity.

Mr. CULLOP. Let me put this kind of case: A large manufacturer desires to contribute a larger sum. He employs 2,000 men. Suppose he gives each one of those men $99 and has him contribute it in his name? Now, are you killing that kind of evil with this kind of bill? Such a thing as that could be done, and has been done, and I fear will be done again.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, may I answer that suggestion?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] yield to the other gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; I always yield with pleasure to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] that if any plutocrat were to distribute a number of single sums around among individuals in that way, to be contributed by them, it would be in fact a contribution by him, and it would have to be published as though it were a single sum.

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; but the books of the committee or of the Clerk of the House of Representatives would not show that fact, and I am desirous of having this bill so perfected that it would reach that kind of condition and punish that kind of violator of the law.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty sympathy with the thought and the desire of the gentleman from Indiana, but I have given a great deal of consideration to this measure, and I believe it is now in the most available shape it can be put in, if we wish to give effect to the desire of Congress and respond to the demand of the people, and I fear that if we attempt by this law to go as far as some gentlemen desire we may so burden it as to destroy the law by its own weight.

Mr. CULLOP. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me submit another question to the gentleman: Could you not have put a provision in there whereby, when the report of the contribution to the committee was made, an affidavit would follow or accompany it, setting forth that contributions had been made in the name of other persons for some particular individual or corporation?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That would be practically to contradict the provisions of the law as it is written. The law requires them to make an itemized, detailed statement, giving the names of the contributors, but where contributions are made in sums less than $100 the aggregate is reported, and not the various items.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. The question I wanted to ask was this: You have seemingly a very far-reaching provision for the filing of the statement of contributions with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. What I wanted to know is whether there is any method by which that will become the property of the general public? Has anybody and everybody the right to inspect these reports when made, and may they be published in the newspapers?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Allow me to say to the gentleman that the pending amendment expressly provides these reports shall be filed in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, to be held by said Clerk as public documents and open to public inspection at all times.

Mr. HARDY. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is in the law now and will be preserved in the law if this bill passes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I desire to ask the gentleman if there is anything in the existing law or in the bill which he has reported from his committee that provides that the contributor shall identify himself, and that the treasurer of the campaign committee shall ascertain the identity of the contributor?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The committee has never deemed it necessary to do that, hence there is no such requirement in the bill. I am sure, answering the gentleman's question further, that nobody would contribute to the Democratic campaign fund who is ashamed to give his true name, and I do not believe any contributor to the other political party would conceal his name and identity.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman will acknowledge that some person desirous of contributing might make it known to the chairman of a congressional committee that he did wish to contribute, and he would intimate that contributions would come in due course of time that might be sent in to the treasurer on letters typewritten, signed "Tom," "Dick," "Harry," "John," and "William," and the treasurer would have no way, except as he might suspect, to know where it came from, and yet he would publish the statement that he received the contributions from these persons, who might be mere myths.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this law seeks to control the action and conduct of the political committee and not of the individual who makes the contribution.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Ought there not to be a provision to make it practicable to determine who does actually contribute?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If the committees will comply with the law as it is proposed to be amended in this bill, I believe it will give to the people what they desire and will give effective publicity to campaign contributions. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. We passed in the last Congress the law which it is now proposed to amend. Will the gentleman indicate exactly what changes are now proposed in sections 5 and 6, and in what respect it is different from the bill as we passed it in the House before?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois was not in his seat—where he generally is, sometimes to my great annoyance—when I made the statement just a few minutes ago.

Mr. MANN. I saw that the gentleman was talking, but he was talking to that side of the House, and we on this side of the House could not hear him.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Then I will explain it to the gentleman's side of the House. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I desire to say that the publicity bill as it passed the House in the last Congress carried a provision requiring publicity to be given not more than 15 nor less than 10 days next before the election, but no other publicity before the election. That feature was stricken out in the Senate. This bill seeks not only to restore the provision which was in the bill as it passed the House last year, but to add to it the requirement that, in addition to the first statement required to be filed, the same committee shall every six days thereafter until the election file a similar supplemental statement containing all items not contained in statements previously filed. That, I believe, is the only change made in section 5.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, it is perfectly plain that if the treasurer filed his statement 15 days before the election, then he would have to file two supplemental statements.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If he filed his statement 10 days before the election, then he would have to file but one supplemental statement, and if he filed it 11 days before the election, then he would have to make no statement during the 5 days next preceding the election,

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. Would it not be better to require the supplemental statement to be filed at a fixed time before the election? This provision gives a chance to juggle about the time, if there is anything to that.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that under this provision of the bill it is possible to file the last statement as much as six days before the election; but that gives six days in which the newspapers can ventilate the contents of the statement. It gives six days for publication and discussion on the stump and through the weekly press, and it seems to me that is about as effective as we can make it.

Mr. KENDALL. Does it not also give six days for the use of a large corruption fund that will not be known about by the public press?

Mr. CULLOP. I should like to make one suggestion.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman wait until I finish with the gentleman from Illinois?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman from Illinois had asked me a question, and I was replying to it.

Mr. MANN. Waiving that for the present, if I may ask a few more questions in reference to section 6, as I understand the changes in section 6 in the existing law they first require the amounts contributed to be stated?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Where the amount is over $100.

Mr. MANN. Where it is over $100. I notice that the gentleman has changed the word "total" to "aggregate" in some places. Is that for the purpose of making a change in the meaning?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I made those changes because it occurred to me that the word "aggregate" was the more appropriate word to use where it is used, and using the word "total" at the end of the paragraph. If the gentleman convinces me that that is wrong, I will be glad to change the word.

Mr. MANN. I asked the question because of the change in the wording, striking out the word "total" in one place and leaving it in in another.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I had the purpose in mind which I have stated to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I think they both mean the same thing.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana for a short question. I hope gentlemen will not prolong this, because I want to yield some time to the other side.

Mr. CULLOP. I would like to suggest that in line 6 the word "sixth" be stricken out and the word "third" inserted, so that it will read "every 3 days after they report 15 days before election."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that he can offer such an amendment, and I shall not oppose it. I think it is possible to have too much. I realize that this measure is not perfect, and the only question is whether the gentleman can make it more nearly perfect, and I hope he can. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri was a member of the committee in the last Congress and assisted in the preparation of the bill which was reported at that time. Now, that bill provided for a preliminary report not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days before the election. As I understand it, the bill of the gentleman provides that after that report there shall be another and possibly two subsequent reports. It occurs to me, if I may suggest to the gentleman, the difficulty in drafting the bill in the last Congress, in which I participated with the gentleman from Missouri, was in fixing upon a proper time for this preliminary report. It did not seem to us that it would be wise to have a succession of preliminary reports. Why would it not be better, instead of imposing this burden on the political committees, if it is thought that 15 or 10 days before election is too early, to require one preliminary report to be made, say, 5 days before the election? That would open it up to discussion, and it seems to me that the advantage of other preliminary reports prior to that report immediately before election would be very slight.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Answering the gentleman, I will say that the objection I have to it is the same objection that governed me and the gentleman from Massachusetts when we agreed on the phraseology of the first bill, introduced a few years ago, making the period not less than 10 days before election. The idea is to give at least 10 days when the preliminary report shall be filed, 10 days of publicity through all the newspapers, and the nearer we get down to the date of election the more impossible would it be for the weekly newspapers, which go into all the homes, to handle the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. The gentleman stated that the object of the bill was to control the great congressional committees. Is there anything in this bill which would prohibit these committees from accepting contributions from corporations?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. In this bill; no. It was expressly omitted for the reason that I participated somewhat in the enactment of the law a few years ago which makes it a crime, punishable by imprisonment, for corporations to contribute to campaign funds.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. KOPP. In the present law, section 6, subdivision 4, it is provided that the names must be given of each person who has received a payment of $10 or more. I notice that in the gentleman's bill he has increased that amount to $100. Will the gentleman state the purpose of the increase in amount?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will be glad to do so. In this I confess that the judgment of the committee may be in error, but the thought that inspired us was that to require the great national committees of either party or the congressional national committee to give name and address of each person who gives the committee or who receives from the committee $10 would require such an endless amount of bookkeeping that it would be entirely too cumbersome. That is the only reason for the change referred to.

Mr. KOPP. Will not this open the door to fraud wider than the old law? It is well known that entries of disbursements of $99 will be made, whereas there could not be very substantial sums or payments in less sums than $10. It seems to me that we could waive the necessity for greater bookkeeping in order to get greater purity of elections.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. My answer is the same that I made to the gentleman from Indiana a few moments ago. While it is possible, I can not conceive that the gentlemen who compose the great committees are going to juggle with the law by giving the committee in a certain State or district several items of $99.95 each in order to evade the law. I will say that if they do, if such a practice should prevail, I will gladly join in an amendment that will cure it.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman for information whether the report of each of the committees after the last election was of any great length?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Oh, I think not of any great length.

Mr. KOPP. Then it seems to me that the fear that the bookkeeping will be complicated is unfounded.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman understands that in these campaigns frequently there are several thousand contributions.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Did the committee of which the gentleman is chairman take into consideration the great importance of having a publication of contributions which secures the nominations of men? The nomination to-day in many localities is of the very first importance, and the money is contributed there to corrupt the electorate.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I fully appreciate that statement and agree with what the gentleman says, but that is a matter, I think, that ought to be controlled by State legislatures and not by Congress. I do not want to undertake to go into the domain of a State or to encroach upon the State jurisdiction.

Mr. COOPER. I think the point raised by my colleague [Mr. KOPP] is a very strong one. What would prevent a man of many millions from giving to a hundred of his employees or a thousand of them $50 or $90 apiece, without any record being made public? It will not do to say that you rely upon the honor of people.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I grant that there is a way of evading this law, but in the case the gentleman speaks of the man will be liable himself to criminal prosecution.

Mr. COOPER. By what law would he be liable?

Mr. KENDALL. Yes; under what law would he be liable?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Under the law which requires a corporation——

Mr. KENDALL. But the gentleman spoke of an individual disbursing this money.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If a corporation gives you money to contribute, then the corporation violates the law and would be subject to punishment.

Mr. KENDALL. But suppose an individual gives a hundred dollars each to a thousand men, would your law touch that?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It would not, unless the fact should be known to the committee, in my opinion.

Mr. CULLOP. He is already liable under the law.

Mr. LEWIS. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether his committee considered the advisability of prohibiting the receipt of contributions that had not been published, after the last report?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. We did consider it, and we found that emergencies might exist which would make it highly proper and right for a great committee to collect money within 48 hours of an election, and therefore we omitted any reference to that matter.

Mr. KENDALL. I want to make this rejoinder to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP], that in the case I supposed, of course the candidate would be liable under the laws of his State, but that conduct could not be ventilated before the public in order to affect the election. That is the point I made.

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. Did the committee consider the question of limiting the amount of money to be legitimately expended by a candidate?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. No. We considered it; yes; but this bill does not cover it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman object to an amendment to that effect?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I certainly would, because I think it would destroy the law. I do not believe this Congress has a right to say how much a citizen can contribute for any purpose in his State.

Mr. AUSTIN. I mean a candidate.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, a candidate. The State laws ought to govern that. I again repeat, I am opposed to an invasion of the power and jurisdiction of the State.

Mr. AUSTIN. To fix the amount of legitimate expenses, to prohibit a candidate for Congress from exceeding that amount.

Mr. LANGLEY. It might cost more in Tennessee than in Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think the State ought to regulate that.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman accept an amendment in effect that where the election of a Member of Congress is shown to have been obtained by the corrupt use of money it would be void.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. No; but I will vote with the gentleman to turn such a man out of Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Why not put it in this bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Because the bill is not drawn for that purpose, and such a provision would be entirely out of harmony with this law.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I was wondering how the gentleman could hold that opinion, in view of the fact that the Constitution says that Congress shall be the judge of the election returns and the qualifications of a Member. Why would it not be proper, in view of that language in the Constitution, to legislate along those lines?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to make myself clear, and if I have failed I fear I will be unable to do so. I do not doubt the power of Congress to thus legislate, but I doubt the wisdom of such legislation. Now, it may be we are all wrong about this, but if it should turn out that we are wrong and abuses grow up which may be remedied, I will go as far as any gentleman on this floor to reach out after those abuses and see if we can not regulate them in the future.

If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] desires to consume time, I will be glad if he would do so now. However, Mr. Speaker, before yielding the floor, I desire to offer the following amendment and have it pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the preamble, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' approved June 25, 1910, be and the same are hereby amended to read as follows:"

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is a mere change of phraseology in the preamble.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I am glad the gentleman offered that to save me the trouble.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I now reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly favor this measure, but, in my judgment, it does not begin to go far enough. As a matter of fact, it apparently costs the Republican national committee a great deal more money for a congressional campaign than it does the Democratic Party [applause on the Democratic side] for this reason: The Democratic fights in the South are made at the primaries, and that is where the Democrats spend their campaign money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not a fact that the Democrats rely on the people to carry the elections and you do not? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KAHN. Oh.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. Just for a question.

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it not a fact that in most of the States where they have primary laws—it is so in Georgia and most of the States in that section—that the States require in primary elections that everyone shall file an account of the expense incurred in that primary election?

Mr. KAHN. That may be so, but the country will look to the report filed in the House of Representatives and will not go to every one of the States to find out what was expended in each one of the different States. Now, this bill was framed for the purpose of giving publicity to campaign expenditures——

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KAHN. I only have five minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Just for one question.

Mr. KAHN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman has said that in the South we spend our money in the primaries. Has there been any money spent in any such primary equal to what Sibley expended in Pennsylvania?

Mr. KAHN. Well, I am not familiar with conditions in the South, but I have heard that your primary contests there are intensely sharp and bitter, and I dare say there is a considerable sum of money spent in many districts in the South at the primaries. Of course when your primary is over you do not have to spend a dollar at the general election. [Applause on the Republican side.] Your contests are decided at your primaries.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman makes a correct statement about the expenditure of money in the primaries in the South, but what I want to ask was if any such amount was expended in a primary in the South as in Sibley's nomination in Pennsylvania?

Mr. KAHN. I suppose Mr. Sibley learned the expenditure of money when he was a Democrat. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I simply want to call to the attention of the House and to the attention of the country the fact that this bill is entirely inadequate, and in order to have a proper publicity bill there should be a clause inserted which would compel the filing of accounts at all primaries, as well as at the general elections, and I would gladly vote for such a feature to be included in the pending bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important in a republican government than to have honest and pure elections. The results of legislation and administration have never been and can never be altogether satisfactory if the source of power is corrupted or polluted in any form or manner. I am in favor of all legislation that is calculated to safeguard the integrity of the ballot in the United States and to protect every citizen in the land in the right to vote and in the fearless exercise of that right against the corrupting power of money or any other of the devices and methods that have been employed in years past to prevent fair elections. Every elector ought to have the right to vote, and to have that vote counted the way he casts it. Elections ought to express the mature, free, and honest convictions of the electors in all parts of the Union.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, can accomplish but little along that line. The only improvement it purports to make over the law that was enacted in the last Congress is that it requires reports of funds collected by national committees, congressional and general, before as well as after elections. It makes, as has been remarked, absolutely no provision to protect the purity, the integrity of the institution of the primary in the United States, which is becoming quite general in the States.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman seems to be basing his opposition to this bill on the proposition that it does not include primaries. Did not the Republican national convention, of which you were a member, vote down a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] providing for the publicity of campaign funds before the election?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why, if the gentleman will give heed, the House of Representatives in the last Congress passed a bill of that kind, and I voted for it.

Mr. JAMES. I am talking about the party nationally.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me say to the gentleman that he is mistaken when he says I was a member of the last Republican national convention. I was not.

Mr. JAMES. Do not dodge the issue.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not dodge the issue. I voted for a measure requiring reports before as well as after elections. I have done my share toward securing full and complete reports of the funds that have been accumulated and expended, and that may be accumulated and expended by campaign committees.

Mr. JAMES. I am willing to assume that the gentleman is better than his party, but what I wanted to know was the position of the gentleman's party on this question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman seems to be well advised upon that proposition. He has been giving me some suggestions that had passed entirely from my own mind in relation to it. Now, the suggestion has been made in relation to a report concerning the expense of the primary in a congressional district of the State of Pennsylvania where one of the candidates spent more than $40,000. Some of the States provide for primaries without requiring publicity of the expenditures of candidates. I say that it is just as important in probably four-fifths of the districts of the United States, and probably more important, to have publicity of expenditures used to secure nominations as it is to have publicity of amounts collected and used for the purpose of influencing elections. Reference has been made to a great section of the country where the only real election is at the primaries, and this bill does not have any bearing upon the primary at all, and therefore does not apply to that section of the country.

It does not apply to that section of the country, and yet Representatives there are insisting on and demanding and clamoring for legislation that will make public the moneys that are expended to influence elections, because they are entirely free from its operation.

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker. Special elections occur occasionally, and there may be a vacancy in a congressional district; under conditions in the membership of the House the two parties stand practically equal, and the election might control the politics of the House. And yet this bill makes absolutely no provision in relation to special elections where a single Representative may be elected and where the election might be accomplished by the expenditure of fabulous sums.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I woud like to know if the gentleman can cite any instance in the last 20 years where the national Democratic Party ever took an active part, or any part, in the nomination or primary election of Representatives in Congress, either South, East, or West? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What difference does it make?

Mr. RAKER. It makes all the difference on earth.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Representatives in Congress are Federal officers. They make laws for all the country. And while we are in the business, why do we not go far enough in our legislation to accomplish something that will be of substantial benefit?

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask the gentleman: When his side of the House had this bill under consideration, why did not he and his colleagues offer this amendment and incorporate it in the law when he had the opportunity?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It came up before on a motion to suspend the rules and was not amendable. We did incorporate the provisions contained in this bill, but when that bill came back from the other branch of Congress the provision in relation to contributions before, as well as after primaries, was stricken out.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this bill. It contains a little good. But it seems to me that the great committee that prepared the bill and brought it into the House should have broadened its provisions, should have made it relate to special elections as well as general elections, should have made it relate to primary elections wherever they are required by the laws of any State, and if that had been done I think it would have gone a long step further in purifying elections.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the getleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR]?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. FARR. Does the gentleman know, speaking about Pennsylvania, that it was due to an act of the Pennsylvania Legislature relative to expenditures at the primaries that Mr. Sibley's extravagant expenditures were indicated and this resulted in forcing him from the Republican ticket in his district, thus showing the importance of this publicity at the primaries as well as at elections?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand that was the case. That was a Republican measure, and this is a Republican measure, because we passed it through the last House. This is a Republican movement. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Republican Party always has stood in favor of honest elections, always has advocated the principle that every citizen of the country who assists in bearing the burdens of the Government ought to have something to say with respect to the making and enforcement of laws and to the levying of taxes and the expenditure of public money.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague from Indiana?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is it not a fact that at Gary, Ind., in the election of 1908 several thousand people cast their votes who had never taken out their first naturalization papers?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, if there has been any such situation in the State of Indiana it must have been down along the Ohio River where my colleague resides. Nothing like that happened in the northwestern part of the State in the district that I represent. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman say that condition never occurred in the election of 1908 at Gary, Ind.?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I can say, and say it with absolute truth, that that charge was made in 1908, and a full investigation under the guise of a contest was made by a Democratic organization, and after an exhaustive investigation the proceeding was dismissed; and the men who instituted it have not even paid the costs of the proceeding. We do not vote anybody in northwestern Indiana except those who have the right to vote, but we do allow everybody there to vote who has the right to vote and we see that the votes are counted. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Does the gentleman want some time?

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not want any time.

Mr. KENDALL. If the gentleman is going to defend the State of Pennsylvania, we want him to do it in a voice loud enough to be heard.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania please speak loud enough for the Chair to hear him?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it will be a pleasure to make an effort to have the Chair hear me. I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] a question or two.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Very well. If I can answer them I will be glad to.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is a member of the committee that reported this bill. I would have asked the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] these questions, but I was afraid I would be unable to make him hear me, the distance being great between us. I understand it is the purpose of this bill to publish, prior to the election, contributions of money made, in the words of the bill "for the purpose of influencing elections". That is true, is it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I suppose so.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know that while there is a time set for filing these reports, there is no time set for making them up?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. They must be made up before they can be filed.

Mr. BUTLER. That is true. Suppose the treasurer of the national committee or of the congressional committee happens to reside in the city of San Francisco and has to file his report here in Washington, his report must necessarily be made up several days prior to day of filing. I suppose he will file his report or statement here on the day stated in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The way to avoid that difficulty is to move the Republican headquarters to Washington.

Mr. BUTLER. I have nothing to do with the location of the treasurer. I am only putting a question to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], whether or not his committee considered the necessity of requiring these reports to be made up on a day certain?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The gentleman has asked me what the committee did and what consideration they gave to this measure. Yesterday in the House, when the joint resolution amending the Constitution of the United States was under consideration, I stated the circumstances regarding the meeting of the committee; that notices were sent out the evening before and did not reach the Republican members of the committee, except in one instance, until the committee had met and acted. I will now say to the gentleman that in the one hour during which, as I am informed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], the committee was in session it found time from its arduous labors in considering the amendment to the Constitution to report out this bill. I can not tell you just what consideration the committee gave to all these questions. I will say to the gentleman that it is my purpose to vote for this bill——

Mr. BUTLER. So is it mine.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Because I think it is a step in the right direction; but I do believe it would have been wiser if the committee had not reported it so soon, and I believe we could then have had a better bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield to me a minute or two?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes if he wishes it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I suppose there can be no difference of opinion upon the purpose of this bill. It is to make known to the public in advance contributions of money made for the purpose of influencing elections. It seems to me it might have been made effective. If the committee had included in this bill a provision that there should be no contributions of money made either for general or for primary election purposes I presume I would have voted for such provision, although I doubt whether an election can be conducted, no matter how honestly, without using for legitimate purposes certain sums of money.

But this bill will not furnish the knowledge that the public demands. It does provide for the day when these reports shall be filed, but it does not provide the time when they shall be made up. If they are filed five days before the election, they must be made up prior to that time, of course. Contributions that were intended to be made might be made after the report is made up but before the report is filed, because of the time necessary for its transmission by mail or otherwise.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the other gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BUTLER. If he does not take more than a minute and three-quarters of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that we have a better corrupt-practices act in Pennsylvania than this one, and better calculated to give the public information about these transactions than does this bill?

Mr. BUTLER. I have no doubt the gentleman is correct in his conclusion.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. COOPER. I observed the reply of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to his colleague as to the excellent character of the corrupt-practice act in the State of Pennsylvania. Does that provide for the publication before election?

Mr. BUTLER. It provides for a filing in the office of the prothonotary of the different courts within so many days after the election. Fifteen days, one of my colleagues says.

Mr. COOPER. After the money has been contributed and expended and the men are in office.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is after the nomination.

Mr. BUTLER. After the nomination.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any provision for the publication before the nomination?

Mr. BUTLER. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. it is both after the primaries and after the election.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask whether the conversation over on that side is a private conversation, or are we supposed to know what is going on?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, we have an act in Pennsylvania that requires all of us who are candidates for office to make and return under oath the amount of contributions made to us for political purposes and the amount expended, but that act requires us to make it after the primary and before the general election. But if we had been making an act in the State of Pennsylvania requiring us to publish in advance the moneys contributed for political purposes it would have been made effective. It would have required the report——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman time enough to finish his statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan yields to the gentleman from Pennsylvania all the time the gentleman wants.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman from Michigan for the privilege and to the Speaker for stating it. This act seems to be weak in the particulars I have stated. There is opportunity for the contribution to be made after this report has been made up but before filing.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Why can not Congress pass a law making it a felony for anyone to offer to contribute, advance, or loan, or for any committee or any other committee to receive any money within five days prior to the election, or prior to a primary?

Mr. BUTLER. I have no doubt Congress could make such a law; and if it did, that it would meet all the complaints and just complaints that are now made, but this bill makes no such provision.

Mr. COOPER. It could, because we could amend it.

Mr. BUTLER. I am criticizing the bill for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MANN. If no contributions could be made after five days before election, who would pay the bills of the committee when it was in debt?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether the political philanthropists are all dead or not.

Mr. MANN. They could not contribute if they were not.

Mr. COOPER. Suppose we compelled the committee to live within its income and not to go in debt for corrupt purposes; let it expend what it received.

Mr. MANN. There is no concern on earth that makes no bills until it has the money in the bank. The gentleman from Wisconsin or the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from Illinois, none of them can do it, and no political committee can do it.

Mr. BUTLER. I would anticipate that no prudent man, treasurer of a committee, would take the chances of getting contributions after election, especially if his side had been unsuccessful. Mr. Speaker, I do not care for any more time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP].

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill, but in one respect I think it takes a step backward, and a vital one. There is no doubt in my mind but that the people of this country are demanding absolute purity in elections, and when we are drawing an act, we should draw it so as to have it as airtight as possible. Now, when they increase the amount of expenditure from $10 to $100, which the committee is required to report, it is leaving a loophole through which practically all of the funds of a great committee can be expended. I hold in my hand the statement of the receipts and the expenditures of the last national Democratic congressional committee during the last election, and nine-tenths of the items in that report are between $10 and $100. If this bill passes, all of those would be grouped under one head. It seems to me that if these gentlemen on that side, as well as on this side of the House, are desirous of having absolute purity in elections, they should not object to putting that back to $10.

The only argument that has been advanced for increasing the amount from $10 to $100 is that it will save a great amount of bookkeeping. The statement of the Democratic campaign committee covers five or six typewritten pages, and if that is all the bookkeeping that is required, surely the argument fades to nothing. So it seems to me that we ought to adopt an amendment unanimously to make this $10; that no contribution shall be made by any person, firm, or corporation in excess of $10, nor shall the committee expend any amount above $10, without having it accounted for as such. I therefore offer the two amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten"; and on page 4, line 3, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this bill may satisfy the majority members of the committee that reported it; but if it is offered in the interests of purer elections, of a purer ballot box, it will not satisfy the American people. It accomplishes nothing that the present law does not accomplish. If Democracy is interested in real reform, let your investigations commence with the primary election and let those investigations continue until after the election in November, and let such investigations be so complete that they will cover all expenditures, whether made by a national committee or made by a candidate himself or by his friends. Let such investigations be most thorough; let them apply to all contributions of which the candidate has any knowledge.

Last fall, when knowledge of the contributions made to the Democratic national congressional committee was published in the newspapers of the country, I was amazed and surprised, as were the people of the State of Iowa, to learn that the man who gave double the amount that any other man gave to the Democratic national committee was Mr. W. C. Beer, of New York.

Who is W. C. Beer? W. C. Beer formerly resided in my State, and while residing there he was known as a poor man. He gave little or nothing in the way of contributions to the Democratic Party in those days, but last fall W. C. Beer made a contribution double the amount of that made by any other Democrat in the United States. That contribution was made the day before election, and at that time W. C. Beer was the confidential man of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. BUTLER. Was Mr. Beer ever a Republican?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know. He paid little attention to politics when he lived in the State of Iowa, but his uncle, Judge Reed, was elected to Congress from Iowa as a Republican; but, Mr. Speaker, I do know that when he made this contribution to the Democratic campaign fund he was the confidential man of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. If you are honest in your attempt to secure publicity——

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Just a minute. If you are honest in your endeavors to obtain publicity of campaign contributions, you should try to ascertain the real source of these contributions. Committees should not be permitted to put in the names of persons as contributors to campaigns when the contribution is in fact made or paid by some one other than the person who is reported as having made the contribution.

Mr. STANLEY. What is Mr. Beer's official relation to J. Pierpont Morgan?

Mr. GOOD. He is the confidential man to J. Pierpont Morgan & Co., and I know of no one closer to J. Pierpont Morgan himself than Mr. W. C. Beer, of New York, who made this enormous contribution.

Mr. STANLEY. Is he the confidential friend of Mr. Morgan or in his employ?

Mr. GOOD. In his employ, I understand.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] that he had better apply for information to the Democratic national congressional committee, which might be better informed.

Mr. STANLEY. Oh, the Democratic national committee is not nearly as close to Mr. Morgan as gentlemen on that side.

Mr. GOOD. The record does not bear out the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAYTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCGUIRE].

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. I am for it because there is some good in it, but there are a great many things that might contribute to the interests and integrity of the American people, the candidates and political committees, that are not in it. I come from a State where the Democratic Party has the governor and has had since we became a State. It has the senate and the house of representatives. Upon their accession to power we had a nonpartisan election law, an election law against which no man had ever raised his voice. Now we have an election law that is a disgrace to civilization and to the human race, passed by a Democratic senate, a Democratic house, and signed by a Democratic governor of the State. I am a little surprised that the Democratic Party will even go this far in their pretense of being in favor of honest elections in this country. Why should not this provide for a publication of contributions in the primaries? I want to relate to you gentlemen a little incident: We have primary elections, and in the last campaign I have every reason to believe the man who ran against me for the nomination spent four times as much as he could spend under the election law——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. May I have a minute more?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield the gentleman a minute additional.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan concedes me a minute more. The penalty for having spent more than he may spend under the law is that he can not go upon the ballot. The gentlemen in charge of that State, the State officials, were in favor of his nomination. After he was defeated he never did render an accounting, and he has not today, of the money that he spent in the primary campaign; and hence I say, if you want to be square with the people, if you are what you profess to be, if you want to guarantee honest elections, if you want to make men honest in their campaigns, insert in here a provision that the candidate must account for every dollar and every penny he spends prior to his nomination.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. JAMES. I understood the gentleman of whom the gentleman from Oklahoma is talking about was a Republican who sought the nomination of your party.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. But he was favored by the Democratic officials of the State.

Mr. JAMES. And you say now he has not made——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I ask for a minute more.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. JAMES. You say now there is a law in your State that requires he shall make publication of the amount expended?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Yes; and the penalty is he can not go on the ballot unless he does so.

Mr. JAMES. And you claim that he has not done so?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. He has not.

Mr. JAMES. Why was he not prosecuted?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Because we have Democratic officials in our State. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] I have only mentioned, Mr. Speaker, one of the vast number of violations of the law in that State, and you can not get a prosecution.

Mr. JAMES. Does the gentleman charge here on this floor that the laws in your State are such that one Republican can not have another Republican prosecuted for a violation of the law?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Not by a Democratic governor and Democratic State officials, and that is exactly what I say.

Mr. JAMES. I want to say to the gentleman that I have a better opinion of his State than he gives to it.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I have a good opinion of the State, but not of the gentlemen who have been in power in that State. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend two sections of a law which we passed in the last Congress. I have no criticism whatever to make of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] or his committee in reporting a bill to the House providing simply for the amendment of these two sections and not including in this report at this time other matters which I think ought to be enacted into law.

The original act provides only for reports of contributions of committees as they are defined in the act, where the committee endeavors to influence the election in two or more States, and hence excludes entirely the matter of contributions either for

the election of a Member of Congress to his own committee or for primary elections, because there are no committees in existence which seek to influence, under the terms of the act as it was defined on the floor here, the primaries in two or more States. The amendments which have been inserted are the changes which have been inserted by the bill; in my opinion are desirable changes—in the main, at least. Under the original law, apparently, while the committees were required to furnish the names of persons contributing on the amounts of expenditures of over $10—the names of persons—they were not required to report the amount contributed or expended. That was undoubtedly an inadvertent defect in the law. And the amendment to section 6 of the original act as carried in here is designed to correct that mistake. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], presiding over his great committee, will bring into this House a bill in regard to campaign contributions both for the election of individual Members of Congress and for their nomination.

The gentleman stated, as I understood him, that it was not within the power of Congress, but that that was a State matter. What is the distinction between our control over elections of Members of Congress in more than one State and our control over the election of a Member in a district?

If we have the constitutional authority to effect the election of 10 Members of Congress, we have the equal authority to control the election of one Member of Congress. There is no distinction absolutely between our power to require a statement of all expenses in regard to the election of a single Member and our power to require the knowledge in regard to the election of all Members.

I have myself been several times a candidate for Congress. At a recent election the gentleman who ran against me is reported to have spent over $40,000 in endeavoring to accomplish his election. At a primary a few years ago a very fine gentleman ran against me, and was reported to have spent over $40,000 in seeking to be nominated. For myself, I am not able to expend such large sums of money, nor am I willing to accept contributions of such amounts, which would allow me to expend them. And I believe it would be far more desirable and effective if Congress should require a man who is a candidate at the primary and at the election to report all of his contributions and expenses and to limit the amount which he may receive or expend. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Does the gentleman wish any more time?

Mr. MANN. I would like another minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Now, I understand perfectly well that in many districts in the country a nomination is equivalent to an election. I have always considered that that was the case in my district, although it was not quite so certain last fall as it had been on previous occasions.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. You get there just the same.

Mr. MANN. There is no reason why we should permit the expenditure of such sums of money for primaries or elections. And I hope the gentleman will take under consideration the right of Congress to control. If there be State laws, let there be in addition a national law. Many men are prone to take chances on the violation of State laws, when their own friends or party friends are in charge of local offices, who would not dare to tamper or challenge the execution of a national law. On both sides of this Chamber, in my opinion, there exists an honest desire that the elections of the country shall be as fair and just as possible, that they should not be affected by corruption, and that they shall not be influenced by the expenditure of great sums of money.

On both sides of the Chamber gentlemen think alike on this question. Why should we not meet with an affirmative response the demand of the country that in these days, when the people believe more now than they ever did before in the effectual control of government by the citizens and believe that their elected officials shall be elected honestly and that they shall have the opportunity to select capable representatives without fear of the influence of money or other corrupt methods? I hope that the House, with the gentleman from Missouri and his party now in responsible control, will not be satisfied with simply crossing a "t" or dotting an "i" on an act which this House passed during the days when the Republicans were in responsible control, but that they will go a step further and add a law, new on the statute books, which we are all prepared to vote for and not feel that they have done their duty simply by bringing into the House a bill which we passed practically as now brought in once before. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining to each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I ask, then, that the gentleman from Missouri use some of his time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer one amendment and have it pending for consideration, to be acted upon at the proper time, and if the Clerk will take it down I will read it to him. It is this:

On page 2, line 6, strike out the word "sixth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "third."

The purpose of offering this amendment is to have the last publication occur not more than three days before the election. The object is to provide that there shall not be time intervening between the last publication and the day of election, so that a large "slush fund" may be collected and distributed throughout the country for the purpose of corrupting the voters. For this reform the Democratic Party has been contending for years.

I am somewhat astonished that Members on that side of the House, our Republican friends, say they are in favor, and their party is in favor, of this kind of legislation. I would ask, How long since have they been converted to this reform? In 1908 the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, from the day of his nomination to within 60 days of the election, appealed to the Republican candidate to cooperate with him to make public before the election all the contributions to their respective campaign funds. The Republican candidate refused to do it; his party refused to do it; but within six weeks of the election, for the purpose of meeting an indignant public opinion, the Republican candidate agreed to a publication of the contributions after the election, instead of before, as the Democratic candidate had requested.

I will ask gentlemen on that side of the House, if your party stands for this kind of a reform, why was it that when it was in the control of the Senate last spring it struck out the most beneficial clause of all in the legislation proposing this reform—the publication of contributions to campaign funds before the election, the provision contained in that bill—and amended it so that the publication would be made after the election? If your party stood in favor of this reform, why did it not leave the provision on that subject as it was when it left the House, and as it had been passed by the House here? Why did they strike out the most important feature of the bill if they stood in favor of this reform?

If gentlemen on that side desired to have reformation by legislation in regard to primary elections, last June, when this bill was before the House, and when you were here with a large majority on this floor, why did you not incorporate that provision in the bill as it passed this House then? What since the adjournment of Congress last June has converted you to this great doctrine of reform? Was it the election in November, 1910, whereby you were swept out of power and the Democratic Party in this House put in power? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I believe in the publication before the election, in order that the people may know what interest, if any, is contributing to the campaign funds of any candidate or any party, and that the people may have this knowledge, so they can intelligently cast their votes. It is a step in the right direction, and the bill should be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I object.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the effort of our friends on the other side to convince the country that they ardently desire more rigid legislation to prevent the improper use of money in influencing elections is grotesque and amusing. You know, and I know, and the world knows, that a law preventing the use of money in elections, in order to be effective, must provide for publishing the names of the men who are seeking to control the electorate before the ballots are cast. The sole purpose of

legislation of this kind is to notify the voter beforehand that certain influences, backed by enormous amounts of dirty money, are attempting to control the electorate. To make a display of the way the election was bought after the goods are delivered is to lock the door after the horse is gone. When you controlled this House you positively refused to allow the record to be made before the election. More than that, when you met in national convention and it was proposed, while you were in the limelight, to pledge your party to the exposure of campaign contributions, you voted it down with hoots and yells. Now, when we have you tied hand and foot, when you are driven to the wall, with a yea-and-nay vote confronting you, you protest vociferously about your great desire for untainted elections.

Mr. JAMES. In the convention they voted it down by 900 to 84.

Mr. STANLEY. By an overwhelming majority. There was no roll call there. You spoke then from your hearts; you gave vent to your purposes. In that convention you did not say you would expose the men who made campaign contributions, because you feared you might stop the contributions.

We are twitted here with the statement that Morgan's confidential man contributed $1,000 to a Democratic campaign fund. Now, I very much dislike to discuss men, high or low, especially when they are not here to answer for themselves. I would hesitate to engage in mere abuse of Mr. Morgan just as much as the humblest individual in the land.

But when by innuendo you would put in the RECORD that J. Pierpont Morgan and the interests he represents are behind the Democratic Party, then I demand that the whole truth be known. When the most nefarious legislation that was ever enacted was on its passage in the Senate—to allow the use of railroad bonds and the bonds of the United States Steel Corporation to be used as a basis for our currency—Mr. Morgan hung over the railing of the Senate gallery, eagerly approving the words of Nelson A. Aldrich. That was a display of his Democracy. When I attempted to have his darling child, the United States Steel Corporation, investigated, and had a resolution for that purpose before the Rules Committee, who opposed it? Not one Democrat. Who favored it? Not one Republican. Do not "shake your gory locks" at us and tell us because Morgan's confidential man gave a thousand dollars that Morgan or Morgan influences are behind the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I apologize for rising again so soon to address the House. I do it under the jibe of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG], who sees fit to criticize the committee for its action. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] has placed this committee under fire before the country, but we have no apologies to offer to the gentleman or to anyone else for our prompt action on these two bills. We point him to the action of the House yesterday, which by an overwhelming vote, with only 15 votes in the negative, favored the election of United States Senators by the people, and these 15 votes were Republicans. We now have a united and unanimous Democracy in favor of this bill.

So far as the hasty action of the committee is concerned, that side of the House, the Republican side, has frequently had it pointed out to them on the floor of this House that unless they ceased to bury legislation in the committee rooms and to make legislation in the committee rooms, that unless they would let it be brought on the floor of the House and acted upon here, they would be driven from this House.

They have been frequently warned on the floor of this House that unless they ceased to increase the expenditures of the people's money they would be driven from this House, yet they went on, and even in the Sixtieth Congress increased new offices and salaries to the extent of $30,000,000. They have been frequently reminded that unless they ceased to place the burden of tariff legislation upon the backs of the people that these burdens would become in time like the burdens of the children of Israel, and that they would be driven from this House. And now, sir, these warnings have been exemplified by the empty Republican seats on the other side of this House. I tell you, sir, we must listen to the demands of the people. And one of these demands is prompt, though prudent, action in the committee rooms. [Applause.] I can not see how any Member of this House can afford to record himself opposing pure election. God speed the day when election corruption funds shall be driven not only from my State, but from every State in the Union. Every corporation or person undertaking to debauch the voter should be swiftly, surely, and severely punished.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Can the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] consume some of his time now?

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the pending bill, and ask that the Clerk read it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 5 of the act of June 25, 1910, 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' shall be amended so as to read as follows:

"'SEC. 5. That the treasurer of every such political committee shall, not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States, file in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., with said Clerk, an itemized detailed statement, sworn to by said treasurer and conforming to the requirements of the following section of this act; and upon every day after the making such statement, and before the day of election, the books and accounts of such committee shall be open to public inspection. It shall also be the duty of said treasurer to file a similar and final statement with said Clerk within 30 days after such election, such final statement also to be sworn to by said treasurer and to conform to the requirements of the following section of this act. The statements so filed with the Clerk of the House shall be preserved by him for 15 months, and shall be a part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.'"

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, one word in explanation of the amendment which I have proposed. It is section 5 of the act as it passed the last House of Representatives, with this addition: That after the preliminary report, made not more than 15 and not less than 10 days before the election, shall have been made, then the books of the committees between the time of making the report and the day of election shall be open to public inspection. There is no reason in the world why contributions as they are received should not be printed in the newspapers when they are received, just as contributions for any public object or for charities are published in newspapers at the time they are received.

It seems to me it is very impracticable to impose on the treasurer the duty of making up a final and definite statement of the receipts and disbursements and swearing to it and filing it in Washington every few days. This gives a starting point of having a preliminary report, and after that the books shall be open to the newspapers, which will have access to them, and they can print the receipts as they are received.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCALL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman offers this as a substitute for the pending bill?

Mr. MCCALL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The bill contains sections 5 and 6 of the law. The gentleman's proposition only affects section 5.

Mr. MCCALL. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert what was read.

Mr. MANN. But that does not cover section 6.

Mr. MCCALL. It strikes out section 6.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman want to strike out section 6 entirely?

Mr. MCCALL. Yes; because although section 6 is in the bill, I do not think it ought to be in.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, from the discussion here to-day it seems apparent that there may be a greater division on party lines on the pending proposition than there was on the one yesterday. However, Mr. Speaker, I hope that when we come to vote on this measure our Republican brethren will join us in the enactment of this wholesome piece of legislation, and do it with the same practical unanimity that they joined with us yesterday in proposing the joint resolution for the amendment of the Constitution.

I congratulate the Republican Party on the progress that it has made since its last national convention. It has progressed to the extent of joining with the Democrats to secure the passage of a measure requiring the publication of campaign expenses after election. I believe that the majority of the members of that party in this Chamber to-day will join with the Democratic Party in the demand made in the Democratic platform written at Denver in 1908; that the campaign contributions shall be published before election. That is what this measure seeks to do, and I hope the Republicans will progress to the extent of again voting with us.

It comes with bad grace from our Republican brethren here who have been in control of the House 16 years, in control of

the Senate and in control of the executive department, to chide us with the failure to bring in a proposition of more far-reaching legislation along the lines than this proposes. They have had uninterrupted control for 16 years. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party never wanted any reform on this subject. It never espoused any reform in this direction. It never made any efforts in this line seriously until it saw the light which broke with a full force and effect and showed the members of that party the way the American people were thinking and demanding, and the Republicans were convinced in November last. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They saw a great light then, and they now object to this measure, going as far as it does, because it does not go further. We hand it back to you, gentlemen, with suggestion that for 16 years nearly you refused to go at all. Because you say this measure is not perfect, because you say this measure does not go as far as it should, you contend that is an argument against the efforts that we are making here to-day to bring about this reform.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party initiated the movement in the country for the publication of campaign contributions. It was the first party that had the courage to write it in its platform, and a former Member of this House was the first public man outside of official life in the United States to espouse the publication of campaign contributions, Hon. Perry Belmont, of New York, a Democrat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I consider this a rather harmless little bill, and I regret exceedingly that any gentleman on either side of the center aisle in this House should endeavor to treat it as a partisan measure. A measure that proposes to promote purer elections and to throw safeguards around the election of public officials is something to which all parties ought to agree. I think this bill should be so amended as to provide up to what time these statements should be made. The bill provides when the statements shall be filed, or within what time they shall be filed, but it does not name the date or length of time preceding the election down to which all receipts and disbursements shall be shown. I think this is a defect that should be remedied by amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in the few minutes that I have that I am not at all satisfied with the scope of this bill or the length to which it goes. I believe that the use of money in primaries and elections is the greatest evil that confronts this Government to-day, and that the greatest danger to our republican institutions is the unrestricted use of money to control primaries and elections. We have had a number of illustrations of this fact in very recent times, and the condition of affairs disclosed in Adams County, Ohio, is not exceptional or one confined to that locality alone. I would, if I had my way, make it a criminal offense for any committee or any person or corporation to send money into a district to influence the election of Members of Congress in that district. Publication of election expenses alone, whether before or after election, is not a sufficient remedy for the evil. I would limit the uses to which money might be expended in any primary or election, and I would make it apply to every congressional district. It is absurd to say that Congress has no control over the election of Members of Congress in any single State or district. The control of Congress, or the right of Congress to control, over such elections is expressly provided for by section 4, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

We can, if we will, control all primaries and all elections in every State and in every district of the United States so far as the election of Congressmen is concerned. This bill, to be at all effective, should provide for publication in each district of all moneys contributed or expended by or on behalf of any and every candidate for Congress. The bill as drawn would not affect my district at all. No national congressional committee ever knows that there is such a district. They only send money, if they do send it at all, into the close districts or districts where the use of money may influence the election. Who is it, Mr. Speaker, that contributes money for the election of Members of Congress? No man in my district, no farmer of this country, no small business man, and no laboring man contributes money to influence the election of Congressmen to represent him. It is the great financial interests that hope to benefit by legislation that contribute money to control the election of Members of Congress, and I suppose it is contributed for the reason that an equivalent is expected in return. If I had my way I would prohibit such contributions absolutely and make it a criminal offense. Truly, money is "the root of all evil" and the source of all corruption, and if pure elections is what we desire, the use of money to influence votes should be regarded as one of the greatest crimes, for it is treason to our free institutions. [Applause.] This bill is just one little step in the right direction, and so I shall vote for its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL].

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by having it strike out all after the enacting clause down to line 23 on page 2 of the bill, so that it would be simply a substitute for the first section.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman will be modified as requested.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of offering an amendment to this bill. I am heartily in favor of this bill so far as it goes, and I congratulate the gentlemen on the other side of this House for the promptness with which they have undertaken to legislate upon this subject, which is of great importance and interest to every citizen of the country. But, gentlemen, you have not gone far enough. It is useless to talk about legislating concerning committees which control elections in two or more States and leaving the districts themselves and the candidates themselves in general elections and primary elections absolutely alone; and upon that point I heartily agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]; and therefore it is my purpose to offer here, for the purpose of giving you an opportunity to vote in good faith upon it, the proposition of requiring the candidate himself to file under oath a statement of the amount of money he has received and expended for election purposes. If there is any reason on earth why the Congress of the United States should control the congressional-election committees they should also control the individual who is a candidate for election to the House. This goes to the root of this matter. I now offer this amendment:

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That a bill entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' be amended by the addition of a section to be numbered 6a, which section shall read as follows: 'It shall be the duty of every candidate or Representative in the Congress of the United States, at least 10 days before any general or primary election before which he is a candidate, to file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, in the District of Columbia, a full and correct statement of all moneys or things of value received from any source and used by him in any way for the purpose of securing his election, and such statement shall contain a full account of all moneys used by any agent or Representative of said candidate for said purposes when known to the candidate. The said statement shall be verified by the oath of the candidate taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the law of the State in which he is a candidate, and shall be sworn to by the candidate in the district in which he is a candidate or Representative in Congress. The several district courts of the United States'"——

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman if he would consent to an amendment including the word "Senator," so it would read "any Senator or Representative"?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JACKSON. I will accept that if I have time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The amendment of the gentleman from Kansas is now pending.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The unanimous consent was that any gentleman could offer an amendment in his time. Of course, under the rule you could only have four pending.

Mr. MANN. The reason I made the inquiry was whether the amendment had been read by the Clerk; whether the Clerk had finished reporting the amendment.

The SPEAKER. He had not, and he will conclude the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to punish violations of this act and on conviction of any candidate for a violation of this section, or of filing a false statement of such expenses he shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri has six minutes remaining.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to call attention to the fact that this bill fails of its purpose in the fifth section. Under the language of that section, if Members of the House will look to the same, they will note that the treasurers who are required to file reports are not required to file them before any special election, nor would they be required

to file them before an election for Members of Congress occurring in the State of Maine, which falls at a different date from that of the election in the other States. These officials are required to file their reports before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States. This is not as it should be, for these reports should be filed before every election, not only before a general election, but before an election occurring in States like Maine, and before special elections occurring by virtue of writs issued by the governors of States. In order to meet that situation I send up this amendment, which I ask to have pending at the desk.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 2, page 2, after the word "which," insert the words "a Representative," and in line 3 strike out the words "in two or more States."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, while I was momentarily absent from the Chamber a few moments ago my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MCGUIRE] assaulted our State and its citizenship in a way, in my judgment, that is not becoming to a Representative.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will not have the time to yield. I have only three minutes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman is mistaken about my assaulting the State.

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield when I have only three minutes.

I have hastily scanned the notes of his remarks, and though they are not corrected, I think they are, as I consulted numerous men on this side of the Chamber, practically correct. But the embarrassment and the sting are lessened somewhat from the fact that the chief malefactor that he assaults was his Republican opponent in the primary.

Now, I will perhaps just have time to say this one thing: If his Republican opponent is guilty of any crime in our State, I think the rest of the delegation from that State, in both branches and of both political parties, will see to it that the court doors are held wide to prosecute any malefactor of justice, whether Republican or Democrat. It seems to me it ill becomes any Member from a State to assault an entire people, assault Republican courts, assault Democratic courts, assault State administration, and assault the whole body politic. Slanders from time to time have fallen from the lips of different political opponents with reference to our State. I do not contend more for my State than for any other, but I do assert here now that the State is full of patriotic and honest people.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield in three minutes. I again renew the assertion that the State administration of our State is not more corrupt than those of other States. I again assert that the Republicans and Democrats alike in our State are not more corrupt than in other States. [Applause.] Our State is new, and conditions are new.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has two minutes remaining.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the House upon the fact that we are now about to give the country another demonstration of Democrats keeping the faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am surprised, after finding such unanimity of publicity sentiment on that side of the House, that the great political party which has been in power for 16 years failed during its reign of power to enact a publicity law. I am satisfied that my Republican friends are getting better all the time, and after one or more elections in which we have more publicity our Republican friends will be real good citizens and will thereafter respond to the demands of the people.

I am sorry this law can not go as far as some of the zealous advocates of publicity seem to want to go. I welcome the assistance of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], who to-day advocates publicity before elections, and who so recently, I think within two or three years, has been converted to that faith. I know the gentleman is in good faith and an earnest advocate of publicity. Mr. Speaker, let me say that some suggestions have been made here which, I think, will improve the bill. Some amendments have been proposed to which I shall offer no objection. One of them, at least, is offered in good faith for the improvement of the bill. I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP] to strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten" in two paragraphs of the bill. [Applause.] You can not give too much publicity for Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We will go as far as any Republican in giving real publicity to campaign contributions and expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, let me say that this scene to-day has revived in my memory another couplet of poetry:

When the devil is sick, the devil a monk would be;
When the devil is well, a devil of a monk is he.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Chair to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment first.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 16, strike out the word "the" and insert the word "said"; and in line 19, add "s" to the word "statement."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other amendments in the order in which they come.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri:
Strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"That sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' approved June 25, 1910, be, and the same are hereby, amended to read as follows:"

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I notice in reading the amendment that the Clerk read "June the twenty-fifth."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read that part of the amendment again.

The Clerk read as follows:

June 25, 1910.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. KOPP:
On page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. KOPP:
On page 4, line 3, strike out "one hundred" and insert "ten."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. CULLOP:
On page 2, line 6, strike out the word "sixth" and insert the word "third."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 145, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. MCCALL:
Strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including line 22, on page 2, and insert the following:
"That section 5 of the act of June 25, 1910, 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected,' shall be amended so as to read as follows:
"'SEC. 5. That the treasurer of every such political committee shall, not more than 15 days and not less than 10 days before an election at which Representatives in Congress are to be elected in two or more States, file in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., with said Clerk, an itemized detailed statement, sworn to by said treasurer and conforming to the requirements of the following section of this act; and upon every day after the making of such statement and before the day of election the books and accounts of such committee shall be open to public inspection. It shall also be the duty of said treasurer to file a similar and final statement with said Clerk within 30 days after such election, such final statement also to be sworn to by said treasurer and to conform to the requirements of the following section of this act. The statements so filed with the Clerk of the House shall be preserved by him for 15 months, and shall be a part of the public records of his office, and shall be open to public inspection.'"

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] may be allowed to correct his amendment so as to leave the bill as already amended down to and including section 9, and make his amendment apply only to what comes after the words "section 5" down to section 6.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I assent to that.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

So that the amendment will read: "Strike out of the bill all after the words 'section 5,' in line 10, on page 1, down to and including line 20, on page 2, and insert the following."

Mr. MANN. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts——

The SPEAKER. Debate is not in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, which is to strike out the portion of the bill named and insert the amendment that has been read by the Clerk.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 65, noes 101.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for another reading of the amendment.

Mr. JAMES. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the roll call. The Clerk will proceed to call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 111, nays 196, answered "present" 2, not voting 79, as follows:

YEAS—111.

Akin, N. Y.	Gillett	Loud	Rees
Anderson, Minn.	Good	McCall	Roberts, Mass.
Austin	Greene	McCreary	Roberts, Nev.
Barchfeld	Guernsey	McGuire, Okla.	Roddenbery
Bartholdt	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinley	Rodenberg
Bowman	Hanna	McKinney	Sloan
Bradley	Harris	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Hartman	McMorran	Smith, Saml. W.
Butler	Hawley	Madden	Speer
Cannon	Hayes	Madison	Steenerson
Carter	Hill	Malby	Stephens, Cal.
Catlin	Hinds	Mann	Sterling
Copley	Howell	Martin, S. Dak.	Stevens, Minn.
Crago	Howland	Matthews	Switzer
Crumpacker	Humphrey, Wash.	Miller	Taylor, Ohio
Dalzell	Jackson	Mondell	Thistlewood
Danforth	Kahn	Moore, Pa.	Utter
Davidson	Kennedy	Morgan	Volstead
Davis, Minn.	Kent	Murdock	Vreeland
Dodds	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Needham	Wedemeyer
Dwight	Knowland	Nye	Wilder
Dyer	Kopp	Patton, Pa.	Willis
Farr	Lafean	Pickett	Wilson, Ill.
Focht	Lafferty	Porter	Wood, N. J.
Fordney	La Follette	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Foss	Langham	Pray	Young, Kans.
French	Langley	Prince	Young, Mich.
Fuller	Lawrence	Prouty	

NAYS—196.

Adair	Cox, Ind.	Hamlin	Lloyd
Adamson	Cravens	Hammond	Lobeck
Aiken, S. C.	Cullop	Hardwick	McCoy
Alexander	Curley	Hardy	McDermott
Allen	Daugherty	Harrison, Miss.	McGillicuddy
Anderson, Ohio	Davis, W. Va.	Harrison, N. Y.	McHenry
Ansberry	Dent	Haugen	Macon
Ashbrook	Denver	Hay	Maguire, Nebr.
Barnhart	Dickinson	Helgesen	Martin, Colo.
Bartlett	Dickson, Miss.	Helm	Mays
Bathrick	Dies	Henry, Tex.	Moon, Tenn.
Beall, Tex.	Difenderfer	Holland	Moore, Tex.
Bell, Ga.	Dixon, Ind.	Houston	Morrison
Berger	Donohoe	Howard	Moss, Ind.
Blackmon	Doremus	Hubbard	Murray
Booher	Doughton	Hughes, Ga.	Nelson
Borland	Dupre	Hughes, N. J.	Norris
Brantley	Edwards	Hull	Oldfield
Brown	Esch	Humphreys, Miss.	Padgett
Buchanan	Faison	Jacoway	Page
Bulkley	Ferris	James	Parran
Burke, Wis.	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Ky.	Patten, N. Y.
Burleson	Flood, Va.	Johnson, S. C.	Pepper
Burnett	Floyd, Ark.	Jones	Peters
Byrnes, S. C.	Foster, Ill.	Kendall	Post
Byrns, Tenn.	Francis	Kindred	Pou
Callaway	Garner	Kipp	Pujo
Candler	Garrett	Kitchin	Rainey
Cantrill	George	Konig	Raker
Carlin	Godwin, N. C.	Konop	Randell, Tex.
Cary	Goeke	Korbly	Ransdell, La.
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lamb	Rauch
Claypool	Gordon	Lee, Ga.	Reilly
Clayton	Gould	Lenroot	Richardson
Cline	Gray	Lever	Robinson
Collier	Gregg, Pa.	Lewis	Rothermel
Connell	Gregg, Tex.	Lindbergh	Rouse
Cooper	Gudger	Linthicum	Rubey
Covington	Hamill	Littlepage	Rucker, Colo.
Rucker, Mo.	Sisson	Sweet	Underhill
Russell	Slayden	Taylor, Ala.	Underwood
Sabath	Small	Taylor, Colo.	Warburton
Saunders	Smith, Tex.	Thayer	Watkins
Scully	Sparkman	Thomas	Whitacre
Shackleford	Stanley	Towner	Wickliffe
Sheppard	Stedman	Townsend	Wilson, N. Y.
Sherley	Stephens, Miss.	Tribble	Wilson, Pa.
Sherwood	Stephens, Tex.	Turnbull	Witherspoon
Sims	Stone	Tuttle	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kinkead, N. J.	Webb

NOT VOTING—79.

Ames	Ellerbe	Hensley	Palmer
Andrus	Estopinal	Higgins	Payne
Anthony	Evans	Hobson	Plumley
Ayres	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Bates	Fields	Latta	Riordan
Bingham	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Sells
Boehne	Fornes	Legare	Sharp
Broussard	Foster, Vt.	Levy	Simmons
Burgess	Fowler	Lindsay	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Gallagher	Littleton	Smith, Cal.
Calder	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Stack
Conry	Glass	McKenzie	Sulloway
Cox, Ohio	Goldfogle	Maher	Sulzer
Currier	Graham	Mitchell	Talbott, Md.
Davenport	Griest	Moon, Pa.	Talcott, N. Y.
De Forest	Hamilton, W. Va.	Morse, Wis.	Tilson
Draper	Heald	Mott	Weeks
Driscoll, D. A.	Heflin	Olmsted	White
Driscoll, M. E.	Henry, Conn.	O'Shaunessy	

So the amendment was lost.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CURRIER.

Mr. AYRES with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Until further notice:

Mr. WEBB with Mr. HIGGINS.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. SHARP with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. SIMMONS.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. DE FOREST.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. DRAPER.

Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts.

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. AMES.

Mr. CONRY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. FOSTER of Vermont.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.

Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. HEALD.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. SULZER with Mr. SULLOWAY.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PLUMLEY.

Mr. LEGARE with Mr. TILSON.

From to-day and ending Monday noon:

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. BATES.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. OLMSTED.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

From April 6 until April 14, inclusive:

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. WEEKS.

From to-day and ending in three weeks:

Mr. LATTA with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment, offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

That a bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected" be amended by the addition of a section to be numbered 6a, which section shall read as follows: "It shall be the duty of every candidate or Representative in the Congress of the United States, at least 10 days before any general or primary election before which he is a candidate, to file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, in the District of Columbia, a full and correct statement of all moneys or things of value received from any source and used by him in any way for the purpose of securing his election, and such statement shall contain a full account of all moneys used by any agent or representative at large of said candidate for said purposes when known to the candidate. The said statement shall be verified by the oath of the candidate, taken before an officer

authorized to administer oaths under the law of the State in which he is a candidate, and shall be sworn to by the candidate in the district in which he is a candidate or Representative in Congress.

"The several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to punish violations of this act, and on conviction of any candidate for a violation of this section or of filing a false statement of such expenses, he shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were 106 ayes and 140 noes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays, and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported by the reading clerk now at the desk so that Members can understand what it is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent, pending his demand for the yeas and nays, that the amendment may be again reported by the Clerk.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the demand of the gentleman from Illinois for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 131, answered "present" 2, not voting 83, as follows:

YEAS—172.

Adair	French	Lindbergh	Rees
Akin, N. Y.	Fuller	Linthicum	Roberts, Mass.
Anderson, Minn.	George	Loud	Roberts, Nev.
Ansberry	Gillett	McCoy	Rucker, Colo.
Austin	Goeke	McCreary	Sabath
Barchfeld	Good	McDermott	Saunders
Barnhart	Goodwin, Ark.	McGuire, Okla.	Scully
Bartholdt	Greene	McKinley	Sherwood
Bathrick	Guernsey	McKinney	Sims
Berger	Hamill	McLaughlin	Sloan
Borland	Hamilton, Mich.	McMorran	Smith, J. M. C.
Bowman	Hanna	Madden	Smith, Saml. W.
Brown	Hardy	Madison	Speer
Buchanan	Harrison, N. Y.	Maguire, Nebr.	Steenerson
Bulkley	Hartman	Malby	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, S. Dak.	Haugen	Mann	Sterling
Burke, Wis.	Hawley	Martin, S. Dak.	Stevens, Minn.
Butler	Hayes	Matthews	Stone
Cannon	Helgesen	Miller	Sweet
Cary	Helm	Mondell	Switzer
Catlin	Hill	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper	Hinds	Morgan	Taylor, Ohio.
Copley	Howell	Moss, Ind.	Thayer
Covington	Howland	Mott	Thistlewood
Cox, Ind.	Hubbard	Murdock	Towner
Crago	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Townsend
Crumpacker	Jackson	Nelson	Tuttle
Dalzell	Kahn	Norris	Underhill
Danforth	Kendall	Nye	Utter
Davidson	Kennedy	Page	Volstead
Davis, Minn.	Kent	Patton, Pa.	Vreeland
Dodds	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pepper	Warburton
Doughton	Knowland	Pickett	Wedemeyer
Dupre	Konop	Porter	Whitacre
Dwight	Kopp	Pou	Wickliffe
Dyer	Lafean	Powers	Wilder
Esch	Lafferty	Pray	Willis
Estopinal	La Follette	Prince	Wilson, Ill.
Farr	Langham	Prouty	Wilson, Pa.
Focht	Langley	Pujo	Wood, N. J.
Fordney	Lawrence	Rainey	Woods, Iowa
Foss	Lenroot	Randsdell, La.	Young, Kans.
Foster, Ill.	Lewis	Rauch	Young, Mich.

NAYS—131.

Adamson	Denver	Hughes, Ga.	Post
Aiken, S. C.	Dickinson	Hughes, N. J.	Raker
Alexander	Dickson, Miss.	Hull	Randell, Tex.
Allen	Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly
Anderson, Ohio	Difenderfer	Jacoway	Richardson
Ashbrook	Dixon, Ind.	Johnson, Ky.	Robinson
Bartlett	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Roddenbery
Beall, Tex.	Doremus	Jones	Rothermel
Bell, Ga.	Edwards	Kindred	Rouse
Blackmon	Ellerbe	Kipp	Rubey
Booher	Faison	Kitchin	Rucker, Mo.
Brantley	Ferris	Konig	Russell
Burleson	Fitzgerald	Korbly	Shackleford
Burnett	Flood, Va.	Lamb	Sheppard
Byrnes, S. C.	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Ga.	Sherley
Byrns, Tenn.	Francis	Legare	Sisson
Callaway	Garner	Lever	Slayden
Candler	Garrett	Littlepage	Small
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Littleton	Smith, Tex.
Carlin	Gordon	Lloyd	Sparkman
Carter	Gray	Lobeck	Stanley
Clark, Fla.	Gregg, Pa.	McGillicuddy	Stedman
Claypool	Gregg, Tex.	McHenry	Stephens, Miss.
Clayton	Gudger	Macon	Stephens, Tex.
Cline	Hamlin	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Ala.
Collier	Hammond	Mays	Thomas
Connell	Hardwick	Moon, Tenn.	Tribble
Cravens	Harrison, Miss.	Moore, Tex.	Turnbull
Cullop	Hay	Morrison	Underwood
Curley	Henry, Tex.	Murray	Watkins
Daugherty	Holland	Oldfield	Witherspoon
Davis, W. Va.	Houston	Padgett	Young, Tex.
Dent	Howard	Peters	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kinkead, N. J.	Webb

NOT VOTING—83.

Ames	Evans	Higgins	Payne
Andrus	Fairchild	Hobson	Plumley
Anthony	Fields	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Ayres	Finley	James	Riordan
Bates	Fornes	Latta	Rodenberg
Bingham	Foster, Vt.	Lee, Pa.	Sells
Boehne	Fowler	Levy	Sharp
Bradley	Gallagher	Lindsay	Simmons
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Slemp
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Smith, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Glass	McCall	Smith, N. Y.
Calder	Goldfogle	McKenzie	Stack
Campbell	Gould	Maher	Sulloway
Conry	Graham	Mitchell	Sulzer
Cox, Ohio	Griest	Moon, Pa.	Talbott, Md.
Currier	Hamilton, W. Va.	Morse, Wis.	Talcott, N. Y.
Davenport	Harris	Olmsted	Tilson
De Forest	Heald	O'Shaunessy	Weeks
Draper	Heflin	Palmer	White
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Parran	Wilson, N. Y.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Patten, N. Y.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. JAMES with Mr. MCCALL.

Until further notice:

Mr. GOULD with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. FIELD with Mr. PARRAN.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. TILSON.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. MITCHELL.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the first part of the amendment which has just been agreed to is not in proper form, and I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the amendment in order that it may be perfected, to give it the proper caption.

The SPEAKER. The previous question having been ordered, the gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to perfect the amendment as follows. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the first five lines and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. That a new section be added to said act at the end thereof, to be known as section 11, as follows: Section 11."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that is simply to put the proper caption to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 2, page 2, after the word "which," insert the words "a Representative or"; in line 3 strike out the words "in two or more States."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 6, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Is it proper at this stage of the proceedings to move to recommit with instructions?

The SPEAKER. It is not. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The question was taken, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask what the number of the section is that was put on the bill a few moments ago?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to answer the gentleman, I will state that it will be section 2 of the bill and section 11 of the law.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit this bill to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with section 2 of the bill stricken out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the gentleman who makes the motion opposed to the bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. As it is now, yes; and so is every other man who wants publicity.

Mr. MANN. Well, we are willing to vote for the bill. Let the gentleman vote against it on the final roll call. That is the test.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I did not say I would vote against it on the final roll call.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recommit this bill to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress to report the same back forthwith with section 2 of the bill stricken out.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 155, noes 136.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 157, nays 149, answered "present" 2, not voting 81, as follows:

YEAS—157.

Adair	Dickson, Miss.	James	Reilly
Adamson	Dies	Johnson, Ky.	Richardson
Aiken, S. C.	Difenderfer	Johnson, S. C.	Robinson
Allen	Dixon, Ind.	Jones	Roddenbery
Anderson, Ohio	Donohoe	Kindred	Rothermel
Ansberry	Doremus	Kipp	Rouse
Ashbrook	Doughton	Kitchin	Rubey
Barnhart	Edwards	Konig	Rucker, Colo.
Bartlett	Faison	Korbly	Rucker, Mo.
Bathrick	Ferris	Lamb	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Legare	Saunders
Blackmon	Floyd, Ark.	Lever	Scully
Booher	Foster, Ill.	Lewis	Shackleford
Brantley	Francis	Linthicum	Sheppard
Brown	Garner	Littlepage	Sherley
Burleson	Garrett	Littleton	Sims
Burnett	Godwin, N. C.	Lloyd	Sisson
Byrnes, S. C.	Goeke	Lobeck	Slayden
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	McCoy	Small
Callaway	Gould	McDermott	Smith, Tex.
Candler	Gregg, Pa.	McGillicuddy	Sparkman
Cantrill	Gregg, Tex.	McHenry	Stanley
Carlin	Gudger	Macon	Stedman
Carter	Hamlin	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Hammond	Martin, Colo.	Stephens, Tex.
Claypool	Hardwick	Mays	Taylor, Ala.
Clayton	Harrison, Miss.	Moon, Tenn.	Taylor, Colo.
Cline	Harrison, N. Y.	Moore, Tex.	Thomas
Collier	Hay	Morrison	Tribble
Connell	Helm	Murray	Turnbull
Covington	Henry, Tex.	Oldfield	Underhill
Cravens	Holland	Padgett	Underwood
Cullop	Houston	Page	Watkins
Curley	Howard	Peters	Witherspoon
Daugherty	Hughes, Ga.	Post	Young, Tex.
Davis, W. Va.	Hughes, N. J.	Pou	The Speaker
Dent	Hull	Rainey	
Denver	Humphreys, Miss.	Randell, Tex.	
Dickinson	Jacoway	Rauch	

NAYS—149.

Akin, N. Y.	George	Lindbergh	Roberts, Nev.
Alexander	Gillett	Loud	Sherwood
Anderson, Minn.	Good	McCall	Sloan
Austin	Goodwin, Ark.	McCreary	Smith, J. M. C.
Barchfeld	Gray	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Saml. W.
Bartholdt	Greene	McKinley	Speer
Berger	Guernsey	McKinney	Steenerson
Borland	Hamill	McLaughlin	Stephens, Cal.
Bowman	Hamilton, Mich.	McMorran	Sterling
Buchanan	Hanna	Madden	Stevens, Minn.
Bulkley	Hardy	Madison	Stone
Burke, S. Dak.	Hartman	Malby	Sulloway
Burke, Wis.	Haugen	Mann	Sweet
Butler	Hawley	Martin, S. Dak.	Switzer
Cannon	Hayes	Matthews	Taylor, Ohio
Cary	Helgesen	Miller	Thayer
Catlin	Hill	Mondell	Thistlewood
Cooper	Hinds	Moore, Pa.	Towner
Copley	Howell	Morgan	Townsend
Cox, Ind.	Howland	Mott	Tuttle
Crago	Hubbard	Murdock	Utter
Crumpacker	Humphrey, Wash.	Needham	Volstead
Dalzell	Jackson	Nelson	Vreeland
Danforth	Kahn	Norris	Warburton
Davidson	Kendall	Nye	Wedemeyer
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Dodds	Kent	Pepper	Wickliffe
Dupre	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pickett	Wilder
Dwight	Knowland	Porter	Willis
Dyer	Konop	Powers	Wilson, Ill.
Esch	Kopp	Pray	Wilson, Pa.
Estopinal	Lafean	Prince	Wood, N. J.
Farr	Lafferty	Prouty	Woods, Iowa
Focht	La Follette	Pujo	Young, Kans.
Fordney	Langham	Raker	Young, Mich.
Foss	Langley	Ransdell, La.	
French	Lawrence	Rees	
Fuller	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kinkead, N. J. Webb

NOT VOTING—81.

Ames	Ellerbe	Higgins	Plumley
Andrus	Evans	Hobson	Redfield
Anthony	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Riordan
Ayres	Fields	Latta	Rodenberg
Bates	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Sells
Bingham	Fornes	Levy	Sharp
Boehne	Foster, Vt.	Lindsay	Simmons
Bradley	Fowler	Longworth	Slemp
Broussard	Gallagher	Loudenslager	Smith, Cal.
Burgess	Gardner, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	Maher	Stack
Calder	Glass	Mitchell	Sulzer
Campbell	Goldfogle	Moon, Pa.	Talbott, Md.
Conry	Graham	Morse, Wis.	Talcott, N. Y.
Cox, Ohio	Griest	Moss, Ind.	Tilson
Currier	Hamilton, W. Va.	Olmsted	Weeks
Davenport	Harris	O'Shaunessy	White
De Forest	Heald	Palmer	Wilson, N. Y.
Draper	Heflin	Parran	
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Patten, N. Y.	
Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Payne	

So the motion to recommit the bill with instructions was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ELLERBE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. Moss of Indiana with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. It is not proper to ask for a recapitulation until the vote is announced.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for a recapitulation.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the instructions of the House of Representatives, I report back from the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress the bill H. R. 2958, amended by striking out section 2 in accordance with the direction of the House, and upon that bill and amendment I move the previous question to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reports back from the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress the bill H. R. 2958, with an amendment striking out section 2, and on that and the passage of the bill he demands the previous question.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I take it it is necessary in any event to order a reengrossment of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is it in order to ask for a separate vote on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Why, a vote would be had on the amendment, of course. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the amendment reported by the gentleman from Missouri from his committee.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri and Mr. HOUSTON demanded a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BORLAND. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman from Missouri——

Mr. FERRIS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. There is already one pending.

Mr. BORLAND. Just a moment. The parliamentary inquiry is this: The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has reported a bill from his committee without any amendment on it. There is no amendment to vote on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BORLAND. The bill has been reported with the section stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The amendment that the gentleman from Missouri reported is to strike out section 2 of this bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the amendment reported from the Clerk's desk. It has not been reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reported?

Mr. MANN. I did not ask unanimous consent. I asked it as a matter of right.

Mr. ADAIR. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out section 2, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 2. That a new section be added to said act at the end thereof, to be known as section 11, as follows:

"SEC. 11. It shall be the duty of every candidate for Representative in Congress of the United States, at least 10 days before any general or primary election before which he is a candidate, to file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, in the District of Columbia, a full and correct statement of all moneys or things of value received from any source and used by him in any way for the purpose of securing his election, and said statement shall contain a true account of all moneys used by any agent or representative of said candidate for said purposes when known to the candidate. The said statement shall be verified by the oath of the candidate, taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the law of the State in which he is a candidate, and shall be sworn to by the candidate in the district in which he is a candidate for Representative in Congress.

"The several district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to punish violations of this act, and upon conviction of any candidate for the violation of this section or of filing a false statement of such expenses, he shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000."

The SPEAKER. The real thing to be voted on is striking that amendment out. When the names of Members are called those in favor of striking it out will say "aye" and those opposed will say "no," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 139, answered "present" 2, not voting 83, as follows:

YEAS—165.

Adair	Dies	Jacoway	Richardson
Adamson	Difenderfer	James	Robinson
Aiken, S. C.	Dixon, Ind.	Johnson, Ky.	Roddenbery
Alexander	Donohoe	Johnson, S. C.	Rothermel
Allen	Doremus	Jones	Rouse
Anderson, Ohio	Doughton	Kindred	Rubey
Ansberry	Dupre	Kipp	Rucker, Colo.
Ashbrook	Edwards	Kitchin	Rucker, Mo.
Barnhart	Estopinal	Konig	Russell
Bartlett	Faison	Korbly	Saunders
Bathrick	Ferris	Lamb	Scully
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Lee, Ga.	Shackleford
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Legare	Sheppard
Blackmon	Floyd, Ark.	Lever	Sherley
Booher	Foster, Ill.	Linthicum	Sherwood
Borland	Francis	Littlepage	Sims
Burleson	Garner	Littleton	Sisson
Burnett	Garrett	Lloyd	Slayden
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Lobeck	Small
Byrns, Tenn.	Goeke	McCoy	Smith, Tex.
Callaway	Goodwin, Ark.	McDermott	Sparkman
Candler	Gordon	McGillicuddy	Stanley
Cantrill	Gould	McHenry	Stedman
Carlin	Gregg, Pa.	Macon	Stephens, Miss.
Carter	Gregg, Tex.	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Tex.
Clark, Fla.	Gudger	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Ala.
Claypool	Hamill	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Clayton	Hamlin	Moon, Tenn.	Thomas
Cline	Hammond	Moore, Tex.	Townsend
Collier	Hardwick	Murray	Tribble
Connell	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Turnbull
Covington	Harrison, N. Y.	Padgett	Tuttle
Cox, Ind.	Hay	Page	Underhill
Cravens	Helm	Peters	Underwood
Cullop	Henry, Tex.	Post	Watkins
Curley	Holland	Pou	Wickliffe
Daugherty	Houston	Pujo	Witherspoon
Davis, W. Va.	Howard	Rainey	Young, Tex.
Dent	Hughes, Ga.	Randell, Tex.	The Speaker
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Ransdell, La.	
Dickinson	Hull	Rauch	
Dickson, Miss.	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly	

NAYS—139.

Akin, N. Y.	George	Lenroot	Raker
Anderson, Minn.	Gillett	Lewis	Rees
Austin	Good	Lindbergh	Roberts, Mass.
Barchfeld	Gray	Loud	Roberts, Nev.
Bartholdt	Greene	McCall	Sloan
Berger	Guernsey	McCreary	Smith, J. M. C.
Bowman	Hamilton, Mich.	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Sami. W.
Brown	Hanna	McKinley	Speer
Buchanan	Hardy	McKinney	Steenerson
Bulkley	Hartman	McLaughlin	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, S. Dak.	Haugen	McMorran	Sterling
Burke, Wis.	Hawley	Madden	Stevens, Minn.
Butler	Hayes	Madison	Stone
Cannon	Helgesen	Malby	Sulloway
Cary	Hill	Mann	Sweet
Catlin	Hinds	Martin, S. Dak.	Switzer
Cooper	Howell	Matthews	Taylor, Ohio
Copley	Howland	Miller	Thayer
Crago	Hubbard	Mondell	Thistlewood
Crumpacker	Humphrey, Wash.	Moore, Pa.	Towner
Dalzell	Jackson	Morgan	Utter
Danforth	Kahn	Mott	Volstead
Davidson	Kendall	Murdock	Vreeland
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Needham	Warburton
De Forest	Kent	Nelson	Wedemeyer
Dodds	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Norris	Whitacre
Dwight	Knowland	Nye	Wilder
Dyer	Konop	Patton, Pa.	Willis
Esch	Kopp	Pepper	Wilson, Ill.
Farr	Lafean	Pickett	Wilson, Pa.
Focht	Lafferty	Porter	Wood, N. J.
Fordney	La Follette	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Foss	Langham	Pray	Young, Kans.
French	Langley	Prince	Young, Mich.
Fuller	Lawrence	Prouty	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kinkead, N. J. Webb

NOT VOTING—83.

Ames	Ellerbe	Higgins	Payne
Andrus	Evans	Hobson	Plumley
Anthony	Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Ayers	Fields	Latta	Riordan
Bates	Finley	Lee, Pa.	Rodenberg
Bingham	Fornes	Levy	Sabath
Boehne	Foster, Vt.	Lindsay	Sells
Bradley	Fowler	Longworth	Sharp
Brantley	Gallagher	Loudenslager	Simmons
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	McKenzie	Slemp
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Maher	Smith, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Glass	Mitchell	Smith, N. Y.
Calder	Goldfogle	Moon, Pa.	Stack
Campbell	Graham	Morrison	Sulzer
Conry	Griest	Morse, Wis.	Talbott, Md.
Cox, Ohio	Hamilton, W. Va.	Moss, Ind.	Talcott, N. Y.
Currier	Harris	Olmsted	Tilson
Davenport	Heald	O'Shaunessy	Weeks
Draper	Heflin	Palmer	White
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Parran	Wilson, N. Y.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Patten, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So the amendment was adopted.

The following additional pair was announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. HARRIS.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 0, answered "present" 0, not voting 82, as follows:

YEAS—307.

Adair	De Forest	Helgesen	McGuire, Okla.
Adamson	Dent	Helm	McHenry
Aiken, S. C.	Denver	Henry, Tex.	McKinley
Akin, N. Y.	Dickinson	Hill	McKinney
Alexander	Dickson, Miss.	Hinds	McLaughlin
Allen	Dies	Hobson	McMorran
Anderson, Minn.	Difenderfer	Holland	Macon
Anderson, Ohio	Dixon, Ind.	Houston	Madden
Ansberry	Dodds	Howard	Madison
Ashbrook	Donohoe	Howell	Maguire, Nebr.
Austin	Doremus	Howland	Malby
Barchfeld	Doughton	Hubbard	Mann
Barnhart	Dupre	Hughes, Ga.	Martin, Colo.
Bartholdt	Dwight	Hughes, N. J.	Martin, S. Dak.
Bartlett	Dyer	Hull	Mays
Bathrick	Edwards	Humphrey, Wash.	Miller
Beall, Tex.	Esch	Humphreys, Miss.	Mondell
Bell, Ga.	Estopinal	Jackson	Moon, Tenn.
Blackmon	Faison	Jacoway	Moore, Pa.
Booher	Farr	James	Moore, Tex.
Borland	Ferris	Johnson, Ky.	Morgan
Bowman	Fitzgerald	Johnson, S. C.	Moss, Ind.
Brown	Flood, Va.	Jones	Mott
Buchanan	Floyd, Ark.	Kahn	Murdock
Bulkley	Focht	Kendall	Murray
Burke, S. Dak.	Fordney	Kennedy	Needham
Burke, Wis.	Foss	Kent	Nelson
Burleson	Foster, Ill.	Kindred	Norris
Burnett	Francis	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Nye
Butler	French	Kinkead, N. J.	Oldfield
Byrnes, S. C.	Fuller	Kipp	Padgett
Byrns, Tenn.	Garner	Kitchin	Page
Callaway	Garrett	Knowland	Patton, Pa.
Candler	George	Konig	Pepper
Cannon	Gillett	Konop	Peters
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Kopp	Pickett
Carlin	Goeke	Korbly	Porter
Carter	Good	Lafean	Post
Cary	Goodwin, Ark.	Lafferty	Pou
Catlin	Gordon	La Follette	Powers
Clark, Fla.	Gould	Lamb	Pray
Claypool	Gray	Langham	Prince
Clayton	Greene	Langley	Prouty
Cline	Gregg, Pa.	Lawrence	Pujo
Collier	Gregg, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Rainey
Connell	Gudger	Legare	Raker
Cooper	Guernsey	Lenroot	Randell, Tex.
Copley	Hamill	Lever	Ransdell, La.
Covington	Hamilton, Mich.	Lewis	Rauch
Cox, Ind.	Hamlin	Lindbergh	Rees
Crago	Hammond	Linthicum	Reilly
Cravens	Hanna	Littlepage	Richardson
Crumpacker	Hardwick	Littleton	Roberts, Mass.
Cullop	Hardy	Lloyd	Roberts, Nev.
Curley	Harrison, Miss.	Lobeck	Robinson
Dalzell	Harrison, N. Y.	Loud	Roddenbery
Danforth	Hartman	McCall	Rothermel
Daugherty	Haugen	McCoy	Rouse
Davidson	Hawley	McCreary	Rubey
Davis, Minn.	Hay	McDermott	Rucker, Colo.
Davis, W. Va.	Hayes	McGillicuddy	Rucker, Mo.

Russell	Sparkman	Taylor, Ohio	Webb
Sabath	Speer	Thayer	Wedemeyer
Saunders	Stanley	Thistlewood	Whitacre
Scully	Stedman	Thomas	Wickliffe
Shackleford	Steenerson	Towner	Wilder
Sheppard	Stephens, Cal.	Townsend	Willis
Sherley	Stephens, Miss.	Tribble	Wilson, Ill.
Sherwood	Stephens, Tex.	Turnbull	Wilson, Pa.
Sims	Sterling	Tuttle	Witherspoon
Sisson	Stevens, Minn.	Underhill	Wood, N. J.
Slayden	Stone	Underwood	Woods, Iowa
Sloan	Sulloway	Utter	Young, Kans.
Small	Sweet	Volstead	Young, Mich.
Smith, J. M. C.	Switzer	Vreeland	Young, Tex.
Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, Ala.	Warburton	The Speaker
Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Colo.	Watkins	

NOT VOTING—82.

Ames	Driscoll, M. E.	Hensley	Payne
Andrus	Ellerbe	Higgins	Plumley
Anthony	Evans	Hughes, W. Va.	Redfield
Ayres	Fairchild	Latta	Riordan
Bates	Fields	Lee, Pa.	Rodenberg
Berger	Finley	Levy	Sells
Bingham	Fornes	Lindsay	Sharp
Boehne	Foster, Vt.	Longworth	Simmons
Bradley	Fowler	Loudenslager	Slemp
Brantley	Gallagher	McKenzie	Smith, Cal.
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Matthews	Stack
Burke, Pa.	Glass	Mitchell	Sulzer
Calder	Goldfogle	Moon, Pa.	Talbott, Md.
Campbell	Graham	Morrison	Talcott, N. Y.
Conry	Griest	Morse, Wis.	Tilson
Cox, Ohio	Hamilton, W. Va.	Olmsted	Weeks
Currier	Harris	O'Shaunessy	White
Davenport	Heald	Palmer	Wilson, N. Y.
Draper	Heflin	Parran	
Driscoll, D. A.	Henry, Conn.	Patten, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pair:

On this vote:

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. HIGGINS.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the result was received with applause.

On motion of Mr. RUCKER of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the following cases, no adverse report having been made thereon:

At the request of Mr. RUCKER of Colorado, the papers in the case of Jeanie G. Lyles (61st Cong.).

At the request of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, the papers in the case of John P. Fitzgerald (H. R. 23132, 61st Cong., 2d sess.).

At the request of Mr. COVINGTON, the papers in the cases of William Lockart (61st Cong.); E. Strimel (61st Cong.); and Oscar Ernst (61st Cong.).

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two sides, one half of the time to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] in general debate.

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And I will state that I intend to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] five hours of my time for him to yield to gentlemen on his side of the House who are in favor of the bill.

Mr. CLAYTON. Is it understood that there will be three days' general debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Two or three days.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman include that in his motion—the three days?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not ask for any limitation of time.

Mr. CLAYTON. I simply wanted the information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 4412, generally known as the reciprocity bill, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that the time be controlled, one-half by him and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Alabama yielding five hours——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not include that in the request.

Mr. JAMES. I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama if he yields five hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] and reserves a like time to himself, and the opposition are to have 10 hours, that would mean 20 hours of general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it takes that length of time, we will continue the debate, and I have no desire to cut off debate unduly; but I should like to finish the general debate in three days, if we can do it.

Mr. BURLESON. Or even in a shorter time.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] is in accord with the gentleman from Alabama on this proposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said that I would yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], to yield to gentlemen on that side who are in favor of the bill.

Mr. DICKINSON. Out of your time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Out of my time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. DALZELL. I simply want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that there is no desire on this side of the House, or upon the part of those whom I represent, to protract the debate unduly. I do not believe we will have any trouble at all in agreeing upon a time to close the debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course we want to conclude the debate on this bill at as early a date as practicable. There is no disposition not to give the Members who really want to debate the bill a fair opportunity to do so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that leave be given to each and all gentlemen who have addressed the House to-day on the publicity bill to extend remarks in the RECORD on that subject for five legislative days.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 15, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Willamette River from Oregon City to Eugene, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 13), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 52) to authorize the payment of certain claims for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, and the same was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 5137) to amend sections 5 and 6 of an act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon United States commissioners over offenses committed in a portion of the permanent Hot Springs Mountain Reservation, Arkansas," approved April 20, 1904; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5138) permitting the Minneapolis, St. Paul, Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the St. Croix River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 5139) to create a national arbitration tribunal and to define the duties and powers thereof; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5140) to provide for the award of congressional medals of honor to officers of the naval service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 5141) to provide and pay additional compensation to the rural free-delivery carriers of mail in the United States, and providing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5142) to establish a fish-culture station at the city of Fargo, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5143) to establish a fish-culture station at or near Sykeston, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 5144) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 5145) authorizing the city of Hot Springs, Ark., to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the fire department of said city on lot No. 3, block No. 115, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5146) providing for the construction of a walk from the National Military Cemetery at Natchez, Miss., to the sidewalks of the city of Natchez; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5147) to provide for the sale of the United States military reservation at Fort Walla Walla, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5148) to declare and define the jurisdiction of courts as to the question of the constitutionality of acts of Congress and of the various States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5149) for the relief of soldiers of the Civil War, the War with Spain, and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 5150) for the relief of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5151) to change the location of the office of collector of customs at Yaquina, Oreg., to Newport, Oreg.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5152) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at McComb, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5153) to cede jurisdiction to the State of Georgia over certain land in Fulton County; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER: Resolution (H. Res. 90) asking for investigation of "Taylor system" of shop management; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CARTER: Resolution (H. Res. 91) requesting the President of the United States to furnish information regarding the appointment of D. C. McCurtain as chief of the Choctaws; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 92) requesting the President to transmit to Congress correspondence relating to Japanese immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: Resolution (H. Res. 93) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to appoint clerk and messenger to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LLOYD: Resolution (H. Res. 94) providing for compensation for an attendant in the ladies' reception room of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) making the 12th day of February in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) proposing an amendment to the Constitution by providing that all of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment except its first sentence shall be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5154) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Klinefelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5155) granting an increase of pension to George W. Luff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5156) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5157) granting an increase of pension to Martin Nighswander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5158) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Lafor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5159) granting an increase of pension to John H. Blessing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5160) granting a pension to Joseph McCurdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5161) granting a pension to Herbert O. Kohr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 5162) for the relief of Ramon B. Harrison; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 5163) granting an increase of pension to John F. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5164) granting a pension to Emma Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5165) granting a pension to Harriet Squier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5166) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5167) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Munklett, alias Henry Reinhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5168) granting an increase of pension to August Spergel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5169) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Walts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5170) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5171) granting an increase of pension to Martin Ehalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5172) granting an increase of pension to David Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5173) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert E. Bridgewater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5174) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5175) granting an increase of pension to William R. Lindley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5176) granting an increase of pension to Clark Duggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5177) granting an increase of pension to Pulaski T. Gaither; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5178) granting an increase of pension to Marquis L. Walts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5179) granting an increase of pension to Philip S. Duley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Lyman C. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5181) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5182) granting an increase of pension to Harrisson M. Stratton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5183) granting an increase of pension to George D. Allhands; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5184) granting an increase of pension to Coleman Romine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5185) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Reed, sr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5186) granting an increase of pension to Luther Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5187) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5188) granting an increase of pension to John L. Hix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5189) granting an increase of pension to William Birth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5190), granting an increase of pension to Francis X. Busam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Crist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5192) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5193) granting an increase of pension to William E. Jenner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5194) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Fite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5195) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5196) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Klingel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5197) granting a pension to Agnes Conrad; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5198) granting a pension to Martin Hirt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5199) granting a pension to William Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5200) granting a pension to Mary A. Burk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5201) for the relief of Sarah Elizabeth Watson, administratrix of the estate of David Buck, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5202) for the relief of Girard G. Butler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5203) for the relief of heirs of Moses J. Ferguson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5204) for the relief of the heirs at law of John A. Regan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5205) for the relief of the heirs of Louis Cato, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5206) for the relief of the heirs of J. B. Clark, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5207) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin Whitehead; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5208) for the relief of heirs or estate of Louis Summers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5209) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Fannie Solari, heir of Emanuel M. Solari, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5210) granting a pension to Annie W. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 5211) granting a pension to M. B. Cavanaugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5212) for the relief of J. Caples Mallonee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5213) for the relief of the heirs at law of William Coolidge; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5214) to pay to the heirs of Lieut. Col. John McIntosh, late of McIntosh County, Ga., certain moneys due for his services in the War of the American Revolution; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 5215) granting an increase of pension to La Roy B. Church; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5216) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5217) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5218) granting a pension to Margaret Furnier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5219) granting a pension to Arve Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5220) to correct the military record of Samuel P. Hedges; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 5221) granting a pension claim to Joseph Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 5222) granting a pension to Mercy Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5223) granting a pension to Frederick L. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5224) for the relief of Joseph B. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5225) for the relief of John T. Witters; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5226) for the relief of Jacob Dillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5227) for the relief of the heirs of Robert Fullerton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5228) for the relief of the legal heirs of John G. Burrus, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5229) granting an increase of pension to William Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5230) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5231) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5232) granting an increase of pension to William J. Vandergrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Cadle Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5234) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Bess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5235) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5236) granting an increase of pension to Moses A. Stark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5237) granting a pension to Sophia C. Neil; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5238) granting a pension to Aaron B. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5239) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John H. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5240) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kinzley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 5241) granting an increase of pension to Stephen F. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5242) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Delos Dubois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5244) granting an increase of pension to William Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5245) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5246) granting a pension to George H. Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5247) granting a pension to Gilbert M. Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 5248) granting a pension to Marcus L. Getter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5249) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan S. Tindall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5250) granting an increase of pension to Lewis W. England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5251) granting a pension to Nancy Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 5252) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. M. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 5253) granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5254) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5255) granting an increase of pension to William L. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5256) granting an increase of pension to Isaac J. Monk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5257) granting an increase of pension to William W. Keene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5258) granting an increase of pension to Nelson E. Haskell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5259) granting a pension to Mary K. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5260) granting an increase of pension to James M. Holliday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5261) granting an increase of pension to Commodore R. Lones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5262) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5263) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cheyne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5264) granting an increase of pension to Jamison R. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5265) granting an increase of pension to Henry U. Caswell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5266) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. A. Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 5267) granting an increase of pension to John Cummins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 5268) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5269) granting an increase of pension to Robert Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5270) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5271) to correct the military record of Patrick H. McGee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 5272) granting an increase of pension to John Quigley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5273) granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5274) granting an increase of pension to Catharine J. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 5275) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Chenoweth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5276) granting an increase of pension to John D. Coates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5277) granting a pension to Arthur B. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5278) for the relief of L. B. Wyatt; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5279) for the relief of Maj. Sanford Willbanks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5280) for the relief of John Thomas Owen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5281) for the relief of Anderson Malon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5282) for the relief of Henry C. Haynes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5283) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Winston, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5284) to authorize the Secretary of War to correct the record of Calhoun Malone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5285) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension for Samuel L. D. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolution of Bethlehem Grange, No. 1752, of Coshocton, Ohio, against the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, evidence to be filed with the claim of William Canady for special relief; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Resolution of Trades and Labor Council of Fond du Lac, Wis., remonstrating against the mobilization of United States troops along the border of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 68 farmers of Fond du Lac County, Wis., against the Canadian reciprocity treaty until the same principle of free trade can be applied to what the American farmers have to buy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Matter relating to repeal of eight-hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, letter of New York Cordage Co., relative to certain tariff rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of International Union of Steam Engineers, Local No. 315, insisting upon having the battleship *New York* built in Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of Republican Club, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the approval of the reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Flora Grange, Boone County, Ill., against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of citizens of Jackson and Nobles Counties, Minn., against passage of Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petitions of citizens of Jamestown, N. Dak., against rural parcels-post service, and of citizens of Walhalla, N. Dak., urging additional compensation to rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens and farmers of Walsh County, N. Dak., against the Canadian reciprocity treaty bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of farmers against the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of towns against establishment of a local rural parcels-post service on the rural-delivery routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition to increase the compensation of rural route free-delivery carriers of mail in the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Paper to accompany bill (H. R. 4850) for the relief of the heirs of Ephraim Jordan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, resolutions of the Georgia-Florida Sawmill Association, protesting against the reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of William J. Vandergrift; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Tennessee Legislature, requesting a return of the cotton tax by the Federal Government in the years 1861–1868 to the States for educational purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of Local Bergen County Socialist Party, against sending troops to Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Johnsonburg Grange, No. 189, Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Paterson, N. J., protesting against a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: Petition of Ole Jacobson and 55 others, against the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of Charles F. M. Morgan, Company B, First Oregon Cavalry, relating to pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Hubbard Lake Grange, No. 192, Hubbard Lake, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Lafayette Mason, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-eighth Ohio Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of Fernando D. Foss and 51 others, relative to the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Coatesville, No. 170; Betsy Ross, No. 119; Pioneer, No. 380; Fairview, No. 89; Old Glory, No. 56; Wilkes-Barre, No. 102; Black Creek, No. 51; Energy, No. 284; Berwyn, No. 21; Egyptian, No. 144; Science, No. 52; Bloomsburg, No. 81; Reading, No. 122; Young America, No. 69; Friendship, No. 41; Columbia, No. 11; Hand in Hand, No. 50; Pride of East Mauch Chunk, No. 162; Magnolia, No. 183; Harmony, No. 124; Jennie Wade, No. 68; North Penn, No. 151; Cohocksink, No. 166; Purity, No. 48; Wisteria, No. 184; Hielman, No. 140; Fair, No. 791; Progress, No. 29; Morrace, No. 109; Pride of T. A. Armstrong, No. 92; Alfretta, No. 115; Richmond, No. 143; June Rose, No. 118; James G. Blaine, No. 2; Martha Washington, No. 37; Goddess of Liberty, No. 87; Spring Mountain, No. 171; Ann M. Ross, No. 187; Martha W. Crow, No. 65; Pride of West Hazelton, No. 201; General J. C. Fremont, No. 32; Pride of Williamsport, No. 104; West Park, No. 108; Relief, No. 16; General D. B. Birney, No. 51; Loyal, No. 94; Mount Carmel, No. 42; Windom, No. 93; Lansdale, No. 111; Major McKinley, No. 90; Lady Franklin, No. 85; Concord, No. 66; Evangeline, No. 179; J. P. Siegfried, No. 149; American Union, No. 537; Ardmore, No. 86; Unity, No. 14; James E. Hyatt, No. 127; Excelsior, No. 4; Lieutenant Cushing, No. 20; Valley Hill, No. 59; Sylvania, No. 71; Kensington, No. 67; Puritan, No. 185; Pen and Pencil, No. 120; Keystone, No. 107; Pottstown, No. 78; Oppstown, No. 195; Pride of Conestoga, No. 142; Allegheny, No. 23; Pride of Manchester, No. 25; Columbian, No. 125; Lawrence, No. 61; Walter S. Newhall, No. 203; Young America, No. 407; Greble, No. 13; Harrogate, No. 979; Charles W. Riggin, No. 878; Shenandoah Valley, No. 530; Wissahickon, No. 100; Liberty, No. 2; Altoona, No. 152; Nuremberg, No. 763; West Park, No. 408; Lebanon Valley, No. 885; Fairmount, No. 321; Pride of Felton, No. 75; Chester, No. 36; Versailles, No. 691; Star, No. 55; Duncannon, No. 181; Pittston, No. 43; Riverside, No. 99; Harry Clay, No. 99; The Temple, No. 62; Sunbury, No. 31; Pittsburg, No. 34; E. A. Shubert, No. 5; Liberty Bell, No. 76; Kearsarge, No. 15; Greble, No. 1; Industry, No. 22; Lily of the Valley, No. 79; Milton,

No. 133; Volunteer, No. 13; Pride of Munson, No. 194; Good Interest, No. 187; Silver Crescent, No. 3; Resolute, No. 77; Pride of Welcome, No. 33; Logan, No. 60; Eden, No. 988; Malto, No. 36; Star of Oberlin, No. 155; Frankford, No. 123; Bellevue, No. 148; Lydia Darrah, No. 110; Clearfield, No. 146; General Putnam, No. 28; Wissahickon, No. 137; Dallastown, No. 105; and West Chester, No. 45, Councils of Daughters of Liberty, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring enactment of an illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOTT: Resolution of Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sandy Creek, N. Y., in favor of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of Great Bend Grange, No. 642, Great Bend, N. Y.; Pennellville Grange, No. 729, Pennellville, N. Y.; Lafargeville Grange, No. 15, Lafargeville, N. Y.; Jefferson County Pomona Grange, Watertown, N. Y.; Amboy Grange, No. 779, Amboy Center, N. Y.; Star Grange, No. 9, Hannsfield, N. Y.; Thousand Island Grange, No. 593, Omar, N. Y.; Pulaski Grange, No. 730, Pulaski, N. Y.; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599, Cape Vincent, N. Y.; Oswego County Pomona Grange, Oswego, N. Y.; Indian River Grange, Antwerp, N. Y.; Smithville Grange, No. 60, Smithville, N. Y.; Plessis Grange, No. 629, Plessis, N. Y.; Lewis County Pomona Grange; Adams Center Grange, No. 590; and Gardner Corners Grange, Gardners Corners, N. Y., Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity bill (H. R. 4412); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of International Molders' Union, Local No. 78, of Watertown, N. Y., favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Resolutions of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pasadena, Cal., in favor of Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Papers to accompany bill for claim for arrearages of pension in case of Dr. Joseph Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Dr. C. F. King and 60 other citizens of Mount Cary, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 15, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, whose love fills all space with rays divine, we hallow Thy name for that greatest of all events which demonstrates the power of life over death and which will be celebrated on the morrow with prayers of gratitude and anthems of praise throughout all Christendom; make us worthy we beseech Thee of such love and power. May our spiritual eyes be opened that we may penetrate the veil and behold our loved ones on the golden shore with outstretched arms to receive us.

So long Thy power has blest us, sure it still
Will lead us on
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till
The night is gone.
And with the morn those angel faces smile,
Which we have loved long since, and lost awhile.

And when the tongue is eloquent no more
The soul shall speak in tears of gratitude.

Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. PLUMLEY, a Representative from the second district of Vermont, appeared at the bar and took the oath of office.

RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, generally known as the reciprocity bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Inasmuch as the House is to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for a long, extensive, and important debate, I wish to inquire of the Speaker if the Committee of the Whole has any power to grant leave to print or to extend remarks in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. It has not except to the individual. That has been the uniform practice since I have been here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, that if there is a desire on that side to have leave to print, I will ask unanimous consent at this time for all gentlemen who speak on the bill to have that right.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is no such desire on this side; there is a desire to curtail it, and I suggest that the gentleman include in his motion a provision that any request in Committee of the Whole for the right to extend remarks, or to print remarks, be referred back to the House and not granted in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that that motion would not be in order. The right of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union is governed by the rules of the House, and my motion could not infringe on those rules. These rules clearly provide that the committee can not grant general leave to print, but that it can grant the right to extend remarks.

Mr. GARRETT. Any one Member can defeat it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is true.

The SPEAKER. All this debate is by unanimous consent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan demands the regular order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. SHERLEY took the chair amid general applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I do not intend to make the opening speech on this bill myself, but expect to close the debate. I yield one hour to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, in opening the debate on the pending measure, I shall ask permission at the outset to acknowledge in behalf of the Democracy of the House our thanks and gratitude to the President of the United States for giving us, in this call for an extra session, the opportunity to quicken the fulfillment of our pledges made to the people. [Applause on Democratic side.] How well and how faithfully we have embraced the opportunity thus far the proceedings of this House during the last 10 days attest. I wish, too, to congratulate the Democracy upon its prompt response to the people's will and the quick redemption of its promises.

Believing that the powers vested in and exercised by former Speakers were subversive of the rights of representative government, we pledged the people that if we were given control of the House we would write into its rules that the one-man power should be destroyed, that the Speaker, whoever he might be, should no longer have the power to appoint committees, to pack committees, so that such legislation as the one man, the Speaker, might will should be kept in or brought out. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have faithfully kept that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Believing that, in the administration of the affairs of this House, there was wasteful extravagance of the people's money, that there had been useless offices created by the Republican Party and filled as political jobs, we pledged the people that, if we were given control, we would effect economy and abolish every political job in and around this Capitol. We have redeemed that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have not only abolished numbers of useless political offices and obsolete committees, but in the current expenses of the House we have effected an economy of 25 per cent, an annual saving to the people and to the Federal Treasury of more than $180,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This, sir, is an earnest of that honest and economical administration which our party would give the country if intrusted with the control of all the departments of the Government.

Believing that the Senate of the United States, and its past several years' record amply justified the belief, was responsive neither to the will nor to the rights of the people, we pledged

that, so far as we should be given the power, we would submit to the legislatures of the several States an amendment to the Constitution whereby the Senators should be elected by a direct vote of the people. We have fully and faithfully kept that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Believing that the American electorate had the right to know before the casting of its ballot to whom each political party was indebted for its campaign funds, we pledged the people that if we were given the power we would enact a law making it compulsory for contributions and the names of contributors and the disbursements to be made public before as well as after the election. That promise has been redeemed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Before the election or before the nominations? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Under the Republican statute the honest electorate found out only after it had voted who had bought the election. Under the Democratic bill we provide that the electorate before it cast its ballot shall know who is attempting to purchase the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, we promised the people that if we were given the power, so far as our jurisdiction extended, instead of violating the pledges, as has been done by our opponents, we would give to the people an honest revision of the tariff downward, and to-day we take the first step in the consummation of that pledge. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Never in the history of the American Congress, either in the term of a Congress or of an administration, has any party effected for the rights and interest of the people so much beneficent legislation and redeemed so many pledges as has the Democracy of this House within the short period of the last 14 days. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the House did nothing else during this term, I could take its accomplishments and reforms made within these few days and match them against all the achievements of the Republican Party for the last decade. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am willing to put on one end of the scale our achievements and redemptions of pledges in the House in the last 14 days and on the other end the achievements and redemptions of the Republican Party for the last 14 years, and then appeal to the intelligence, patriotism, and sense of justice of the American people to decide the preponderance. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The administration of President Taft will stand out to the future in unique solitude. It is the first in the history of the Government that has been forced, in the exercise of the power given the President by the Constitution, to convene on extraordinary occasions two sessions of Congress in one term. It is the first time in our history that a President has felt the necessity of calling an extra session when the popular branch of the Government was in the hands of an adverse party. This, fellow Democrats, is a most splendid tribute from a Republican President to the patriotism and wisdom of the Democracy of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let it be remembered that no Democrat is in the least responsible for this extra session, but that the sole responsibility for its necessity rests upon the members of the President's party in this Capitol.

The Constitution declares that only on extraordinary occasions shall the President convene Congress. The President first exercised this power when, sir, he was but a few days from his oath of inauguration. He felt, he knew, that as the result of 12 years of Republican legislation, the exact age of the Dingley tariff, the condition both of the people and of the Treasury was so distressing that he was compelled to call Congress together to repeal the most important and the most iniquitous law of 12 years of Republican control. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And now, when the work of that session, called to undo former Republican legislation, has been on the statute books less than 2 years, he feels that its resulting conditions, confronting both the people and the administration, are so grave and so extraordinary that it is necessary to call together a Democratic House and a Republican Senate in order to undo the legislation of that extra session. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The first extra session was to repeal the Dingley iniquity; this extra session is to modify and repeal, so far as the President dares to do it in order to hold his face with Republican leaders, the Payne-Aldrich iniquity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For 10 years I have been accustomed to hear, both from the other side of the aisle and from the White House, and always with a sense of the ridiculous, much talk and rant about Republican capacity for constructive statesmanship. Do you hear anything about that nowadays, gentleman? [Laughter.] Why, my friends, if any Republican in this presence would display the audacity of referring to Republican constructive statesmanship now, in the light of the last two years, every Republican in the House would bow his head in humiliation and mortification. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You and I may differ in our opinion as to your capacity for legislative construction, but one thing is certain, your President believes that every important act you have done requires destruction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He called your first session together to destroy the only act upon which you claimed the right to control the Government; and he calls this session and begs us Democrats to help him destroy what you did in that session. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, my friends, we are going to do it the best we can. [Laughter.] I have heard so long and so often on that side for the last 10 years praises for the occupant of the White House that it sounds neither good nor grateful to hear Republicans now denouncing the great dispenser of public patronage. Two years only of their President's administration, and not a Republican leader on that side dares to stand and speak one commending word for their President. On the contrary, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee in the last session, both in their report and on the floor, denounced their own President for turning traitor to Republican policies and principles and indorsing Democratic policies and principles. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I read in the report on the reciprocity measure of the Republican majority on that committee in the last Congress, signed by Mr. DALZELL, Mr. FORDNEY, and others, which no doubt will be adopted as the minority report at this session, a denunciation of the pending measure as "an abandonment of the policy of protection"; and they give that as a reason why a Republican majority in the last Congress voted against and why a Republican majority in this Congress will vote against the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You Republicans denounce your President for his betrayal of Republican principles; we Democrats commend him for his conversion to Democratic policies. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The standpatters say this bill is a blow at Republican protection. For that reason they oppose it. For that reason I advocate it. For the same reason every loyal, patriotic Democrat in and outside of this House ought to favor it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say to my Democratic colleagues that if there was no other reason that presented itself to my judgment to advocate and vote for this reciprocity measure, this report, written by the high chief priest of protection, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], would furnish the strongest reason why I, as a Democrat, should favor and advocate it. It is a blow at Republican protection. Though this blow is a weak one, I will never raise my hand to stay it, especially since the strength of our arguments has so appealed to the judgment of a Republican President that he stands with uplifted arm to make the assault. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Strike, Mr. President, strike! Although I have not an overflowing love for or an overabundant confidence in a Republican administration, I will not abandon our cause because its righteousness has almost converted even a Republican President to our theory of the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, politics is a great humbler of a man's pride; it excepts not that of a President. Let me present to the House Mr. Taft before and Mr. Taft after the election. Let us see what the President before the election thought and said of us, who are now earnestly, faithfully, and patriotically cooperating with him to enact into law the pending measure. I hold in my hand the Republican textbook used in the campaign of 1910. In the attempt to persuade enough of the voters in this country to return here a Republican instead of a Democratic House, these words of Mr. Taft are carried in large black letters, so that whoever should glance at this book could not fail to see his opinion of my fellow Democrats:

> The difficulty with the Democratic Party, and the reasons why the American people thus far have manifested their distrust of it, is because it has no policy which the country can depend upon.

And yet in less than six months he is beseeching us, in order to win back public favor to a repudiated administration, to help him put upon the statute books a Democratic policy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let us read further:

> Its whole stock in trade is that of irresponsible criticism and obstruction, but when charged with responsibility for doing anything it utterly fails.

Oh, my friends, how the vicissitudes of American politics humiliate the pride of even a President. Irresponsible obstructionists! Utter failures! And yet before that libel upon a great and historic political organization, numbering within its

embrace over 7,000,000 voters, becomes cold upon his lips, the desperate necessities of a discredited administration send this President to bended knees, begging before this Democratic majority. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Instead of that daring and dashing defiance and cruel slander of the Democratic Party, he comes with outstretched hands and sobbing voice, cooing, loving, beseeching us to save his administration from certain oblivion by voting into law this reciprocity agreement. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Whatever be our prejudices, we must commend his political judgment and wisdom. He finds himself and his administration in distressing straits. He must propose something to check increasing public disfavor. Ransacking in vain the history and record of his own party, he turns to that of our party, and in the hope to regain the people's confidence he resorts to a Democratic policy and presents it to the consideration of the Congress and the people as an administration measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This measure is Democratic. We are twitted by the standpat Republicans in the House, in the cloakroom, in the committee room, and in the press with the taunt that we Democrats are standing by a Republican President. My friends, that talk does not interfere with me. We do sometimes stand by a Republican President and you sometimes stand by a Republican President. The difference is this: We Democrats stand by a Republican President only when he is right, while you Republicans stand by a Republican President only when he is wrong. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I regret that we are going to have a few patriotic, loyal Democrats on this side who feel it to be their duty to vote against the pending measure. They tell me that one of the reasons why they can not reconcile it with their consciences is because it is a Republican measure—a Republican President's measure. I want to say to those sensitive Democrats who are so prejudiced and who so hate anything coming from a Republican source, now, at this session, that if they had been equally as prejudiced and equally as sensitive as to the source from which measures came at the last extra session the Democrats would have written, with the aid of a few Republican votes, into the statute books a specific demand of the Democratic platform. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] And now these sensitive Democrats, here and elsewhere in the Capitol, are so prejudiced against its source that they will vote against the pending bill. Yet they could, during the last extra session, leave the Democratic side and abandon the Democratic platform and join hands and lock shoulders with my friend DALZELL and my friends PAYNE and Aldrich, and other standpat Republicans, and defeat the redemption of a plain Democratic pledge. [Loud applause.]

Oh, my friends, you can not fool the people at home by saying that this is a Republican measure. Who knows whether it is a Republican measure or not, and who says so? Standpat Republicans are denouncing the President because he favors it, declaring it to be a Democratic measure.

The Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee of the last House and more than 95 per cent of the Democratic Members of that House declared it Democratic and favored it and went on record for it. All but one of the 14 Democratic members of the present Ways and Means Committee, from which comes this bill, and more than 95 per cent of the Democratic Members of this House declare it to be Democratic and will vote for it. A majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the last House and a majority of the Republican Members of that House denounced it as Democratic and un-Republican and opposed it. A majority of the Republicans of the present House declare it to be Democratic and un-Republican and will vote against it. Read the record vote of the last session. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Gaines], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the four high priests of the stand-pat protection synagogue, and a majority of their fellow Republicans against it. The present Democratic Speaker [Mr. CLARK] favors it and declares it to be Democratic. The Republican ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON] opposes it and denounces it as Democratic and un-Republican. And yet some of my sensitive and partisan Democratic friends, here and elsewhere, are unwilling to support it on the ground that it is Republican and un-Democratic, but at the same time are willing to abandon their Democratic comrades, as the battle wages, and join the ranks of the majority of the Republicans, and, side by side with Mr. CANNON and Mr. DALZELL, try to shoot to pieces the flag we are bearing. And they will go back to an honest, intelligent Democratic constituency and say to them, as they say to us, "I can not stomach this measure because it is a Republican measure." [Laughter.] Oh, gentlemen, that is thinner than moonshine. [Laughter.] You have got to get some other excuse.

Now, I say that my friend DALZELL, in talking about the tariff, for once in his life told a plain political truth when he said that this is a Democratic and not a Republican measure. [Laughter.] Why, gentlemen, freer trade relations with Canada, reciprocity with Canada, has been the Democratic policy for 50 years. Mr. DALZELL is right when he says it is un-Republican. Canada is the one excepted country with which the Republican Party for the last 50 years has always refused to make a reciprocal arrangement. In the debates in the Senate in 1890 and 1892 Mr. FRYE, Mr. Hale, and other Senators said that, while the Republican Party was willing to make agreements for reciprocal trade relations with other countries of the Western Hemisphere, they must except Canada. The Democrats declared then that the one country of all countries with which we should have a reciprocal trade agreement was Canada. John Sherman offered an amendment to the McKinley bill including Canada specifically, and, as I recall, only two Republican Senators favored it—Sherman and Plumb.

It is not a Republican measure; it is not a Republican policy. It is a Democratic measure; it is a Democratic policy. Why, away back in 1848 Robert J. Walker, the great tariff-reform Democrat of that generation, the author of the famous Walker tariff bill of 1846, in his annual report urged upon Congress the wisdom, the benefit, and the necessity of this country making a reciprocity agreement with Canada. In 1854 a Democratic administration, a Democratic Congress enacted into law a trade agreement with Canada known as the Canadian trade treaty. It was substantially similar to the present measure, the main difference being that this provides for reduction of the tariff on a greater number of manufactured articles. It appealed so strongly to the judgment and conscience of all parties in the Senate and in the House that there was neither debate nor division against it. The Republicans in January, 1865, passed an act giving a year's notice, as required, of the termination of the reciprocity agreement. It terminated in 1866.

My friends, since I have opened this debate I have not had the advantage at this session of the argument of the most resourceful and the best debater on the Republican side, my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], but I take it that every argument he can now make against this bill, every reason he can now give why one should vote against it, was given in a most carefully prepared and apparently a most carefully studied speech made in February last. I want to say to the gentleman that I know he did not intentionally mislead the House in that speech. I know that he did not intentionally misquote any of the facts or any of the statistics in regard to the effect and result of the former reciprocal agreement with Canada. He declared to this House, and it stands in the RECORD, that the results of that agreement with Canada were so disastrous to the United States that Congress repealed it in 1865, and to substantiate his statement of the great disaster which it wrought to the people he declared that our exports to Canada dwindled from $20,800,000 the year the reciprocity began to $15,200,000 at the expiration of the 12 years of the treaty, while Canada's exports to us increased from $12,000,000 to $46,000,000 during the same time; that when it began the balance of trade in our favor was $8,000,000 annually, but that during the treaty this had been wiped out and at its expiration the annual balance against us and in favor of Canada was $28,000,000 or $30,000,000. He quoted statistics, gotten from somewhere, sustaining him. He contended that our export trade with Canada was practically destroyed, while Canada's export trade to us was enormously increased.

Mr. Chairman, I know my friend was too busy with other things; he was too much occupied with the lamentations over the results of the last election [laughter] to give sufficient time to substantiate these figures; that the person who did the work of gathering up these statistics for him imposed very seriously upon his statistical credulity. What are the facts? Taking the four years immediately preceding the treaty, our total exports to Canada were only $43,000,000; but in the four years immediately succeeding the treaty our exports were over $104,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And yet a Representative of 250,000 intelligent, honest, and patriotic people stands here in this House, and in order to obtain a party advantage, in order to defeat a Democratic measure, emanating from a Republican President, tells his colleagues and the country that our exports to Canada decreased from $20,800,000 in the 12 years that followed the treaty down to $15,200,000.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. I want to say to the gentleman that the figures I quoted and that are in my speech are not my figures——

Mr. KITCHIN. I knew they were not. [Laughter.] That is what I said.

Mr. DALZELL. They are the figures of the deceased Senator Morrill, of Vermont. They were given by the Senator on the floor of the Senate; and, as I think, the gentleman will find, if he takes the statistics furnished by the Bureau of Statistics, they are borne out by the official statistics.

Mr. KITCHIN. I knew, Mr. Chairman, that with the sensitiveness of the American people now for truth and right, no man, though it be my friend from Pennsylvania, would admit the authorship of such fallacious and misleading figures. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He goes to the tomb and attributes these statistical fallacies to an honored man who has been in his grave for more than a decade. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If Mr. Morrill gave the figures that the gentleman quoted here to this House and incorporated in his speech, then Mr. Morrill was imposed upon by some greedy protectionist and monopolist as badly as the gentleman from Pennsylvania was. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why did the gentleman select only 1 year out of the 12 years of the treaty to show our imports from Canada? And why the year 1866, the year following the close of the Civil War? An investigation would have shown him that our imports in that year from all nations amounted to about $100,000,000 more than in any previous year. He dared not give the House and the country another one of the 12 years while the treaty was in force. Why did he not produce the statistics of our trade with Canada for the years between the making of the treaty and the breaking out of the Civil War and compare them with the same number of years before the treaty? Let me say here that, even while that great war was raging and the fate of the Union was in the balance, with the energies and industries of our people halted and paralyzed, our exports to Canada were more than her exports to us. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me give the House some accurate statistics compiled by the Department of Commerce and Labor. For the four years immediately preceding the treaty our exports to Canada were $43,948,288, and for the four years immediately succeeding they were $104,510,165. Our balance of trade for the four preceding years was $21,492,000, while for the four succeeding years it amounted to $30,221,000. I remind the gentleman, too, that the total trade between Canada and the United States for the four years immediately preceding amounted to only $66,400,000, and for the four years immediately succeeding to $178,798,000. Our exports to Canada for the 12 years immediately preceding the treaty of 1854 were less than $120,000,000. For the 12 years succeeding, the 12 years of its existence, they amounted to over $300,000,000—nearly three times as much. The total trade between Canada and the United States for the 12 years preceding the treaty was less than $160,000,000, but for the 12 years during its existence it was more than $550,000,000, and a balance of trade for every term of 2, 3, 4, 6, or 12 years was in favor of American production and American manufacture. [Applause.]

My friends, the same influences that are fighting this measure now forced then a Republican Congress to terminate that treaty, not in the interest of American trade, not in the interest of international right or justice, but in the interest of protection and monopolistic greed. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If this reciprocity measure fails to pass, either in this House or at the other end of the Capitol, its defeat will be inspired and caused by the same powerful and avaricious interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] declared in his speech that this reciprocity was against the farmer and in the interest of the protected manufacturers. Oh, my friends, contemplate the phenomenal spectacle of the Hon. JOHN DALZELL opposing any tariff measure that is in the interest of the protected manufacturers! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I have got as much credulity as any man in this world, and just as much confidence in my friend from Pennsylvania as any other man has, I reckon [laughter], but to save my life I would strain my credulity to the breaking point if I believed he would oppose any measure that would be of advantage to the American manufacturers, when Pittsburg, his home city, is the very citadel of protection. [Laughter and applause.]

And be it remembered that while he loves the farmer mighty good, each and every one of the manufactured articles which this bill reduces or puts on the free list is made in the city of Pittsburg, the home of the distinguished gentleman who now so loves the farmer. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Barbed wire, tin plates, galvanized iron or steel wire, and so forth, are put on the free list. They are made in Pittsburg, the home of my friend Mr. DALZELL. The tariff on portable and traction engines, farming implements, knives and forks, cutlery, and so forth, are reduced. They are made in Pittsburg, the home of my friend Mr. DALZELL. And now he comes and opposes this measure because it is going to hurt the American farmer. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Well, well; did you ever in all your life, gentlemen? [Laughter.]

Let us see how this reciprocity measure is going to injure the farmer from the standpoint of the gentleman and of Pittsburg. The tariff on farm wagons is reduced from 35 per cent to 22 per cent; on feed crushers, field rollers, manure spreaders, from 45 per cent to 20 per cent; on cutlery, from over 70 per cent to 27½ per cent; on table knives and forks, scissors and shears, from over 50 per cent to 27½ per cent; barbed wire and other wire for fencing go to the free list. If this bill passes, the farmer may get his wire fencing a little cheaper; his wagons and other farming implements a little cheaper; his cutlery, his knives and forks, a little cheaper; his salt, his lumber, and many other articles he must have a little cheaper; and Pittsburg manufacturers may have to sell these articles a little cheaper. Therefore, my friends, it is the most natural thing in the world for the gentleman from Pittsburg to have apprehensions that the farmer may thereby be seriously injured. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] No wonder my friend is vigorously opposing this measure in behalf of the farmer [laughter] and making for the first time in his life a public confession of his love for the American farmer. [Laughter.]

My friends, we have all observed that the standpat Republican is the one now who is loving the farmer the most. My friend from Pennsylvania shed more tears over the farmer in the last two months, since reciprocity has been before Congress and the country, than all the insurgents on that side. [Laughter.] I want to say that I am glad to see the insurgents now dancing around the fires with the distinguished standpatter of Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, shouting hosannas and hallelujahs to the farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say to him——

Mr. JAMES. And CANNON.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes. It is a most delightful thing to see my friends LENROOT, COOPER, NORRIS, MADISON, LINDBERGH, and other insurgents all joining hands around the ring, with my friend DALZELL and my friend CANNON in the middle, singing songs together. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They have a common ground, they have a common love and sympathy and a common desire to fool in the future, as in the past, the American farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Most assuredly.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman has been saying much about the necessity of accuracy of statement. I voted for the reciprocity agreement, and I am going to vote for it again, and so is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Good! I commend your patriotism.

Mr. JAMES. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to say that I think there are about three insurgents who are supporting the President's reciprocity bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am glad to hear that. We are going to get them all if they vote right.

I have been here with my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] about 11 years, and I have heard him so often, and I have heard him make many a tariff speech, but I never heard him use the name of "farmer" until this reciprocity came up. I have seen him speak for and vote for a tariff, formulated for the purpose of exacting tribute from the farmer, but I do not recall ever to have heard him mention the farmer's name before. He is a new convert to the farmer's rights. And when he made that speech last session his voice was broken and his cheeks wet with tears as he referred to the poor, down-trodden farmer being sacrificed by the President. But, remembering his past record, in the interest of the Steel Trust and the other trusts, and seeing the tears filling his eyes, a line of poetry came to my mind that I used to see in one of the old readers:

Tears, idle tears, I know not whence nor why they come.

[Laughter.]

I do not mind his fooling himself and other Republicans into the belief that this reciprocity measure is in the interest of the protected manufacturers of Pittsburg and Pennsylvania, thereby causing him to oppose it, but what I regret to see is that he has come over to our side, and even invaded the sacred Democratic soil of my own State and fooled some of us Demo-

crats. [Laughter and applause.] He declares his further opposition to the measure because it "compels the farmer to produce in a free-trade market and to buy in a protected market." Why, gentlemen, if that would be its effect, and my friend DALZELL could really convince himself of it, we would expect him, in view of his public record, to be its strongest advocate. That is his policy; that is what he has been advocating ever since he came to Congress. The inspiration of his public life has been to enact tariff laws so that the American farmer, as well as the American laborer, the American doctor, the American lawyer, the American mechanic, the American shopgirl, the American consumer, of whatever avocation, shall be forced to buy here in the highest protected tariff market of the world [applause on the Democratic side], while he knows that the prices for the products of American farmers are fixed in the free-trade markets, in competition with the farm products of every nation [applause on the Democratic side]; and he further knows that the labor of every American citizen, in shop or field or mine or factory, is sold in the free open markets of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Talk about the free list and protected American labor! Why, everything that an American citizen wears, from his head to his feet, almost everything the American citizen consumes or uses, is on the high tariff list, while all the pauperized labor of all the countries on earth are on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He opposes a free list which gives the American farmer, the American laborer, the American consumer some benefit, but is in favor of a free list in labor which gives the Steel Trust, that employs tens of thousands of foreigners, who can not speak the English language, and other protected trusts of Pittsburg and Pennsylvania all the benefit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I commend to the House the reading of the gentleman's speech. As a protectionist he proves too much. He shows conclusively that American manufacturers do not need protection. He declares, and produces figures to sustain him, that American manufacturers of all kinds are exporting to Canada, in the face of the Canadian tariff, in competition with England, though she has a preferential tariff rate against us, 50 per cent more of their products than do the British manufacturers. He could have added that we are selling Canada, in spite of her tariff, more manufactured products than all the nations of the world combined. It is inconceivable to me how any intelligent man can contend that the American manufacturer needs a high tariff to protect him in our home market against British and other foreign competition, when this same manufacturer is sending his products to Canada, burdened with a tariff one-third heavier than British goods bear, and has actually captured the Canadian market in competition with England and all the other nations of the earth. If our manufacturers can compete and outsell England, with a preferential tariff in her favor, in Canada, it is absurd to say that we can not compete and outsell her here, at our own doors, in the home market. I have said, my friends, that this measure is a Democratic policy.

I have referred to the fact that reciprocity was first urged in 1848 by Robert J. Walker, a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury; that the Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress passed a reciprocity agreement with Canada in 1854 substantially similar with the present proposed one; that under its 12 years of operation our trade with Canada largely increased; that it was repealed by a Republican Congress, against Democratic protest, on the demands of protection and monopolistic greed. The Democratic Party for a half century has advocated freer trade relations and reciprocal agreements with Canada. But some Democrats here and at the other end of the Capitol, to justify their votes against the pending measure, have denounced reciprocity as un-Democratic. Gentlemen who enjoy the franking privilege at both ends of the Capitol have broadcasted my State with denunciations of it as a Republican policy. They have condemned it as against the expressed declaration of our party platforms. They have quoted from the Democratic campaign book of 1902 to prove that our party opposes reciprocity. They have declared that our party in the Senate in 1890, when the McKinley bill was under discussion, bitterly assailed the policy of reciprocity as un-Democratic; that it was the handmaid of protection. They have told the people of my State that Ransom and Vance—the mention of whose names always thrills with conscious pride the heart of every patriotic North Carolinian—fought against and voted against reciprocity because it was un-Democratic. Gentleman who make these charges and send them out to my people ought to know better, and one moment's investigation would show them that there is not a shadow of ground to warrant such assertions. Vance and Ransom, Vest and Beck, as well as other Democratic leaders in the Senate, did vote against the so-called reciprocity amendment of the McKinley bill. They—and, in view of his interviews in the public press on this question, I wish the attention of my friend and colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB]—did denounce it as a "sham reciprocity." But they demanded real reciprocity with Canada and the countries south of us. Senator Gray, of Delaware, a distinguished Democratic Senator, offered an amendment to the McKinley bill providing for reciprocity with Canada and other countries of the Western Hemisphere. This amendment received the solid Democratic vote of the Senate, while the solid Republican vote was cast against it. Ransom and Vance were for it. Neither did any Democrat then nor did the Democratic platform of 1892, which has been garbled in support of the opposition to this bill, condemn reciprocity.

But both the Democratic Senators in 1890 and the platform of 1892 did denounce the Republican sham reciprocity of the McKinley bill. All good Democrats denounced it then, all good Democrats denounce it now, as a sham reciprocity. It failed, as every intelligent man knew it would, to widen the market for a single American product. Instead of providing for the free entry of or the reduction of the tariff on importations, it gave the President power to increase the tariff, to put a tariff tax on tea and coffee that were on the free list; on sugar that the bill itself had placed on the free list, if he should conclude countries exporting such articles imposed unreasonable duties on our products.

Instead of a reduction, it vested the President with the power to increase taxes on American consumption. To show to my people that a vote against this measure is in harmony with Democratic policies and a vote for it is un-Democratic, garbled extracts from the Democratic platform of 1892 have been sent out from Washington to the press of my State. It may not be so interesting to gentlemen here, but the people in my State wish to know the truth, and the whole truth, as to the Democratic position on reciprocity. Let me read the part of the platform which has been scattered throughout my State as a justification for opposing this bill:

> We denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, etc.

The preceding lines of the reciprocity plank in that platform have been omitted in the literature sent to my State.

Let me read that section in the platform as it is:

> SEC. 4. Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, etc.

You will observe that the three lines showing that reciprocity is a "time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith" is left out in this antireciprocity literature, and the extract is garbled from the midst of the sentence after the word "but," and makes the platform to read: "We denounce the sham reciprocity," and so forth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So, gentlemen, the Democratic platform of 1892 declares that reciprocity is a "time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith." But if, sirs, that is not sufficiently clear to the doubting, let me read the reciprocity plank in the Democratic platform of 1904:

> RECIPROCITY.
>
> We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada, and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining, or commerce.

Both parties have favored reciprocity. But there is a wide difference between Republican reciprocity and Democratic reciprocity. Republican reciprocity is well defined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the speech to which I have referred, thus:

> Republican reciprocity is reciprocity in noncompeting articles and in nothing else. * * * Products admitted to the United States must not compete with ours. * * * Reciprocity in competing products is absolutely inconsistent with the policy of protection.

He defines Republican reciprocity just as Senator Hale and other Republican Senators in the Senate debates in 1890 and 1892; just as the Republican platforms of 1900 and 1904; just as the Republican Handbook of 1908 did, and just as the report of a majority of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee at the last session did.

Republicans always heretofore opposed and a majority of them in the House now oppose any reduction or removal of the tariff, by reciprocity or otherwise, that will permit any foreign product to compete with the trusts and manufacturers. A reciprocity such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the other stand-pat Republicans favor is the handmaid of protection. They take the broad, bold stand that no products shall touch the American shores that will compete with the Steel Trust, that will compete with Mr. Aldrich's Rubber Trust,

the Woolen Trust, the Sugar Trust, or with any other trust or protected interest that have maintained and controlled the Republican Party for the last quarter of a century. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Senator Vest declared that Democratic reciprocity meant freer trade relations with one or more nations in all articles required to sustain life or give comfort to the American citizen, whether competitive or noncompetitive. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Democratic Party favors now and has always favored that kind of reciprocity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield such time as is necessary for the gentleman from North Carolina to conclude his remarks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish now to take up one subject or phase of the pending question about which deception and humbugism have been pushed to the limit. I do not know a Democrat or a Republican who does not put his opposition to this measure upon the apparent ground that by removal of the tariff, as to Canada, on agricultural products, such as wheat, corn, barley, and other grain, cattle and other live stock, the American farmer will be injured. Now, gentlemen, I believe that I can show, not only to an intelligent farmer, but I believe that I can show to even a Member of this House, even a Republican Member [laughter], that this tariff on the farmer's products—his wheat, his corn, his rye, his barley, his hogs, his cattle, all of his live stock—is the most transparent deception that was ever perpetrated upon an honest people and that ever discredited the statute books of an honest government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, most assuredly, my friend.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If you are correct in your surmises, why is it that wheat in Dakota is worth over 10 to 12 cents on the bushel more than it is right across the line in Canada, with no difference in freight at all?

Mr. KITCHIN. It is because there is absolutely no foundation for the truth of your statement [applause on the Democratic side], and I am going to show you before I get through, or else I am going to convict every Republican that had charge of the statistical department of this Government for the last 15 years of willfully deceiving the American public. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If you are right, why, then, has the Tariff Board reported that there is a difference of 10 cents?

Mr. KITCHIN. The Tariff Board has made no such report. But if it has, it is for the same reason that every Republican has in advocating a tariff on the farmer's product, namely, in order to fool the farmers in the West into voting the Republican ticket, so that the trusts and protected interests can continue to maintain the high tariff wall behind which to rob the American farmer and consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Less than three months ago the gentlemen upon that side of the House opposed the creation of a tariff commission, on the ground that the members of that commission would be the creatures of President Taft. Does the gentleman think this board now is the creature of President Taft, when they have reported contrary to the views expressed by him?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not seen the views expressed by him, except in his message. But as to the Tariff Board. We took the position on this floor that a tariff board was a cowardly subterfuge—that you Republicans tried to create a tariff board in order to delay the mandate and orders of 14,000,000 of American voters. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And Mr. Taft in a public letter or speech, published in the Republican campaign textbook of 1910, substantiates that position. He declared to the people that the time to have revision was after his Tariff Board had reported, and that it would take the balance of his term for it to accumulate proper data upon which to make a report. But let me read from the Republican textbook exactly what he said:

> Now, I think it is utterly useless, as I think it would be greatly distressing to business, to talk of another revision of the tariff during the present Congress. I should think that it would certainly take the rest of this administration to accumulate the data upon which a new and proper revision of the tariff might be had.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Delay! Delay! That is what you Republicans and your President desired to accomplish by the creation of the Tariff Commission. We knew it was a fraud, and we knew it was proposed and established for purposes of delay. You wanted to extend the lease of the trusts to plunder. You proposed a tariff board not to reduce the tariff but to fool the people again and feed them on more promises. Republican promises are in one respect like United States bonds, payable only at the option of the promiser [laughter on the Democratic side], and you have fooled some of the farmers into the belief that they were just about as good as United States bonds. [Renewed laughter.] But they are getting on to you. You have violated your pledges. You have delayed tariff revision; you have fooled the farmer; you have fed him on promises; and you have done that for 25 years. Now you propose to feed him on some new Tariff Board promises in the hope to fool him some more. [Laughter.] Mr. Taft further said, in a letter to Chairman MCKINLEY, also published in this textbook, that he would make recommendations as to revision or reduction of the tariff only after his Tariff Board made its report either on the entire tariff or on any of the schedules.

Now, then, if the President was candid and sincere in not desiring, for want of proper information or for other reason, to touch the tariff until his Tariff Board reported, why is it that he sends to the Congress a reciprocity tariff measure that affects more than 200 articles produced in this country not only before his own Tariff Board reports but even before it has made an investigation as to any of them? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Oh, do not tell me about your Tariff Board. [Laughter.]

But the gentleman says the Tariff Board does not agree with the President. If the Tariff Board does not agree with the President and with the standpatters for a protective tariff policy, that Tariff Board is not going to last long, and Republicans will soon be clamoring for us to abolish the "blamed old" Tariff Board. [Laughter.] Tariff boards are created by protectionists, of protectionists, and for protectionists, created to promote protection and to obstruct tariff reform.

Did not the gentleman say that the Tariff Board had reported against this reciprocity measure that reduces the tariff? It certainly made no report and no investigation before the President sent his reciprocity message to the last Congress. But if it has since reported against reciprocity, it corroborates what I said: Tariff boards are made to prevent the reduction of the tariff. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I understand these insurgents in the West. Any man that did not have sympathy with the predicament in which the insurgents of the agricultural West find themselves would not be possessed of the common virtues of a gentleman. [Laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not a single insurgent from the West who could retain his seat here if the grain and live-stock farmers of the West were convinced that this Republican tariff on their agricultural products was a fake and a humbug. What other appeal would you have to make to the farmer in Iowa or Wisconsin or Minnesota or Kansas or elsewhere if you should admit that the tariff on the farmer's wheat, corn, live stock, and so forth, is a snare and a fake, as it is? [Laughter.] The very life and political existence of my friend LENROOT and of these other insurgents of the West depends on the fact that the farmer of the agricultural West shall still be kept blind and deceived in the belief that the tariff on his products causes him to get higher prices, and that if the Democrats get into power they will remove the tariff on his products and thereby bankrupt him. You have got to do that, for the very minute you admit—what we are going to prove—that this duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat and so much on corn and rye and barley and cattle and other farm products is a delusion and a snare, kept there for the express purpose of deceiving your constituents into returning Republicans to Congress, you are undone.

Now, let us take wheat. Oh, yes; these insurgents and these standpatters have been going about the rural districts of this country, and especially in Iowa, and Illinois, and Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and elsewhere out there in the West, telling the people, "Why, gentlemen, you just vote for a Democratic Representative and elect a Democratic Congress and President and he will go there and take the tariff off of your wheat, and off of your corn, and off of your barley, and off of your live stock, and just open these markets to the Canadian wheat and the Canadian corn and other Canadian products, and they will flood our market and destroy the farming industry of the country."

The farmer, being too busy and too tired to investigate himself, often takes your word for it and begins to fear: "Now, here, we must keep the Democrats out, because if the Demo-

crats get in up there in Washington, just as sure as anything in this world they will take the tariff off of wheat and corn and all our stuff, because Mr. LENROOT says they will do it." [Laughter.] Why, gentlemen, I tell you it is absolutely inconceivable to me that any intelligent farmer, or any intelligent man, or even a Republican [laughter], can sit down quietly, without an office sticking up before him, and consider the facts and then arise from his study and say that this tariff on wheat, corn, barley, or other grain, or on cattle and live stock, affects in any way the prices that the farmer receives. You know, I know, and every farmer who is now undeceived by you knows that the tariff on wheat and the farmers' products is absolutely bogus. He knows that the price for his wheat, his barley, his rye, and so forth, as well as his live stock, is fixed not here in America, but in the open markets of the world, in competition with all the world. You know and I know that when we make in this country over a hundred million bushels of wheat more than the American public consumes, that surplus is bound to overflow and go out into the markets of the world in competition with the products of the serfs of Russia, the ryots of India, the fellahs of Egypt to meet at Liverpool and London the surplus wheat of the world from Canada to India, and that surplus fixes the price not only abroad, but fixes the price in the Dakotas, in Minnesota, in Illinois, in every other market of our country. If the surplus shipped abroad does not fix the price, if the farmers of the Middle West or anywhere else in the country do not get as much for their 100,000,000 and more bushels of surplus wheat abroad or their surplus of corn, barley, cattle, and live stock, why, in the name of common sense, do they ship these products abroad when they can get a better price for them at home? I can understand how a farmer who is a big enough fool to let you deceive him into the belief that this tariff is helping him will sell his wheat and other stuff abroad for less than he could get right at home, but I am talking about the intelligent farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Upon the same theory, will the gentleman be in favor of placing cotton manufactures of every description upon the free list, where there is also a surplus shipped abroad?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, you protective-tariff fellows, in order to allow the New England cotton manufacturers to exact exorbitant millions of dollars from the American people, are claiming in every campaign and in every Congress that we do not make enough to supply our own consumption, and you want a tariff wall so high as to shut out foreign goods, and by thus giving our manufacturers a monopoly encourage them to make enough to supply the American market.

Mr. HILL. I do not resent the charge against the New England cotton manufacturers, but I simply suggest to the gentleman from North Carolina that in the last year more cotton has been used in manufacturing in the Southern States than in New England.

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, certainly; I hope it is true. We in the South intend to make the New England mills come down and put their mills there, or else go out of business. [Applause.] Because with the cotton right at home, right at our own mills, with the best labor, the most honest labor, and the most orderly labor in the world, we can compete in cotton goods with the world. We are not asking for protection, but you people have been asking our southern mills and trying to fool them into joining you in demanding high protection, so that New England may have the benefit of it. New England is exporting few cotton goods. She is extorting oppressive prices from the American consumer under this tariff; but I want to say to my friend from Connecticut that we are going to break up that system. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I would like to ask the gentleman for an honest confession, if his own honest manufacturers from North Carolina did not appear here two years ago and demand higher rates?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know whether an honest manufacturer from North Carolina came here or not. We have a great many cotton manufacturers in North Carolina that came from Connecticut, the State of the gentleman. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like the gentleman from North Carolina, in this connection, with reference to the manufacturers of the South, to explain at length clearly something of the nature of the labor that is employed in these mills of his State.

Mr. KITCHIN. What State is the gentleman from?

Mr. FOCHT. Pennsylvania.

Mr. KITCHIN. I assert that the labor of North Carolina gets more for their work than 90 per cent of the labor in Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. I deny that.

Mr. KITCHIN. The labor bulletins issued by the Republican department here show that in Pennsylvania, in its coal mines, in the iron mines, in the steel works, and many other protected industries labor is paid less and works longer hours than in any other State in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOCHT. I deny that, either on the farm, factory, or anywhere. I would like to ask the gentleman to give us some educational statistics.

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, gentlemen, it never bothers me to hear a Republican repudiate the truth; that is a habit with them. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Oh, you repudiate your debts even, in the South.

Mr. KITCHIN. Here is an original bill that I hold in my hand, just handed me, an account with a coal miner, who received for 12 days' work in the mines of Pennsylvania the great and munificent sum, under the protective tariff of the Payne-Aldrich Act, $8.40. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOCHT. He did not earn any more or he would have received it; they are paid by the ton.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, gentlemen, let me return to this bogus tariff on wheat and other farm products, and show you what a humbug it is.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I find that it is usual for men to give an opinion on subjects that pertain to matters farthest from where they reside.

Mr. KITCHIN. In other words, upon subjects they know nothing about. If so, I am going to yield to the gentleman and let him talk. [Laughter and applause.] If the gentleman wants to learn the truth to-day, wants really to learn something about wheat and the tariff on agricultural products, if he will take his seat, and if it gets too hot for him I will have the pages throw water on it—— [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am very cool now.

Mr. KITCHIN. If he will possess himself in patience and keep cool I am going to show him that no Republican in the House can stand up and say that he honestly wants to ascertain the truth and then go back home and say that the tariff on the farmer's grain and cattle and live stock and other farm products helps him or that its removal will injure him.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit a question? I really ought not to have prefaced my question, and I will withdraw it.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is always dangerous to have a preamble. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Now, I want some information about wheat.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right, I will give it to you. I have it right here, provided the Republican statisticians that have been in office here 12 or 15 years are correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman has stated that the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and in London.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman know that we raise different grades of wheat in the United States?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman know that in the Northwest United States, especially in Minnesota, the banner wheat State of the United States, and in the Dakotas, which are next to it, we raise what is called No. 1 northern and No. 1 hard spring wheat?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will take what you say about that to be true.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman know that to be a fact?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have heard that, yes. Go ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman inform me how much of the Dakota and Minnesota No. 1 northern or No. 1 hard spring wheat has ever been exported to Liverpool or anywhere else?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know how much of that particular kind has been exported to Liverpool or any other place.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That particular grade.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will tell the gentleman this, that if that particular grade is grown in India or in Russia or in Canada or elsewhere, then that particular grade in Canada or in India or Russia brings the same price in the markets as the Minnesota and Dakota wheat. If there is any difference, which some of the Minnesota gentlemen contend, in the Winnipeg and Duluth and Minneapolis markets, it is on account of this superior quality of the Minneapolis and Duluth wheat, and not on account of the tariff, as I shall later show.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will state this to the gentleman: No. 1 northern and No. 1 hard of Winnipeg is occasionally exported to Liverpool, but I would like to have the gentleman show me where one bushel of No. 1 northern or No. 1 hard of the Minnesota and Dakota wheat, of which we raise about 200,000,000 bushels annually, was ever exported across the water at all; and the reason is that there has been for the last 10 years a difference of from 11 to 15 cents a bushel between the price in Canada and in North Dakota and Minnesota.

Mr. KITCHIN. And that same difference——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Those are the facts.

Mr. KITCHIN. And that same difference, if it be, exists between Nebraska and Illinois and Kansas wheat?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They do not ship the Minnesota and Dakota wheat to those places. They manufacture it in Minneapolis.

Mr. KITCHIN. And Winnipeg——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That goes to Liverpool because it is from 11 to 15 cents a bushel cheaper than it is right across the line in the Dakotas.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to make a challenge to the gentleman now.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is the same kind of wheat, too.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can not find quotations in any daily paper, published in Minneapolis or Duluth or elsewhere in the United States, showing that wheat is 11 to 15 cents higher in Minneapolis, or other point in the United States, than wheat of the same grade in Canada or other markets of the world, exclusive of the difference in transportation charges.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can show that for the last 10 years absolutely from personal knowledge on that grade of wheat.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman want to make the point that in Minnesota and Dakota a superior grade of wheat is grown to that of any other country?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I do.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then, that is the reason, if you have a superior grade to that of any other country, to that of Canada, that Canada can not compete with you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield? Did I understand the gentleman to say that if they raise the same wheat in Canada the price would be the same?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to say that they do raise identically the same wheat.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then the gentleman does not agree with the gentleman from Minnesota. He says they do not; that a superior grade is grown in Minnesota and the Dakotas.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the gentleman from North Carolina misunderstood the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota rose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, we are going to debate this question just as long as you gentlemen wish, long enough for you to deceive, or try to deceive, the American farmer again as you have in the past. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made one statement and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] makes another statement, and they cross——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. KITCHIN. You two gentlemen can go out into the cloakroom and settle your contradictions about Minnesota and Dakota and Canadian wheat, but do not come in here and take up the time of men who are trying to teach you Republicans the truth about this wheat situation. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman this: That because of the climate and the soil the same quality of wheat is raised along the border in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta that is raised in North Dakota, Minnesota, and Montana, and the difference in price on that grade of wheat is from 11 to 15 cents a bushel, just one side of the line or the other, cheaper on the Canadian side than on the United States side, and has been so for 15 years.

Mr. KITCHIN. I need not carry on any controversy with the gentleman longer, because that statement is exactly contrary to the statement that he made awhile ago to the effect that Minnesota and Dakota grew a superior grade of wheat to that of Canada or any other country.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Not at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman wants to make an amendment to it, I will accept his amendment and go ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. My statements are exactly alike.

Mr. KITCHIN. If there is the difference to which the gentleman refers in the price of wheat in Minnesota and in Canada, it is bound to be on account of the superiority of grade or of freight rates, or both. I again challenge gentlemen to produce, now or hereafter in this debate, statistics from the department or quotations from any daily papers showing there was as much difference as 11 to 15 cents per bushel in the price of wheat of the same grade at Minneapolis and Winnipeg. I challenge you to show by the statistics of the department or quotations from the press that there was as much difference in the price of wheat between the Minneapolis and Winnipeg markets as there was between the Minneapolis and the Chicago markets. You will find, as I have found, and everyone will find, that wheat in Chicago, the great wheat market of this country, is from 2 to 5 cents less than wheat quoted in the Winnipeg market and many other markets in Canada, and higher in the Canadian market than in the Cincinnati, St. Louis, and many other markets in this country.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit——

Mr. KITCHIN. So if there is from 11 to 15 cents difference between wheat at Winnipeg and Minneapolis, there is a much greater difference between wheat at Minneapolis and Chicago. Do you want a tariff wall between Chicago and Minneapolis? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] If the tariff, as you contend, makes the difference between wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg, what makes the greater difference between wheat at Minneapolis and Chicago? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The Chicago market, let me inform the gentleman, is based upon southern winter wheat and not upon Canadian northern No. 1 hard——

Mr. KITCHIN. The South makes practically no wheat for the market.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will give you some exact data from the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have not time to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I thought the gentleman wanted information.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can put it in his speech. Of course, I understand very readily why the gentleman wants to put it in my speech, because he is ambitious, and he knows that my speech will be read. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And if he puts it in his speech he fears that nobody will ever read it except himself and his secretary. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the quotations on yesterday show that May wheat was 88½ cents per bushel in Chicago and 91 cents in Winnipeg, showing Canada wheat about 3 cents a bushel higher than our wheat, and it is so all the time; that is, about 3 cents a bushel higher than ours.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Just as I stated some moments ago, quotations are higher in Winnipeg than in Chicago.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And 96 cents in Minneapolis, the great wheat market of the world.

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; but Minneapolis does not supply all the wheat in the Union or regulate the wheat trade of the world. That was only a local condition existing there. Now, one other question. One gentleman said the President's proposal as to reciprocity with Canada made the price of wheat go down. I want to ask if it made wheat go down, did it not also make barley go up, which was quoted yesterday at $1.12 a bushel in our markets, the highest price ever known in the production of that grain for years? If it made wheat go down, then it surely made barley go up.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the gentleman from North Carolina, and that is if it is not a stock Republican protection argument, and of other protectionists,

that whenever you remove a duty from a foreign article that the foreigner immediately raises the price of the foreign article to the American level, and that the American consumer does not get the benefit of it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, they make any kind of argument that is inconsistent and fallacious. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. And according to that argument Canadian wheat will immediately go up on the passage of this reciprocal trade agreement——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And it did, and ours went down 10 or 11 cents.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to approach the Canadian and foreign wheat ghost. Why, they tell us, if we remove the tariff the wheat of Canada and of the world is going to flow in to us. What is going to bring it here? Who needs it here? Would not the wheat farmer of Canada, of Argentina, and of Russia be the biggest fool in the world to try to ship his wheat here when we are already producing more than 120,000,000 bushels more than we need, more than we can sell here, more than the American public consumes, and which we are yearly sending abroad, in grain and flour, to the markets of the world? Why do we want their surplus? Who is going to buy an article when he has got more of it than he needs and is trying to dispose of the surplus? Let us see about this immense wheat flood that is going to inundate the United States and that seems to alarm our friends so much.

Since the Statistical Abstract for 1910 is not yet published, I shall use the four years from 1906 to 1909, both inclusive. Let me remind my frightened friends that the total imports of wheat from all the world for these four years amounted in value to only $656,000, while we exported for the same years, in competition with Canada and all the other wheat-producing nations of the earth, over $256,000,000 worth, and in addition to this over $236,000,000 of flour made of American wheat. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We produced that much more than we needed for home consumption, more than the American public could consume. In other words, we exported in this enormous surplus to the markets of the world in competition with Canadian wheat, with Indian wheat, with Argentine wheat, with Russian wheat, 400 times as much wheat and over 225 times as much flour as we imported from all the world.

And yet as against this stupendous amount—these hundreds of millions of dollars of wheat sold abroad by us in competition with the world at a better price than at home—these antireciprocity gentlemen are trying to scare the farmers to death with this little half million dollars of wheat imported here, perhaps as seed wheat for the farmers. You can fool the Republican farmers out in Wisconsin and Minnesota and other Western States, but I just dare you to come down into North Carolina where the intelligent farmers raise a little wheat and try such a poppy-cock argument on them. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. JAMES. If the argument made by our Republican friends is true, that wheat sells for more here than it does in Canada, and the farmer would be affected by free wheat, why was it that the American farmer shipped $256,000,000 worth of wheat abroad and sold it there when he could have sold it for more here at home?

Mr. KITCHIN. Their argument is not true, and the fact is that every bushel of this enormous amount of wheat brought a better price abroad than they could get at home. That is the reason it was sold there. Now, as to corn. No man outside of the insane asylum and the Republican Party believes or has the cheek to insist that a tariff on corn affects its price. We grow in the United States 80 per cent of the corn of the world. In the four years 1906 to 1909, inclusive, we exported $165,460,335 worth of corn, while we imported of all kinds and for seed purposes only $216,796; that is, we exported more than 700 times as much as we imported. We exported to Canada in the last four years over $20,000,000 worth of corn, while we imported practically none. But still there are Republicans who go back to Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, Nebraska, and other corn-growing States and tell the farmers that President Taft and the old Democrats down here are trying to destroy the corn industry of the West by removing the tariff and admitting the Canadian corn to swamp our markets [laughter], when there is not an agricultural township in any State in the West that does not produce more corn annually than does Canada with all her Provinces. I shall not discuss further this bogus corn tariff. In fact, every honest man and some Republicans [laughter] admit that the tariff does not and can not influence in the least the price of corn. Let us take some other products of the farm, such as barley, oats, rye, cattle, and horses. In these four years we exported $21,087,222 worth of barley and imported only $258,755, or nearly 100 times as much as we imported, and last year we imported less than $1,500 worth and exported more than $4,500,000. Of rye, we exported $4,700,781 worth and we imported only $197 worth, or over 20,000 times as much as we imported. Of oats, we exported $19,335,127 worth and imported $2,868,775 worth, or over 6 times as much as we imported. Now, as to horses and cattle. We exported in the four years $124,042,692 worth of horses and imported, exclusive of horses for breeding purposes, only $4,089,831 worth, or more than 30 times as much as we imported. Take cattle. Our exports of cattle for the four years amounted to the large sum of $124,042,692, while our imports, exclusive of cattle for breeding purposes, amounted to only $4,089,831; that is, we exported, in competition with the cattle raisers of the world, more than 30 times as many as we imported. In addition to this we exported over $125,000,000 of beef products. In the four years we exported of hog products—hams, bacon, shoulders, pork, lard, and so forth—the enormous sum of $450,000,000, while we imported practically none.

Mr. Chairman, in the face of such facts, showing that we are producing a surplus of such agricultural products far in excess of American consumption, far more than we can sell in the United States, which surplus must seek foreign markets in competition with the world, which markets, by the law of supply and demand, must fix the price both at home and abroad, it is incredible to me that any intelligent, honest man will continue to insist that the tariff here on such farm products does or can affect the prices.

But, it is asked, if the surplus shipped abroad fixes the price of the farmer's product at home and it is unaffected by the tariff, why does not the surplus of manufactured products, such as those of the meat packers and the United States Steel Corporation, shipped abroad, fix the home price, unaffected by the tariff? The answer is easy. If the farmers could combine and organize in a trust, such as the Meat Trust, the Steel Trust, and other trusts, thereby having the power to control the output, to say when, where, and how much should be put on the market and to fix the price, they could take advantage of the tariff and charge their purchasers in the home market the world-market price plus the tariff. But, being so many in number and so diffused and scattered throughout the country, it is impossible for them to so combine and organize. On the other hand, the meat packers, the steel, and many other manufacturing plants are so few in number and vast in influence they can and do organize into trusts, control the output, fix the price, hold up the American consumer to the world price plus the tariff, and then sell their surplus abroad to the foreigners at the cheaper world-market price.

Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to expose, once and for all, this tariff fraud and deception that have been practiced on the American farmer, especially the farmer of the West, by the Republican Party for the last third of a century. I have attempted to show by the logic and reason of the thing, from the facts and statistics, that the tariff on the farmer's products, wheat, rye, corn, barley, oats, cattle and live stock, and so forth, is absolutely bogus. I shall now undertake to sustain the proposition by authorities so high, respectively, both in Democratic and Republican opinion, that neither Democrat nor Republican can dispute. I wish to say that if any Democrat, in his opposition to reciprocity, takes the position that it is going to hurt the farmer by a removal of the tariff from his products, he will be giving the lie to Democratic campaign speeches, Democratic campaign books, and Democratic Senators and Members of the House for all these years. It has been the Democratic position, sustained by the facts and by common experience, that this tariff on the farmer's product is a fraud and a delusion and put on by the Republicans to catch and fool the farmer into electing a Republican Congress so that it might write tariff laws to enable the monopolists to fasten their relentless grasp on the throats of the 90,000,000 American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me read to my Democratic friends extracts from speeches and reports of the Democratic leaders of the past.

The late Senator Beck, Kentucky's great Senator and statesman, in a minority report against the tariff bill reported by the Republican Committee on Finance in the Senate in 1888, said:

> Intelligent men everywhere concede that protection can not protect any product of this country which is raised or prepared for market here cheaper than it can be elsewhere, or is produced in such quantities that our own people can not consume it. Cotton, wheat, beef, pork, provisions, tobacco, oils, and dozens of other things illustrate this.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is absurd to talk about protecting either cotton or wheat.

I will now read from the report of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, in 1890, against the McKinley bill:

> For the further purpose of inducing the farmers of the country to believe that they can and will derive some benefit from the protective policy, this bill imposes various rates of duty upon certain important

agricultural products which it is well known could not be imported to any material extent with or without duty. For instance, corn is subjected to a duty of 15 cents a bushel; corn meal, 20 cents a bushel; oats, 15 cents per bushel; rye, 10 cents per bushel; wheat, 25 cents per bushel; wheat flour, 25 per cent ad valorem, etc.

* * * * * * *

We produce a great surplus of all these articles and many others every year, which we are compelled to send abroad and sell in the free markets of the world in competition with similar products from other countries.

It is impossible to protect the farmer against foreign competition in his home market for he has no such competition, and the insertion or retention of these articles in a tariff bill is a device which will deceive no one who gives a moment's thought to the subject.

* * * * * * *

This statement shows how futile it is to attempt to afford protection to the farmers of the country by imposing duties upon the importation of these products, and this large and intelligent class of citizens can not be reconciled in this way to a policy which increases taxes upon their clothing, tableware, carpets, earthenware, glassware, agricultural implements, and other necessary articles.

This report was signed by such men as John G. Carlisle, R. Q. Mills, Benton McMillan, C. R. Breckenridge, and R. P. Flower.

I call attention to the report of Hon. William L. Wilson, in behalf of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee, in 1894:

Of the staple agricultural products, including meats and provisions, we are such large exporters, and must continue to be such large exporters, that any duties upon them are useless for protection and fruitless for revenue, and generally can only be imposed for the purpose of deluding the less intelligent of our farmers into the belief that they are receiving some consideration and benefit under the tariff, although the prices of their products are fixed in the world's market in competition with like products produced by the cheapest labor of the world. For the producers of our great export staples, which, having fully supplied the home market, must overflow and seek large purchases elsewhere, the only effect of a protective tariff is to take from one-fourth to one-half of the products for which they could exchange their surplus should they venture to buy in the market where they are obliged to sell or to compel them to give a like portion of the avails of their labor, when turned into money, by increasing the cost of what they buy in the home market.

Senator Vest, the great Senator from Missouri, who for years was the Democratic leader of the Senate, in a speech made in the Senate on August 27, 1890, said:

Now, we ought to be perfectly candid with each other. These increases are made to catch the farmer vote under the pretense that an increase duty, where there is no competition at all, helps the farmer. I do not know an intelligent man in this country who is not aware that there is no competition whatever between foreign cattle that are brought into this country and those we raise. It is the most transparent humbug that was ever attempted, even in politics.

* * * * * * *

Mr. President, is there any man who does not know that what the farmers of this country need is more market, not more protection? They want more opportunity to sell.

If Senators will turn to the wheat importation, to which we shall come directly, which was manufactured on the same fraudulent basis to impose upon the farmers, it will be found that we exported in 1889 46,000,000 bushels of wheat and imported 1,998.

This whole schedule—the agricultural schedule—made to allure the farmer into the belief that it is for his protection, is manufactured in the same way and for the same purpose.

Senator Beck, Senator Vest, Mr. Carlisle, Mr. Wilson, and all the Democratic leaders denounced it as fraud and humbug. I want now to call the attention of the House, and especially the attention of my State colleagues to the opinion of Senator Zeb Vance, North Carolina's great commoner, whose public life to this day is, and I trust will ever be, the inspiration of its Democracy. In a speech in the Senate he said:

Now, sir, here are three great classes of producers of our country—the agriculturists, the miners, and the manufacturers—and they have made this compact—or, at least, it has been made for them—that the taxes are to be levied upon the articles made by the manufacturer for their "encouragement" and "protection" against competition; and taxes have been levied upon articles that compete with the miners who dig ores of iron and coal and everything of that kind from the soil. To give it the appearance of equality and justice tariffs are also levied upon the wheat, and the corn, and the oats, and the cotton, and so forth, grown by the farmer. That, on paper, looks fair, but it so happens that it is a reality for the manufacturer and miner and it is a delusion and snare for the farmer.

* * * * * * *

The miners and the manufacturers together have grown rich and accumulated enormous wealth by this protective arrangement. But how has it been with the farmer? He has found that there is nothing to compete with him. A duty of 25 cents a bushel is laid upon his wheat, 10 cents on his corn, and so forth, but it turns out, in fact and in truth, that there is no competition with him coming from abroad; there is nothing to protect him against.

I say, therefore, that when this beautiful theory of protection came into practice, while it was a reality, and a substantial reality, for the manufacturer and miner, the agricultural man finds it to be a delusion and a cheat.

The prices of all his products are fixed by the markets abroad; and why? Because he makes more than will supply the home market and the surplus which goes abroad fixes the price of what is sold in the home market.

Vance denounced it as a cheat and delusion, yet we have Democrats that want to go back to North Carolina and tell the people that old "Zeb" Vance when he denounced this tariff as a fraud was lying [applause], and that the Republicans were telling the truth when they said that this tariff was a genuine benefit to the farmer. The people of my State will ask the question: Who is right, "Zeb" Vance or these antireciprocity Democrats? I venture the statement that whenever you see a good Democrat against this reciprocity bill you must scratch a little deeper than corn, rye, barley, oats, live stock, and so forth, to find the real reason for the opposition. [Applause.]

Scratch a little and you will find lumber reduction [laughter and applause]; and a little deeper and you will find wood-pulp reduction, and the biggest wood-pulp plant south of the Potomac is in North Carolina; scratch a little deeper and you will find some mica reduction, and there is some mica made in North Carolina. [Applause and laughter.] Now, when a Republican President and many Republicans here are willing to concede that they have been fooling the farmers for 30 years about the tariff on their products, some of our Democrats come along and say, "Do not admit that, because we want to fool the farmer as you have been doing, and get protection for lumber in our State, for wood pulp and mica in our districts." [Laughter.] Gentlemen, I can stand here and read all day extracts from Democratic reports of the House and Senate, from Democratic campaign books, and from leading Democrats in denunciation of this tariff fraud. It is unjust to the Democratic Party, unjust to its record; it is unjust to great Democrats like Beck, Vest, Carlisle, McMillin, Wilson, Ransom, and Vance for Democrats in this House now to repudiate their teachings and the position of the Democratic Party and adopt the old worn-out, threadbare Republican argument of deception. I am going to quote from one gentleman in North Carolina, living to-day, and who has the confidence of thousands of Democrats in the State, and whose opinion upon this question of the tariff on the farmer's product will be taken as authority by many people in North Carolina. That gentleman, if it is not unparliamentary, is the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS has been a Senator for nearly 12 years. He is and has been for years a leading Democratic figure in North Carolina. He was for years chairman of the Democratic executive committee of that State. He was when he was elected to the Senate, and he remained for years, the chairman of the Democratic State executive committee. In the campaign of 1902 Senator Pritchard, a Republican Senator from North Carolina, was making a canvass for his reelection. Senator SIMMONS, as chairman of the Democratic executive committee, on the 11th day of October, 1902, made a great speech in reply to Senator Pritchard, answering the arguments and showing the fallacy of the Republican position on the tariff. The Democratic executive committee was so impressed with the logic and strength of his argument that it sent out through the State as a campaign document many thousand copies of this speech. I want every friend of Senator SIMMONS here and in North Carolina to read that speech. Permit me to read a part of it, to which I call the especial attention of my State colleagues:

The truth is, the whole Republican argument that tariff regulates the price of farm products is utterly false. Every corn and wheat and cotton farmer knows that the price of these crops is regulated by the laws of supply and demand, that we export of these crops from one-fifth to one-third of all we produce, and that the price of the whole crop is regulated by the price which the surplus brings in the foreign markets. The cotton and corn and wheat farmer knows that the bulk of that part of his crop which he does not sell at home for home consumption is purchased for shipment abroad, and the purchaser does not pay him any more than it will bring when sold abroad.

* * * * * * *

Our chief raw materials are cotton, corn, wheat, and other products of the farm which can not be benefited by protection, because we export them in large quantities.

That was Mr. SIMMONS's carefully prepared, carefully written, and carefully delivered speech, not only as our Senator, but as a leader of North Carolina Democracy; and yet in the face of that there are Democratic gentlemen in this Capitol—and it is unparliamentary to name them here—who enjoy the franking privilege, who in justification of their opposition to this measure are spreading with approval throughout North Carolina the old, fraudulent Republican argument that the tariff on agricultural products is a great benefit to the farmer and its removal will greatly injure him.

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, and that is whether he refers to me when he speaks about gentlemen sending out Senator SIMMONS's or any other man's speech under a franking privilege?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I said it may be unparliamentary for me to use the name. Of course, it would not be unparliamentary for me to use the gentleman's name here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUDGER. Does not the gentleman think it would be fairer to name the party than to leave the suspicion that because I oppose reciprocity I am one of those men?

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the gentleman have the franking privilege when Mr. SIMMONS's speech was sent out?

Mr. GUDGER. I have had the privilege of franking ever since I was elected to Congress.

Mr. KITCHIN. And what was the gentleman's question?

Mr. GUDGER. I asked the gentleman if he does not think it would be fairer to name the men who are sending out Senator SIMMONS's speech rather than to leave the reflection upon all of us from North Carolina who are opposing reciprocity?

Mr. KITCHIN. I presume that the gentleman who made that speech is sending it out. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUDGER. Then why does not the gentleman say so?

Mr. KITCHIN. But it is unparliamentary to say so in this body [laughter], because we are not permitted to criticize or even use the sacred name of a Senator of the United States in such a body as this. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, that is not all. This same distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, who honors us in the Senate, made a speech on June 25, 1910, only a few months ago, and that speech was such a good one that the campaign committee sent it out in the Democratic campaign book of 1910. In that speech he said:

> The tariff does not help the farmer either to fix or control the volume of his products or their market value. As to his products the tariff is almost entirely inoperative, even when a duty is imposed pretendedly for their protection. Neither can he control nor influence the prices of his products. That is determined by natural law, over which he has no control.

In this speech he contends, and truly so, that the prices of the farmer's products are fixed in the markets of the world in competition with the world, and he denounces the tariff on his products as a "fake." And yet, within a few short months after, on the 3d day of March, 1911, this same distinguished gentleman made a speech in the Senate, which has been widely circulated in my State, in opposition to the Canadian reciprocity, putting such opposition on the grounds that the removal of the tariff on agricultural products, even as to Canada, would be "oppression to the farmer"; that it would "press down the price of farm products."

I shall refrain from any comments on such a sudden and complete change of position, and shall refuse to scratch for the reason. I might make the observation, however, that there is in the reciprocity bill a removal of the tariff on rough lumber, on wood pulp, and many other tariff reductions.

Gentlemen, I have read you Democratic authority; now I am going to produce Republican authority to the effect that the farmer's tariff is a fake and a fraud. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in a most elaborate speech in the Senate on January 28, 1910, contended that the tariff on agricultural products, of which we made a surplus and exported, had no influence on the prices of such products. I will read a short extract from it:

> There are articles upon which a tariff duty is imposed which this country exports and would not import under any system of duties, because we have a surplus for sale. Under this head comes practically all the food products, both vegetable and animal, and a removal of the duties on food products would obviously have little or no effect on the prices, because we export such articles and can sell them in the world's market at a profit.

He, however, overlooked the fact, established by the hard experience of the American consumer, that when the farmer's raw products gets into the hands of the trusts and becomes their finished product, then the trusts, such as the Meat Trust, charge our own people the world's price with the high tariff added, while they sell their surplus abroad at the lower price of the world's market.

Senator LODGE may not be good authority in the opinion of some of the Republicans here. I understand why you insurgent Republicans will not believe anything that a standpat Senator like Mr. LODGE says, but I have insurgent authority. Where is that renowned New England insurgent, an insurgent always, the Hon. AUGUSTUS PEABODY GARDNER? Where is he? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I am here. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. As I said, I do not blame you insurgents for not believing anything that a standpat Republican says. I do not believe much they say myself. But you must believe what your colleague and insurgent friend says. Now, gentlemen, the older Members will recollect that beautiful chart that was exhibited here before us on the 24th of February of last year by my friend, the honorable insurgent from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and his eloquent speech, in which he attempted to prove and to be used as a Republican campaign document, and, I believe, was used in the campaign book, that the prices of foodstuffs, of the farmer's products—wheat, corn, meat, and so forth—were lower here than in any other nation under the sun. It was a confession on his part, by chart and speech, that the Republicans had been hoodwinking the farmers all these years.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Do I understand you to include wheat?

Mr. KITCHIN. You included flour. What do you make flour out of? I will include wheat. Reread your speech and you will find wheat included and discussed.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It was not there. Naval vessels do not buy wheat for their crews. That chart showed the actual prices paid by the naval training ship *Ranger* for its crew.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did you not then prove or try to prove, and did you not assert, that the prices of farm products were lower here than anywhere else in the world?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do not remember such statements. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] And I defy the gentleman to find a single word in my speech which will uphold that contention.

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course, I do not want to waste my time reading a Republican speech. [Laughter.] I know what you said here. I do not know how that speech reads in the RECORD. I will say now to the new Members who have just entered Congress that a speech made on this floor is sometimes entirely different from the speech put into the RECORD. We have a sort of courtesy here—letting a fellow revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

But I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], I do know what took place in this Chamber, because I replied to his speech the next day and showed how ridiculous it was for him and the Republican Party to go up and down this country, in the agricultural sections, as they had been doing for 30 years, preaching to the farmer that the price of his products was raised and kept high by the Republican tariff, and then at that late day admit that they had been deceiving the farmer all the time—that the tariff had nothing to do with the prices of his products; that they were lower here than in any other country.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield; certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I find that the chart which I exhibited last year——

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, what the gentleman said was a great deal more significant and interesting than what he showed on the chart.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I trust the gentleman will allow me to make a full statement, inasmuch as he has made an imputation. I did not mention either flour or wheat when I told the relative prices paid in the nine foreign ports and in the port of Boston by the Massachusetts training ship *Ranger*. I did, however, read the following statement, and this is the only thing that would justify the gentleman in his assertion:

> The immigrant finds on coming to America that if he can buy in quantity (and in cases when he need not) his flour, fuel, potatoes, etc., all cost less than in the land he left.
>
> [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. All of which, Mr. Chairman, sustains my argument. But the gentleman did in his speech, if not in his chart, discuss wheat and attempted to show that it was as high or higher elsewhere than here.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. KITCHIN. I will get Mr. UNDERWOOD to give the gentleman all the time he desires.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No, sir; that is not fair. Those are the words of Samuel Gompers that I was reading to you. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, I want to say this, as I said then, if you indorse what Samuel Gompers says, it is the first time you or any other Republican ever indorsed anything that a labor leader said. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Do you want to contradict him? Are you contradicting him as usual? North Carolina, unlike Massachusetts, is not a labor State.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to give you all the time to explode in after I get through. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Do not attack me by saying that I print in the RECORD words which I do not utter on the floor of the House, unless I have the express permission of the House to do so, and do not say that I suppress anything which I utter.

Mr. KITCHIN. I say, and every Republican and every Democrat in the House at that time knows it, that the whole burden

of the gentleman's argument here before the House was that the prices of food products in this country were lower than they were in any other country in the world, and every man knows that was the gentleman's argument, and I do not care what he put in the RECORD.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I absolutely admit that that statement of the gentleman is correct, and that food prices are lower here; but what I object to is the statement of the gentleman that I suppressed words which I had uttered on the floor of this House. I have never done so since I have been in Congress.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman might omit them by mistake; but the gentleman admits now that I am right, that the farmer's products must go out into the world and meet the competition of the world, and that the prices of farm products are as low or lower here than anywhere else on the face of the earth. I have been trying to prove here for the last hour what the gentleman now admits. This being true, the tariff does not affect the price of the wheat, barley, corn, rye, cattle, and other live stock of the American farmer, and a removal of the tariff from them can not, therefore, diminish the price and injure the farmer.

I shall now proceed to unmask with its own hand the Republican Party, and out of its own mouth expose in its nakedness its false pretense and deception, to which the American farmer has been a patient victim for the last third of a century.

On February 9, 1910, the Senate, under resolution, appointed a select committee to investigate the prices of commodities and the cause of any increase in same. The Republican members were Senators LODGE, of Massachusetts; GALLINGER, of New Hampshire; MCCUMBER, of North Dakota; SMOOT, of Utah; and CRAWFORD, of South Dakota. The Democratic members were Senators CLARKE, of Arkansas; JOHNSTON, of Alabama; and SMITH, of South Carolina. After months of investigation report was made to the Senate, the Republican members filing the majority and the Democratic members a minority report. I hold in my hands both reports. I call the attention of the House—and I wish every farmer in the country could hear it—that this unanimous report of the Republican Senators, after a full and thorough investigation, expressly declares that the tariff on wheat, corn, rye, barley, oats, cattle, and live stock, and the agricultural products has nothing to do with their prices. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It further declares that the prices of these products of the farm are fixed in the markets of the world, and it contends and produces figures to show that these products are higher in London and Liverpool and the world's markets than they are here in high-protection United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But let me read from this remarkable report:

The tariff seems to have been no material factor in causing the advance in prices during the last decade. The greatest advances have been made in commodities upon which the tariff has little or no effect, and the absolute removal of the tariff on many of these commodities could not afford any relief at the present time, for the reason that the prices of these commodities, with a few exceptions, were as high or higher in other countries than in the United States.

It then mentions, as the articles which the tariff does not and can not affect, "the principal farm grains—barley, corn, oats, rye, and wheat—cattle, and live stock."

I have not time to quote more, but it devotes page after page in proof that the tariff does not and can not have any influence one way or the other on their prices; that the prices for them, both at home and abroad, are fixed in the markets of the world; that these prices are as high, and in many markets higher, than in the United States. In other words, it confesses that this tariff is a fraud and false pretense practiced on the farmer. As I said, the Democratic Senators on that committee filed a minority report. While there was much difference of opinion as to the effect of the tariff on other subjects, both reports, majority and minority, agreed on the fact that the tariff on these products of the farm had absolutely nothing to do with their prices; that such a tariff was purely bogus. I commend this report by Republican Senators to the reading of every Republican.

Mr. Chairman, this is not all. I shall now produce an authority which should forever estop the Republican Party from again palming off on the people, and especially the farmer, its old, false, and fraudulent argument that the tariff on the farmer's product affects and increases its price. I have here the campaign book for 1910 of the Republican Party, entitled "Republican Textbook." I am going to quote from it in order to nail forever the bald admission by the Republican Party of its willful and persistent deception of the American farmer. Turn to page 144, and we read:

The present advance in prices is, as has been stated, primarily an advance in farm products and food of domestic production. * * * The tariff seems to have been no material factor in causing advance in prices during the past decade. * * * The advance in prices during the last 10 years appears to have no relation with tariff legislation.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

But more. From pages 146 and 147, we read:

That the tariff is not the cause of the present advance is conclusively shown by the fact that the greatest advance has been made in commodities which are usually produced in such quantities to furnish a large surplus to other countries.

Of such products it mentions "barley, corn, oats, rye, wheat," and live stock, "consisting of cattle, hogs, sheep," and so forth. It continues:

But the fact that exports of products of the farm continue in such large quantities indicates that the price movement is due, not to the tariff, but to a world-wide movement upward in the prices of these commodities.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

But to emphasize its past deception and its present confession, it concludes:

The course of prices indicates plainly that the world is demanding our food supplies and that the prices have advanced here, not by reason of the tariff, but with the general upward movement.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

My friends, the Democratic Party has for 25 years, in this Capitol, on the stump, through the press, denounced this farmers' product tariff as a fraud and a sham, put on and kept on by the Republicans for the purpose of fooling the farmers into voting the Republican ticket; and now when the Republican Party, through its President, through its senatorial report, and through its textbook, is ready to confess its guilt and admit that we have been right all the time, to my surprise and regret, we have a few Democrats here and at the other end of the Capitol who object to the Republicans making such admission and are trying to prevent them from doing it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And yet, in the face of that senatorial report, in the face of that Republican textbook, there are Republicans, insurgents and standpatters, who will have the audacity to stand here before us and on the stump before the people, and still insist that the farmer's prosperity depends upon a tariff on his wheat, corn, rye, barley, cattle, live stock, and other products. Stand where you may, that report, that textbook, will stare you in the face and condemn you of false pretense and deception. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is not honest, it is not right, for Republicans here or elsewhere to persist in the attempt to further humbug the American farmer.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why any American farmer should become alarmed over the enactment of this Canadian reciprocity agreement. To him it will prove a benefit. I call attention to one sweeping fact that ought to convince every intelligent man that the American farmer has nothing to lose but all to gain by this reciprocity. Canada buys from us annually five times more of agricultural products than we buy from her. In the last five years we have yearly, on the average, exported to Canada more than $20,000,000 worth of farm products, while she has exported to us less than, on the average, $4,000,000. In other words, Canada needs our farm products five times as much as we need hers. For the five years 1906 to 1910, inclusive, we exported to Canada $4,442,307 worth of wheat, while she exported to us only $776,239 worth; she bought from us over five times as much as we bought from her. Of corn, we exported in the five years to Canada $21,704,317 worth and imported less than $10,000; that is, she purchased of us more than 2,000 times more than she sold us. I have been unable to get the figures as to the barley trade between the two countries for the last five years. I have it only for 1910. For that year we sold to Canada $99,810 worth of barley and purchased only $1,221. Of cattle, we sold to her $1,578,179 worth and purchased $958,138; that is, we sold her over $600,000 more of cattle than she sold us. Of horses, we sold Canada $14,172,075 worth, while we purchased only $2,648,301, a balance in our favor of over $11,000,000. For apples, berries, and other fruits, vegetables, tobacco, cotton, peanuts, and other agricultural products Canada is our customer, notwithstanding the fact that she levies a tariff duty upon their importation. Reciprocity removes the tariff against our agricultural products and gives them free entrance into Canada. Why is Canada in favor of reciprocity with us? It is not to open a market for her surplus wheat or any of her surplus farm products. She has the same market for her surplus wheat and other surplus farm products as we have for ours; the same means as we have to get her products to the markets of the world. She ships her surplus to Liverpool and London. We ship our surplus to Liverpool and London, and both the exporters of the United States and of Canada get the same price in the same markets for the same products.

But Canada wants our market here for her other products, and these products the American public wishes to buy. She produces lumber, shingles, laths. The American farmer does not. She produces wood pulp and paper. The American farmer does not. She produces coal, copper, asbestos, nickel ore. The American farmer does not. Canada's great exports to us consist of lumber, shingles, laths, lumber and timber products, wood pulp, paper, copper, nickel ore, and other mineral products, fish, and chemicals, none of which our farmer produces, and many of which he must have. What Canada wants is a removal or lowering of our tariff walls against these products which her people wish to sell us, and the removal and lowering of her tariff walls against our products which her people wish to buy and which we wish to sell. She wants reciprocity and we want reciprocity, so that she can sell us these products, and with her increased sales from them buy from us more of our horses, cattle, grain, vegetables, fruits, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and other agricultural and manufactured products, which she needs.

This measure gives the farmer of Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kansas, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and other Western and border States cheaper lumber, cheaper shingles. It gives him cheaper wire for fencing. It gives him cheaper salt, cheaper wagons, and many other articles he must have. It is inconceivable to me how any Member on this floor, especially from the West, who claims to be the friend of the farmer, can fail to vote for this measure that provides some relief at least from the trusts who are yearly plundering the farmers. But in order to stand by the Lumber Trust and lumber kings, the Paper Trust, the Steel Trust, the Salt Trust, and all the trusts and special interests, on whose products the tariff is either removed or lowered by this bill, the Republicans, insurgents and standpatters alike, under the leadership of Mr. CANNON and Mr. DALZELL, are fighting this measure under the flimsy pretext and excuse that reciprocity will hurt the farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. There are many on this side who are willing to vote to amend this treaty by placing every trust-made article upon the free list. Are you?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am in favor of placing these trust-made articles on the free list, and I am going to vote for it, and if you are honest and sincere about it we Democrats are going to give you, within the next few days, an opportunity to vote for such a bill, without amending and thereby jeopardizing this or any other good measure. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to the fact that, although we are unable to change a pact made by the two Governments, the Democratic Party have reported this bill to the House with a third section added, which invites the President of the United States to put every article on the free list between this country and Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Ah, our Republican friends are anxious about the free list, and those most anxious to get it now are those who heretofore have been most vigorously opposed to a free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I observe, too, that those who now seem most earnest for a free list for the farmer are the strongest opponents of this bill, and are trying the hardest to put something onto it which they hope will defeat both reciprocity and the free list, in the House or in the Senate. Let us see about the free list. I hold here the free-list bill which we have introduced. What do you want on the free list for the farmer? Do you want farm implements? All right, here they are, every kind and description. Do you want salt? Here it is. Do you want lumber, rough and dressed, shingles, laths, posts? Here they are. Do you want boots and shoes? Here they are. Do you want wagons and carts? Here they are. Do you want cotton bagging and ties and grain sacks? Here they are. What do you want on the free list that we are not going to give you an opportunity to vote for?

My friends, we will hear much during this debate about amending this reciprocity bill by placing on the free list something for the farmer and the laboring man, and many amendments will be offered by those opposed to the bill, not with a desire to better it, but to defeat it. The opponents will play the same game at this session that they did at the last when the reciprocity bill was pending. My good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, the leader of the opposition forces then, as well as now, made a motion to recommit the bill, with instructions to add a long string of articles to the free list, including meat products, flour and other food products, farming implements, and so forth. I said to the House then that the Republicans were not sincere in demanding that meat products and other food products should be placed on the free list, because there had been bills introduced by Republicans pending before the Republican Ways and Means Committee for six months, putting flour, meat, and other food products on the free list, and that neither Mr. DALZELL nor any other Republican on that committee had voted to bring out any such bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I remind Republicans, and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DALZELL, that we have put in our free-list bill every single article that was contained in his motion to recommit. [Applause.] And I say to the gentleman that we are going to expose him when he votes against that free-list bill as the most consummate——

Several MEMBERS. State it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Lover of the farmer in the United States. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to love the farmer so good that he is going to vote against everything that we have on the free list for the farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If you have a bill containing the same items that are contained in the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recommit, why did you vote against that motion?

Mr. KITCHIN. Because the motion was not made in sincerity. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knew and the gentleman from Minnesota knew that it was made to defeat reciprocity; knew it never could become a law with that in it. Both knew that reciprocity and the gentleman's free-list items would be defeated. Now, if you are in favor of removing the tariff on those articles, we are going to give an opportunity to test your sincerity. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Let me finish this question. You say that it was put on there insincerely for the purpose of defeating the treaty?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] was candid enough in his speech to say that it was done for that very purpose. I do not know whether a Republican will tell the truth about such matters; the gentleman knows better than I do. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Did the gentleman ever know of a tentative reciprocity treaty being changed by an amendment put on it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, there is no use discussing anything of that sort.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will assert from my knowledge that there never was one defeated. I wanted to say that I voted for the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania sincerely, and I shall vote for it again. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman voted for it because he wanted to kill it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No, sir. I voted for it absolutely and sincerely.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am glad the gentleman is the only man that was fooled by the motion. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I voted for it in the interest of the consumers.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. I want to show to the House how badly fooled the gentleman from Minnesota has been and has continued to be by the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to amend the reciprocity treaty. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] had in that motion to amend placing articles on the free list, and among these items was fresh meats, which Canada had refused to accede to the United States and reciprocally place upon the free list, and the adoption of the Dalzell amendment would have absolutely killed the reciprocity bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not deny it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. JAMES. I have it from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who told me that the President of the United States told him so.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It was rumor to that effect?

Mr. JAMES. No, sir; it is the word of the President of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I should question whether the President of the United States ever said it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that I asked the President of the United States himself why it was not put on the free list, when cattle were put on the free list, and the President stated to me that he wanted to put meat on the free list, but the Canadian commissioners refused to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I understood the President said this, and the public interviews showed that he was in favor of making absolute free trade between Canada and the United States, and they objected to that, but that he did not specifically deny or state that they objected to meat alone.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not talking about an interview; I am stating what the President of the United States said to me, and I will assure the gentleman that if he will go to the White House this afternoon the President will so state to him.

Mr. HILL. It is entirely fair to supplement the statement of the gentleman from Alabama that in making the reciprocity treaty Canada yielded on fresh meats seven times as much as the United States did in order to get together.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. I want to ask if the gentleman from Minnesota will persist in the statement that he will again vote for the motion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. For the purpose of putting those items on the free list I will vote every time to put them on the free list, no matter in what form they appear.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would regret to see any Democrat, in the face of Democratic policies, in the face of Democratic pledges to honestly revise the tariff downward, in the very teeth of a specific demand of the Democratic platform that the tariff on lumber, on wood pulp, on print paper should be removed, enroll himself among the opponents of this measure. It is in line with reciprocity policies, as I have shown you, which have been pursued and indorsed and advocated by Democrats for 50 years. It goes further. It incorporates in it, in part, the express declaration of the Democratic platform in favor of free print paper and free wood pulp and free lumber. I can not see how any Democrat can vote against it unless that Democrat wants to vote either for the Lumber Trust, the Salt Trust, the Farming Implement Trust, or the Wood Pulp and Print Paper Trust, or the Steel Trust, or the mica producer, on whose products the tariff is either removed or reduced in the interest of the American consumer.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to ask the gentleman if he is talking to that side of the House on the reciprocity measure or the measure that he is talking of introducing?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, if the gentleman has not intelligence enough to know what an intelligent gentleman is talking about, I can not take up time explaining to the gentleman. [Laughter.] I will have to refuse to yield further to the gentleman. I am going to quit you and let you take a second thought. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, I want to ask another question.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, then, quick.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In talking about that you ask them about free lumber. I want to say this does not put lumber on the free list.

Mr. KITCHIN. It puts rough lumber on the free list, and thus makes a reduction on every kind of lumber, whether rough or planed, of from $1 to $1.25 a thousand feet. Does not that help your farmers out in North Dakota?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am from Washington.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, you are from Washington! Oh, I see why the gentleman is against it. Washington! [Laughter.] The home of timber kings and lumber trusts! There are four men in the State of Washington who, with their companies, own more standing timber than there is pine timber in the whole 13 Southern States! Lumber trusts, lumber kings, from Washington; certainly; certainly! [Prolonged applause and laughter.]

Why, no wonder that a shrewd, smart Republican can fool a busy farmer when that gentleman over there came very nearly fooling me. [Laughter.] Why, he looked so sincere and so candid and so meek when he was talking about the tariff on the farmer's wheat that I really thought he was even fooled into the belief that a tariff helped the farmer, and now I see back behind him old man Weyerhaeuser, who and whose companies own more lumber than all of the standing timber in all of the Southern States. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota rose.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, please sit down. [Laughter.] Let me get through.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman refuse to yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me get through this——

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It is on North Carolina lumber.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, all right. Go ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Did the gentleman have an opportunity to vote for free lumber during the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and I voted for it.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. So did I.

Mr. KITCHIN. Two good patriots! [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How about the balance of the North Carolina delegation?

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, boys, I am almost ashamed to say. [Prolonged laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. How about the 38 Members more on the Democratic side? How did they vote on free lumber?

Mr. KITCHIN. They voted mighty, mighty bad. [Laughter.] All right; now the gentleman is asking me a question, and let me ask some.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And did they not defeat free lumber?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; with the aid of an almost solid vote on that side. I never have said that all Democrats were at all times and under all circumstances good patriots. [Laughter.] I have often said there are a few Democrats as bad sometimes as most Republicans are all the time. [Laughter.] Now, you ask me why a little minority of 38 Democrats (there were only 32, as I recall) voted against free lumber. Let me ask you, why did over 75 per cent of you Republicans over there vote against free lumber? More than 75 per cent of the Democrats voted squarely with the platform for the removal of the duty on lumber, and 75 per cent, yes, 85 per cent, of you Republicans voted with the Lumber Trust, the timber kings, to keep it on [applause on the Democratic side]; and yet you ask me how a little minority on our side voted.

Mr. Chairman, the proof that the tariff on agricultural products, which is removed by this bill, is a sham, is so clear and overwhelming that it will sweep the intelligent mind to conviction in spite of itself. We underrate the good sense and intelligence of the American farmer if we delude ourselves into the belief that we can vote against this bill in the interest of the timber kings, the Paper Trust, Steel Trust, and other trusts, and then plead to him the excuse that we did so because it removed, as to Canada, the tariff on his products. He knows that such a tariff is a fake. He knows that it does not and can not affect the price of his products. He knows that each year his products go out into the markets of the world in competition with the world, and the price at home and abroad is fixed by the world's market. He knows that what he needs is not the retention of a fake tariff on what he sells, but a removal or reduction of the real tariff on what he buys. He knows, or will find out, that this bill, among other things, puts salt, rough lumber, barbed wire and other wire for fencing on the free list; that it reduces the tariff on cutlery from over 70 per cent to 27½ per cent; on scissors and shears and knives and forks from over 50 per cent to 27½ per cent; on clocks and watches from over 40 per cent to 27½ per cent. He knows, or will find out, that it reduces the tariff on farm wagons from 35 per cent to 22 per cent; on feed cutters, crushers, field rollers and manure spreaders from 45 per cent to 20 per cent; that it reduces the tariff on shingles, laths, and many other articles which he must buy.

He knows, or will find out, that because of this removal or reduction of the tariff on these articles the Lumber Trust and timber syndicates of the West, the Salt Trust, the Steel Trust, the Farming Implement Trust, the Watch Trust, and all the other trusts whose articles are reduced are "raising heaven and earth" to defeat this bill. He knows that those on this floor who have heretofore been supposed to be the most friendly to the trusts and the special interests are the most vigorous opponents of this measure. When you vote against this bill and go back to your district, the farmer, whom you hope to delude, will be the first to ask, Why did you vote in the interest of the Salt Trust against removal of the tax on salt? He will ask you, Why did you vote in the interest of the Lumber Trust and timber syndicates against putting rough lumber on the free list and against reducing the tax on shingles and laths? What are you going to tell him? He is going to ask you, Why did you vote with the Steel Trust and other Representatives on this floor against putting barbed wire and other wire for fencing on the free list and against a reduction of the tax on cutlery, scissors and shears, and knives and forks? What answer will you, what answer can you, give? He will

want to know why you voted with the Watch Trust against the reduction of the tariff tax on watches and clocks. He is certainly going to ask you why you voted in the interest of the Farming Implement Trust against a reduction of the tax on wagons, feed cutters, grain crushers, field rollers, and manure spreaders? What will be your answer? Are you going to have the cheek to put up the old, stale, fake plea of a "tariff on the farmer's products"? Are you going to discredit his intelligence by trying to fool him again about a tariff on wheat, corn, rye, cattle, and so forth? Why, gentlemen, he will laugh in your face. The trusts and special interests must furnish you a better plea.

There is another gentleman in your district who is interested in this bill and who is going to ask you some questions. The laboring man knows that this bill puts fish on the free list; that it reduces the tax on flour from—at the present prices—$1.15 per barrel to 50 cents per barrel; that it reduces the tax on bacon and hams from 4 cents to 1½ cents per pound, on shoulders, sides, salted pork, and beef and dried and smoked meats from 25 per cent to 1½ cents per pound; that it removes the tax on butter and cheese. He knows, or will find out, that the big flour mills, the Meat Trust, and the Elgin Butter Trust are bitterly fighting this bill. He is going to ask you why you voted in the interest of the big flour mills against a reduction of the tax on flour. Why did you vote against giving the laboring man and his family untaxed fish, untaxed butter, and cheese? He is certainly going to make you tell him why, in opposing the reduction of the outrageous tax on meat and beef in these hungry days of the high cost of living, you saw fit to vote in favor of the Meat Trust, the huge Armour-Swift-Morris combine, and against the laboring man and his wife and children. What are you going to say to him? You can not put up to him the bogus excuse of the "farmers' tariff." The Meat Trust will have to hunt for you a better plea to satisfy him.

Still another gentleman in your district will have some questions to put to you. The editor of the country weekly paper, as well as the city daily, knows that this bill puts on the free list print paper; that it loosens the grip which the International Paper Co., known as the Paper Trust, has on the throats of the tens of thousands of newspaper owners throughout the country. He is going to ask you why you voted in the interest of the Paper Trust against removing the tax on print paper. And if you are a Democrat, he is going to read to you the Democratic platform, which demanded the "immediate repeal of the tariff on print paper."

My friends, the humor of some of the opponents of this bill, both on this side of the Chamber as well as on that, is most delightful. They say that they oppose it because it is in the interest of the trusts and the protected manufacturers. It seems never to have occurred to them that if this bill is in the interest of the trusts and manufacturers that the ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], instead of leading the opposition, would be the strongest advocates of this measure in this body. And they say that Canada does not ship to us any wire fencing or cutlery or wagons or meat products or other manufactured articles. But why? Because our tariff wall is too high. This bill proposes to lower it. The manufacturers and trusts are fighting it. The Armour-Swift-Morris combine know that with the Canadian tariff on our hogs, cattle, and other live stock removed, and our tariff on beef and meat products removed or reduced, that English and Canadian capital will establish in Canada larger meat-packing plants, and these will compete in the American market with the Meat Trust in purchasing the farmer's cattle, hogs, and other live stock, and will compete also with the trust in selling to the American consumer meat products, and thus the live-stock grower will have another competing buyer and the American consumer will have another competing seller of meat products. So it will be with wire fencing, cutlery, farm wagons, and other articles whose tariff is reduced by this bill. The trusts in the United States fear, with a reduced tariff on their products, the establishment by Canadian and English capital and, perhaps American capital, of competing plants across the line in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the positive, organized opposition against reciprocity is not the American farmer, but the American protected monopolist. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Every Democrat and every Republican on this floor knows that the two great organizing forces behind the opposition are the International Paper Co., known as the Paper Trust, that controls 80 per cent of all the paper used throughout the length and breadth of this country from the big metropolitan daily to the smallest country weekly, and the Lumber Trust and timber kings of the West, who own and control over 80 per cent of the standing timber of the United States. They have organized the protected forces against it, and, pretending great anxiety for the agricultural interests, have had the shrewdness to play upon the fears and to alarm some of the farmers against it.

My friend from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] came near fooling this whole House in the belief that he was anxious about the farmer, and then we happened to find out about those old lumber kings out there in Washington.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like to ask you what I said or what led you to believe that I was speaking in favor of the lumbermen?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, the lumbermen, who have a real keen and shrewd advocate on this floor, will not let him talk lumber. He must talk wheat and vote lumber. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Do you decline to answer my question?

Mr. KITCHIN. You would be the most foolish representative of the Lumber Trust in the world if you would stand here on the floor and say, "I represent the Lumber Trust in the West." Oh, no. In order for the trust to get some votes against reciprocity, you have got to be for the farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will promise you this, that I will vote for free lumber if you will vote for free sugar on any bill that you put in.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will vote for both when the time comes, and you will vote for neither. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, let me remind opponents of this bill, who have deceived themselves into the belief that a sufficient excuse to their rural constituents is the assertion that it is in the interest of the American protected manufacturers, that the American Protective Tariff League, the lobbying organization of the manufacturers and trusts, does not take the same view. There are no smarter fellows than the members of this league. They know what they want. They know whether this bill will help or hurt the protected interests. They are waging a most active and vigorous campaign against it.

Let me read from an Indiana paper, the Daily Sun:

> We have received a package of postal cards from the American Protective Tariff League, accompanied by the request that they be handed to voters who will fill out the blanks and mail them to Members of Congress. On the back of the card is a request that we "cooperate and help defeat the Canadian reciprocity bill."

I have here one of the postal cards referred to in this paper, sent out by the league to a voter and by the voter to his Representative. The league is playing the same old game of fooling the farmer. It recognizes the fact, as Republicans here do, that unless the American farmers can be kept deluded as to protection on his products the manufacturers and trusts can not hope to get his vote for protection to them.

Let me read two of the several "whereases" on the address side of the card:

> Whereas, in our judgment, the Canadian reciprocity agreement is a gross violation of the policy of protection, in that it unfairly sacrifices the interests of American agriculture.

How anxious and how alarmed are these organized plunderers of the farmer over the "sacrificing of the interests of American agriculture" by this bill!

But the next "whereas" exposes the grounds for such anxiety and alarm:

> Whereas the manufacturer can not hope to retain protection for his industry when protection shall have been denied to the farmer.

We must fool the farmer; we must make him believe that this scheme of tariff robbery embraces his interest as well as ours. He must save for us the right to plunder, by this scheme, the American farmer and the American people.

Now let me read the "resolve" of the league:

> *Resolved*, That the American Protective Tariff League is unalterably opposed to the adoption of the Canadian tariff agreement, and urges that all friends of protection bring to bear every proper influence upon the Congress of the United States against the adoption of said agreement.

In the face of that resolution of the American Protective Tariff League, what Democrat or Republican will have the audacity, here or at home, to offer as an excuse for voting against this bill that it was in the interest of the trusts and manufacturers? Gentlemen, if I had made no investigation of the subject, after seeing that resolution and knowing the bitter opposition of the American Protective Tariff League to the bill, I would have felt it, not only my duty as a Democrat, but my duty as an honest, patriotic citizen, to vote for this reciprocity

bill and against the demands of the American Protective Tariff League. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer apologies for consuming so much time. If, however, my good Republican friends had not interrupted me so often, I would have finished long ago. Before concluding, I wish to express regret that it became necessary in this debate—a necessity anticipated because of the character of the discussion at the last session and the minority report of the Republicans—in advocating reciprocity with Canada by which freer intercourse between the two peoples should be established, to descend to the low level of bushels, and pounds, and yards and feet, and dollars and cents.

But in the minority report and in the speeches last session of the opposition they gave notice of the ground upon which they would give battle, and that impelled me to meet and refute their sordid arguments. I wish in this debate we could raise the question to a broader and higher and more patriotic plane. There is no more reason why a tariff wall should be maintained between this country and Canada, stretching 3,000 miles, than there should be between the State of Pennsylvania and the State of New York. The people of Canada are our people. We are of the same blood. We have the same ancestry. Hundreds of thousands of American citizens have crossed the line and made homes there. They have our institutions. They have our aspirations; they have our inspirations. They have the same thrift and industry. We allow them to cross any part of the 3,000 miles of the imaginary dividing line with their wives and children and friends; foreigner or native, they come or go anywhere in America; but just as soon as one of them takes a chicken, a horse, a bushel of wheat, any property the product of the mine, the farm, or the factory, the law steps in and penalizes him—taxes his people and our people. This is a cruel injustice and wrong to both people, which this bill partly remedies. When we bind together that country with this, not with the cords of entangling treaties and alliances, but with the stronger ties of mutual intercourse and commerce, we form a bond of such strength that human power can not break it asunder. I want the comradeship and love and peace of Canada for our people. They want and need ours. When we have joined these two together in bonds of commercial interest and intercourse—and I hope this will lead to absolute free trade between the two countries—then in the future, when our peace, our happiness, our safety, our commerce are threatened, as in the days of the Revolution there came up from South Carolina the cry, "The cause of Boston is the cause of all," so there will come up from every Canadian throat, from Columbia to Quebec, "The cause of the United States is the cause of all." She will realize that what affects our peace will affect her peace; what will affect our commerce will affect her commerce; what will affect our safety will affect her safety. Every instinct of self-preservation, every sentiment of peace, of prosperity, and of happiness will impel her sympathies and her good offices to our side.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning, this is only a step in the right direction, but still a step. I trust that when the vote is taken every Democrat on this side, for the good of his party and his country, will fall into ranks, and that we will take that step all together in one solid phalanx. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] consume some of his time?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been consumed by that side?

The CHAIRMAN. Three hours, exactly.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, before I begin the few remarks I shall have to make, I ask permission that I may revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD. A portion of what I have to present will be somewhat technical in argument, containing some statistics, with which I would not weary the House. Therefore I ask that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD at their conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. JAMES. I shall not object to that, Mr. Chairman. I think that permission ought to be granted to all Members of the House; but some gentleman here this morning interposed an objection. I am not going to object to the right being extended to the gentleman from Maine, but I think it ought to be extended to every one who wants it, on both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. HINDS. I will cooperate with the gentleman to secure that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, I can not remove from my mind the firm conviction that the policy proposed in this bill is of an importance out of all proportion to the scantiness of the investigation which has preceded it. The farmers of this Nation are more than a third of its people, and whatsoever affects the basis of their industries affects all. I know how hard it is to bring the realization of this fact home to those who dwell in great cities, especially to those who control stupendous industrial and commercial interests, besides which a farm of 150 acres seems an inconsiderable enterprise. Even the great intellect of Horace Greeley succumbed to the prevailing delusion, if we may credit the statement of the brilliant eulogist of Lincoln who said that Horace Greeley thought himself a bigger man than Abraham Lincoln because he lived in a bigger town. But I am convinced that if the dwellers in cities will look below the surface of this question they will see that it does not concern the farmer alone. If in what I am to say I shall seem to speak of him entirely, it is because his industry is at the foundation of our prosperity, and in speaking of him I speak of all. The dwellers in cities can not disassociate their interest from that of the farmers. Diminish the purchasing power of the American farmer and you diminish by so much the prosperity of every city and of every laborer, clerk, merchant, and banker within its limits.

A hundred and twenty-five years ago, when our fathers were first agitating the question of a tariff, the New York Chamber of Commerce reminded the opposing farmers that agriculture could not flourish without commerce. To-day the merchant and manufacturer may well be reminded that commerce and manufactures are not likely to flourish without a successful agriculture.

THE QUESTION TO BE ARGUED ON BROAD NATIONAL GROUNDS.

The question is too great and important to be argued on anything but broad national grounds. Grievously as this bill affects industries of the State of Maine, I am not here to argue that it affects Maine more than it affects every other State in the North or in the South, in the East or in the West. In Maine we see more clearly because we are nearer the conditions, but if the gentlemen of the Democratic Party succeed in carrying this bill through this House and this Congress, its ultimate effects on the economic and social life of this Nation must be such that Maine will be neither the loudest nor the most inconsolable in her lamentations.

I do not mean to say by this that the challenges which are ringing out from the States bordering on Canada are to be disregarded. When the sentries on the picket line begin to challenge and fire it behooves the whole army to take notice.

BURDENS AND BENEFITS NOT JUSTLY APPORTIONED.

The manner in which this bill distributes its supposed benefits and its undoubted hardships violates mankind's fundamental idea of justice and equity. Since the dawn of time, through all mythologies and religions, man has expressed his inborn idea that to those who have the suffering and self-denial should come the bliss of the better world, the peace of the Elysian fields, the joy of the golden streets. That is real reciprocity. But this bill introduces into that ancient, instinctive idea of equity, a new principle; that one class of citizens is to have the sacrifices, while another class enjoys the rewards. The dairymen of New York and Ohio are to tread the earthly pathway of self-denial, and in reward the makers of barbed-wire fencing are to roam the Elysian fields [laughter]; the wheat farmers of the Dakotas are to keep the long vigil of unrestricted competition, and in return the automobile makers of Detroit are to speed over the streets of gold; the fishermen of Gloucester who keep watch and watch with death on the banks of Newfoundland are to surrender their market, and in return the Connecticut clock makers are to set up their timepieces in the realms of bliss, where a thousand years are but as a day; the potato farmer of Maine or Michigan is to have the troubles of Lazarus, but the maker of harvesting machines is to rest his head on the bosom of Abraham. [Laughter and applause.] One class sows that another may reap, and you call it reciprocity.

Names count for much with us, and the names of Blaine and McKinley are being used to commend this proposition. There is no warrant for this. In his youth in 1864, as a Member of this House, Mr. Blaine voted to repeal an arrangement with Canada far better than the one proposed now, since it gave free coal, which this does not. And in his later days Mr.

Blaine in his Twenty Years of Congress referred to that reciprocity as "one-sided, vexatious, and unprofitable." Mr. McKinley made the very tariff duties which you are now trying to sweep away; and, like Mr. Blaine, never favored reciprocity in competing products.

FREE TRADE IN FARM PRODUCTS REVERSES THE POLICY OF A CENTURY.

The broad proposition which is before us is that tariff duties levied on our borders against commodities produced by foreign people, be swept away, so far as the principal and practically the only competitors of our farmers are affected. We are giving the farmer free trade and are pleading in justification that it will not hurt him and will help the consumer. If these two pleas are consistent and truthful, well and good. If either or both be fallacious, we must know it.

One significant fact may arouse in our minds a suspicion that we are wrong in removing the protection from the farmer's products. Protection for the farmer is an old national policy coeval with the Constitution itself. In 1789 living was simple. There were not many food products of the farm that could be imported. Potatoes were raised abroad only in limited quantities. The peasantry of France still believed them poisonous. The bread eaten by the American people was principally made of Indian corn, wheaten bread appearing on the table only when the minister came. But there was one foreign article that could compete in our markets—cheese. And the statesmen of 1789 put a duty of 4 cents a pound on cheese. For a hundred and twenty-five years, with few intervals, there has been a tariff on cheese, usually 4 cents a pound, in 1816 as high as 9 cents. Under the Democratic Wilson tariff it was 4 cents, to-day it is 6 cents. Our fathers made it 4 cents when the nearest competition was 3,000 miles away, over an ocean. Freight ran into dollars and weeks. To-day our tariff on cheese is only 6 cents a pound, and one of the great cheese-making countries of the world is separated from our markets only by a few cents and a few hours.

You propose to reverse the policy of a hundred and twenty-five years and give us, not lower duties, but free trade with our only competitor, not only in cheese, but in all the principal farm products. Many of us have hoped for a reasonable, symmetrical tariff on manufactured goods founded on scientifically acquired information. How can that ever be if we are to proceed against the farmer with this crude violence?

LONG ESTABLISHED POLICY SHOULD BE REVERSED ONLY AFTER CAREFUL EXAMINATION.

I am not one of those who believe that a policy should always continue because it has continued a century and a quarter. Because butter, wheat, oats, and potatoes were protected in 1824 is not in itself a reason why they should be protected now. Because even the Democratic tariff makers in 1857 and again in 1894 considered it wise to give the farmers a substantial protection is not a compelling reason to constrain our acts here and now. But when wise men and partially wise men in certain situations have at different times reasoned out the same line of action, what they have done has attained great authority and dignity. Statesmen and jurists have used their acts as the mariner uses the lighthouse. They have been disregarded only after the fullest investigation and the most mature deliberation.

To-day and here, however, we are brushing aside the experience of our past. We are disregarding the progressive and enlightened conclusions of statesmanship in Germany, France, and England and are doing this great thing without investigation worthy the name.

One night the States-General of France voted a king off the throne and changed the order of society. That stands as the great precedent of precipitate legislative action. But the people of France had read, studied, and pondered for nearly 10 years the Red Book of Necker, wherein the greatest finance minister of the age had set forth the state of the nation. You are proposing to-day a great new policy that goes to the very social fabric of America, and where is the great committee of this House that has probed to the bottom of it, and where is the book that has spread its investigations before the American people?

THE NECESSITY OF ACCURATE REASONING ON THIS QUESTION.

To many this thing seems simple. Because Canada has New-World conditions which, generally speaking, are like our own, therefore there can be no harm in letting her agricultural products compete in our markets. That seems plausible, and it has the ear of the American people to-day, because we have always thought of tariffs as applying chiefly to manufactures. But right here let us stop and examine, for here is the fork of the road.

It was my good fortune once to hear from the gallery of the English House of Commons a debate on the management of English railways. And one plausible orator, with much confidence of assertion, declared that statistics showed the loss of life to be far greater on American roads than on English. From this he deduced conclusions unfavorable to American skill and capacity. But a member from the Government bench answered him; I do not know the name or the rank of that modest, well-poised gentleman. I have no doubt he had been trained in one of those two great universities where the scholars of England—greater than her Wellingtons and her Nelsons—have for a thousand years taught the youth of England to search for and know the truth. Taking up the statements so detrimental to the United States, so flattering to English pride, he admitted that the statistics did show a greater loss of life on American railroads, but he pointed out that America was a very great country; that many thousand miles of her road had been extended hastily in sparsely populated regions. It was to be expected that there would be great loss of life on such roads. But in the older settled East, where fixed conditions prevailed, the loss of life was so little as to show that American skill and capacity were not to be compared unfavorably with English. I do not recount this narrative to read any lesson to the brilliant and discriminating intellects in this Hall. I do it merely for the sake of the argument I am about to make, to arrest your attention, especially the attention of the Democratic majority before it pushes home this blow at the prosperity of the farmer and the social life of the Nation.

GREAT DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE FARM HOME AND THE FACTORY.

The fact that Canada has New-World conditions, that her labor is not crushed down as in the older countries, furnishes, I will admit, a fair argument that you might with safety remove the duties on manufactured goods in the future when conditions of labor shall have equalized. The argument, then, may some day be sound when applied to factories. Is it sound when applied to farms?

No; and for this reason, that the farm is primarily not a factory, but a home.

Capitalists gather up money, build mills, call in laborers, and turn out product for the main purpose of paying dividends on the capital they have gathered up.

The farmer acquires land that he may found a home.

It is not the lack of bricks, machinery, or factory sites that checks the expansion of factories, but the disappearance of dividends.

The expansion of farms ceases only when there is no more land under the western sun.

Dividends are the fundamental conditions of manufactures.

Areas of land for homes are the fundamental condition of agriculture.

If the factory's product falls in price below the dividend-producing line, the factory shuts down to wait for better times. The building of new factories is discouraged.

Did any of you gentlemen ever hear of the farms shutting down as factories shut down because the bottom fell out of the market for their products? We heard that the farmers of Kansas once burned their corn when they could not sell it. But farming went on, because the homes could not stop.

When cotton goods fall in the market, the cotton mills curtail production and save loss by running fewer weeks in the year.

When the farmer's products fall in the market, he must produce not less but more, because the expense of the home must be met.

Manufactures, organized by trusts and gentlemen's agreements, easily control output and prevent overproduction.

Farmers, by the necessities of their condition, are controlled in their production only by the Almighty's dispensation of sunshine and rain.

The farm is evidently to be distinguished from the factory. And may we not make a blunder—a great blunder such as Napoleon said was worse than a crime—if in our reasoning here we apply to the agricultural schedule of our tariff the same formulas that we apply to the manufacturing schedule? [Applause on the Republican side.]

At this point let us guard against a confusion of thought. I am not trying to show that farming creates homes and manufacturing does not. But in manufacturing the homes are the incident, not the object. A corporation with a thousand employees curtails production without responsibility as to its effect on the families of those employees. The human-life necessities do not impel an overproduction disastrous to the market. But when we turn to agriculture, the human-life necessities do that very thing. It is because of this that we must vary our accustomed formulas if we would not work a fearful havoc when we deal with the agricultural schedule.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE FARM HOME AND ITS RELATION TO MANUFACTURES.

A century ago the farm home was more preeminently the unit of civilization than to-day. It was almost independent within itself. The father and sons tilled the fields, cared for the cattle, and especially the sheep, while the mother and daughters kept the house and spun and wove the clothing. The daughters were the spinsters, and to this day an unmarried woman, whether she dwell in humble cottage or princely castle, is a spinster—living monument of the old independence of the farm home. In process of time the factory has taken over the family industries, as well as most of the village trades. The farmer and his family devote themselves to the simpler products, the raw materials; and after their own food supply is secure, must sell enough surplus to pay for the manufactured goods, professional services, and so forth, which are needed to satisfy their wants and tastes. It is obvious that if all in the world were farmers, there would be no people to buy the surplus. It is evident, then, that there must be other people, not engaged in farming, to buy and consume this surplus of the farmer, else he will be unable to purchase manufactured articles. It seems most consistent with reason that these other people who are to purchase the farmer's surplus should be his own neighbors, or, at least, of his own Nation or region, and especially those of his neighbors who are engaged in manufacturing the very articles which he needs to buy. And it is evident that both farmers and artisans will be most prosperous and the happiest when there are enough farmers to take the artisan's goods at a fair price, and enough artisans, professional men, and so forth, to take the farmer's surplus at a fair price.

EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND MANUFACTURES.

This brings us to the question of proportion, or equilibrium, of manufactured and agricultural products. And it is right here on this point that the whole situation likely to be created by this reciprocity treaty develops itself. Our manufactures, syndicated as they are by trusts and associations, are easily controllable and do not tend to run into an overproduction, disastrous to profits on capital or the wages of labor. But the farms, being an aggregation of homes, disorganized, and each impelled by its own necessities, tend constantly to overproduce. And this overproduction becomes disastrous unless the limitation of acreage possible to be cultivated intervenes to prevent. Therefore the element of prime importance in this discussion is the relation of acreage to the capacity of the home market furnished by the nonagricultural classes.

Of this doctrine of the equilibrium of the home market we have heard little among English-speaking peoples, because England hopelessly destroyed the equilibrium of her home market when, as a result of the stimulation of the Napoleonic wars, she got more people into manufacturing than her acres, in the opinion of a dominating school of her statesmen, could possibly feed, even under the highest development of her agriculture. Then she felt forced to open her markets to the agricultural products of the world. We, who found our market in her necessities, have not examined her situation. But England herself is awakening, and in 1906, after exhaustive investigations, her tariff commission made a significant report. There has been, that report says—

a broad contrast between the policy adopted by foreign countries and that adopted by the United Kingdom. Generally speaking, all foreign and European countries accept as the basis of their economic policy the necessity for maintaining a flourishing agriculture. This is partly due to economic reasons, partly to considerations of national defense and security. The result, speaking generally, is that these countries, instead of pursuing an exclusively manufacturing or an exclusively agrarian policy, have endeavored to maintain a balance between agriculture and manufactures.

"A balance between agriculture and manufactures!" Have any of us studied it before plunging into this great departure from the pathway traced by the instincts of our statesmen for a century and a quarter?

RELATION OF THE EQUILIBRIUM TO NATIONAL POWER AND SOCIAL LIFE.

"Consideration of national defense and security!" Have any of us studied the relations of agriculture to that great subject? We have thought of battleships and forts and have registered our thoughts in billion-dollar marks.

Have we forgotten that the farm home is the greatest nursery of men and women that a nation has? When Bismarck turned from free trade to protection and established Germany's agricultural duties, he did it on the ground of the salvation of the Prussian State and the German Empire. [Applause on the Republican side.] Wealth and factories are great assets of a nation, I grant you. I hope we and our neighbors will always have an abundance of both; but if we look over the history of our race in the parent country for the long course of time the word that comes oftenest from the pens of historians and the tongues of orators is not "wealth" or "factories," but "yeomanry." From Crecy to the Crimea, and on to this day, the yeomanry of England have been her proudest boast. And when the statesmen who but recently formed England's tariff commission came to examine the condition of the realm one of their most striking recommendations was a duty on agricultural products as an important means of encouraging small farmers—men of the yeomanry class.

Do you remember what the Boer War revealed to England? That her military recruits were undersized and that their vitality was lowered by the conditions of crowded city life. Well may her statesmen have turned their eyes backward to those stalwart farmer boys, the yeoman archers of England, who laid low the mailed chivalry of France, or those other country boys, stalwart in form and stern of conscience, whose valor at Dunbar and Worcester commended their leader to immortal fame and their model of organization to English-speaking soldiers for 250 years. And so the English statesmen—bethinking themselves of valor as well as of trade—recommended a tariff on agricultural products. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That is what English statesmen recommended after investigation and study. What you propose to do here and now is to tear down American agricultural duties after neither investigation nor study. [Applause on the Republican side.]

HOW THE EQUILIBRIUM OF THE FARMERS' MARKET WAS LOST.

Since other nations have thought it worth while to study the equilibrium of the farmers' market, it may be worth our time to halt for a moment the speedy onward course of this bill and reflect on it ourselves. It concerns all, the proudest city and the smallest town. It overrides all consideration of special profits or losses that we may think we see in this agreement.

Up to 1850 this equilibrium between agriculture and the home market was maintained the world over, because transportation was still costly on land and sea, and agricultural products, being bulky, were restrained by the cost of freight from flooding any particular market. But from 1850 onward the application of steam to land and water transportation revolutionized the economic condition of the world, and soon brought to the front one great and all-controlling economic phenomenon—the opening of the broad and fertile prairies of the western United States.

Farm products began to fly through space and hurl themselves upon far-distant places in unheard-of quantities. This was especially so with farm products raised on new lands, under the stimulus of nature's stored-up fertility. In 1878 the fast-freight and refrigerator car came into activity, and the dairyman of the West was constructively moved up to the door of the eastern farmer, and the two went merrily to work to make one another poor with overcompetition. The equilibrium of the market between the farmer's surplus and the artisan's product, from being constant and sure, under the eyes of all, became a flighty and inconstant thing, doing unexpected acts in response to distant voices. That a German farmer on the sands of Brandenburg should find the conditions in the little market town where his fathers had resorted for three centuries turned upside down by some farmers on a River Platte in a land called Nebraska, thousands of miles distant under the westward sun, was a phenomenon astounding and portentous. Well may it have driven Bismarck, imbued with the free-trade theories of the universities and sharing the prejudices of the country squires of Germany against manufactures, from the free-trade to the protection camp. [Applause on the Republican side.]

EFFECTS OF THE DISTURBANCE OF THE AMERICAN FARMERS' MARKET, ESPECIALLY IN NEW ENGLAND.

The markets of four great communities afford us an instructive lesson as to the effects of this phenomenon: The eastern United States, England, Germany, and France. Eastern United States, North and South, being in the same Nation with the new lands, met the flood of cheap products under free-trade conditions as it fell with full force in the years between 1870 and 1890. Many men in this Hall remember the dearth it produced. The Tariff Board in its brief contribution to this subject refers to it. If, in illustrating it, I refer to New England, it is only because I am most familiar with that region.

In New England this destruction of his markets brought the farmer a great revolution and a long dearth. The measure of that dearth is found in the values of farms and farm buildings in those six States. When agriculture has a fair chance, farm values ought to increase. The accumulations of industry ought to result in permanent improvements, the betterment of buildings, the fertilization of the land. What was the case? The total value of the farm realty of New England in 1890 was very little more than it had been in 1860, 30 years before. In those

30 years that splendid race of farmers practically stood still, and $20,000,000 measures the only increase in the value of their property. From 1890 to 1900 the increase was nearly $40,000,000, and from 1900 to 1910, when the equilibrium of markets was restored, the increase was over $170,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] I dwell on this feature of the equilibrium of markets because the percentage of this increase bears a striking resemblance to that between 1850 and 1860, when the old equilibrium existed.

The following table, prepared by the Census Bureau, tells as eloquently as columns of figures can the story of the long dearth on New England farms and the long halt of 30 years:

Average value of land, buildings, and other improvements per farm for each State from 1850 to 1910.

Year.	Total.	Maine.	New Hampshire.	Vermont.	Massachusetts.	Rhode Island.	Connecticut.
1910	$3,708	$2,659	$3,176	$3,442	$5,238	$5,287	$5,166
1900	2,753	1,628	2,392	2,510	4,189	4,206	3,616
1890	2,579	1,590	2,270	2,473	3,710	3,977	3,609
1880	2,802	1,591	2,367	3,078	3,806	4,164	3,957
1870 [1]	3,240	1,722	2,719	4,120	4,393	4,019	4,871
1860	2,589	1,413	2,285	2,980	3,462	3,616	3,607
1850	2,222	1,173	1,181	2,129	3,202	3,170	3,240

[1] One-fifth should be deducted for depreciated currency.

THE DEARTH NOT PECULIAR TO NEW ENGLAND.

While the effects of the long dearth were more pronounced in New England, perhaps, than elsewhere, yet in the whole North Atlantic Division, which includes New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, as well as New England, in 30 years, from 1860 to 1890, the value of farms and farm buildings increased only two-thirds as much as it had in the single decade from 1850 to 1860 under normal markets. This North Atlantic Division of the United States shows the effect of the opening of new lands on the old lands, as no other section of the United States could do at this time. With the best home market in America in their midst, with the much-vaunted world's market of Europe nearer to them than to any other farmers on this Continent, with the inherited appliances and improvements belonging to established countries, the farmers of the North Atlantic States could barely hold their own for 30 years. The West was the new and growing region; she will figure as an old and settled country in the new influx. So also will the South, which then did not notice, amid the ravages of war, the minor ravages of competition.

Our Tariff Board, in its meager report on this vast subject—meager because in the hot haste with which this House is moving there is no time for the scientific examination which I believe Mr. Emery and his associates would make so well—comments on one fact which it has found, but on the vast significance of which it has had no time to dwell. It says of the most flourishing Canadian Province—Ontario:

Ontario, while reporting the highest Canadian land value, shows the lowest Canadian rate of increase. It is worthy of note that Ontario is feeling the competition of western Canada, just as some years ago the eastern part of the United States felt the competition of our western lands.

The farmers of Ontario are already losing the equilibrium of their markets. All eastern Canada will soon be in the throes of it. And we are now proposing to tear down our ancient dikes and invite the flood to roll over us. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The New England farmer saved himself by courage and intelligence. The census shows that of the 12,000,000 acres of improved land in the six States in 1860, only 7,000,000 acres remain improved. But the officials of the Census Bureau advise me that a difference in methods of classification of improved land accounts for much of the difference. Yet, undoubtedly, there has been some decline. Take as an example, and not an extreme example, the State of Maine. "The acreage of improved land increased steadily until 1880," says the census report, "when a marked decline began, and in 1900 the percentage of farm land improved was smaller than ever before reported." And the Director of the Census went on to specify as one of the causes of this "the competition of western lands in cereal production."

After an agonizing struggle the New England farmer moved to a new base. He ceased to raise beef and sheep, he went out of wheat and the cereals, and became a dairyman, a grower of fruits, and a market gardener. He lessened his acreage, but kept in the business, for the farm is a home and is hostage of fate for the farmer in bad as well as good times. And to-day the census of 1910 shows that there are over 3,000 more farms in New England than there were in 1860. On a new basis that splendid race of farmers are reversing the decadence of two generations. And just in the hour of victory the statesmen of America, without scientific investigation, with hardly a hearing that deserves the name, propose to turn loose on them the competition of a new empire. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Can not the gentlemen on the Democratic side of this House see how futile a plan it is to bring on the American farmer the destruction of equilibrium in his markets and then expect to recompense him by lowering the duties on a few of the things he buys? You bring upon him a colossal calamity and then propose to salve his wounds with commercial percentages. You destroy his business and then pretend to cheapen the tools with which he carries it on. [Applause on the Republican side.]

SIMILAR EFFECTS IN THE ENGLISH FARMER'S MARKET.

England also met the deluge under free-trade conditions. What happened is succinctly stated by Mr. James J. Hill in his new work, Highways of Progress:

Agriculture in England—

He says—

has suffered in the last 25 years by the opening of new land in America and the cheapening of the world's transportation.

The English tariff commission gives in 1906 the same report:

The causes of the decline in agriculture are world-wide in their operation, affecting all importing countries. The striking feature in the case of the United Kingdom is that agriculture has been more depressed than in any other country and more depressed than any other branch of economic activity. During the last 25 years the course of all agricultural prices has been the same downward direction, with the result that agriculture has been subject to a great combination of causes, all tending toward its depression.

And, most significant of all, that commission goes on to say:

European countries generally have pursued a policy involving import duties on agricultural produce, whereas in the United Kingdom agriculturists have been subject to the unrestricted importation of foreign produce on terms not dissimilar, in many cases, from those experienced by manufacturers who complain of dumping.

These dry official statements give little of the tragedy of England's position. Forty thousand of her acres went out of culture last year. In the county of Buckingham farms sell as low as $63 an acre.

Buckingham County is about 30 miles from London and halfway between London and Birmingham. Many railroads connect it with both those cities. London is that great world's market that is dangled so temptingly before our farmers when some one wants to trade shadow for substance with them. London is the great capital of want and misery. The rise and fall of her tide of paupers is recorded in the journals as we record the prospects of a wheat crop. They are a host greater than the men who held with Meade the heights over Gettysburg. How could it be otherwise when the virgin soil of New Zealand and Canada can put out of business farmers within 30 miles of the world's market?

Dairy and grazing farms in Surrey sell for $123 an acre. Surrey is near London, and London is the world's great market for milk, butter, and cheese. But that market is not the English farmer's market. The Canadians, the New Zealanders, and the Danes possess it. Do you wonder that the English tariff commission recommends a duty on butter and cheese?

HOW THE GERMAN FARMERS ESCAPED THE TROUBLES OF THE AMERICAN AND ENGLISH FARMERS.

As we turn from England and her sad picture, we find another story in Germany and France, where statesmen and people united to preserve the equilibrium of the home market. I will quote again from Mr. James J. Hill's book, because Mr. Hill, one of the world's great captains of industry, is an unrivaled observer of economic facts. I wish that at this juncture his farm was bigger than his railroad, for where a man's treasure is there is his heart also. [Laughter.] Mr. Hill says:

How to meet German competition is to-day the study of every intelligent leader of industry and every cabinet on the Continent of Europe. It will be found that a large share of her world-wide success is due to symmetrical national development. Agricultural industry has not been slighted. Behold a contrast that throws light upon the idle host of England's unemployed marching despondently through streets whose shop windows are crowded with wares of German make. Between 1875 and 1900 in Great Britain 2,691,428 acres which were under cereals and 755,255 acres which were under green crops went out of cultivation. In Germany, during the same period, the cultivated area grew from 22,840,950 to 23,971,573 hectares, an increase of 5 per cent.

The German farmer owes his proud position largely to the wisdom of Bismarck, a statesman of that school who investigate first and then act, instead of acting first and investigating afterwards. [Applause.] He had been a free trader, but facts

converted him, and in May, 1879, he bore this testimony in the Reichstag:

Is not the moment approaching when our agriculture will no longer be able to exist because corn is pressed down to a price at which it can not be remuneratively produced in Germany, taxation, the cost of living, and the cost of land being as they are? When that moment comes, then not only agriculture but the Prussian State and the German Empire will go to ruin as well.

And then and there the tariff duties of Germany on agricultural products were established, and the trend of her policy has been to raise them and not lower them.

HAPPY POSITION OF THE FRENCH FARMER UNDER PROTECTION.

In France we find the same lesson, yet France was menaced. "The trouble in France, as elsewhere," writes Meredith, an English authority, "centered in the persistent fall in the prices of agricultural produce, due in part to the general appreciation of gold, but due principally to the cheapening of transport and the appearance on the home market of transoceanic cereals and meat. The result was the increased protection of agricultural products in 1885 and 1887 and the tariff of 1892."

Mr. Hill, who is inclined to free trade, does not in his book notice the protective legislation of France and Germany, but the prosperity of France's agriculture to-day he paints in the most brilliant colors.

TARIFF ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS PROTECTS FROM TROUBLE.

It seems to me proven beyond a doubt that the opening of large areas of new lands tends to destroy agriculture in the old lands, and that the wisest statesmanship of the world forfends this calamity by protective tariffs.

When trouble comes to manufacturers, everyone—the statesman included—knows it. The great capitalists are in these halls; idle workmen are on the streets; outgoing steamers are crowded with foreign laborers returning home; other laborers search new employment. Willing minds study remedies, for the smoke no longer rises from the tall chimneys, the channels of trade dry up, and all know that times are hard. It is a sad thing when manufacturers are in trouble.

When the long dearth comes to the farmer there are no spectacular accompaniments. He finds one day that his market has dropped below the line of profit. He drives home sadly, searching his mind in vain for a cause that may lie at the end of a railroad a thousand miles away, or 10,000 miles away across two oceans. As prices continue low, he goes quietly to the local Pharoah, and soon the farmer holds the title and pays the taxes, while the Pharoah holds the mortgage and gets what little income there is, although there is not much in it for even the Pharoah. And so the long struggle goes on. When the farmer's arm fails, the children take up the battle—the son or the daughter. When the trouble comes to the factory, the machinery stops and the smoke ceases to roll from the tall chimney. The smoke does not fail in the farmhouse chimney, for on the hearth burns the oldest altar fire of the race. The farm goes on through the long dearth, but the hardship is more or less great.

It is because of the insidious ills that come with the destruction of equilibrium in the farmer's markets that legislative interference should be taken only after careful inquiry. Those bulwarks which you to-day are proposing to tear down without inquiry worthy of the name were last established by the labors of three great men—William McKinley, President; Thomas B. Reed, Speaker; and Nelson Dingley, chairman of Ways and Means. In a modest capacity I had the fortune to sit in their councils many times during their seven years' battle. With the greatest care and the utmost caution they raised the defenses of the farmer's market. They were wrong, you say. If they were wrong, then the systematic and painstaking German statesmen are wrong to-day. If they were wrong, then the philosophic statesmen of France are wrong to-day. If they were wrong, then the tariff commission of England toiled for years to search out truth only to produce error. Those three men had visions that reached the future, but they never let their feet stray from the highway of fact.

Agricultural prosperity was destroyed so long in the old-settled parts of this country that we are regarding as something abnormal the recent advance. There is, however, nothing abnormal about it. The West is coming to a normal condition of settlement; our wise tariff prevents foreign dumping; the natural equilibrium of markets is restored. No one who examines can doubt this. Prices—I mean those the farmer gets, not what the consumer pays—have been dropping for the last year, indicating that there are no abnormal increases.

WHAT WILL CANADIAN COMPETITION DO?

We now confront the next great question: "Will the opening up of our markets to Canadian farm products disturb this equilibrium and throw us back into the old distress?"

In other words, will enough Canadian farm products come over the line to disturb disastrously our markets? There is a great chorus from the large cities that no trouble need be feared by the farmer, that the consumer will pay about as much as ever, but that "trade relations" will be improved. But while this chorus is going on some very shrewd gentlemen in Wall Street are indulging in prophecy. The Canadian Pacific is the greatest railroad on the North American Continent. It connects all Canada and runs into all the great northern markets of the United States. If great quantities of Canadian products are coming in, that road will do most of the hauling. The day the trade agreement passed the House in March Canadian Pacific stock touched the highest point in its history, and it has been soaring ever since, in notable contrast most of the time to the American railroads. Some shrewd men evidently think that some butter, cheese, cream, milk, hay, potatoes, apples, wheat, and so forth, will come over the line. The situation recalls the story of the newspaper reporter who went to find out whether an eminent clergyman was going to accept a call to another city. "There is no decision about it," said the daughter, who met the reporter at the door, "father is upstairs praying for guidance, but mother is downstairs packing the trunks, so I guess we are going."

I do not propose to dwell long on the statistics of present trade in farm produce over the border. It is small and proves nothing except that Canada sends little here. But she sends much to England, and thereby proves that she could send much to our nearer markets.

In 1908 when Canada was sending us only 23,000 dozens of eggs she was sending England 1,200,000 dozen. While she has in the last five years sent to us an average of less than 100,000 pounds of butter a year she has sent to England as high as 33,000,000 pounds in a year. In the same five years she has sent us an average of less than 150,000 pounds of cheese a year, but her normal annual export to England was, until New Zealand began to shut her out, about 200,000,000 pounds. In 1900 she sent to us less than 20,000 barrels of apples, but in the same year she sent to England more than 1,000,000 barrels.

When a Canadian farmer sends cheese to England he meets there the competition of all the world, and the competitor whom he has to watch the sharpest is a man from the opposite side of the earth—the farmer of New Zealand. If the barriers along our border were down, if the greatest and best home market on earth was thrown open to his milk, cream, and butter, do you suppose the Canadian farmer would toil to make cheese to compete with a New Zealander in a market on the other side of an ocean 3,000 miles wide?

RELATION OF GREGORY KING'S LAW TO THE INFLUX OF CANADIAN SUPPLIES.

Does anyone know how much produce will break our market? Has any committee of this House investigated this great problem before plunging ahead to reverse the economic policy of a century and a quarter? We do not know on this floor, but one thing we can do is to examine the general nature of markets. More than 200 years ago Gregory King discovered the law of prices that bears his name. That law which Prof. Thorold Rogers tells us "is not thought of in times of high and low prices as it should be" is as follows:

In a commodity a deficit of—

1	tenth	raises	the	price	above	the	common	rate	3	tenths.
2	tenths	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	8	"
3	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	16	"
4	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	28	"
5	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	45	"

And this law applies similarly to the effects of a surplus in lowering the price below the common rate.

This law, called by a high authority "one of the most important generalizations in statistics," must not be neglected in the vast problem before us to-day.

GREGORY KING'S LAW AS ILLUSTRATING THE POTATO SITUATION.

In connection with this law of Gregory King, the potato situation in the United States is worth considering. While the consumer in the cities has found potato prices high the farmers know that potatoes have been low, around 25 cents a bushel. Our own farmers have overstocked our own home market, great as that is, our manufacturing industries alone disbursing to their officers and employees, who are consumers, over $3,000,000,000 a year in salaries and wages. Do you know how little of acreage participates in the overproduction that knocks down the potato market—to the producer, not to the consumer necessarily? Potatoes are produced all over the United States to an extent that meets a large proportion of the local demand, but 13 counties in what are called the 5 potato States, Maine, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, make up the deficit and produce this year the two-tenths, or five-tenths of surplus, which, under Gregory King's law, drives down the price

eight-tenths or forty-five tenths. Our 13 counties are liable to overstock even our magnificent home market, where $3,000,000,000 of industrial wages are floating about, and our potato farmer prospers only because he gets good years in with the bad. But add to our 13 counties the acreage of the great potato Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, with the hope of our near-by home market to stimulate their farmers, and bad years must inevitably be constant. Their whole surplus will pour over our line, because they have no home market to absorb it. The industrial disbursements of those Provinces are but little more than those of the little State of Rhode Island.

If you want to know the capacity of the potato land of New Brunswick I will cite you to the fact that the single Maine county of Aroostook, which lies adjacent to New Brunswick and has similar land, produced in 1909 about one-tenth of the entire potato crop of the United States. I understand that the Legislature of New Brunswick, like the Legislature of Maine, has withheld its sanction from this trade agreement. Some gentlemen have thought this strange. It seems to me that there is nothing strange in it. If, under the glittering lure of the American market, Canada develops her potato land—and to-day she is not doing it, for want of a market—she will make the American farmer poor and her own farmer poor, too. The destruction of the equilibrium of our market will not in the end benefit her. When the western United States farmer was flooding the cereal and dairy market of the eastern United States, he did not prosper. Kansas appeared to bleed in those days as she had never bled before. And the potato farmers of both Maine and New Brunswick, who now have to pay millions of dollars annually for fertilizers, may look with alarm to that rich virgin soil of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, where the few straggling pioneer farmers in that vast domain produced in 1909 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes.

CONDITIONS IN CANADA'S FOUR EASTERN PROVINCES.

Canada has all the conditions for a great agricultural development inevitable to destroy the equilibrium of our market. Except in the Province of Ontario, she has no home market to speak of to absorb the surplus of her farmers. In the four Provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec, out of 2,500,000 people at the last census about 150,000 were wage earners in industrial establishments, and their annual wages amounted to a little over $50,000,000. The little State of Rhode Island alone had that year two-thirds as many industrial wage earners and disbursed to them over $43,000,000 in wages. But those four Provinces of Canada have an area far greater than all New England, with New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois added. The four Provinces live to themselves. When we speak of growing Canada we mean Ontario and the west. In the 20 years comprised by the two last Canadian censuses, the four vast eastern Provinces added to their population 300,000. In one decade of that 20 years the State of Massachusetts increased nearly twice 300,000, and Mr. Archibald Blue, commissioner of the coming Canadian census, is quoted in the papers as predicting scarcely any increase in the eastern Provinces, but a large growth in western Canada. There is little prospect for advance in those eastern Provinces unless we divert to them purchases we now make from our own farmers. The farmers of eastern Canada, having no markets except the distant English market, live to themselves. But if stirred into life by access to our home market, they will show great capacity for exportations, because they have no home market to absorb their surplus.

BOUNDLESS RESOURCES OF WESTERN CANADA AS A COMPETITOR.

When we turn to western Canada we have a repetition of the conditions which once prevailed in the United States. Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia are an empire of a million square miles. The Canadian representative at the International Institute at Rome told the delegates last year the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta were as large as England, France, Germany, and Italy. The five great western Provinces, rich in a fertile soil, have a domain as great as that of the combined States of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas. When you remember the vast flood of agricultural produce that those States have poured into the markets of the world we can form some idea of what western Canada will do to the equilibrium of markets for the next two generations of Americans. The London Economist, England's great journal of finance and trade, has recently sent a correspondent into Canada west. After noting that the United States produced 600,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1910, this correspondent records that in the Canadian west there are 200,000,000 acres of wheat land not yet touched by the plow that can produce 3,000,000,000 bushels of wheat annually, and there are furthermore 250,000,000 acres suitable for cattle raising. But wheat and cattle are not the only products. In 1909 Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and in the last year the dairy commissioner of Canada has noted that the dairying industry is growing rapidly in northern Saskatchewan and northern Alberta. Northern Ontario, hitherto almost unknown, but now opened up for mining, has been found to have splendid potato land, equaling the best in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The Canadian Pacific and Grank Trunk are opening up this region to settlers and promise to make it as populous as older Ontario.

We have supposed that western Canada was a cold country, but last year in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta half the seeding was done by the end of March; in Saskatchewan young stock began to run on the prairies early in March; and in October last the superintendent of the Government farm at Indian Head, Manitoba, wrote that the cattle were still in pasture, while fall plowing continued in Alberta until November 25. It has been assumed that corn can not be raised there, but in August, 1910, the superintendent of the experimental farm at Brandon, Manitoba, wrote, "Corn is a splendid crop." Such, then, is Canada, west and east, in what are known as the nine Provinces. They have an area of agricultural lands nearly equal to half the entire area of continental United States. Its possibilities for agricultural development are unlimited. Give to those lands our home market and two generations of American farmers will not see the equilibrium of their market restored.

When we had the last destruction of equilibrium and the long dearth began there were no riots, no outcries, but there was sadness and consternation in many hillside homes. And as they always do when the home farm becomes unprosperous, the young people went forth to what they heard were richer lands. In my youth I saw them go and witnessed the tears and lamentations of that going. I have lived to see their children come back to visit the old homes, strong men and noble women, strangers to their father's home, but Americans all, with the common traditions and the common hopes of the land of the free.

Pass this bill, put into force this old reactionary policy that the rest of the world has discarded, that even England wants to discard, and the dearth will begin again, the young men and the young women will turn their faces again to the setting sun—not to Missouri or Iowa, but to Saskatchewan and Alberta. And some day their children will revisit their father's homes. I do not doubt the magnificence of the manhood and the womanhood they will bring; but they will not be of the assets of this country. They will come from an alien land, from under a foreign flag, and out of strange eyes they will look on the countrymen of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. [Applause on the Republican side.]

VAST POSSIBILITIES OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

If we admit, as we must, that Canada will destroy the prosperity of our agriculture, yet we have to deal with the insistent question of those who press this bill, "What are we to do for food in the United States if we do not have Canada's supplies?" This question is none the less insistent although the prices the farmer gets are falling right along in the face of increased crops.

If we are honest with ourselves, the answer to this question is startling. What the United States needs to-day, if there is a shortage of food, is not the wholesale and slap-dash addition of vast areas to the sphere of our home market, but the systematic and gradual improvement of the acres we have. It is not flattering to our pride; but in our agricultural methods we rank with the second-rate nations, Spain, Russia, India, and not with the leaders, Great Britain, Germany, France, Austria, and Hungary. The International Institute at Rome has averaged the wheat yield for the world for the five years preceding 1908 and finds that where the United States produces less than 14 bushels to the acre Great Britain produces over 31, Germany over 29, France over 20, Austria over 19, Hungary over 17.

To quote again from Mr. James J. Hill's book, Highways of Progress, he has this about agriculture in the United States:

Only one-half the land in private ownership is now tilled. That tillage does not produce one-half what the land might be made to yield, without losing an atom of its fertility.

In profit we are satisfied with a small yield at the expense of the most rapid soil deterioration. We are satisfied with a national annual average product of $11.38 per acre at the cost of a diminishing annual return from the same fields, when we might as well secure two to three times that sum.

WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE AND NOT DISCOURAGE THE FARMER.

I feel as humiliated as Mr. Hill does at this showing of American agriculture. But there is a reason and excuse for it. For 30 years an opening of new lands at the expense of the old kept the farmer poor and discouraged by destroying the equilibrium of his markets. Discouraged farmers do not progress. The development of English tillage occurred in the days before the deluge from new lands; and that its excellence has been maintained through what the London Times of last June called "so protracted a struggle with overwhelming foreign competition" is a notable tribute to one of the finest races of farmers on earth.

The American farmer will forge to the front if our statesmanship will cease smashing his markets. [Applause on the Republican side.] The chart of our Agricultural Department shows that in the last few years, since his markets have been reaching equilibrium, the average production per acre in 10 leading crops has been the highest in 50 years. I am proud to say that in this development the farmers of Maine have an honorable preeminence.

MAINE AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT FAIR MARKETS WILL DO.

I will again cite Maine as an example of the benefits of fair markets as contrasted with unbalanced markets and as an example of what farmers will do under proper conditions. In that State in the decade just closed farm lands have increased 75 per cent in value, or a total for that State of $30,000,000 increase. The farm lands and buildings in that State in the last decade have increased over $62,000,000 in value. From 1880 to 1900, 5,000 farms, every one of them a home, had ceased to exist. From 1900 to 1910 the farms of Maine increased in number by nearly 500, and the long tendency toward abandonment was practically checked. This was not the only healthful sign. The number owning farms increased, the number of tenant farmers decreased, the annual expenditures for farm labor increased from two and a half million dollars to $5,000,000, and most significant of all, the expenditures for fertilizers increased from a little over $800,000 to more than $5,000,000.

I have commented on the shortsightedness of considering this question from the standpoint of the farmer alone. This prosperity of the farmer has reacted on the cities. In Maine, the metropolis, Portland, has grown as in no previous decade of her history. When 5,000 farms of Maine were going out of business progress was slow. With the farmer prosperous, all else prospers, for he spends his money at home. But if by this new policy we are to increase the purchasing power of the potato farmer of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Saskatchewan, the apple farmer of Nova Scotia, the dairyman of Quebec, those farmers will spend their money in their own cities. If they spend it in ours they must hoist their goods over a high Canadian tariff wall before they can get them home, because of the articles for which we might have a market in Canada very few are made free by this bill.

If I may be pardoned again for citing the example of Maine, which is the great agricultural State of New England, I will call attention to a most happy effect of the restoration of equilibrium in the farmer's market. That is the increase of rural population in towns under 4,000.

In the two decades preceding 1900 all the growth of the State was in the cities and large villages. The rural communities made a startling decrease. In the gain of the whole State in the last decade—a gain which greatly exceeds that of the preceding decade—the cities do not contribute all and then help make up a deficit for the country. The country and small villages gained one-third of the total gain, and even the towns under 2,000 population turned the tide of loss. Give us equilibrium of markets for another decade and the old prosperity of country life in America will return, for what the census shows as to Maine will undoubtedly be found true in many other States, especially in the East and South.

THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITY FOR CONSERVATION.

There is no limit for many years to the progress which our farmers may make for themselves and for the cities which supply them. To quote again from James J. Hill's book:

> An industrious, fairly intelligent, and exceedingly comfortable agricultural community can raise from the soil food enough for the needs of 490 persons to the square mile. Adopting that ratio, the 414,498,487 acres of improved farm lands in the United States on the date of the last official report—an area materially enlarged by the present time—would support in comfort 317,350,405 people, enabling them at the same time to raise considerable food for export and to engage in necessary manufacturing employments. Applying the same ratio to the entire acreage of farm lands within the United States, both improved and unimproved, which was at the same date 838,591,774, the population indicated as able to live with comfort and prosperity on the actually existing agricultural area of this country, under an intelligent system and a fairly competent but by no means highly scientific method of agriculture, rises to 642,046,823.

[Applause.]

Let any gentleman who sees golden visions of prosperity in buying from the Canadian farmers instead of from our own farmers apply Mr. Hill's estimate to his own State. Such a development of agriculture, with a harmonious supplementary development of manufactures on her great water powers, would give to Maine a population of 5,000,000 people. Her commercial metropolis, Portland, would find in that population business to justify a great and healthy growth, based on a prosperous country about. Is not that growth better than the congestion of people driven from unprofitable farms to seek employment in the city, like the idle thousands of London who tramp the streets in want while the acres of England are going out of cultivation? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Here lies the greatest conservation opportunity ever placed before a nation. It is an opportunity that can be seized only by the efforts of the farmers. And yet we to-day are proposing to take the heart out of their efforts by destroying the natural equilibrium of their home market. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE FARMER NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR COST OF LIVING IN THE CITIES.

While the proposed proceeding against the farmer is evidently indefensible, the outcry in the cities against the high cost of living impels us onward in our search for a victim. We all admit the high prices; many of us are oppressed by them; few of us know that wholesale prices have been falling for nearly a year, so much does the retail price affect us. But has anyone proven that the ruin of the American farmer will lower prices in the cities except as it may shrivel the business of the cities? And ought not some one to prove this before we proceed to spoil the farmer's home market for the next two generations?

To give a little personal experience, while the farmers of Maine have been getting 25 cents a bushel for potatoes, I have been paying for them a dollar a bushel. You may think this an extreme illustration of the difference between the price the farmer gets and the price the consumer pays. I am not certain that it is. Unfortunately we have had no investigation on this highly important point. In another distinguished body an inquiry was proposed last year, but, unless my memory is at fault, an appropriation for it was defeated by objection from the Democratic side of the Chamber. But our own observation and that of others will show us that there is a vast difference between consumers' prices and farmers' prices. Last summer Mr. B. F. Yoakum, head of the Frisco Railway system, published in the Saturday Evening Post an article on "The farmer and the cost of living," in which he set forth, after what he considered "a careful investigation," the food bill of New York City for the year as related to the farmer. Here it is:

	Received by farmer.	Paid by consumer.
Onions	$321,000	$8,212,000
Potatoes	8,437,000	60,000,000
Coffee	2,402,000	12,009,000
Rice	1,354,000	6,191,000
Cabbages	1,825,000	9,125,000
Milk	22,912,000	48,880,000
Eggs	17,238,000	28,730,000
Meat and poultry	219,300,000	291,000,000
	274,289,000	464,147,000

Mr. Yoakum was not arguing on the tariff question, but on the need of railroad development, and therefore he may be considered an unprejudiced witness so far as this subject is concerned.

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of the onion increased 10 times on its way from the farmer to the New York City consumer. If this high authority is correct, has anyone searched those people who have that onion between the time it leaves the farmer's hands and gets to the consumer? And if no one has, ought it not to be done before we try and convict the farmer as the robber and sentence him to lose his paltry protection of 40 cents a bushel on onions. Is the one who takes one-tenth for an onion he has planted and raised to be pursued and those who take nine-tenths escape investigation even?

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of the potato increased more than seven times on its way from the farmer to the New York City consumer. If this high authority is correct, has anyone searched the people who have that potato between the time it leaves the farmer's hands and gets to the consumer?

And if no one has, ought it not to be done before we try and convict the farmer as the robber and sentence him to lose his paltry protection of 25 cents a bushel? Is the man who takes one-seventh for a potato he has planted and raised to be pursued, while no questions are to be asked as to those who get the six-sevenths?

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of rice increased five times from the hands of the farmer to the hands of the consumer. If this high authority is correct, has anyone searched the people who have that rice between the time it leaves the farmer's hands and gets to the consumer? And if no one has, ought it not to be done before we try and convict the rice farmer and take from him the duty of 2 cents a pound. This bill, it is true, does not touch rice; but does the rice farmer of the Carolinas think that protection is going to last for the few after it is stripped from the many?

Mr. Yoakum shows that the price of eggs doubles from the time they leave the farmer's hands to the time they reach the consumer's hands in New York. As our own Agricultural Department has published figures tending to confirm this estimate, it gives confidence in the estimates as to other commodities, startling as they may seem.

Who gets the great increases between the farmer and the consumer? I see no evidence that the retail merchant gets more than his necessities as to rent, display, advertising, labor, and service compel him to take. We can conjecture as to the causes, but we have not ascertained scientifically.

THE TARIFF OF NO EFFECT ON PRICES TO THE CONSUMER.

The price of coffee is estimated to increase five times from the producer to the consumer; and as there is absolutely free trade in coffee, here is a patent suggestion that the tariff, while it has important bearing on the equilibrium of the farmer's market, has very little influence on what the consumer pays. In the very height of high prices last fall the minority Democratic members of the investigating committee of another distinguished body came to this conclusion:

Notwithstanding the large increase in the price of farm products, the farmer has realized a small net return on his labor and investment.

Can not you leave the farmer this small net return? Can not you do it in consideration of the long dearth he has suffered? There he stands, the dampness of honest toil on his brow, in his heart the satisfaction that he has lasted through the trial. He is a hero. He has won the long fight. He has done it with brains as well as muscle. When the onset was fiercest he reduced his acreage and intensified his culture; that is, he contracted the wings and strengthened the center. If he had been a man with a sword we would have given him pension and office, and that exquisite American adulation of accepting every word from his lips as the last thing in wisdom. But as he is a farmer, and as farmers are organized very imperfectly for unity of action, we pat him on the back, say he is a good fellow, and, without investigation, without even an unscientific investigation worthy the name, we turn loose on him new and unnumbered hordes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CONSUMERS OF COAL, FLOUR, AND MEAT.

By admitting that this question should be settled on broad, national grounds only, I do not wish to be understood as condoning in any way the great injustices committed on certain industries and certain sections of the country. It has been a longing of New England, stimulated by the Democratic orators for more than half a century, that she might buy coal at those great and near-by mines of Nova Scotia. Gov. Foss of Massachusetts told us last fall that free coal was one of the great blessings of reciprocity for us. But realizing the benefit of the broad national policy of protection, the better judgment of our people has favored buying coal in the distant fields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, although the freight paid to the railroads is a burden on industry. The old reciprocity treaty of 1854 gave this Canadian coal free entrance, and the official documents of the time seem to show that it found a large market on the Atlantic seaboard. This new treaty lets in over the border line freely every natural product that New England produces herself; but this one great commodity that she does not produce, that her northern climate makes so precious to her people, is denied her. The old treaty wrote in "coal" in bold, satisfying black letters; this agreement, if it does anything in this line, makes only a penurious little concession by reducing the duty on coal screenings to 15 cents a ton, which it was in the Dingley law, where it was intended to be in the Payne law. That may help some big mills, if they use these screenings, and is good as far as it goes; but the most sedate New England farmer, if he can control his anger at the injustice, will hardly control his mirth at the ridiculousness of an arrangement that sets in motion into his market free as air all the potatoes, beets, turnips, hay, cabbages, butter, cheese, hoof-parting and cud-chewing animals that Canada can produce, and allow himself and his neighbors such coal as will strain through a hole half an inch square.

It would be possible to go much further in criticism of details of this agreement. If duties between this country and Canada are burdens, which I do not admit, it may be pointed out that we are taking all burdens off the flour-makers and leaving much on the flour consumers; that we are taking all burden off the great incorporated butchers' trust and leaving much on the consumers of meat.

THE FISHERIES AND OTHER INDUSTRIES.

If this were a council of national defense I would recall that the two great militant civilizations of Europe, Germany and France, protect by ample duties the hard-won spoil of their fishermen, that they may have those fishermen in their hour of need, as we have had ours in every crisis since Washington crossed the Delaware. After preserving in the field of diplomacy the fishing rights won by our fathers on the field of battle, John Quincy Adams transmitted to his posterity a seal intended to commemorate the glory both of his country and his family. And the legend on that seal was such as you could not honestly write across the face of this bill—"Piscemur, venemur, ut olim"—"We keep our fishing grounds and our hunting grounds as of old."

THE SAFE AND UNSAFE COURSE.

It is because we are in doubt as to the main features of this great problem and are overriding facts where inquiry seems to have removed doubts, that I confess a great impatience of this capital move that the House seems about to make. The European nations, where scholarship and scientific inquiry is applied to political problems as nowhere else on earth, Germany and France, strictly maintain their agricultural duties. The tariff commission of England, after collecting volumes of facts, has recommended agricultural duties for England.

Years ago, on a stormy afternoon, a gallant steamer sailed down an eastern harbor on its way to a coastwise port. As she went down that harbor other steamers running to that same coast were coming back, for the sky and sea promised ill, but that one steamer went on in defiance of the common judgment of the sea that afternoon. And she went to one of the great sea tragedies of the Atlantic.

Is this House to disregard the common judgment of the nations and without investigation plunge forward to do this great thing? Even before you change the postage rates on a few magazines you have an investigation by a learned commission. But you propose to change the fundamental conditions of 6,000,000 farm homes with no investigation worthy the name.

As one Member I protest against this dangerous haste and against this bill, as tending to break up farm homes, retard rural development, and increase the congestion of the cities. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield some further time on his side.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I have no person here now to whom I can do it, it is so late.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope that hereafter this debate will run in the afternoon longer than it has this evening.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman, but he should remember that this is Saturday afternoon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this is Saturday afternoon and that to-morrow is Easter, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 745. An act providing for the erection of a statue to Thomas Jefferson at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to continue the consideration of the revision and codification of the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a statue of Alexander Hamilton in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Monday, April 17, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Deckers Creek, W. Va. (H. Doc. No. 14), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5286) for the erection of a public building at the city of Upper Sandusky, in the State of Ohio, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5287) for the erection of a public building at the city of Bellevue, in the State of Ohio, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5288) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clyde, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5289) for the erection of a public building at the city of Fremont, in the State of Ohio, and appropriating moneys therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5290) to define the true intent and meaning of section 48 of the act of August 28, 1894, levying taxes on distilled spirits, to regulate the business of reclaiming waste spirits from empty whisky barrels, and to define the status of persons engaged in such business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 5291) to promote the safety of travelers on railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to strengthen the construction of day or passenger coaches, mail cars, chair, smoking, and combination cars and tourist sleepers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 5292) for the erection of a memorial structure to Gen. Ulysses S. Grant at Point Pleasant, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 5293) to provide for the collection, transcription, and publication of material relating to the history of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5294) for the purchase of a site for a post-office building at Algona, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5295) for the purchase of a site for a post-office building at Carroll, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5296) to erect a memorial to Gen. Nathaniel Lyon; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PALMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 5297) to place certain soldiers on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5298) for the erection of a public building at Madison, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5299) to provide for the erection of a public building at Redfield, in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 5300) for the construction of a dam and lock in the Mermentau River, La., and appropriating $75,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5301) to erect an extension to the post-office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5302) for removal of drift and bar at the mouth of Bayou Cortableau, St. Landry Parish, La., for the maintenance of navigation, and appropriating $100,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5303) for the construction of a dam and lock in the Mermentau River, La., and appropriating $75,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5304) for the improvement of the channel of the Red River at Alexandria, La., and appropriating $20,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5305) for the construction of an interstate inland waterway, and appropriating $300,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5306) to erect an extension to the post-office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5307) to provide for improving the navigable capacity of the Calcasieu and the Mermentau Rivers, La.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5308) for protecting the caving banks of Red River at Boyce Landing, Rapides Parish, State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5309) for the improvement of navigation in Bayou Plaquemine Brule; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5310) for the erection of a public building at Jennings, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5311) to erect an extension to the post-office and Federal court building at Alexandria, La.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5312) for the completion of the jetties at Calcasieu Pass and the construction of a channel through Calcasieu Lake, and appropriating $1,150,000 therefor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 5313) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5314) for a public building at Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5315) to provide for a public building at New Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5316) to provide for the removal of the body of the late Maj. Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock from Norristown, Pa., to the national cemetery, Arlington, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5317) authorizing the Secretary of War to procure medals for the Logan Guards, of Lewistown; the Allen Infantry, of Allentown; the Ringgold Light Artillery, of Reading; and the Washington Artillerists and National Light Infantry, of Pottsville, Pa., who were the first soldiers to arrive, on April 18, 1861, for the defense of the city of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5318) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Lewisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5319) to provide for site and public building at Lewisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5320) to provide for site and public building at Lewistown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5321) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Conrad Weiser; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5322) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Waynesboro, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5323) to authorize the extension of Underwood Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 5324) providing for leave of absence for certain civilian employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 5325) to amend section 2, chapter 1159, United States Statutes at Large, volume 32, part 1, page 405, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 5326) to correct the military record of the officers and enlisted men of the Enrolled Missouri Militia and other militia organizations of the State of Missouri that cooperated with the military forces of the United States in suppressing the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5327) to extend the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, to all State militia and other organizations that were organized for the defense of the Union and cooperated with military and naval forces of the United States in the suppression of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5328) to regulate the issuance of restraining orders and injunctions and procedure thereon and to limit the meaning of "conspiracy" in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5329) to establish the Fredericksburg and adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 95) to give to the respective committees on expenditures in the several executive departments of the Government authority to send for books and papers and other evidences, to subpœna witnesses and examine them under oath, and in other ways to conduct investigations under the rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Resolution (H. Res. 96) directing the Committee on Labor to investigate the various systems of old-age insurance, old-age pension, and annuities that are now in operation in different countries of the world, and to determine the practicability of establishing such systems in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARTER: Resolution (H. Res. 97) authorizing the Speaker to appoint a committee of three to investigate the administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes by the different departments of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5330) granting an increase of pension to Edmond R. Ash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5331) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5332) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Scheufler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5333) granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Babb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5334) granting an increase of pension to Abram H. Handal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 5335) granting an increase of pension to Frank Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 5336) granting an increase of pension to William Carey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5337) granting a pension to Samuel H. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5338) to correct the military record of Thomas J. W. Richards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 5339) for the relief of Parsey O. Burrough, surviving member of the firm of Henry S. Hannis & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5340) granting an increase of pension to Romeo J. Crossland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 5341) granting an increase of pension to Henry Flesher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5342) granting an increase of pension to Camille Mayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 5343) granting an increase of pension to George H. Bolsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5344) granting an increase of pension to Stephen O. Weston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5345) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5346) granting an increase of pension to Latimore T. Pinnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5347) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5348) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5349) granting an increase of pension to John N. Baty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5350) for the relief of James Graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5351) for the relief of Thomas D. Flynn, alias Thomas D. Allen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 5352) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 5353) granting an increase of pension to Abraham M. Heifner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 5354) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5355) granting an increase of pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5356) granting an increase of pension to William A. De Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5357) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5358) granting an increase of pension to John Q. Walling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 5359) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5360) granting an increase of pension to Peter Beicher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5361) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5362) granting an increase of pension to Benneville De Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) granting an increase of pension to John R. Leffard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5366) granting an increase of pension to James K. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5367) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Clelan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5368) granting an increase of pension to John Cluck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5369) granting an increase of pension to David M. Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5370) granting an increase of pension to David Criswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5371) granting an increase of pension to Samuel De Armitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5372) granting an increase of pension to Adam Dengler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5373) granting an increase of pension to John Donachy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5374) granting an increase of pension to David B. Dromgold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5375) granting an increase of pension to Israel Duke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5376) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dunlap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5377) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5378) granting an increase of pension to James E. Forrester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5379) granting an increase of pension to David Funk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5380) granting an increase of pension to Peter B. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5381) granting an increase of pension to William Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5382) granting an increase of pension to Henry Halk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5383) granting an increase of pension to John C. Hamer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5384) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Hommel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5385) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Hawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5386) granting an increase of pension to John J. Houswerth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5387) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ickes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5388) granting an increase of pension to Israel A. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5389) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Locke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5390) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5391) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5392) granting an increase of pension to Galen H. Lotz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5393) granting an increase of pension to Henry Loudenschlager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5394) granting an increase of pension to William B. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5395) granting an increase of pension to Catharine C. Loy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5396) granting an increase of pension to David A. McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) granting an increase of pension to William E. McKinstry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5398) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Mader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5399) granting an increase of pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5400) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5401) granting an increase of pension to William Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5402) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Prough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5403) granting an increase of pension to Austing Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5404) granting an increase of pension to Lewis A. Ranck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5405) granting an increase of pension to Henry Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Rex; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5407) granting an increase of pension to David C. Rhodes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) granting an increase of pension to John J. Rosensteel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5409) granting an increase of pension to John Rourke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5410) granting an increase of pension to David Secrest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5411) granting an increase of pension to John C. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5412) granting an increase of pension to Soworrow F. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5413) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Shuman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) granting an increase of pension to James K. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5415) granting an increase of pension to Arthur V. B. Sonders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5416) granting an increase of pension to George M. Spanogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5417) granting an increase of pension to John A. Speck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5418) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stahl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5419) granting an increase of pension to Amos M. Stroh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5420) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Swineford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5421) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5422) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Vandling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5423) granting an increase of pension to George Wineland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5424) granting an increase of pension to William M. Witherow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5425) granting an increase of pension to John Wogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5426) granting a pension to John D. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5427) granting a pension to Samuel Bair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5428) granting a pension to Sadie Doan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5429) granting a pension to William Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5430) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5431) granting a pension to Jacob H. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5432) granting a pension to Allison F. Kohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5433) granting a pension to Casper Wickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5434) for the relief of W. H. H. Carrigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5435) for the relief of George W. Clevenger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5436) for the relief of Peter Keckler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5437) for the relief of Cyrus E. Kennedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5438) for the relief of Michael Nave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of John M. Querry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5440) for the relief of Jackson Taylor Vaun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5441) for the relief of John Weil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5442) for the relief of Henry C. Wolfe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5443) for the relief of the legal representatives of Thomas P. Mitchell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5444) for the relief of the trustees of Tonoloway Baptist Church, Fulton County, Pa.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5445) to correct the military record of George W. Parker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 5446) granting a pension to Margaret R. Rorabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5447) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 5448) for the relief of Fred A. Emerson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of lock masters, lockmen, and other laborers and mechanics employed by the United States Government in the locks and dams of the Kanawha River, in West Virginia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5450) granting an increase of pension to William P. Routt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5451) for the relief of the heirs of Richard S. Rew, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 5452) for the relief of Elizabeth Lynch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 5453) granting an increase of pension to James S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 5454) providing for the releasing of the claim of the United States Government to Arpent lot No. 87, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5455) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5456) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 5457) granting an increase of pension to William H. Oppelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 5458) granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5459) granting an increase of pension to Edgar A. Whitaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5460) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5461) granting an increase of pension to Martin Sarvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 5462) to correct the military record of Augustus J. Fairbanks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5463) to correct the military record of Aaron S. Winner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5464) to correct the military record of Nathaniel Monroe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 5465) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5466) granting an increase of pension to Esek B. Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5467) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 5468) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5469) granting an increase of pension to John Humphreys; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5470) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5471) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Fredricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5472) granting an increase of pension to Aaron H. Waitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5473) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hetrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5474) granting an increase of pension to J. A. Goodale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5475) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Fredricks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5476) granting a pension to Fannie L. McVey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5477) granting a pension to Florinda Butler Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5478) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5479) granting a pension to James R. Pittard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5480) for the relief of David Siess; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5481) for the relief of G. S. Cheves; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5482) for the relief of Alonzo L. Boyer; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5483) for the relief of J. Martin Compton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5484) for the relief of Florimand Izard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5485) for the relief of Martin Guillory; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5486) for the relief of Odon Ducatte; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5487) for the relief of Blaize Motte; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5488) for the relief of W. T. Maddox and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5489) for the relief of Marcelin Martin; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5490) for the relief of Mrs. Octave Simoneaux, of Alexandria, parish of Rapides, La.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5491) for the relief of the estate of William Bailey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5492) for the relief of the estate of Francois Joseph Vantrot, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5493) for the relief of estate of Pierre C. Richard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5494) for the relief of the estate of Theophile Sanvald; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of the estate of Babtice Joubert, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of the estate of Abraham Wimberly, deceased, late of Acadia Parish, La.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5497) for the relief of the heirs of Francois Pitre, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5498) for the relief of the heirs of Dalicourt Pitre, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5499) for the relief of heirs of Joseph Gradengo; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5500) for the relief of heirs of Hillaire Paillett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5501) for the relief of the heirs of Felix Dejean; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5502) for the relief of the heirs of Pierre Goudeau; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5503) for the relief of the heirs of Rodolphe Chachere; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5504) for relief of the heirs of J. Casimir Le Blanc; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5505) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph D. Guidry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5506) for the relief of the heirs of Felix J. Guidry; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5507) for the relief of heirs of Victor Lastrapes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5508) for the relief of heirs of Emile Lambert, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5509) for the relief of heirs of Robert M. Morrow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5510) for the relief of the heirs of Jean Marie Tatin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5511) for the relief of heirs of Laura H. Cheves, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5512) for the relief of heirs of Mrs. Louis Valliere, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5513) for the relief of heirs of Jean Baptiste Rabot, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5514) for the relief of the heirs of Jabez Tanner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5515) for the relief of heirs of Jean Baptiste Malveau, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5516) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel Goos, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5517) for the relief of heirs of Thomas J. Hickman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5518) for the relief of the heirs of Louis Malveau, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5519) for the relief of heirs of H. T. Burges, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5520) for the relief of the heirs of Jabez Tanner, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5521) for the relief of heirs or estate of Andre N. Robin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of heirs or estate of Louis Lalonde, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5523) for the relief of heirs or estates of Stephen W. Quirk and Anne L. Quirk, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5524) for the relief of heirs or estate of Martha L. Wells, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5525) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Eugene Senette, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5526) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Joseph Ezernack, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5527) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Bernard Curley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5528) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Zephania Squyres; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5529) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Alexander Lemelle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5530) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Alphonse Meuillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5531) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Euphemie Lemelle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5532) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Sarah Bushnell and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5533) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Clarisse Donato, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5534) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Rigobert Lemelle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5535) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Bellot A. Donato, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5536) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Jean Baptiste Lazare, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5537) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alfred C. Parham, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5538) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Lucien Meuillon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5539) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the heirs of Matthew J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5540) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Matthew J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5541) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Emile E. Zimmer, administrator of estate of George Neck, sr., deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5542) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Marie Josephine Le Sassier,

administratrix of estate of François Meuillon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 5543) granting an increase of pension to David M. Kinsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5544) granting an increase of pension to George Cantner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5545) granting an increase of pension to James Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5546) granting an increase of pension to William A. Rusie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5547) granting a pension to William Swift Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5548) granting a pension to Thomas J. Colfer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5549) granting a pension to Clarinda H. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5550) granting a pension to Annetta B. Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5551) granting a pension to Roy Bruner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5552) for the relief of William H. Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5553) for the relief of John Lynch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5554) granting an increase of pension to John Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5555) granting an increase of pension to John Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5556) granting a pension to R. D. Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5557) granting a pension to John Hodges; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 5558) for the relief of Xantippe Jackson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5559) for the relief of the estates of Stephen Cordell and Elizabeth Cordell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 5560) granting an increase of pension to Milford James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5561) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cushman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5562) granting an increase of pension to John Galloway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5563) granting an increase of pension to Fidel Saile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5564) granting an increase of pension to Zenus Funk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5565) granting an increase of pension to John McPhern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5566) granting an increase of pension to Michael R. Godfrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5567) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5568) granting an increase of pension to Clark S. Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5569) granting an increase of pension to James Fitch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5570) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5571) granting a pension to Fanny I. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 5572) for the relief of Robert Coggan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPEER: A bill (H. R. 5573) granting an increase of pension to James M. Wonders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5574) granting an increase of pension to James M. Tabor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5575) granting an increase of pension to Seymour Wheelock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5576) granting an increase of pension to George C. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5577) granting an increase of pension to Sidney J. Crocker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 5578) granting a pension to Escar Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 5579) granting an increase of pension to John R. Hurd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5580) granting an increase of pension to David H. Daywalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5581) granting an increase of pension to John W. Foot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5582) granting an increase of pension to Smith M. Demeree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5583) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Foote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5584) granting an increase of pension to James A. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5585) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Seger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5586) granting a pension to Elizabeth Merlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: A bill (H. R. 5587) granting an increase of pension to Joel Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5588) granting an increase of pension to Almon B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5589) granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5590) granting an increase of pension to George L. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5591) granting an increase of pension to Clinton S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 5592) granting an increase of pension to George R. Shebbeard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 5593) granting a pension to Alma D. Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5594) for the relief of Daniel Swisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AKIN of New York: Petitions of Anresville Grange, Mapletown Grange, Gansevoort Grange, Saratoga Grange, Glens Falls Grange, Mayfield Grange, Montgomery County Agricultural Society, George L. Cary, and Leebers' Lane Grange, all of the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Petition of Clyde Kraut Co., of Clyde, Ohio, asking for amendment to pure-food law indorsing "name on label"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolutions of the Georgia-Florida Sawmill Association, relating to the tariff on lumber, iron, steel, and sawmill machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of Emil H. Lorens and others, of La Crosse, Wis., in favor, and of the Manufacturers and Jobbers' Club of La Crosse, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Casberg Camp, No. 11, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Wisconsin, for the repeal of the anti-canteen law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held by the Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, opposing under any guise the establishment of closer relations with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of International Brotherhood of Papermakers, in opposition to Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Atlanta Builders' Exchange for the repeal of the eight-hour law as to Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Walsh County, N. Dak., against the pending reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of C. W. Hammilton, of Lisbon, N. Dak., against extension of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, favoring additional compensation for rural free delivery carriers of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petition of various citizens of McLennan County, Tex., asking for the withdrawal of United States troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of H. H. Stickfort and 8 others, residents of Lewiston, Mich., urging the establishing of a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. C. Shepard and other residents of Mikado, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Resolutions of Tri-City Federation of Labor, of Rock Island and Moline, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, opposed to the concentration of troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER: Resolution of Tri-City Federation of Labor at Davenport, Iowa, and Rock Island and Moline, Ill., protesting the concentration of United States military forces on borders of Mexico and against any intervention of the United States forces in the affairs of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of White Prairie Grange No. 2039, Wilton Junction, Iowa, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. W. Kiess, of De Witt; W. E. Spencer and others, of Davenport; N. K. Ross and others, of Victor, and Joseph F. Holub, of Iowa City, against rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: Protest of members of local Fallon Socialist Party, against the mobilization of troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), protest of citizens of Sheffield, Pa., against the mobilization of troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Petitions of Scottsburg Grange, No. 1220; Bethany Grange, No. 748; Transit Grange, No. 1092; North Java Grange, No. 1158; Lyndonville Grange, No. 1146; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Perry Grange, No. 1163; Grange No. 1086, of Hermitage, Wyoming County; Kent Grange, No. 1145; Warsaw Grange, No. 1088; Wyoming County Pomona Grange; Dale Grange, No. 1171; Darien Grange, No. 1063; Hermitage Grange, No. 1086; Corfu Grange; Medina Grange, No. 1160; Gaines Grange, No. 1147; Clarendon Grange, No. 1083; Knowlesville Grange, No. 1124; Attica Grange, No. 1058; Bergen Grange, No. 163; Waterport Grange, No. 1059; Byron Grange, No. 395; Gasport Grange, No. 1151; Pomona Grange of Genesee County; and Pomona Grange of Livingston County, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of New York; and of Maple Ridge Culture Club, of Medina, and the Chamber of Commerce of Watertown, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petitions of Advance Pump & Compressor Co. and Progressive Republicans' League, of Battle Creek, Mich., in favor of Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions and protests of Brady Grange, No. 61; Fred. M. Warner, ex-governor of Michigan; Bert Smith; National Lincoln Sheep Breeders' Association; Calhoon Bros., Oak Grove Farms; certain members American Ramboiullet Sheep Breeders' Association; Isbell Bean Co.; Kalamazoo Paper Co. and Standard Paper Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich., in opposition to Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petitions of W. F. Strahm and other members of Friendship Grange, No. 670, Kenton, Ohio, and F. J. Burner and other members of Benton Ridge Grange, No. 942, Benton Ridge, Ohio, against the passage of the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to George R. Shebbeard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Lawrenceville Grange, No. 170, Patrons of Husbandry, of Lawrenceville, N. J., protesting against the enactment of proposed reciprocal tariff legislation between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 17, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is present and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator elect from Washington will present himself at the desk.

Mr. POINDEXTER was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. JONES, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2958. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected"; and

H. J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the United States Extra Customs Laborers' Association of the port of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to ameliorate the present condition of certain employees serving as extra customs laborers in the customs service of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren of Beatrice, Nebr., and a petition of the congregation of the Verdigris Church, of Madison, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the national committee of the Unemployed and the Brotherhood Welfare Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to ameliorate the condition of the wage earners of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McCUMBER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hatton, Grafton, Walsh County, Adams County, Richland County, Washburn, Gardner, Williams County, Harvey, Stark County, Steele County, Ransom County, Bottineau County, McLean County, and Sargent County, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Local Grange of Hillstown; Indian River Grange, of Milford; Local Grange of West Hartford; and of Local Grange of Clinton, of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of the Business Men's and Civic Association of Wethersfield, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers; of Local Grange of Pembroke; Local Grange of Union; Local Grange of Bedford; Local Grange of Westmoreland; Local Grange No. 167, of Candia; and of Local Grange No. 208, of Franconia, of the Patrons of Husbandry; and of sundry citizens of Lee, Surry, Westmoreland, Manchester, and Mount Vernon, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Charles Gordon and 36 other citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a petition of Post No. 73, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Neosho Falls, Kans., and a petition of D. M. Vance Post, No. 2, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren of McPherson, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors into prohibition districts, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 806, Patrons of Husbandry, of Elk Lake, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of Central Pomona Grange, No. 1, of Berlin; Plainville Grange, No. 54, of Plainville; West Hartford Grange, of West Hartford; and Mad River Grange, of Waterbury, of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of the Busi-

ness Men's and Civic Association of Wethersfield, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of Local Grange, of Centerville; Local Grange No. 1164, of Stalwart; and Local Grange No. 1490, of Sturgis, Patrons of Husbandry, and sundry farmers of Ashland, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Albany, N. Y., and a memorial of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange, of New Orleans, La., praying that bagging and ties be placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Educative and Cooperative Union, of Pierce County, Ga., praying for an increase in the duty on cotton, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted at the General Conference of Congregational Churches of Florida and the Southeast, favoring the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Tampa District Retail Druggists' Association, of Tampa, Fla., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented memorials of Local Grange of Florence; Local Grange No. 25, of Erwin; Local Grange No. 3, of Watertown; Local Grange No. 4, of Dempster; Black Hills Pomona Grange, of Whitewood; and of Local Grange of White, all of the Patrons of Husbandry; of the Farmers' Grain Dealers' Association; and of sundry citizens of Coleman, Amherst, Claremont, Crandon, Frankfort, Redfield, Arlington, Sinai, and Sisseton, all in the State of South Dakota, and of the American National Live Stock Association, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 40, Patrons of Husbandry, of Windsor, N. J., and a memorial of Local Grange No. 45, Patrons of Husbandry, of Marlton, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., praying that an investigation be made into the condition of dairy products for the prevention and spread of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers and Jobbers' Club of La Cross, Wis., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the Riverside Fibre & Paper Co., of Appleton; the Gilbert Paper Co., of Menasha; the Beloit Iron Works, of Beloit; of J. J. Plank & Co., of Appleton; and of sundry employees of the Wisconsin Tissue Paper Co., of Appleton; of the Patten Paper Co., of Appleton and Oconto Falls, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURNHAM presented memorials of Reunion Grange, No. 303, Patrons of Husbandry, of Middleton; of Great Meadow Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Westmoreland; and of Myron H. Porter, of Surry; Hiram F. Newell, of Surry; Chester M. McClening, Willard Bill., jr., and Charles K. Cobb, of Westmoreland; Frank H. Pearson, of Stratham; Hon. Frank P. Carpenter and A. B. Carptenter, of Manchester, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of John A. Logan Post, No. 3, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, of Lafayette, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Thorntown Grange, No. 378, Patrons of Husbandry, of Whitley County, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented memorials of Local Grange No. 124, of Grays River; Fruitvale Grange, No. 348, of North Yakima; Oakview Grange, No. 311, of Centralia; Mountain Side Grange, No. 190, of Van Zandt; Local Grange No. 835, of Naches; Local Grange No. 227, of Olympia; Local Grange No. 123, of St. Helen; Local Grange No. 200, of Olympia; Local Grange No. 82, of Vancouver; Local Grange No. 208, of Bellingham; Local Grange No. 184, of Centralia; Local Grange No. 22, of Omak; Local Grange No. 51, of Oakesdale; Local Grange No. 407, of Centralia; Local Grange No. 265, of Kent; and Local Grange No. 114, of Ewartsville, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 1056) to pay the legal heirs of the late John A. Lynch for valuable services rendered by him as the projector and promoter of the International American Conference and the Intercontinental Railway (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Railroads.

A bill (S. 1057) granting an increase of pension to Job Utley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1058) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton Lutes;

A bill (S. 1059) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Elkins;

A bill (S. 1060) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Church;

A bill (S. 1061) granting a pension to Charles Falbisaner;

A bill (S. 1062) granting an increase of pension to Julia Baldwin;

A bill (S. 1063) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Taylor;

A bill (S. 1064) granting a pension to Francis M. Walker;

A bill (S. 1065) granting a pension to Herman Tichter; and

A bill (S. 1066) granting an increase of pension to William R. Rennels; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1067) providing for the appointment of two cadets from the District of Columbia to the United States Military Academy at West Point; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1068) authorizing the extension of First Street east, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1069) to authorize the widening and extension of Minnesota Avenue from Pennsylvania Avenue SE. to its present terminus, near Eastern Avenue, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1070) to require the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. to build and maintain bridges, etc., over the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal;

A bill (S. 1071) authorizing the extension of Barry Place NW., and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1072) to amend section 895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1073) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia";

A bill (S. 1074) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1898";

A bill (S. 1075) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes";

A bill (S. 1076) making drunkenness in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor, and to provide a hospital for inebriates, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1077) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to suspend and revoke certain licenses and permits;

A bill (S. 1078) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," approved July 28, 1892, as to kiteflying;

A bill (S. 1079) providing for the regulation and suspension of traffic and processions on highways in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1080) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906, by prohibiting the sale of poisonous hair dressing;

A bill (S. 1081) to provide for punishment for larceny of public property from the workhouse and the reformatory of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1082) to receive arrearages of taxes due to the District of Columbia, to July 1, 1908, at 6 per cent interest per annum, in lieu of penalties, and costs;

A bill (S. 1083) to provide an additional method for enforcing and foreclosing tax sales and tax deeds in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1084) to amend the laws for the protection of birds, game, and fish in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1085) to amend the act of Congress approved April 22, 1904, authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1086) to amend sections 680 and 686 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1087) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907;

A bill (S. 1088) to amend an act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia, approved June 18, 1898;

A bill (S. 1089) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District," approved May 13, 1908;

A bill (S. 1090) providing for guides in the District of Columbia, and defining their duties;

A bill (S. 1091) to license operators of cinematographs, moving-picture machines, and similar apparatus, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1092) to protect public health by regulating the production and sale of milk, cream, and ice cream in and for the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1093) to provide for the extension of Buchanan Street NW. between Piney Branch Road and Sixteenth Street, and the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1094) for the widening of Sixteenth Street NW. at Piney Branch, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1095) to authorize the surveyor of the District of Columbia to adopt the system of designating land in the District of Columbia in force in the office of the assessor of said District (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 1096) to provide for acquirement, by condemnation, of lands at Cape Henry, Va., for the purpose of fortification and coast defense; to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

A bill (S. 1097) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Virginia; and

A bill (S. 1098) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. William Campbell; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1099) to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battle Fields Memorial Park, in the State of Virginia;

A bill (S. 1100) authorizing the Secretary of War to have constructed macadamized roadbeds on the roads along the eastern boundary of the Arlington National Cemetery and along the westerly boundary of the Fort Myer (Va.) Reservation; and

A bill (S. 1101) authorizing the Secretary of War to have constructed a direct road leading from the southern end of the new highway bridge across the Potomac River to the National Cemetery at Arlington and Fort Myer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1102) for the relief of Ethel M. Young; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1103) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1104) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico";

A bill (S. 1105) granting a pension to Priscilla L. Howe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1106) granting an increase of pension to John Clause (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1107) granting an increase of pension to Paul A. Greely (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1108) granting a pension to Oliver H. Perry (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1109) granting a pension to Delbert Cross (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1110) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette M. Bratton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1111) granting an increase of pension to George Heflen (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1112) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Heflen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 1113) granting a pension to Adelia M. Custer (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1114) granting an increase of pension to John Goldsmith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1115) granting an increase of pension to Christian C. Bradymeyer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1116) granting an increase of pension to William R. Harris;

A bill (S. 1117) granting a pension to Jennie West;

A bill (S. 1118) granting an increase of pension to Ryland W. Darnall;

A bill (S. 1119) granting an increase of pension to Nathan H. Miller (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1120) granting an increase of pension to Jared C. Meek (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1121) granting an increase of pension to William Tinder (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 1122) to amend section 2291 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to homestead entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1123) to establish a branch soldiers' home in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1124) granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service and to their widows and minor children; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 1125) granting a pension to John Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1126) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Hashman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 1127) to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Lower Brule Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1128) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Depredations.

A bill (S. 1129) regulating the settlement of the accounts between the United States and the several States relative to the disposition of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1130) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Yancey, alias Christopher Columbus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 1131) for the relief of Edward C. Andre; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1132) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Douglas, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHIVELY:
A bill (S. 1133) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Smith;
A bill (S. 1134) granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Reynolds;
A bill (S. 1135) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rupe;
A bill (S. 1136) granting an increase of pension to Libbins W. Davis;
A bill (S. 1137) granting an increase of pension to John Denny;
A bill (S. 1138) granting an increase of pension to William H. Power; and
A bill (S. 1139) granting a pension to Elijah Watts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. SWANSON:
A bill (S. 1140) for the relief of the Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1141) to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
A bill (S. 1142) to protect the monuments already erected on the battlefields of Bull Run, Va., and other monuments that may be there erected; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. POMERENE:
A bill (S. 1143) granting an increase of pension to John S. Armstrong;
A bill (S. 1144) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Conrad;
A bill (S. 1145) granting an increase of pension to John Turner;
A bill (S. 1146) granting an increase of pension to William Donnelly;
A bill (S. 1147) granting an increase of pension to William F. Hart; and
A bill (S. 1148) granting an increase of pension to Spencer Ford (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. NELSON:
A bill (S. 1149) permitting the Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the St. Croix River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota; to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. LODGE:
A bill (S. 1150) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. ROOT:
A bill (S. 1151) granting an increase of pension to Louise B. Otis;
A bill (S. 1152) granting an increase of pension to Mary Bradford Crowninshield; and
A bill (S. 1153) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Augusta Erben; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1154) for the relief of F. W. Theodore Schroeter; and
A bill (S. 1155) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. HEYBURN:
A bill (S. 1156) granting a pension to Marcia M. Maris (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. BRANDEGEE:
A bill (S. 1157) granting a pension to Catherine M. Burdick;
A bill (S. 1158) granting a pension to Mary I. Clark;
A bill (S. 1159) granting a pension to Eliza F. Tucker; and
A bill (S. 1160) granting an increase of pension to Bertha H. Tiesler; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. PERKINS:
A bill (S. 1161) for the relief of Edward S. Salomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:
A bill (S. 1162) relating to the removal of employees of the Government in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.
By Mr. BURNHAM:
A bill (S. 1163) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Atwood; and
A bill (S. 1164) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hibbard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. CLAPP:
A bill (S. 1165) granting an increase of pension to Zacheus Borager (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. TOWNSEND:
A bill (S. 1166) granting an increase of pension to John W. Doane; and
A bill (S. 1167) granting an increase of pension to Elias Shaffer; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. SHIVELY:
A bill (S. 1168) for the relief of Christopher C. McCamment;
A bill (S. 1169) for the relief of John Vankirk;
A bill (S. 1170) for the relief of Nathan Mendenhall;
A bill (S. 1171) to remedy in the line of the Army the inequalities in rank due to the past system of regimental promotion; and
A bill (S. 1172) for the relief of Herman Fisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
By Mr. BACON:
A bill (S. 1173) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. BOURNE:
A bill (S. 1174) to amend the act of May 22, 1902, establishing Crater Lake National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.
A bill (S. 1175) to authorize the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.
A bill (S. 1176) to establish a biological station for the study of fish diseases; to the Committee on Fisheries.
By Mr. WILLIAMS:
A bill (S. 1177) granting a pension to Fred. G. Rockel;
A bill (S. 1178) granting a pension to Frederick Hess;
A bill (S. 1179) granting a pension to Maria Chotard Conner; and
A bill (S. 1180) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Kent; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1181) for the relief of John M. Maynor (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. OWEN:
A bill (S. 1182) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.
A bill (S. 1183) providing for the deposit of Indian funds in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
A bill (S. 1184) granting an increase of pension to George Bond (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1185) granting an increase of pension to Stoughton A. Cheever (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. STEPHENSON:
A bill (S. 1186) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Armstrong (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1187) granting an increase of pension to Larentz Czarnezki (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1188) granting an increase of pension to John Bettner (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1189) granting an increase of pension to John Busha (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1190) granting an increase of pension to William Eldridge (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1191) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Leasure, jr. (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1192) granting an increase of pension to Washington H. Wells (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1193) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Thomas (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1194) granting an increase of pension to Christian Miller (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1195) granting an increase of pension to Albert C. Jefferson;
A bill (S. 1196) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Fry;
A bill (S. 1197) granting an increase of pension to William A. Cutler;
A bill (S. 1198) granting an increase of pension to Leander Chapman;
A bill (S. 1199) granting an increase of pension to John Burritt;
A bill S. 1200) granting an increase of pension to Robert Murray;
A bill (S. 1201) granting an increase of pension to John McEathron;
A bill (S. 1202) granting a pension to Henry Le Marsh;
A bill (S. 1203) granting an increase of pension to Joseph La Duke;
A bill (S. 1204) granting a pension to Anna P. La Duke;
A bill (S. 1205) granting an increase of pension to John Jones;

A bill (S. 1206) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ridgman;
A bill (S. 1207) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Powers;
A bill (S. 1208) granting an increase of pension to John G. Porterfield;
A bill (S. 1209) granting an increase of pension to John M. Park;
A bill (S. 1210) granting an increase of pension to David J. Ryan;
A bill (S. 1211) granting an increase of pension to Ole A. Thompson; and
A bill (S. 1212) granting an increase of pension to Franklin S. Woodnorth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:
A bill (S. 1213) granting a pension to Fred T. Macomber;
A bill (S. 1214) granting an increase of pension to Lyman C. Brown;
A bill (S. 1215) granting an increase of pension to Alfred B. Wilcox;
A bill (S. 1216) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Malcolm;
A bill (S. 1217) granting an increase of pension to Alfred B. Loop;
A bill (S. 1218) granting an increase of pension to John Thompson;
A bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to William S. Davidson; and
A bill (S. 1220) granting an increase of pension to George F. Raulston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:
A bill (S. 1221) granting an increase of pension to Wyatt C. Crawford;
A bill (S. 1222) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Edmondson;
A bill (S. 1223) granting an increase of pension to George M. Pierce;
A bill (S. 1224) granting a pension to John W. Massey;
A bill (S. 1225) granting an increase of pension to George H. Proeger;
A bill (S. 1226) granting a pension to Louisa A. Ritchey;
A bill (S. 1227) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Jackson (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1228) granting an increase of pension to Edward Jenison (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1229) granting an increase of pension to William Carter (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1230) for the relief of John P. Roberson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1231) for the relief of the heirs of John W. West, deceased; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
A bill (S. 1232) for the relief of Angeline L. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1233) for the relief of Lewis H. Guest; and
A bill (S. 1234) to correct the military record of Alfred Rebsamen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:
A bill (S. 1235) for the erection of a memorial on the grounds of William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., in honor of Hon. Peyton Randolph, first President of the Continental Congress; to the Committee on the Library.
A bill (S. 1236) to place Dr. Henry Smith on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1237) for the promotion of Joseph A. O'Connor, carpenter in the United States Navy, to the rank of chief carpenter, and place him on the retired list;
A bill (S. 1238) providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Patrick Deery, United States Navy; and
A bill (S. 1239) to appoint Holmes E. Offley upon the retired list of the Navy with the rank of lieutenant; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.
A bill (S. 1240) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases herein enumerated;
A bill (S. 1241) for the relief of John S. Mann and the estate of Lewis W. Mann, deceased;
A bill (S. 1242) for the relief of W. T. Flippin, administrator of John F. Flippin, deceased;
A bill (S. 1243) for the relief of the estate of William D. Wright, deceased;
A bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Joseph H. Shafer;
A bill (S. 1245) for the relief of George M. Fry;
A bill (S. 1246) for the relief of G. W. Browder;
A bill (S. 1247) for the relief of John W. Fairfax;
A bill (S. 1248) for the relief of David R. Mister;
A bill (S. 1249) for the relief of Adam Carpenter;
A bill (S. 1250) for the relief of Joseph T. Chance and the heirs of John R. Burton, deceased;
A bill (S. 1251) for the relief of Thomas Johnson or his legal representatives;
A bill (S. 1252) for the relief of the heirs of Lemmus J. Spence, deceased;
A bill (S. 1253) for the relief of the estate of Thomas H. Nelson, deceased;
A bill (S. 1254) for the relief of George S. Ayre;
A bill (S. 1255) for the relief of William T. Miles;
A bill (S. 1256) for the relief of the estate of Arthur F. Clift, deceased;
A bill (S. 1257) for the relief of the legal heirs of the late L. Claiborne Jones;
A bill (S. 1258) for the relief of the heirs of James Bowles, deceased;
A bill (S. 1259) for the relief of the estate of Letitia Tyler Semple;
A bill (S. 1260) for the relief of the estate of James G. Hodges, deceased;
A bill (S. 1261) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of John Heater;
A bill (S. 1262) for the relief of E. A. R. Wyatt, heir of Edward A. Wyatt, deceased;
A bill (S. 1263) for the relief of H. L. Briscoe, heir of Sarah Briscoe;
A bill (S. 1264) for the relief of Joseph C. Boggs;
A bill (S. 1265) for the relief of the heirs of William Walton, deceased;
A bill (S. 1266) for the relief of the heirs of William Samuel Custis;
A bill (S. 1267) for the relief of Wesley Rankins;
A bill (S. 1268) for the relief of Luther H. Potterfield;
A bill (S. 1269) for the relief of Bland Massie;
A bill (S. 1270) for the relief of John Henry Edwards;
A bill (S. 1271) for the relief of the estate of Mary N. Cox, deceased;
A bill (S. 1272) for the relief of R. H. Hayden and Emma Hayden, executrix of the estate of Logan F. Hayden, deceased;
A bill (S. 1273) for the relief of Bolivar Sheild;
A bill (S. 1274) for the relief of the heirs of Robert L. Martin;
A bill (S. 1275) for the relief of the estate of H. F. Cocke, deceased;
A bill (S. 1276) for the relief of the estate of William A. Coffman, deceased;
A bill (S. 1277) for the relief of heirs and estate of Joseph Blosser, deceased;
A bill (S. 1278) for the relief of C. N. Rash;
A bill (S. 1279) for the relief of the estate of Jacob Cook, deceased;
A bill (S. 1280) for the relief of the estate of Simeon H. Wootton, deceased;
A bill (S. 1281) for the relief of Joseph E. Funkhouser;
A bill (S. 1282) for the relief of the estate of Branon Thatcher, deceased;
A bill (S. 1283) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to try, adjudicate, and determine certain claims for compensation for carrying the mails and pay for the discontinuance of postal service;
A bill (S. 1284) for the relief of Tyree Bros.;
A bill (S. 1285) for the relief of William Corcoran;
A bill (S. 1286) for the relief of the heirs of John E. Lewis, deceased;
A bill (S. 1287) for the relief of Norval Cox and heirs of Robert Rollins, deceased;
A bill (S. 1288) for the relief of the heirs of Matthew Smith, deceased;
A bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Robert E. Jackson;
A bill (S. 1290) to reimburse J. H. Whealton for moneys paid by him as surety for C. W. Fullerton, late postmaster of Whealton, Va.;
A bill (S. 1291) for the relief of Mary Cornick;
A bill (S. 1292) for the relief of James H. Hottel;
A bill (S. 1293) for the relief of Herbert Thompson;
A bill (S. 1294) for the relief of Harrison Capp;
A bill (S. 1295) for the relief of John W. Ritenour;
A bill (S. 1296) for the relief of Hulda V. Coffer;
A bill (S. 1297) for the relief of the estate of George P. Loehr, deceased;
A bill (S. 1298) for the relief of the heirs of Susan M. Pendleton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1299) for the relief of the heirs of J. D. Makely, deceased;

A bill (S. 1300) for the relief of the estate of Brandt Kincheloe, deceased;

A bill (S. 1301) for the relief of the estate of John Jett, deceased;

A bill (S. 1302) for the relief of Mrs. C. N. Graves, widow of R. F. Grave, jr., deceased;

A bill (S. 1303) for the relief of the heirs of John A. Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 1304) to provide for the payment of certain moneys advanced by the States of Virginia and Maryland to the United States Government to be applied toward erecting public buildings for the Federal Government in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Laura V. Phipps;

A bill (S. 1306) for the relief of Tilman Jeter;

A bill (S. 1307) for the relief of A. O. Tucker;

A bill (S. 1308) for the relief of Martin Maddux;

A bill (S. 1309) for the relief of Benjamin P. Loyall;

A bill (S. 1310) for the relief of Elise Trigg Shields;

A bill (S. 1311) for the relief of Frank Hoskins;

A bill (S. 1312) for the relief of the Seaboard Air Line Railway;

A bill (S. 1313) for the relief of Edgar M. Wilson, administrator of Thomas B. Van Buren, deceased;

A bill (S. 1314) for the relief of the Richmond Locomotive Works, successor of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works;

A bill (S. 1315) for the relief of the Potomac Steamboat Co.;

A bill (S. 1316) for the relief of the heirs at law of Capt. John Lewis;

A bill (S. 1317) for the relief of heirs and estate of James Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 1318) for the relief of Abraham Kellar;

A bill (S. 1319) for the relief of the legal representative of William C. Read;

A bill (S. 1320) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Samuel Sheetz, deceased;

A bill (S. 1321) for the relief of the heirs of William Southworth, deceased;

A bill (S. 1322) for the relief of Granville J. Kelly;

A bill (S. 1323) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander K. Phillips, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1324) for the relief of Mary E. Collier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 1325) granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Bowles; and

A bill (S. 1326) granting an increase of pension to Amos Brough; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 15) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 17) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona; to the Committee on Territories.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 18) authorizing free or reduced transportation to members of the Grand Army of the Republic and others whenever attending regular annual encampments, reunions, or conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MONUMENT TO GEORGE ROGERS CLARK.

Mr. BRADLEY. I introduce a bill and ask that it be read.

The bill (S. 1327) to provide for the selection and purchase of a site for and erection of a monument or memorial to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Library, as follows:

Whereas Gen. George Rogers Clark, under seeming impossibilities, through the severest hardships that ever attended any successful military campaign, and by the exercise of the most wonderful generalship recorded in the annals of history, won and secured to the United States our immense northwestern territory, making feasible the acquisition of the vast territory embraced in the Louisiana Purchase, thereby winning for himself the name of "the Empire Builder of the West"; and

Whereas his remains are now interred in Cave Hill Cemetery, near Louisville, Ky., unmarked except by a modest headstone: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That William H. Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, John M. Harlan, Champ Clark, and Thomas R. Marshall be, and they are hereby, created a commission to be known as "The Clark monument or memorial commission" to select and procure a location at some point in Jefferson County, Ky., and to select a plan and design for a monument or memorial to be erected in said county to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark, subject to the approval of Congress.

SEC. 2. That in the discharge of its duties hereunder said commission is authorized to employ the services of such artists, sculptors, architects, and others as it shall deem necessary, and to avail itself of the services or advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, created by the act approved May 17, 1910.

SEC. 3. That this construction shall be entered upon as speedily as practicable after the plan and design therefor is determined upon and approved by Congress, and shall be prosecuted to completion under the direction of said commission and the Secretary of War, under a contract hereby authorized to be entered into by said Secretary in a total sum not exceeding $300,000.

SEC. 4. That vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled by appointment by the President of the United States: *Provided*, That no member hereby or hereafter appointed shall receive any compensation for his services save necessary expenses incurred thereby.

SEC. 5. That to defray the necessary expenses of the commission herein created and the cost of procuring plans or designs for a monument or memorial as aforesaid, there is hereby appropriated the sum of $10,000, to be immediately available.

SEC. 6. That said commission shall annually submit to Congress an estimate of the amount of money necessary to be expended to carry out the work herein authorized.

PUBLICITY OF ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS.

Mr. OWEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2958) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. R. 2958. An act to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I think the joint resolution ought to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Similar joint resolutions formerly went to that committee, with the exception of a joint resolution in the last Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

BOARD OF MANAGERS, NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) for appointment of a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Hon. Nathan Bay Scott, of West Virginia, be, and he is hereby, appointed as a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States, to succeed Capt. Henry E. Palmer, deceased, whose term of office would expire April 21, 1916.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BROWN subsequently said: I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which in my absence this morning Senate joint resolution 14, with reference to a vacancy in the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Home, was passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska enters a motion for a reconsideration of the votes by which Senate joint resolution 14 was engrossed, read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask may be read and lie on the table. At a later day

I will move its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I desire, however, before that is done at an early day, possibly at the next meeting of the Senate, to make the resolution the basis of some observations.

The resolution (S. Res. 19) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas a condition of turbulence and disorder prevails throughout the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas as a result of such turbulence and disorder, it is reported that the lives of a large number of American citizens resident in Mexico are imperiled, and that their property is in danger of lawless appropriation by bands of irresponsible men; and

Whereas in conflicts between the military forces of the Mexican Government and revolutionists near the border line between the United States and Mexico several American citizens on the American side of the boundary line have been slain as the result of Mexicans firing across the line, and other American citizens while peaceably pursuing their avocations or while in their homes have been wounded; and

Whereas a great and important public work on the Colorado River in Lower California is being constructed by Americans, and for which work Congress has made a large appropriation, and which work is being constructed on the Mexican side by American engineers and contractors under an agreement made with the Mexican Government, is being obstructed and endangered by repeated interferences of lawless bands of Mexican revolutionists who have at different times appropriated property of the contractors engaged in the work and have so seriously delayed the work as to greatly endanger it by threatening the lives of workmen and thus disorganizing the working force; and

Whereas numerous leading newspapers in Europe, especially in London, report that certain European Governments, many of whose subjects and citizens reside in Mexico and have large property interests there, are contemplating some intervention by force in the affairs of the Mexican Republic, ostensibly for the protection of the lives and interests of their people; and

Whereas one European power has already landed on Mexican territory an armed force of marines from one of its warships under the pretense of preventing an attack upon a Mexican town by revolutionary forces; and

Whereas this unfortunate condition in the governmental and political affairs of Mexico appears to grow worse and more acute from day to day: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and hereby is, directed to make speedy inquiry into the facts recited in the preamble hereto and into such other facts as said committee may deem necessary to a complete explanation and exposition of the actual conditions prevailing in Mexico, and said committee is directed to make report of its findings, with such recommendations as the committee may deem advisable, respecting the duty of the United States in the premises, and which report may be made to the Senate in open or executive session, as the said committee may deem most expedient in the public interest.

AMENDMENTS TO TARIFF BILLS.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, in pursuance of a notice heretofore given by me, I submit the following resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution (S. Res. 18) was read and referred to the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Resolved, That there be added as one of the standing rules of the Senate the following, to wit:

"That no amendment to any bill passed by the House amending or changing by general application the import duties prescribed by existing law shall be in order or allowed in the Senate unless such proposed amendment seeks to amend or change a paragraph or item embraced in the schedule or schedules, all or a part of which is sought to be amended or changed by the House bill, or unless such proposed amendment is directly related to the subject matter of the House bill and is germane thereto."

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I noticed a moment ago that House joint resolution 39 providing for the direct election of Senators by the people was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. During the last Congress a similar joint resolution, introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and was there considered and reported to the Senate. In looking up the precedents with regard to resolutions upon this particular subject I find that prior to the last Congress references had been made to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I make this statement now so as to account, perhaps, for the fact that I did not ask that the joint resolution go in this case to the Committee on the Judiciary and did not object to its being placed in the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I ask, for information, whether it is true that other joint resolutions with reference to the election of Senators by direct vote have gone at this session to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. BACON. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a matter of information, the Chair, of his own knowledge, can not tell the Senator. The Secretary informs the Chair, however, that they have been so referred. It would be the Chair's notion to refer such joint resolutions to the Committee on the Judiciary; but a request otherwise was made, and by unanimous consent, the matter being put by the Chair to the Senate, the reference was made to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, in the interest of uniformity of procedure, if there is no graver reason—and I think perhaps other reasons might be shown—resolutions on this subject should be referred to some one committee; the appropriate committee should be determined; and the question being before the Senate, it might as well be determined now as at another time. I ask unanimous consent that all bills or resolutions heretofore introduced in the Senate at this session of Congress directed to a change in the system of electing United States Senators be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. For that purpose I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of all bills and joint resolutions relating to the election of Senators by direct vote of the people which may have heretofore at the present session been referred to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of all bills and joint resolutions relating to the election of Senators by direct vote of the people which have been introduced at this session of Congress and referred to that committee, and that such bills and joint resolutions be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Is there objection?

Mr. CULBERSON. I object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I myself think that the joint resolution which has been referred this morning to the Committee on Privileges and Elections should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It relates not to the ordinary matter of the privileges of the floor and the election of Senators, but it relates to a change in the fundamental law of the land, a change in the Constitution of the United States. If there is any question which should be referred to the law committee of the Senate, it is a proposition to make a change in the Constitution.

It will not do to say, Mr. President, that such a question should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections because of the fact that it relates to the particular matter of an election, for, if that argument is good, then every proposition to change the Constitution would, when presented, be referred to some other committee than the Committee on the Judiciary. It would be referred to some committee which had charge of a subject that was more nearly related to the direct object of the change.

The object of the appointment of a Judiciary Committee is to have referred to it questions which affect the enactment of law which relates to the judiciary system and other matters which relate strictly to a legal question. I think, therefore, that all proposed changes in the Constitution ought to go to the Judiciary Committee.

I will say that, of course, everybody recognizes that the lawyers on the Committee on Privileges and Elections are just as able as are the lawyers on the Judiciary Committee, but it is not a fact that it is necessary that all members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections should be lawyers, whereas it is considered necessary that all members of the Judiciary Committee should be lawyers.

This particular question is one that in the last Congress was dealt with by the Judiciary Committee exclusively. That committee had charge of all proposed legislation upon that subject. It brought a joint resolution into the Senate, which was acted upon by the Senate, and other resolutions on the same lines which have been introduced in the Senate during the present session have already been referred to the Judiciary Committee.

We have considered the question, Mr. President, as to the reference of bills to the Judiciary Committee in relation to other matters. I remember that in a former session—I have forgotten whether it was in the last session—there was legislation proposed for Porto Rico the nature of which properly would bring it more directly to the consideration of the Judiciary Committee. The question was raised whether it should not go to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico. It was contended that it should go to that committee. There were questions involved which related to the judicial system of Porto Rico and other questions which related to the confirmation of judicial officers in Porto Rico. The contention then was that as we had a special committee to consider those matters the proposed legislation should go to that committee rather than to the Judiciary Committee. After consideration, it was determined that, while the legislation did relate to Porto Rican matters, its nature was such as properly required its reference to the Judiciary Committee.

Analogizing that to the present case, while it is true that this proposed change relates to the election of Senators, the nature of it involves the gravest of all considerations, such as should be in charge, it seems to me, of the Judiciary Committee. I trust that it may be so referred.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it is not my intention to enter into an extended consideration of this question, but some suggestions made by the Senator from Georgia in giving reasons why this proposed legislation should go to the Judiciary Committee seem to me to call for more than a passing notice.

The Senator, if I understood his remarks and their purport, suggested that because of the gravity of the question, because of the necessity for high consideration, it should go to the Judiciary Committee. If I misunderstood the Senator, I should be very glad to be corrected.

Mr. BACON. The Senator misunderstands me in a certain application, certainly, if he thinks I used any such language as that. I mean this: That the class of questions which properly goes to the Judiciary Committee is the class that relates to a change in the Constitution, and that among the class of questions which should properly go to the Judiciary Committee this was one of the gravest. I do not mean to say, Mr. President, that a grave question ought not to be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. There could not be any graver question before the Senate than the right of a Senator to his seat on this floor, and yet nobody would contend that because of the fact that it was such a grave question it should go to the Judiciary Committee.

I hope that illustration disabuses the mind of the honorable and learned Senator of any suggestion that I intended to imply that because the question was grave it ought not to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. I say, belonging to the class of questions which should properly go to the Judiciary Committee, and being one of the gravest of that class, it should go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not intend to criticize the Senator. I merely desired to draw forth such an expression as would leave no question in the RECORD as to what the Senator from Georgia intended by his remarks.

I am inclined to think that such a joint resolution should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It pertains to the election of Senators and to their privilege as Senators. The Judiciary Committee has nothing especially to do, more than another, with such a question. Through accident, I think during the last Congress, such a resolution went to the Committee on the Judiciary and was reported out of that committee and rejected by the Senate.

It is not fair to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to send matters of this kind to another committee, in view of the fact that in the past, relying upon precedent or rather appealing to it, such matters have been referred to and reported back by the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I regret that the ranking member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections is not present. I sent for him, but have not been able to call his attention to the fact that this question is being considered. I think it had better rest without action until he is present.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I called attention to the reference by the Chair to the Committee on Privileges and Elections because of the fact that I cared not, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, this morning to insist that that committee be given the consideration of this particular joint resolution. During the last Congress, as I before remarked, a similar resolution was presented. It was then thought best to send it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but having in my mind exactly the idea suggested by the Senator from Georgia, that this is a matter which went to the amendment of the fundamental law of the land, and without personal knowledge of the course that other like resolutions had taken theretofore, I moved, and the motion was sustained, that the joint resolution go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

That committee has heretofore considered a like joint resolution and reported to the Senate the result of its labors. Since that time my attention has been called to the fact that the invariable practice of the Senate theretofore has been to send this identical subject matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; that that course was agreed to by the eminent Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Hoar, who made one report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and by the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Turpie, who made a minority report from that committee. Therefore, and further in view of the fact that the Judiciary Committee has also pending before it now a similar resolution, I made no objection to the reference as made by the Chair in the present instance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask what disposition has been made of the joint resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that reference has not been changed. No suggestion has been made to change it. The joint resolution is now with the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas moves that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged——

Mr. CULBERSON. I will simply state that there is now pending before that committee three joint resolutions on the same subject, introduced at this session, and referred without question at the time they were introduced.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single word. It was at my instance, I believe, that the reference was made to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I was cognizant of the fact that always prior to the last session such reference had been made, and I kept in mind the further fact that the Committee on the Judiciary is a committee having a very large number of bills before it—an overworked committee—while the Committee on Privileges and Elections has practically nothing to do, provided this joint resolution goes to the Committee on the Judiciary. I believe that the reference as made is the proper reference, and I trust that the committee will not be discharged and the reference changed.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understand that the matter is in such a position before the Senate that one objection carries it over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas moves that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is not my motion I submit to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the only motion——

Mr. CULBERSON. I understood the Chair had made the reference against its judgment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator is incorrect in the fact. The Chair had originally suggested a reference to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from New Hampshire then asked that the reference be to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Chair then stated, after waiting a reasonable length of time, that unless there was objection the reference would be as suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire. That reference was made.

Some little time after—a lot of business intervening—the matter was again brought up, at the present time. Now, the joint resolution is with the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULBERSON. The joint resolution has been referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Now I move that the action of the Senate in referring the joint resolution to the Committee on Privileges and Elections be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that that go over.

Mr. CULBERSON. Not to discharge the committee, in that form, nor was any such purpose intended by me originally.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask that the motion go over.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Georgia will wait one moment, the Senator from Idaho asks that the motion of the Senator from Texas go over until to-morrow. The Chair hardly thinks it is a motion which must go over as a matter of right. A motion to discharge the committee would have to go over, but a motion to reconsider the action of the Senate just taken does not have to go over, the Chair thinks, under the rule.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not controvert the decision of the Chair, for I think the Chair is correct, but I think the motion is an improper one, because, as I understand the rule, no motion can be made during the morning hour that does not go over under objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion would not be in order before 1 o'clock, the Chair thinks.

Mr. BACON. I desire, with the permission of the Chair, to make a suggestion. While the Chair has directed that the joint resolution be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, it has not in fact been so sent. The committee has never been charged with it, has never received it, and really a motion to discharge the committee would not be in order. I want to say this——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not the motion.

Mr. BACON. I understand that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas changed his motion.

Mr. BACON. I was simply premising that. The suggestion I wish to make is that in every tribunal, whether a legislative tribunal or a judicial tribunal, matters which are in process of disposition, until finally acted upon, are what are known in the legal procedure as in gremio legis—that is, in the bosom of the body; and it is not necessary, in my opinion, that there should be any motion to reconsider or any motion to discharge. It is simply sufficient for the body now having the matter still in its hands, it not having passed from it, simply to determine that it should go to such a committee rather than to the one previously indicated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that when business has intervened following a reference, the reference stands until the Senate takes some other action, but the Chair further thinks that the motion of the Senator from Texas would not be in order until after 1 o'clock. Then the motion could be made.

Mr. CULBERSON. I can enter it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, yes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Which is practically what I have done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. If I may venture to make a suggestion, the desire is to carry the joint resolution over. Supposing the motion to reconsider prevails; that brings the joint resolution before the Senate again for its first reading. Of course, the second reading on the same day can only be had by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. And a single objection to its second reading on the same day would send it over, which would carry the question of reference with it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I was necessarily detained from the Chamber when this matter first arose, and I do not know that I am entirely familiar with the situation. As I understand, the reference was made to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; that thereafter the Senator from Texas made a motion to reconsider that reference; and that that motion, in the opinion of the Chair, could not be made, as a matter of fact, until 1 o'clock. If that is the situation, I do not care at this time to take up the time of the Senate——

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the situation.

Mr. BORAH. In discussing the matter, but will wait until the appropriate time to do so, at 1 o'clock.

LAWS OF PORTO RICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 813, 61st Cong., 3d sess.), which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. 11):

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 31 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1911, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith copies of the acts and resolutions enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico during the session beginning January 9 and ending March 9, 1911.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 17, 1911.*

RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, on January 30, 1911, American citizens resident in Japan held a meeting in Yokohama and considered the relations between this country and Japan. They adopted resolutions and some addresses were delivered, notably one by the American ambassador to Japan. From his address I desire to read into the RECORD two sentences, as follows:

> Let me assure you, Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen—and I ought to know something about it—that there is no cause under the sun why there should be distrust between the people of these two countries. [Applause.] There are no questions of importance pending, and no business being conducted diplomatically which should excite the suspicions or make the slightest trouble as between the two peoples.

This is not a very long pamphlet, and I should like to ask that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMOOT. I have examined the pamphlet, and I think no Senator will object to its publication as a document (S. Doc. No. 9). I do hope, however, that in future where any outside matters are desired to be published as public documents they will first be submitted to the Committee on Printing. I have no objection to the publication of this pamphlet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the order is entered.

BANKRUPTCY LAW.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask to have printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. No. 10) the United States bankruptcy law of July 1, 1898, and amendments thereto to June 25, 1910. Uniform system with marginal notes and index, and general orders and forms in bankruptcy, adopted and established by the Supreme Court of the United States November 28, 1898.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection that order is entered.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to ask also that 500 copies of the document be printed for the document room of the Senate. The request can either be passed upon now or referred to the Committee on Printing.

There being no objection, the order was reduced to writing and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That 500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 10, Sixty-second Congress, first session, United States bankruptcy law, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. In view of certain circumstances relating to the assignment of committees, which I need not explain, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONS OF NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to call up, for the purpose of submitting some observations thereon, Senate joint resolution No. 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution indicated, which will be read by its title.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territory of New Mexico and the Territory of Arizona.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the Sixty-first Congress passed an act entitled "An act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States." This act was approved by the President on the 20th day of June, 1910.

On the 21st day of January, 1911, the people of New Mexico adopted a constitution, and on the 7th day of February, 1911, the people of Arizona adopted theirs. An effort was made in the expiring moments of the last Congress to adopt House joint resolution 295, approving the constitution of New Mexico, and the purpose of the friends of the resolution, in the light of subsequent events, seems to have been to admit New Mexico to the Union and postpone or defeat the admission of Arizona. But if this was the purpose it was defeated, because the friends of Arizona were there to insist that the same treatment should be accorded to the people of both Territories, and the splendid fight made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to see that equal and exact justice should be accorded to the people of both is fresh in the minds of most of the Members of this body.

No enabling act was necessary under the Constitution, nor under any law of Congress, to authorize the people of either of these Territories to apply to Congress for admission to the Union. On the contrary, the method of procedure has been left entirely to the States, and in some instances, notably upon the admission of Vermont, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maine, Michigan, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, California, and Oregon, the initial steps were taken for the preparation of their constitutions and admission to the Union without any enabling acts having been previously passed by Congress.

The act in question is the first in the history of our country where provision has been made in a single act enabling two Territories to take the initial steps looking to the framing and adoption of a constitution as preliminary to their knocking at the doors of Congress for admission as component parts of the Federal Union. The restrictions and limitations applicable to each of the Territories in question are practically the same, and I shall insist that both Territories are entitled to admission at one and the same time under the same terms and conditions, if they have met the requirements of the Constitution and the act of authorization, and the conditions exist in both which entitle them to admission at the hands of this Congress.

I do not understand that any objection is made to their admission on the ground that the necessary conditions do not exist in both to entitle them to admission, or that any objection whatsoever has heretofore been made to the admission of the Territory of New Mexico, either because of any constitutional inhibition or any alleged violation of the Constitution of the United States in the provisions of the constitution which her people have adopted and certified up through the proper channels for the approval of Congress, notwithstanding the fact that they have adopted one entirely hostile to their best inter-

ests; but it has been objected to the constitution adopted by the people of Arizona that it is violative of that portion of section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that—

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

If the constitution adopted by the constitutional convention of Arizona is violative of this provision, it is also violative of section 20 of the enabling act of June 20, 1910, which provides in substance that the constitution of Arizona shall be republican in form and shall make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

Section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution is a restatement in slightly different language of the substance of a proviso in Article IV of the Ordinance of 1787 for the government of the territory of the United States northwest of the Ohio River, requiring that the constitutions and government of the States carved out of this territory and admitted by their delegates into the Congress shall be republican and in conformity to the principles contained in said articles.

The provision of the enabling act with reference to the admission of Arizona is a reenactment, first, of the provision covering the admission of new States adopted by the Constitutional Congress on the 13th of July, 1787, and, second, of section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution of the United States, as it was finally ratified by the Thirteen Colonies.

The territory embraced within the limits of Arizona is a part of the territory ceded to the United States by Mexico under the terms of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848, and a part of what is known as the Gadsden Purchase of 1852, and there is no limitation or restriction placed upon the Congress of the United States in either the treaty or the agreement of purchase as to the admission of this acquired territory into the Union.

In the Louisiana Purchase, however, the duty is imposed that States carved out of the territory shall be admitted to the Union under the terms of the Constitution. It has been assumed without question, even in the absence of such treaty stipulation, that all territory acquired by the United States, whether under treaty or otherwise, can only be admitted to the Union upon a compliance with the provisions of the Constitution and the requirements of the ordinance of 1787, which became a compact between the several States of the Union at the time of its adoption with reference to the territory then owned by them, and which was practically ceded to the United States to be later admitted in due course to statehood.

In considering the constitution adopted by the people of Arizona, therefore, it will be necessary to consider it in the light of these instruments and the construction placed thereon by all the departments of government, national and State.

The provisions of the Arizona constitution which it is insisted are obnoxious to the Constitution are Articles IV and VIII, establishing as a part of the fundamental law the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. These provisions are as follows:

ARTICLE IV.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

1. Initiative and referendum.

SEC. 1. (1) The legislative authority of the State shall be vested in a legislature, consisting of a senate and a house of representatives, but the people reserve the power to propose laws and amendments to the constitution and to enact or reject such laws and amendments at the polls, independently of the legislature; and they also reserve, for use at their own option, the power to approve or reject at the polls any act, or item, section, or part of any act, of the legislature.

(2) The first of these reserved powers is the initiative. Under this power 10 per cent of the qualified electors shall have the right to propose any measure, and 15 per cent shall have the right to propose any amendment to the constitution.

(3) The second of these reserved powers is the referendum. Under this power the legislature, or 5 per cent of the qualified electors, may order the submission to the people at the polls of any measure, or item, section, or part of any measure, enacted by the legislature, except laws immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or for the support and maintenance of the departments of the State government and State institutions; but to allow opportunity for referendum petitions, no act passed by the legislature shall be operative for 90 days after the close of the session of the legislature enacting such measure, except such as require earlier operation to preserve the public peace, health, or safety, or to provide appropriations for the support and maintenance of the departments of State and of State institutions: *Provided*, That no such emergency measure shall be considered passed by the legislature unless it shall state in a separate section why it is necessary that it shall become immediately operative, and shall be approved by the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the members elected to each house of the legislature, taken by roll call of ayes and nays, and also approved by the governor; and should such measure be vetoed by the governor, it shall not become a law unless it shall be approved by the votes of three-fourths of the members elected to each house of the legislature, taken by roll call of ayes and nays.

(4) All petitions submitted under the power of the initiative shall be known as initiative petitions, and shall be filed with the secretary of state not less than four months preceding the date of the election at which the measures so proposed are to be voted upon. All petitions submitted under the power of the referendum shall be known as referendum petitions, and shall be filed with the secretary of state not more than 90 days after the final adjournment of the session of the legislature which shall have passed the measure to which the referendum is applied. The filing of a referendum petition against any item, section, or part of any measure shall not prevent the remainder of such measure from becoming operative.

(5) Any measure of amendment to the constitution proposed under the initiative, and any measure to which the referendum is applied, shall be referred to a vote of the qualified electors, and shall become law when approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon and upon proclamation of the governor, and not otherwise.

(6) The veto power of the governor shall not extend to initiative or referendum measures approved by a majority of the qualified electors.

(7) The whole number of votes cast for all candidates for governor at the general election last preceding the filing of any initiative or referendum petition on a State or county measure shall be the basis on which the number of qualified electors required to sign such petition shall be computed.

(8) The powers of the initiative and the referendum are hereby further reserved to the qualified electors of every incorporated city, town, and county as to all local, city, town, or county matters on which such incorporated cities, towns, and counties are or shall be empowered by general laws to legislate. Such incorporated cities, towns, and counties may prescribe the manner of exercising said power within the restrictions of general laws. Under the power of the initiative 15 per cent of the qualified electors may propose measures on such local, city, town, or county matters, and 10 per cent of the electors may propose the referendum on legislation enacted within and by such city, town, or county. Until provided by general law, said cities and towns may prescribe the basis on which said percentages shall be computed.

(9) Every initiative or referendum petition shall be addressed to the secretary of state in the case of petitions for or on State measures, and to the clerk of the board of supervisors, city clerk, or corresponding officer in the case of petitions for or on county, city, or town measures; and shall contain the declaration of each petitioner, for himself, that he is a qualified elector of the State (and in the case of petitions for or on city, town, or county measures, of the city, town, or county affected), his post-office address, the street and number, if any, of his residence, and the date on which he signed such petition. Each sheet containing petitioners' signatures shall be attached to a full and correct copy of the title and text of the measure so proposed to be initiated or referred to the people, and every sheet of every such petition containing signatures shall be verified by the affidavit of the person who circulated said sheet or petition, setting forth that each of the names on said sheet was signed in the presence of the affiant, and that in the belief of the affiant each signer was a qualified elector of the State, or, in the case of a city, town, or county measure, of the city, town, or county affected by the measure so proposed to be initiated or referred to the people.

(10) When any initiative or referendum petition or any measure referred to the people by the legislature shall be filed, in accordance with this section, with the secretary of state, he shall cause to be printed on the official ballot of the next regular general election the title and number of said measure, together with the words "Yes" and "No" in such manner that the electors may express at the polls their approval or disapproval of the measure.

(11) The text of all measures to be submitted shall be published as proposed amendments to the constitution are published, and in submitting such measures and proposed amendments the secretary of state and all other officers shall be guided by the general law until legislation shall be especially provided therefor.

(12) If two or more conflicting measures or amendments to the constitution shall be approved by the people at the same election, the measure or amendment receiving the greatest number of affirmative votes shall prevail in all particulars as to which there is conflict.

(13) It shall be the duty of the secretary of state, in the presence of the governor and the chief justice of the supreme court, to canvass the votes for and against each such measure or proposed amendment to the constitution within 30 days after the election, and upon the completion of the canvass the governor shall forthwith issue a proclamation, giving the whole number of votes cast for and against each measure or proposed amendment, and declaring such measures or amendments as are approved by a majority of those voting thereon to be law.

(14) This section shall not be construed to deprive the legislature of the right to enact any measure.

(15) This section of the constitution shall be, in all respects, self-executing.

SEC. 2. The legislature shall provide a penalty for any willful violation of any of the provisions of the preceding section.

ARTICLE VIII.

REMOVAL FROM OFFICE.

1. Recall of public officers.

SECTION 1. Every public officer in the State of Arizona holding an elective office, either by election or appointment, is subject to recall from such office by the qualified electors of the electoral district from which candidates are elected to such office. Such electoral district may include the whole State. Such number of said electors as shall equal 25 per cent of the number of votes cast at the last preceding general election for all of the candidates for the office held by such officer may by petition, which shall be known as a recall petition, demand his recall.

SEC. 2. Every recall petition must contain a general statement in not more than 200 words of the grounds of such demand, and must be filed in the office in which petitions for nominations to the office held by the incumbent are required to be filed. The signatures to such recall petition need not all be on one sheet of paper, but each signer must add to his signature the date of his signing said petition and his place of residence, giving his street and number, if any, should he reside in a town or city. One of the signers of each sheet of such petition, or the person circulating such sheet, must make and subscribe an oath on said sheet that the signatures thereon are genuine.

SEC. 3. If said officer shall offer his resignation, it shall be accepted, and the vacancy shall be filled as may be provided by law. If he shall not resign within five days after a recall petition is filed, a special election shall be ordered to be held, not less than 20 nor more than 30 days after such order, to determine whether such officer shall be recalled. On the ballots at said election shall be printed the reasons, as set forth in the petition, for demanding his recall, and, in not more

than 200 words, the officer's justification of his course in office. He shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of said election shall have been officially declared.

SEC. 4. Unless he otherwise request, in writing, his name shall be placed as a candidate on the official ballot without nomination. Other candidates for the office may be nominated to be voted for at said election. The candidate who shall receive the highest number of votes shall be declared elected for the remainder of the term. Unless the incumbent receive the highest number of votes, he shall be deemed to be removed from office, upon qualification of his successor. In the event that his successor shall not qualify within five days after the result of said election shall have been declared, the said office shall be vacant, and may be filled as provided by law.

SEC. 5. No recall petition shall be circulated against any officer until he shall have held his office for a period of six months, except that it may be filed against a member of the legislature at any time after five days from the beginning of the first session after his election. After one recall petition and election, no further recall petition shall be filed against the same officer during the term for which he was elected, unless petitioners signing such petition shall first pay into the public treasury, which has paid such election expenses, all expenses of the preceding election.

SEC. 6. The general election laws shall apply to recall elections in so far as applicable. Laws necessary to facilitate the operation of the provisions of this article shall be enacted, including provision for payment by the public treasury of the reasonable special election campaign expenses of such officer.

Is there anything in these provisions violative either of the letter or the spirit of the Constitution or, if you please, of the terms of the enabling act? If not, nothing remains for Congress to determine except the single question whether the necessary conditions exist in Arizona as to area, productivity, capacity, population, and the loyalty and good disposition of her people. As to this latter proposition no objection has been raised, and I shall confine myself to a discussion of the question whether the constitution of Arizona does in any respect violate section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution of the United States; and I maintain, first, that no argument can be found, either in reason or by analogy, that makes the Arizona constitution providing for the initiative, referendum, and recall obnoxious to this or any provision of the Constitution of the United States; second, that these provisions are but the reservation of powers in a written constitution which have been exercised in this country from the earliest colonial times, and the exercise of them has been recognized as constitutional by the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government, both State and National.

In ascertaining what the framers of the Constitution meant when they declared that Congress should guarantee to every State a republican form of government, resort must be had to the conditions which surrounded the administration of the governments of the several Colonies as well as to contemporaneous and subsequent discussion and judicial decision.

There was nothing which preceded the Constitutional Convention that could have caused the framers of what Gladstone declared "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man" to fear to intrust the people of the States that might thereafter be admitted to the Union with the power of governing themselves, of enacting their own laws, whether directly or by representatives or by the union of both. Both of these systems, separately and in combination, were in vogue in the Colonies at the adoption of the Constitution, and had been since the earliest settlement of New England. The Revolutionary War had been fought to a successful conclusion by the participation of Colonies some of which were practically governed by the people without more than the form of representative governments. If in framing the constitutional provision under discussion its framers feared to intrust the people with all power, why did they not go further and enjoin, as a condition of admission to the Union, a modification of the Constitution and laws of the Colonies to the idea that the people could not be trusted?

A fair consideration of contemporary literature and discussion will lead to the inevitable conclusion that the fear that animated the framers of the Constitution was not the fear of the mob spirit which we hear so much about in these days, it was not the fear that the people were incapable of self-government or that they could not be trusted to legislate for themselves, but it was a fear that attempts might later be made to establish forms of government with aristocratic or monarchical tendencies, and to protect them from domestic insurrection or foreign invasion.

The Declaration of Independence itself contains the severest possible arraignment of the despotism of a monarchy, and expresses absolute confidence in the people. There is no suggestion in that remarkable document that the people themselves were incapable of self-government; on the contrary, one of its most frequently quoted provisions is that wherein it is stated as a self-evident truth—

that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these things it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

To establish and maintain a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed the Revolution was fought. It was a battle for individual rights and individual liberty against the despotism of monarchy, and emerging from the smoke of battle the framers of the Constitution could only have had in mind the establishment of a republican form of government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed as contradistinguished from a monarchical form. It was upon this theory that one of the resolutions submitted to the convention by Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, was, after some slight amendments, unanimously adopted declaring it the duty of Congress to guarantee to every State a republican form of government.

As further tending to prove that this was the object and purpose of the framers of the Constitution let us recur to the letter of Madison in The Federalist, edited by him in conjunction with Hamilton and Jay. In discussing the provision of the Constitution now under consideration he says:

To guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government, to protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the legislature or of the executive (when the legislature can not be convened) against domestic violence.

In a confederacy founded on republican principles and composed of republican members the superintending government ought clearly to possess authority to defend the system against aristocratic or monarchical innovations. The more intimate the nature of such a union may be the greater interest have the members in the political institutions of each other, and the greater right to insist that the forms of government under which the compact was entered into should be substantially maintained. But a right implies a remedy; and where else could the remedy be deposited than where it is deposited by the Constitution? Governments of dissimilar principles and forms have been found less adapted to a Federal coalition of any sort than those of kindred nature. * * * But the authority extends no further than to a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a preexisting government of the form which is to be guaranteed. As long, therefore, as the existing republican forms are continued by the States they are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican forms they have a right to do so and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is that they shall not exchange republican for antirepublican constitutions, a restriction which, it is presumed, will hardly be considered as a grievance. (Letter No. 43.)

This letter was addressed to the people of the State of New York at a time when the ratification of the Constitution by that State was under consideration, and by a distinguished member of the Constitutional Convention. Here is a distinct declaration of the purposes of the convention to authorize Congress to defend the system of government provided for by the Constitution against aristocratic or monarchical innovations and a right of any State at any time to substitute other republican forms of government not inconsistent with the general plan and their right to claim a Federal guaranty for the latter, the only restriction being that no State should exchange a republican for an antirepublican constitution.

This statement, by so distinguished a statesman and one who was entirely familiar with the differing conditions and forms of government in the Thirteen Colonies prior to and at the time when the Constitution was being framed in convention, is entitled to the greatest weight in attempting to arrive at the purposes of the convention in framing the section thereof under consideration; and it must therefore be taken in connection with the conditions and forms of government as they existed in the Colonies before and at the time of the convention.

In this connection it is proper to call attention to some of the constitutions and bills of rights of the Colonies prior to the formation of the Federal Constitution.

The North Carolina bill of rights of 1776 declares:

1. That all political power is vested in and derived from the people only.

The Virginia bill of rights of 1776 declares:

SECTION 1. That all men are by nature equal, free, and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they can not by any compact deprive or divest their posterity, namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

SEC. 2. That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people.

The Maryland bill of rights of 1776 says:

1. That all government of right originates from the people, is founded in compact only, and instituted solely for the good of the whole.

The Pennsylvania bill of rights of 1776 declares:

III. That the people of this State have the sole, exclusive, and inherent right of governing and regulating the internal police of the same.

The New York bill of rights of 1777 declares:

I. This convention, therefore, in the name and by the authority of the good people of this State, doth ordain, determine, and declare that

no authority shall, on any pretense whatever, be exercised over the people or members of this State but such as shall be derived from and granted by them.

The Connecticut constitution of 1777 declares:

That the ancient form of civil government, contained in the charter from Charles the Second, King of England, and adopted by the people of this State, shall be and remain the civil constitution of this State, under the sole authority of the people thereof, independent of any king or prince whatever. And that this Republic is, and shall forever be and remain, a free, sovereign, and independent State, by the name of the State of Connecticut.

The first constitution submitted in Massachusetts was rejected by the people by direct vote at town meetings in the spring of 1779, because it contained no bill of rights, and for other reasons. The next constitution submitted, that of 1780, the people adopted by direct vote at town meetings and by more than two-thirds of all who voted. The bill of rights declares:

ARTICLE I. All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and inalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness.

ART. IV. The people of this Commonwealth have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign, and independent State, and do, and forever shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not, or may not hereafter be, by them expressly delegated to the United States of America in Congress assembled.

In New Hampshire four constitutions were submitted to the people, who voted directly upon them at town meetings. The first three were rejected (American Political Science Review, Vol. II, p. 549), largely because there were no express limitations upon the power of the legislature—no bill of rights. The bill of rights of the fourth one, that of 1784, declares:

VII. The people of this State have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves as a free, sovereign, and independent State, and do, and forever hereafter shall, exercise and enjoy every power, jurisdiction, and right pertaining thereto which is not or may not hereafter be by them expressly delegated to the United States of America in Congress assembled.

The Vermont constitution of 1777 declares:

IV. That the people of this State have the sole, exclusive, and inherent right of governing and regulating the internal police of the same.

The New Jersey constitution of 1776 declares:

Whereas all the constitutional authority ever possessed by the Kings of Great Britain over these Colonies or their other dominions was, by compact, derived from the people and held of them for the common interest of the whole society, allegiance and protection are, in the nature of things, reciprocal ties, each equally depending upon the other and liable to be dissolved by the others being refused or withdrawn. And whereas George III, King of Great Britain, has refused protection to the good people of these Colonies, and, by assenting to sundry acts of the British Parliament, attempted to subject them to the absolute dominion of that body, and has also made war upon them in the most cruel and unnatural manner for no other cause than asserting their just rights, all civil authority under him is necessarily at an end and a dissolution of government in each Colony has consequently taken place.

The South Carolina constitution of 1776 declares:

I. That this congress, being a full and free representation of the people of this Colony, shall henceforth be deemed and called the General Assembly of South Carolina, and as such shall continue until the 21st day of October next, and no longer.

The Georgia constitution of 1777 declares:

We, therefore, the representatives of the people, from whom all power originates, and for whose benefit all government is intended, by virtue of the power delegated to us, do ordain and declare, and it is hereby ordained and declared, that the following rules and regulations be adopted for the future government of this State.

It will be seen from these excerpts from the bills of rights and constitutions of the several Colonies, each and all of which must have been in the minds of the framers of the Federal Constitution, that, far from entertaining any fear of the people, there was an expression of absolute confidence in them in each of the Colonies as the source from which all power had its origin. Many of the Colonies had been governed as pure democracies, the people legislating directly at town meetings held for that purpose and electing as well as instructing those who were to assist in administering the laws of their own making.

The representative idea was one of gradual evolution. There was no sudden change from a pure democracy to a representative form of government. There has never been a time when the governments, either of the Colonies or the States, were entirely representative. On the contrary, with the gradual trend toward the representative system the direct system remained intact for many years after the adoption of the Constitution, and it has never yet been entirely abolished in any of the States. Always the tendency was, even in the most typically representative forms of government, to make the representatives or agents of the people directly responsive to the popular will. I shall show later that so long as these representatives or agents of the people were acting in truth and in fact as their representatives, the people were satisfied with the transference of a part of the power which they had formerly exercised under constitutional limitations and restrictions to representatives, but when these agents began to reach a point where they ignored the popular will, were no longer responsive thereto, but responded rather to the dictation of the political machine and the corrupt party boss, the pendulum began to swing in the opposite direction, and checks began to be devised against legislative and representative usurpation. What was once, in part at least, a representative form of government, has become a misrepresentative form of government, and in a determination to correct this the initiative, the referendum, and the recall had their origin.

The Arizona constitution and the constitutions of other States from which it was copied are not an enlargement of the powers which were exercised by the people of the Colonies in the regulation of their affairs, but it is a resumption or rather the assertion of powers which had become dormant by nonuse, by embodying them in the fundamental law—the written constitution. If there be any difference the powers of the people under the colonial forms of government were more ample and more frequently used for restraining the acts of their representatives than any power attempted to be reserved to or exercised by the people of Arizona under the constitution to which objection is now made.

I have undertaken briefly to call attention to conditions as they existed in the Colonies prior to the adoption of the Constitution and to contemporaneous interpretation of the provision now under consideration as to its purposes and as to the intent of its framers. Let us look now at the interpretation placed upon it by later text writers and courts.

Sutherland, in his Notes on the United States Constitution (p 603), says that—

The distinguishing feature of the republican form of government is the right of the people to choose their own officers for governmental administration and to pass their own laws; by virtue of the legislative power reposed in representative bodies and by the adoption of a constitution the people limit their own power as against the sudden impulses of mere majorities. The State here referred to is a member of the Union, an organized people or a community of free citizens, occupying a definite territory. The provision does not undertake to designate any particular government as republican, nor is the exact form in any manner especially indicated.

Justice Story, in his work on the Constitution (Vol. II, sec. 1814), in giving the reasons for this provision of the Constitution, says:

The want of a provision of this nature was felt as a capital defect in the plan of the confederation, as it might in its consequences endanger, if not overthrow, the Union. Without a guaranty the assistance to be derived from a national government in repairing domestic dangers which might threaten the existence of the State constitutions could not be demanded as a right from the National Government. Usurpation might raise its standard and trample upon the liberties of the people, while the National Government could legally do nothing more than behold the encroachment with indignation and regret. A successful faction might erect a tyranny on the ruins of order and law, while no succor could be constitutionally afforded by the Union to the friends and supporters of the Government. But this is not all; the destruction of the National Government itself or of neighboring States might result from a successful rebellion in a single State.

It will thus be seen that this eminent jurist did not suggest that there was any fear on the part of the framers of the Constitution that there was danger to be apprehended from the people because of the exercise of those powers which were inherent in them as sovereigns, or that the exercise of legislative or other power by them would make their Government unrepublican in form. The reasons given by him for the enactment of the constitutional provision were based on the dangers to be apprehended from internal usurpation or external invasion—in other words, the establishment through these instrumentalities of a form of government inconsistent with those which were in force in the Colonies at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

This view is further strengthened by Judge Story in section 1815, where he says:

That the Federalist has spoken with so much force and propriety upon this subject that it supersedes all further reasoning—

and then quotes the letter of Mr. Madison to the people of New York, which is heretofore referred to at length. Adopting the reasoning of that letter as his own, he states, after quoting it at length:

It may not be amiss further to observe (in the language of another commentator) that every pretext for intermeddling with the domestic concerns of any State under color of protecting it against domestic violence is taken away by that part of the provision which renders an application from the legislature or executive authority of the State in danger necessary to be made to the General Government before this interference can be at all proper. On the other hand, this article becomes an immense acquisition of strength and additional force to the aid of any State government in case of an internal rebellion or insurrection against lawful authority.

Here again is the suggestion that Congress can not take the initiative, even in cases of domestic violence. The initiative

must be taken and the application made by the legislative or executive authority of the State.

Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, in his Constitutional History of the United States (Vol. I, p. 363), states:

> The object of this provision was to secure to the people of each State the power of governing their community through the action of a majority, according to the fundamental rules which they might prescribe for ascertaining the public will.

Nowhere have I been able to find a suggestion that this provision was intended to curb the people in the adoption of constitutions and in the enactment of laws, whether directly or indirectly, within the several States which might seem to them best to conserve and preserve their liberties and their rights. They have the undoubted right at any time to change their fundamental law to suit their own needs, so long as the form of government adopted by them is republican in form.

That distinguished Democrat and authority on constitutional law, John Randolph Tucker, in his work on the United States (Vol. II, sec. 311), says:

> The word "guarantee" does not mean "to form," "to establish," "to create"; it means "to warrant," "to secure," "to protect" the State—that is, the body politic—in its right to have a republican form of government. It defends the people against the interference of any foreign power or of any intestine conspiracy against its right as a body politic to establish for itself republican forms of government. To allow the guarantor to take the initiative and, under the pretext of its duty as guarantor, to impose a form of government upon the people of a State would make this clause, intended for protection, an excuse for destructive invasion. No occasion for the exercise of this important yet dangerous power has ever arisen except as the result of civil war.

The supreme court of Oklahoma, whose constitution is substantially the same as that of the proposed constitution of Arizona, in ex parte Wagner (21 Okla., 33), sustained the constitution of that State as not obnoxious to the Federal Constitution guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government.

Mr. Justice Wilson, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention and was later a member of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Chisholm *v.* Georgia (2 Dall., 419), speaking of what constituted a republican form of government, said:

> As a citizen I know the government of that State [Georgia] to be republican, and my short definition of such a government is one constructed on this principle, that the supreme power resides in the body of the people.

It should be remembered in connection with this decision that Mr. Justice Wilson was considered one of the ablest constitutional lawyers in the convention which framed the Constitution, and it was he who proposed the amendment to the resolution of Gov. Randolph which resulted in the unanimous adoption of the section of the Constitution as it now stands.

The Supreme Court of the United States, In re Duncan (139 U. S., 449), holds that the distinguishing feature of a republican form of government is the right of the people to choose officers for governmental administration and to pass their own laws; and in Miner *v.* Happersett (21 Wall., 162), in speaking of this provision of the Constitution, says:

> It is true that the United States guarantees to every State a republican form of government. * * * No particular government is designated as republican, neither is the exact form to be guaranteed in any manner especially designated. * * * The guaranty necessarily implies the duty on the part of the States themselves to supply such a government. All the States had governments when the Constitution was adopted. * * * These governments the Constitution did not change. They are accepted precisely as they were, and it is therefore to be presumed that they were such as it was the duty of the States to provide. Thus we have unmistakable evidence of what was republican in form within the meaning of that term as employed in the Constitution.

The supreme court of California, In re Pfahler (150 Cal., 171), where a similar attack was made upon the charter of the city of Los Angeles, held to substantially the same doctrine, overruling former decisions of the court which seemed to maintain a different view.

In Kadderly *v.* The City of Portland (44 Oreg., 118) the initiative and referendum amendment to the constitution of that State, which is on all fours with the constitution of Arizona, and which was attacked because it violated the provision of the Constitution now under consideration, Mr. Justice Bean, a judge of distinguished ability, who was subsequently appointed one of the United States circuit judges, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

> Nor do we think the amendment void because in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, Article IV, section 4, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government. The purpose of this provision of the Constitution is to protect the people of the several States against aristocratic and monarchical invasions and against insurrections and domestic violence and to prevent them from abolishing a republican form of government. (Cooley, Const. Lim., 7 ed., 45; 2 Story, Const., 5 ed., sec. 1815.) But it does not forbid them from amending or changing their constitution in any way they may see fit, so long as none of these results is accomplished. No particular style of government is designated in the Constitution as republican, nor is its exact form in any way prescribed. A republican form of government is a government administered by representatives chosen or appointed by the people or by their authority. Mr. Madison says it is "a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior." (The Federalist, 302.) And in discussing the section of the Constitution of the United States now under consideration he says: "But the authority extends no further than a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a preexisting government of the form which is to be guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican forms, they have a right to do so, and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is that they shall not exchange republican for antirepublican constitutions." (The Federalist, 342.) Now, the initiative and referendum amendment does not abolish or destroy the republican form of government or substitute another in its place. The representative character of the government still remains. The people have simply reserved to themselves a larger share of legislative power, but they have not overthrown the republican form of the government or substituted another in its place. The government is still divided into the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, the duties of which are discharged by representatives selected by the people.
>
> 8. Under this amendment, it is true, the people may exercise a legislative power, and may, in effect, veto or defeat bills passed and approved by the legislature and the governor; but the legislative and executive departments are not destroyed, nor are their powers or authority materially curtailed. Laws proposed and enacted by the people under the initiative clause of the amendment are subject to the same constitutional limitations as other statutes, and may be amended or repealed by the legislature at will.

In the case of Kiernan *v.* City of Portland (111 Pac. Rep., 379) the same court, speaking through Judge King, again upheld the Oregon system of direct legislation as not obnoxious to the Constitution of the United States, and, amongst other things, say:

> It is difficult to conceive of any system of lawmaking coming nearer to the great body of the people of the entire State, or by those comprising the various municipalities, than that now in use here, and being so we are at a loss to understand how the adoption and use of this system can be held a departure from a republican form of government. It was to escape the oppression resulting from governments controlled by the select few, so often ruling under the assumption that "might makes right," that gave birth to republics. Monarchical rulers refuse to recognize their accountability to the people governed by them. In a republic the converse is the rule; the tenure of office may be for a short or a long period, or even for life, yet those in office are at all times answerable, either directly or indirectly, to the people, and in proportion to their responsibility to those for whom they may be the public agents, and the nearer the power to enact laws and control public servants lies with the great body of the people, the more nearly does a government take unto itself the form of a republic—not in name alone, but in fact. From this it follows that each republic may differ in its political system, or in the political machinery by which it moves, but so long as the ultimate control of its officials and affairs of state remains in its citizens it will, in the eye of all republics, be recognized as a government of that class. Of this we have many examples in Central and South America.
>
> It becomes, then, a matter of degree, and the fear manifested by the briefs filed in this case would seem to indicate, not that we are drifting from the secure moorings of a republic, but that our State, by the direct system of legislation complained of, is becoming too democratic, advancing too rapidly toward a republic pure in form. This, it is true, counsel for petitioner does not concede, but under any interpretation of which the term is capable, or from any view thus far found expressed in the writings of the prominent statesmen who were members of the Constitutional Convention, or who figured in the early upbuilding of the Nation, it follows that the system here assailed brings us nearer to a State republican in form than before its adoption.

In the case of Hopkins *v.* The City of Duluth (81 Minn., 189) the charter of Duluth had been submitted to the direct vote of the citizens and adopted. It was subsequently assailed because it was violative of section 4 of Article IV of the Federal Constitution. This contention was not sustained, and the court held:

> The provision referred to provides that "the United States shall guarantee to every State a republican form of government and protect them from invasion," etc. The purpose of this guaranty was to protect a union founded upon republican principles against aristocratic and monarchical invasions. * * * It will be admitted, however, that this State can not supplant its republican form of government by "aristocratic and monarchical invasions" upon principles inherent in the nature of a government, but it may change its constitution in any way consistent with its own fundamental law; and we are unable to see the force of the suggestion that the amendment of 1898 is not republican in form as well as in spirit. It is true that, by the submission of charters and amendments to municipalities in the manner provided for by the amendment, a change is effected, but it is a change that by every historical sanction from the earliest times is republican in form and essence. The Federal as well as the State government is representative in character, and the people do not directly vote upon the adoption of the laws by which they are governed. Yet it can not be said that, if they were able to do so, a provision to effectuate that purpose would not be republican. * * * The test of republican or democratic government is the will of the people, expressed in majorities, under the proper forms of law. Every proposal for a change of government must of necessity be submitted, either directly or indirectly, through a designated origin, whether it be upon the motion of one or of more persons, upon the instance of an individual citizen or a number; but so long as the ultimatum of decision is left to the will of the people at the ballot box it is essentially republican, and the theoretical distinction urged by the learned counsel for the contestee practically amounts to no more than the argument that the change provided for is new and radical. It may turn out that the amendment is beneficial or otherwise, yet its tendencies are clearly republican, and must be upheld by this court.

The coordinate branches of the National Government—the executive, legislative, and judicial—as well as those of the State governments, have recognized that the government proposed to be established under the Arizona constitution is republican in form. The Arizona constitution is almost in ipsis verbis of the constitutions of Oregon, Montana, South Dakota, and Oklahoma, in each of which the popular initiative and the optional referendum, and in some of them the recall, make more effective the voice of the people and operate as checks and balances against legislative malfeasance, corruption, and misrule.

Oklahoma was admitted to the Union with these provisions in the constitution, and Congress recognized that it was republican in form by admitting it to the Union, and the President by proclamation, carrying out the resolution of Congress in that behalf, declared that the constitution of Oklahoma was republican in form.

And again, after the adoption by the people of Oregon, Montana, and South Dakota of amendments to their constitutions putting into effect the provisions which it is claimed are obnoxious to the Federal Constitution, the Senators and the Representatives from these States, as well as from Oklahoma, have been admitted to their seats without question; and this constituted a recognition by Congress that these States had republican forms of government.

Sutherland, in the work referred to, restates, at page 604, a well-established rule on this subject when he says that:

> Recognition of a State government, as well as its republican character, is necessarily implied from the admission of its Senators and Representatives to seats in Congress, citing United States *v.* Rhodes (47 Fed. Cases, 16151), White *v.* Hart (13 Wall., 646), Luther *v.* Borden (7 How., 1) as authority for the doctrine enunciated in the text.

Legislative and executive interpretations are entitled to great weight, under well-established rules of law, in construing statutes and constitutions.

I maintain that the standard by which the Congress is to determine whether or not the constitution presented by a people asking admission as a State is that the constitution shall conform in its essential details to the governments that were in existence at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and, applying that as the rule and guide of action, the constitution presented by the people of Arizona is republican in form because it is conformable in all essential details to the forms of government and methods of administration in many, at least, of the Colonies at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

If a higher duty than this devolves upon the Congress of the United States, where is that duty to begin and end? If they have power to take the initiative and, taking the constitution of Arizona by its four corners, modeled as it has been after the constitutions which are in force in older States, say that it is not republican in form, can the Congress then go further and demand that those States which have constitutions amended and are now exact counterparts of the Arizona constitution shall amend these constitutions again, shall undo the work of the constitutional conventions, shall nullify laws that have been enacted by legislature and people, because the Congress of the United States is of the opinion that these particular constitutions are not republican in form?

How is the Congress to exercise this power of nullifying the constitutions of these States? Where is the modus operandi pointed out in the Constitution? Is it to be done by an act of Congress, or is it to be done by the declaration of war against a State that refuses to nullify its constitution and to adopt one that may be consonant with the views of Congress as to what, in its opinion, constitutes a republican form of government? The suggestion of the proposition carries its own refutation, and Congress has no such power.

If Congress determines that the constitution adopted by the people of Arizona is not republican in form because of the provisions in regard to the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, what does Congress intend to do with reference to South Dakota, Oregon, Montana, Arkansas, and a number of the older States which have amended their constitutions in these respects since their admission to the Union; and what is it to do with reference to Oklahoma, whose constitution has met the approval of Congress, of the President, and the court of last resort in that State?

Having discussed the intent of the framers of the Constitution with reference to section 4 of Article IV of the Constitution in the light of contemporaneous discussion and subsequent executive, legislative, and judicial interpretation, I desire to show that there is nothing new in the initiative, the referendum, and the recall to which objection is now made, and in the discussion of this question I do not deem it necessary to trace the genesis of either or to show the method of their development and application in any of the Old World governments. I shall confine myself to our own country, where abundant warrant can be found to sustain the position that the doctrine embodied in the Arizona constitution is not a new one.

And, first, as to the initiative. It will be observed that no attempt is made to abolish the Legislature of Arizona under the provisions of the Constitution; it is left intact, with all the powers that are usually given to the legislative body under the provisions of the constitutions of the other States of the Union. To that extent, therefore, the government sought to be established, in so far as the legislature is concerned, is distinctly representative in form, but the people reserve to themselves two distinct powers and point out the mode and manner of the exercise thereof, one of which it might truthfully be said is for the correction of sins of omission and the other for the correction of those of commission, namely: First, they reserve to themselves the power to initiate laws and, concurrently with the legislature, to enact or reject by their vote such laws as may be so proposed; second, they reserve to themselves the power, at their option and upon proper steps being first taken, to have referred to them for approval or rejection any law or laws passed by the legislature. The system proposed by the Arizona constitution, and which, as I have stated, is modeled after the amended constitutions of Oregon and other of the older States, is not unlike the system of government that was in vogue in New England at and prior to the time of the adoption of the Constitution. There the people legislated directly upon local affairs, whilst in State affairs legislation was through a legislative assembly directly elected, each member of which was under instructions given by his constituents at special town meetings, which could be at any time called by the selectmen or any 10 citizens. In other of the Colonies legislation was had by the legislative assembly and by county governments, and in both cases the members were instructed at county conferences or mass meetings of the citizens.

I have already referred to and quoted from the bills of rights and constitutions of a number of the States antedating the adoption of the Constitution to show that sovereignty resided in the people, and that this fact was of necessity in the minds of those who subscribed to the Declaration of Independence when they declared—

> that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed—

as well as in the minds of those who framed the Federal Constitution. These constitutions, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, recognize to the fullest extent the right of the people to govern themselves.

The power of the people under the initiative system takes the place of the power exercised by the colonists in New England of legislating directly and of instructing their delegates to the legislature—a power which, though exercised in the earlier days of the Republic, has been gradually abandoned under the party system. It is but a revival of that system, and in many States has become a part of the written constitutions.

The time was when the citizen instructed the delegates to the legislative bodies and the officers who were to administer the laws, but under the party and convention system there has been an abandonment of this salutary rule, and instead of the people instructing their delegates and the officers who are to administer the law these instructions come now from the political machine and corrupt party boss. There has been a complete reversal of the forms of government in vogue in the earlier days of the Republic, and it is because of this that it has been found necessary for the people to resume, or rather to reassert in a written constitution, a right and power which in days gone by they were wont to exercise, but which they have unconsciously and gradually ceased to use. This power is now to be exercised again under the initiative system, and where the representatives in the legislative assemblies ignore the will of the people and listen, rather, to those who in many cases have become the representatives of a corrupt party system, and of those who are wont to clamor at the legislative halls for legislation in behalf of special interests, the people themselves can, upon their own initiative, enact laws in the interest of the whole people and can, under the power reserved to them through the referendum, defeat legislation which is hostile to the public interest.

Nor must it be forgotten that laws enacted by the people are subject in the final analysis to legislative control, because, as was held in the case of Kadderly *v.* The City of Portland (to which I have heretofore referred), the legislature has power to amend and to repeal any law enacted under the initiative system.

Further than that, it would be within the power of the legislature under the Arizona system, as it has been held to be

within the power of the legislature and the executive under the Oregon constitution, to defeat a referendum upon a law passed by the legislature by the declaration of an emergency in the statute that the public peace, health, and safety demanded that it should go into effect at once. Such an emergency declared to an act passed by the legislature, when not vetoed by the executive, is beyond the reach of the people under the referendum system. The legislature is the sole judge as to whether or not an emergency shall be declared, and though there is some conflict of opinion the weight of authority is that the courts of the country can not interfere with that legislative right; so that in the final analysis the power reserved to the people under the initiative system and under the power of the referendum is but a method of expressing the will of the people, a method of instructing their representatives to the legislature, and a method of showing disapproval of their conduct in the enactment of laws which have not for their purpose the common good. No more perfect system of checks against the improvident or improper use of power, whether by the legislature or the people, was ever devised than the system now under discussion.

The system of government therefore proposed under this constitution is a mixed government, a representative government in combination with direct legislation, and it is none the less a republican form of government, because there is perfect cooperation between the legislative or representative body and the people acting directly.

Irrespective of the particular language used in the Arizona constitution reserving to the people the power of directly enacting laws and of taking a referendum on legislation passed by the legislature, both of these powers have been from time immemorial exercised by the people of the older States. Most, if not all, of the new States admitted to the Union have by direct vote of the people adopted their constitutions, whether acting pursuant to enabling acts which expressly directed this to be done or upon their own initiative. These constitutions are sometimes more than mere fundamentals of government. Many of them contain express provisions which are self-acting and need no further legislation to put them into effect. The adoption of these constitutions by direct vote of the people, containing, as many of them do, provisions regulating the duties of the citizen and the rights of property, are just as much direct legislation as if they had been enacted under just such limitations and restrictions as are contained in the constitution of Arizona. No suggestion has ever been made at any time that because these fundamental laws have been enacted by a direct vote of the people that they are therefore unrepublican and ought not to be admitted to the Union. There can be no distinction between such legislation and legislation which might hereafter be enacted by the people under the provisions of the Arizona constitution, and which has heretofore been enacted by the people under the constitutions of Oregon and Oklahoma.

Let us look at some of the constitutions which have contained general legislation and which the courts have sustained as sufficient without additional legislation to make them effective.

Section 4 of Article XVI of the constitution of Pennsylvania adopted in 1873 provides as to how the shareholders may vote in the election of directors of a corporation.

Section 5 provides that all incorporations must have known place of business and an agent.

Section 7 provides that corporations shall not issue stock or bonds except under certain limitations, and that all fictitious increase of stock shall be void.

Article XVII regulates railroads and canals and provides among other things for the right of railroads to construct railroads across the State, and the right of one railroad to connect with or cross another railroad, and the duty of the railroad to receive passengers from other railroads. Also, that every railroad or canal corporation shall maintain an office where transfer of its stock shall be made, and its books shall be kept for inspection by stockholders and creditors, and so forth.

Section 8 of this article provides that there shall be no free passes issued except to officers and employees of the company. And there are many other similar provisions.

Now, note that. It is just as much direct legislation as if it had been enacted by a legislature or if it had been enacted by the people under the initiative system of legislation. It is just as complete and as active.

The constitution of New Jersey, 1844, Article I, section 5, provides:

> In all prosecutions or indictments for libel the truth may be given in evidence to the jury. And if it shall appear to the jury that the matter charged as libelous is true and was published with good motives and justifiable ends, the party shall be acquitted.

And the same provision is contained in many other constitutions.

Article XIII of the constitution of Illinois adopted in 1870 regulates warehouses. Among other provisions, section 4 is as follows:

> All railroad companies and other common carriers on railroads shall weigh and measure grain at points where it is shipped and receipt for the full amount, and shall be responsible for the delivery of such amount to the owner or the consignee thereof at the place of destination.

Section 6 of Article XI provides:

> That every stockholder in a railroad corporation or institution shall be individually responsible and liable to its creditors over and above the amount of stock by him or her held to an amount equal to his or her respective shares so held.

Substantially the same provision is contained in the constitutions of Iowa, Indiana, Washington, and other States.

Section 2 of Article XV of the constitution of Kansas adopted in 1855 prohibited lotteries in that State. Many other States have the same provision.

Section 6 of Article XV of the constitution of Kansas adopted in 1857 provides that—

> All property, both real and personal, of the wife owned or claimed by marriage and that acquired afterwards by gift, devise, or consent, shall be her separate property.

Section 9 of Article XV of the constitution of Kansas, 1859, provides:

> A homestead to the extent of 160 acres of farming land or of 1 acre within the limits of an incorporated town or city, occupied as a residence by the family of the owner, shall be exempt from officer's sale under any process of law, etc.

Similar provisions exist in many other States.

The constitution of Washington regulates corporations in great detail. Section 191 prohibits pooling; section 193 prohibits the consolidation of railroads; section 194, that railroad stock shall be considered personalty; section 197 prohibits passes; section 198 provides for the rights of express companies on railroads; and so forth.

Section 3 of Article IX of the constitution of Wyoming provides:

> No boy under the age of 14 years and no woman or girl of any age shall be permitted to be in or about any dangerous mine, etc.

Section 4 of Article IX provides for the liability for violation of the preceding section; and section 6 of Article X provides that no corporation shall have power to engage in more than one general line of business; Article X also regulates railroads and telegraph lines in detail; section 12 of Article XV provides for an exemption from taxation of churches, public cemeteries, and so forth; section 1 of Article XIX provides that eight hours shall constitute a lawful day's work in all lines. That article also provides that certain contracts with laborers shall be unlawful.

I have shown that legislation by direct vote of the people has been expressly authorized by and enacted in the constitutions of a number of the States and the power recognized by Congress. I shall now undertake to show that the power reserved under the referendum clause of the Arizona constitution has been reserved by the constitution of nearly every State in the Union, has been recognized by Congress as a valid reservation of power, and has been exercised as well by Congress itself. It has been exercised by the States under constitutional authority in matters affecting localities in the States, as well as in matters affecting the whole State.

And, first, as to those affecting the States at large. One of the earliest constitutional provisions for a referendum is to be found in Article I, section 23, of the constitution of Georgia (1798), which is as follows:

> And this convention doth further declare and assert that all the territory within the present temporary line, and within the limits aforesaid, is now, of right, the property of the free citizens of the State and held by them in sovereignty inalienable, but by their consent.

At the time of the adoption of the New York constitution in 1846 the question of extending the right of suffrage to the negroes was referred to the people, and a like provision was made in the Michigan constitution in 1850. The constitutions of Wisconsin (1848), Kansas (1858), Colorado (1876), South Dakota (1889), Washington (1889), and North Dakota (1895) contain provisions for a referendum of questions affecting suffrage, leaving it absolutely and entirely to a vote of the majority of the people as to whether these provisions should be operative or not. The constitution of Rhode Island (1842) provides that the general assembly shall have no power without the express consent of the people to incur debts in excess of $50,000, nor shall they in any case without such consent pledge the faith of the State for the payment of the obligations of others.

The constitutions of Michigan (1843), New Jersey (1844), New York and Iowa (1846), Illinois (1848), California (1849), Kentucky (1850), Kansas (1859), Nebraska (1866), Missouri (1875), Colorado (1876), Louisiana (1879), Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Wyoming (1889), and South Carolina (1895) have adopted measures providing for a referendum involving the creation of debts on behalf of these States or the pledging of the credit thereof. The State of Texas, in its constitution of 1845, provided for the permanent establishment of the seat of government by vote of the people at an election the time, place, and conduct of which was fixed by the constitution. Numerous States followed the example set by Texas and adopted substantially the same provision with reference to the location of the State capital.

Following the same course, the State of Iowa, in its constitution of 1846, provided that no act of the general assembly authorizing or creating corporations or associations with banking powers should take effect or be in force until submitted to the people at a general or special election and by a majority of them approved. Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Kansas, and Missouri followed with constitutional provisions of substantially the same character.

Innumerable instances might be cited showing that legislation with reference to the sale of school lands, that relating to State aid to railways, to taxation, the location of State universities, the extension of suffrage, and appropriations for State purposes was required by constitutional provision to be submitted to the voters of the State for approval or rejection.

The second class of constitutional provisions providing for a referendum are those which affect local governments, and within this class come a great variety of subjects. The first provision of this kind is to be found in the constitution of Tennessee of 1834, where the people reserved to themselves the right to cooperate in acts of government involving the change of county lines. Section 4 of Article X provided that—

> No part of the county shall be taken to form a new county or a part thereof without the consent of a majority of the qualified voters in such part taken off.

Practically the same provision has been embodied in later constitutions of many of the States, some requiring a majority of the electors and some two-thirds as a condition to changing county lines.

Section 5 of Article VIII of the Maryland constitution of 1864 provided that—

> The general assembly shall levy at each regular session after the adoption of the constitution an annual tax of not less than 10 cents on each $100 of taxable property throughout the State for the purpose of free schools: *Provided*, That the general assembly shall not levy any additional school tax upon particular counties unless such county express by popular vote its desire for such tax.

This provision is not only a provision of initiative legislation on the one part, but contains in the very section a provision for the referendum of the act to the people of the county.

Other States followed with constitutional provisions requiring a referendum on laws increasing the rate of taxation for school purposes. Amongst these were Missouri (1875), Texas (1876), and Florida (1885). Those providing for a referendum to authorize an increased tax rate in counties were Texas (1868), Illinois (1870), Nebraska (1875), West Virginia (1872), Missouri (1875), and Louisiana (1879). The provision in the Missouri constitution specifically fixes the rate which may be imposed upon the people, which can not be increased without the assent of the people, and inasmuch as it is an example of direct legislation, self-executing, as well as an example of the application of the referendum principle, I quote it at length. It is as follows:

> Taxes for county, city, town, and school purposes may be levied on all subjects and objects of taxation, but the valuation of property therefor shall not exceed the valuation of the same property in such town, city, or school district for State and county purposes. For county purposes the annual rate on property in counties having $6,000,000 or less shall not, in the aggregate, exceed 50 cents on the $100 valuation; in counties having $6,000,000 and under $10,000,000 said rate shall not exceed 40 cents on the $100 valuation; in counties having $10,000,000 and under $30,000,000 said rate shall not exceed 50 cents on the $100 valuation; and in counties having $30,000,000 or more said rate shall not exceed 35 cents on the $100 valuation. For city and town purposes the annual rate on the property in cities and towns having 30,000 inhabitants or more shall not, in the aggregate, exceed 100 cents on the $100 valuation; in cities and towns having less than 30,000 and over 10,000 inhabitants said rate shall not exceed 60 cents on the $100 valuation; in cities and towns having less than 10,000 and more than 1,000 inhabitants said rate shall not exceed 50 cents on the $100 valuation; and in towns having 1,000 inhabitants or less said rate shall not exceed 25 cents on the $100 valuation. For school purposes in districts the annual rate on property shall not exceed 40 cents on the $100 valuation: *Provided*, The aforesaid annual rates for school purposes may be increased in districts formed of cities and towns to an amount not to exceed $1 on the $100 valuation; and in other districts to an amount not to exceed 65 cents on the $100 valuation, on the condition that a majority of the voters who are taxpayers, voting at an election to decide the question, vote for said increase. For the purpose of erecting public buildings in counties, cities, or school districts, the rates of taxation herein limited may be increased when the rate of such an increase and the purpose for which it is intended shall have been submitted to a vote of the people, and two-thirds of the qualified voters of such county, city, or school district voting at such election shall vote therefor. The rate herein allowed to each county shall be ascertained by the amount of taxable property therein, according to the last assessment for State and county purposes, and the rate allowed to each city and town by the number of inhabitants according to the last census taken under the authority of the State or the United States; said restrictions as to rates shall apply to taxes of every kind and description, whether general or special, except taxes to pay valid indebtedness now existing or bonds which may be issued in renewal of such indebtedness.

Provisions are also to be found in the constitutions of many of the States subjecting to a referendum local matters with regard to creating municipal indebtedness and the issuance of bonds, the acquiring of waterworks and plants for light, changing lines of judicial districts, the formation of new courts, and other questions of a purely local character; but I do not deem it necessary to quote at length from the constitutions embodying these provisions, satisfying myself with a mere reference thereto.

The provisions of the first class have generally been sustained by the courts, with some difference of judicial opinion as to the latter class of cases; but the conflict of judicial decision, it will be found, usually precedes the written constitutions authorizing the referendum, and out of this conflict, it will be found, has grown the written constitution authorizing the referendum on matters affecting localities in the several States. The people have been driven to these constitutional restrictions to place a check upon legislative extravagance and the abuse of trust by the agents of government. It has been found necessary to protect the people through these instrumentalities, both from oppression and from uncertainty of judicial interpretation.

Other instances might be cited to show that affirmative legislation is contained in the fundamental laws of the States which have been enacted directly by the people. What difference can it make how the initial steps have been taken, whether pursuant to an enabling act which authorizes the people to formulate and directly vote upon a constitution, or whether without such enabling act, as has been done by Oregon and some other States of the Union on their own initiative, or by a certain percentage of the voters of a State, as authorized to be done under the Arizona constitution? Can it be said that in the latter case the constitution, which expressly authorizes it, makes the government of the State unrepublican, and in the former cases, where exactly the same results are obtained, the government of the States is republican? For Congress now to hold that the inclusion of the initiative and referendum in the fundamental law of Arizona would give to that State a form of government that was not republican in character, would of necessity revise the whole policy of the Government. Congress itself, by act of July 9, 1846, which had for its purpose the recession of a part of the District of Columbia to the State of Virginia, submitted to the qualified electors of the District the question of recession, provided the machinery for the election, and enacted that if a majority should be against accepting the provisions of the act it should be void and of no effect, otherwise it should be in full force.

The objection most seriously urged against the Arizona constitution is the provision which it contains with reference to the recall of public officers. There is no limitation as to the class of officers to whom it shall apply. It is general in its terms and is intended to reach those holding office, whether by election or appointment. The provision is not essentially different from that embodied in the constitutions of Oregon and Oklahoma, and possibly other States, as well as in the charters of many of the larger cities of the country.

The objection most frequently made to the Arizona constitution is the application of the recall to the judiciary. The question involved is not one of individual opinion but one of principle, and that is, whether the people of Arizona or the majority of them have the right, if they see fit, in their wisdom, to make the recall applicable to the judiciary as well as to other public servants. The argument usually urged against the application of the recall to the judiciary is that it tends to destroy its independence. To make this insistence impeaches the intelligence and integrity of the people of a State, and it assumes that for slight and trivial reasons, based upon the determination of an issue between individuals, or between an individual and the Commonwealth or between the Commonwealth and a nation, the machinery of the recall might be set in motion to punish a court with whom the majority of the people might disagree. That may be possible, but it is not at all probable; for, although the recall has been in operation for a number of years under charter and constitutional provisions like the Arizona constitution, it has only been used twice—once in the city of Los Angeles, Cal., and once in the city of Seattle, Wash. (I have just learned that it has been used in Texas on one occasion.) It is generally

admitted by friends, as well as opponents of the measure, that there was justification for the recall in both instances, in one, at least, of which a servant and agent of the people, occupying the highest position in their gift, had entered into combination with gamblers and thugs and the denizens of the red-light district to levy graft and defeat the will of the people to purposes of piracy and plunder.

But as an abstract proposition, why should a judicial officer any more than any other public official be independent of the wishes of his constituents? It is not a democratic conception of republican government that places the representative in a position which will make him indifferent to the wishes of his constituents. Such a conception is aristocratic; it is monarchical; it is autocratic. The democratic conception, on the contrary, is that the people will think for themselves and that the agent or servant of the people, in whatever position he serves, is but the reflection of the popular will. As an abstract proposition, therefore, there is no reason why the judicial officer, as well as every officer of the Government, should not be responsive to the will of those whose servant he is. But the idea of the recall as applied to the judiciary, as well as to other agents, representatives, and servants of the people, is older than the Constitution itself. The principle has been recognized in every department of Government, and more particularly is this true with reference to the judiciary.

Section 33 of the bill of rights of Maryland, of 1776, provides:

That the independency and uprightness of judges are essential to the impartial administration of justice and a great security to the rights and liberties of the people; whereas the chancellor and judges ought to hold commissions during good behavior; and the said chancellor and judges shall be removed for misbehavior on conviction in a court of law, and may be removed by the governor upon the address of the general assembly: *Provided*, That two-thirds of all the members of each house concur in such address.

Absolutely leaving to the legislative body the power, upon the address of two-thirds of its membership, to remove the judge, even without a hearing; and there it was assumed that this was for the purpose of maintaining the independence of the judiciary rather than of affecting and destroying it.

This provision is reenacted in the constitution of 1851 (Art. IV, sec. 4) and in the constitution of 1864 (Art. IV, sec. 4) and again in the constitution of 1867 (Art. IV, sec. 4), and is at this time a part of the fundamental law of that State.

It has not had the effect to destroy the independency of the judiciary of that magnificent Commonwealth.

This observation may be made—and it is applicable to the constitutions of other States to which I shall call attention—that the recall of judges, in addition to the provision for removal on the ground of incompetency, of willful neglect of duty, of misbehavior in office, or any other crime, or on impeachment, is a general power and is left to the discretion of the general assembly. Sometimes a two-thirds vote is necessary and in other cases only a majority. The bill of rights of Maryland states the reasons for the vesting of this great discretionary power in the legislative assembly. It is because it was deemed necessary to maintain the independency and the uprightness of judges rather than to destroy their independency and responsibility for their acts.

The constitution of Georgia of 1798 (Art. III, sec. 1) provides that—

The judges of the superior court shall be elected for the term of three years, removable by the governor on the address of two-thirds of both houses for that purpose, or by impeachment and conviction thereon.

The same provision is to be found in the amendment to the constitution ratified in 1812, and again in the amendment ratified in 1818, and again in 1835 and in 1865.

No one has ever heard the integrity of the judicial system called in question in that State.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] to the constitution of Virginia, with which I know he is familiar.

The constitution of Virginia of 1830 (Art. V, sec. 6) contains the same provision. It was reenacted in the constitution of 1850 (Art. VII, sec. 17) and in 1864 (Art. VI, sec. 16) and in 1870 (Art. VI, sec. 23) and in 1902 (Art. VI, sec. 104). The power of removal for cause is vested in a majority of the members of the legislature. This provision is now a part of the fundamental law of Virginia.

The constitution of Texas of 1845 provides for the appointment of judges by the governor, by and with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the senate, and Article IV, section 8, provides:

The judges of the supreme and district courts shall be removed by the governor, on the address of two-thirds of each house of the legislature, for willful neglect of duty or other reasonable cause—

Absolutely vesting in the legislature the power of determining whether or not a cause exists—

which shall not be sufficient ground for impeachment: *Provided, however*, That the cause or causes for which such removal shall be required shall be stated at length in such address and entered on the journals of each house: *And provided further*, That the cause or causes shall be notified to the judge so intended to be removed; and he shall be admitted to a hearing in his own defense before any vote for such address shall pass; and in all such cases the vote shall be taken by yeas and nays and entered on the journals of each house, respectively.

It will be observed that the legislature is vested with the power, by a two-thirds vote, of compelling the governor to remove a judge for willful neglect of duty or other reasonable cause which shall not be sufficient ground for impeachment. This vests a most extraordinary power in a legislative body. Has its tendency been to compel the judiciary of that Commonwealth to decide controversies between citizens to suit the whims of the legislative assembly or to destroy the independence of the judiciary?

The same provision is to be found in the constitution of 1868 (Art. V, sec. 10) and in that of 1876 (Art. XV, sec. 8), and is now a part of the fundamental law of Texas.

The constitutions of Delaware, Connecticut, and other States have substantially the same provisions, but reference to a few only is sufficient to establish the principle for which I contend—that the power of recall with reference to the judiciary is not a new thing in the constitutional history of the country, and differs only in the Arizona constitution from the constitutions of other States in that there is a transference of the power of recall from the legislature to the people. The principle is the same. If the transference of this power to the people tends to destroy the independence of the judiciary may it not also be claimed that the power to exercise it in the case of the legislature tends to destroy that independence? Recent developments tend to show that some legislative bodies at least are influenced by the corruptest motives, and if they may be corrupted to secure the enactment or defeat of laws, or to secure the election or defeat of Senators, may they not be influenced by the same corrupt instrumentalities to unseat the judges? It is safe to say that the tenure of a judge, whether appointive or elective, is more secure in the hands of the people than in the average legislature of to-day.

But the recall has been applied from the earliest days of the Republic to other officers than judicial. In the summer of 1783—I call the attention of my Democratic friends to this—it was expected that the Assembly of Virginia would call a convention for the establishment of a constitution. Jefferson prepared a draft of one, with the design that it should be proposed in such convention. This draft, among other things, provided that—

The Delegates to Congress shall be appointed by joint ballot of both houses of the assembly for a term not exceeding one year, subject to being recalled within the term by joint vote of both said houses. (Jefferson's Notes on Virginia.)

It is probable that this suggestion of Jefferson had its birth in Article VIII of the bill of rights of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of 1780, which provides:

In order to prevent those who are vested with authority from becoming oppressors, the people have a right, at such periods and in such manner as they shall establish by their frame of government, to cause their public officers to return to private life, and to fill up vacant places by certain and regular elections and appointments.

This declaration contained in the bill of rights of Massachusetts finds expression in Chapter IV of the constitution of 1780 of that Commonwealth, which provides for the election of Delegates to the Congress of the United States who "may be recalled at any time within the year and others chosen and commissioned" in their stead.

The constitution of New Hampshire of 1784 provides for the election of Delegates to the Congress, and states that they—

may be recalled at any time within the year and others chosen and commissioned in the same manner in their stead.

The Articles of Confederation of 1778 (Art. V) contain, among other things, this provision:

ART. V. For the more convenient management of the general interest of the United States, Delegates shall be annually appointed, in such manner as the legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its Delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead, for the remainder of the year.

So under the old Articles of Confederation that power was expressly reserved to each of the Colonies.

It may be argued that because this power was not reserved in the Federal Constitution that therefore the framers of that instrument thought it inadvisable to provide a method of recalling unfaithful or corrupt officials, but it must be remembered that the Constitution of the United States is but a grant of

power and reserves to the people of the several States those powers which are not expressly granted; and in this view the Constitution of the United States is but a recognition of the power of the people of the several States to exercise those powers and privileges which had been exercised prior to the adoption of the Constitution. The exercise of the power by the people of Arizona is one of the rights reserved to the people, and the fact that they have seen fit to embody it in a written constitution should have no controlling influence with the Congress of the United States on the question of the admission of Arizona to the Union.

Having attempted to show that the initiative, the referendum, and the recall are as old or older than the Constitution of the United States, occasionally finding expression in the written constitutions of the Colonies and of the States, and again without this express recognition in such constitutions, being nevertheless exercised as a part of the power expressly reserved to the people of the several States, it is proper to consider why it is that one after another of the States of the Union has expressly ingrafted all of these powers as a part of the more modern written constitutions.

The movement has grown out of the perversion of the party system of government exercised through the caucus and convention. It has become necessary because this system, which was unknown to the framers of the Constitution, has through the instrumentality of the convention tended to destroy the integrity of the representative system of government. Just as the Australian-ballot law, the direct-primary law, and the corrupt-practices act have been resorted to for the protection of elections against the control and manipulation of corrupt influences, so the people have found it necessary to create a system of checks and balances in the fundamental laws of the States to protect them against the acts of the corrupt or faithless public servant, whether in the legislative or judicial or executive branches of the Government.

As long as these representatives nominated under the convention system were faithful to their duties there was no demand for the exercise of the reserve powers which are now expressly sought to be exercised through the instrumentality of the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. With the growth of the party system, however, and the development of the convention system, which removed the representative and public servant too far from the people and almost entirely out of touch with them, recourse to restrictive and controlling methods became necessary. It must be remembered in this connection that in colonial times and in the earlier days of the Government inaugurated under the Constitution parties as well as conventions were practically unknown. The people acted directly in matters of selecting their representatives and instructed them as to their duties. These instructions were implicitly obeyed. Gradually, with the growth of parties, systems were evolved for suggesting candidates and formulating policies and platforms as well. Candidates for the Presidency were nominated in the congressional caucus by the Representatives in Congress of the different political parties, but this method soon subjected itself to the charge of usurping the functions of the people, who considered themselves, rightly, the source of all power. It was eventually abandoned, and the convention system took its place.

The first convention was that held in 1831 by the anti-Masonic Party, and this was later followed by the Democratic and Whig Parties. The convention of delegates, although not recognized by the Constitution of the United States or the laws of Congress or of the States, continued to grow in strength and influence, using its power with such insolence that in 1844 John C. Calhoun refused to suffer his name to go before a convention for the presidential nomination, publishing an address in which he said amongst other things:

> I hold it impossible to form a scheme more perfectly calculated to annihilate the control of the people over the presidential election and vest it in those who make politics a trade and who live and expect to live on the Government. (Benton's Thirty Years' View, Vol. II, p. 596.)

At the Democratic national convention of 1844, although a majority of the delegates were pledged to Van Buren, who had formerly been President, he failed of nomination by reason of violated pledges, and Polk was nominated. In speaking of the convention Senator Benton says:

> That convention is an era in our political history to be looked back upon as the starting point in a course of usurpation which has taken the choice of President out of the hands of the people and vested it in the hands of a self-constituted and irresponsible assemblage. The wrong to Mr. Van Buren was personal and temporary, and died with the occasion, and constitutes no part of the object in writing this chapter; the wrong to the people and the injury to republican institutions and to our form of government was deep and abiding, and calls for the grave and correctional judgment of history. It was the first instance in which a body of men, unknown to the laws and the Constitution, and many of them (as being Members of Congress or holding offices of honor or profit) constitutionally disqualified to serve even as electors, assumed to treat the American Presidency as their private property, to be disposed at their own will and pleasure, and, it may be added, for their own profit, for many of them demanded and received reward. It was the first instance of such a disposal of the Presidency—for these nominations are the election, so far as the party is concerned—but not the last. It has become the rule since, and has been improved upon. These assemblages now perpetuate themselves through a committee of their own, ramified into each State, sitting permanently from four years to four years, and working incessantly to govern the election that is to come, after having governed the one that is past. The man they choose must always be a character of no force, that they may rule him; and they rule always for their own advantage, "constituting a power behind the throne greater than the throne."

Commenting upon Calhoun's views of the convention, Mr. Benton remarks:

> Mr. Calhoun considered the convention system, degenerated to the point it was in 1844, to have been a hundred times more objectionable than the Congress caucuses, which had been repudiated by the people. Measured by the same scale, they are a thousand times worse at present (1853), having succeeded to every objection that was made against the Congress caucuses and superadded a multitude of others going directly to scandalous corruption, open intrigue, direct bargain and sale, and flagrant disregard of the popular will. (Thirty Years' View, Vol. II, p. 597.)

Mr. President, it has taken the people of this country more than 60 years to realize the truth of the statement contained by Calhoun in his address and by Benton in his work, but they have gradually come to an understanding of the matter, and that has given birth to this progressive movement.

We have, therefore, eminent and respectable authority for the statement that the convention system in the first half century of our history had degenerated into a machine which not only disregarded the rights of the people, but usurped the powers and functions which it was intended by the framers of the Constitution should be and remain a part of the reserved rights of the people of the several States. This system, instead of growing better, has gradually grown worse since the days of Calhoun and Benton. Through it the party machine and the corrupt political boss have practically obtained control of the instrumentalities of government, both National and State.

Men who have watched the political movements of the times know that the chairmen of the various political parties in the different States of the Union, directly or indirectly, name the delegates to the county conventions, to the State conventions, and sometimes under the direction of the national chairman the delegates to the national convention. Through the power thus exercised candidates for the legislature are named in the county conventions and candidates for the State offices in the State conventions, so that in the final analysis, although the people have been deluded into the belief that because they have assisted in the election of men nominated for office in the manner I have suggested they have had a voice in their affairs; they have practically had no voice, because they have had little to do with the selection of their candidates. It is well known that men are frequently nominated for the legislatures and for State offices as well under this system not so much because of their fitness to represent or to serve their several constituencies as because it was well understood that they would act as the faithful representatives of the particular interests that it was intended they should serve. It has not been found so extremely difficult in times past, by the corrupt and copious use of money, to control conventions and to secure the nomination of men who could be relied upon to carry out the dictates of an unscrupulous party machine dominated by a more unscrupulous party boss. The money to accomplish these purposes has been furnished not infrequently by public-service and other great financial interests, by corporations, and by men who were interested not in accomplishing the greatest good for the greatest number, but in securing valuable franchises and special privileges without compensation, or in preventing the passage of laws that would stay their hands in raids upon the public treasury.

The interests of the people of a State have too often been subordinated to the packing of a convention in the interest of a particular candidate for the Senate of the United States, and all the money that has been necessary to do this has been furnished sometimes by corporations and interests entirely outside of the particular States. This money has not been furnished from motives of disinterested patriotism or philanthropy, but rather to insure the election of men who could be relied upon to stand as the representatives not of the people, but of special interests and the beneficiaries of class legislation.

We have recently had before us here in the Senate a case where the "jack pot" played an important part in the election of a Member of this Chamber, and it seems that the end of this celebrated case has not yet been reached. Instance after instance might be cited to show that particular interests, directing the movements of a corrupt political leader, have sought to control legislative bodies for their own corrupt purposes.

This condition is an absolute perversion of the purposes of government as established by our fathers. In theory the people have had a representative form of government; in fact it has not been representative. The history of the development of the party system of government, the evolution of the convention, the boss, the corrupt machine, and the spoils system is impartially and truthfully recited in Bryce's American Commonwealth, and not a statement therein contained but finds verification in the political conditions of to-day in State and Nation. We may, if we will, vilify the muckraker and abuse the independent press of the country, but these instrumentalities for the dissemination of news and turning the limelight on the rascals in public life have driven the people to understand at last that some corrective method must be applied to bring back the Government to the people, who are, and of right ought to be, the source of all power. The masses move slowly toward the correction of abuses and the adoption of reforms, but when once they know that their rights are being invaded they can be absolutely and entirely relied upon to work such reforms as may be necessary to correct the evils of government.

The magazines and the press, while they may have occasionally exaggerated conditions, have nevertheless told much of truth in reference to the rottenness of our system of government under the domination of the corrupt political boss and machine, and the movement for reforms may be traced to the light that has been turned on our affairs through their instrumentality. It is because of these conditions to which attention was called by Benton and Calhoun, and later by Bryce and the press and the magazine writers of the country, that the people have determined to secure to themselves purity, honesty, and efficiency in the administration of affairs. It was these conditions, which can not truthfully be denied, that gave life and vitality to the initiative and to the referendum as instrumentalities for securing to the people legislation which their representatives neglected to give them and to check extravagance and corruption on the part of these same representatives in the enactment of laws which were opposed to the public welfare and in the interests of the privileged classes. It was this condition which determined the people to assert their right to recall the faithless public servant, and the three in combination are a perfect safeguard to the rights of the people and an absolute check upon maladministration of affairs. They are essential to the perpetuation of our institutions and the preservation of a republican form of government.

Mr. OWEN. I ask, for the purpose of illustrating and emphasizing the argument made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], that there be printed as a Senate document an argument on the initiative and referendum before the supreme court of Oregon, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the following matter be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. SMOOT. Would the Senator object to having it go to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. OWEN. I have no objection to its going to the Committee on Printing, but I think there should be no objection to the printing. It is an argument in support of this proposition; it is directly in point; and I should like to have it printed as a document so as to have the Senate informed with regard to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I would very much prefer to have it go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. OWEN. Very well; I will make no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I call up the motion I entered this morning to reconsider the action of the Senate in referring the joint resolution on the subject of the election of Senators by the people to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas moves to reconsider the action by which House joint resolution 39 was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator from Texas if he has any objection to letting the motion go over until the next meeting of the Senate.

Mr. CULBERSON. After a full consideration of the matter, I must insist upon action now on the motion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I stated this morning, I was absent, necessarily, at the time this matter arose in the first instance before the Senate, and I desire to say now briefly what I should have said then had I been present.

This joint resolution in the same form was before the Judiciary Committee during the last session of Congress, and was passed upon favorably by the committee and brought to the Senate, and with some modification voted upon. Some three or four resolutions covering the same subject matter have been introduced during this extraordinary session and have already gone to the Judiciary Committee, and I naturally assumed that the resolution coming here from the House would follow the course of the other resolutions and go to the Judiciary Committee

I think that this joint resolution ought to be referred to the Judiciary Committee for a number of very good reasons. The first and most important reason is that to my mind the joint resolution has fared much better before the Judiciary Committee than it has fared before other committees. I desire to be entirely frank in regard to the matter. I am exceedingly anxious that the joint resolution should come before the Senate at as early a day as is practicable or possible, as are all friends of the resolution; and we feel that it should take the course which it has heretofore taken with some degree of success of its being heard.

Of course I am not to be construed as personally criticizing the members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, but it is nevertheless a fact that that committee has had similar resolutions before it off and on for the last 20 years, and they have never reached the Senate so far as I have been able to determine as yet. I know the joint resolution will fare somewhat better if it is placed before the committee where it has already been passed upon favorably.

But there is a second reason which is a very good reason to my mind. There are questions involved in the joint resolution which are of considerable moment from a legal standpoint, and if the joint resolution should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections it would very likely at some time during the session be referred to the Judiciary Committee for action, because there are questions involved in the resolution which the Judiciary Committee naturally have jurisdiction to consider, and it would undoubtedly be thought proper for that committee to take charge of the resolution. I do not know of anything that is of special importance in regard to the resolution that the Committee on Privileges and Elections would be peculiarly equipped to pass upon, but there are matters involved in the resolution upon which the Judiciary Committee, in the discharge of its proper functions and the exercise of its proper jurisdiction, ought to consider.

I hope, Mr. President, that this joint resolution will finally find its place before the committee where the other resolutions which have been introduced have gone, where this resolution in the same form at one time rested, and from which it came, the committee which really exercises a jurisdiction that ought to be exercised in this particular instance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider the action of the Senate referring the joint resolution to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the title of the joint resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title will be read.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. GALLINGER. I object to a second reading of the joint resolution to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes over under the rule.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 20, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 17, 1911.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Herbert L. Faulkner, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for the district of Alaska, division No. 1, vice Daniel A. Sutherland, removed. (Mr. Faulkner is now serving under appointment by the court.)

Edward S. Schmidt, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the district of Indiana, vice Henry C. Pettit, whose term has expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Robert C. Lee, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi. (A reappointment, his term having expired January 19, 1910.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Kensey J. Hampton, quartermaster, to be quartermaster with the rank of major from March 3, 1911, to fill an original vacancy.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Colden L'H. Ruggles, Ordnance Department, to be lieutenant colonel from April 13, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Frank E. Hobbs, who died April 12, 1911.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Hornsby Evans, Nineteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 2, 1911, vice First Lieut. Kaolin L. Whitson, Ninth Infantry, who died March 1, 1911.

PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

First Lieut. William H. Armstrong, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, to be captain from March 31, 1911, vice Capt. Emil J. Huebscher, retired from active service March 30, 1911.

Second Lieut. Daniel Rodriguez, Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 31, 1911, vice First Lieut. William H. Armstrong, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 12, 1911.

Joseph Cushman Breitling, of Vermont.
Charles Frye Sanborn, of Illinois.
Walter Franz von Zelinski, of Illinois.
William Holland Wilmer, of the District of Columbia.

To be first lieutenant with rank from February 16, 1911.

John Edwin Rhodes, of Illinois.

NOTE.—The above-named person was nominated to the Senate on February 21, 1911, under the name of John Edwin Rhoades, for appointment to the designated office, and his nomination was confirmed March 2, 1911.

This message is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the name of the nominee.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill vacancies:

Harry L. Brinser,
Farmer Morrison,
Claude C. Bloch,
Cyrus W. Cole,
John W. Greenslade,
Victor A. Kimberly,
William R. Sayles, jr., and
James H. Tomb.

Carpenter James J. Murphy to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as a carpenter.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

William J. Atwood to be postmaster at Midland, Cal. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

COLORADO.

William H. Bloom to be postmaster at Limon, Colo., in place of Frances M. Carman, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

John C. Hale to be postmaster at North Chicago, Ill., in place of Charles W. Vedder, resigned.

INDIANA.

Edgar T. Botkin to be postmaster at Farmland, Ind., in place of Edgar T. Botkin. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1910.

Enos Coffin to be postmaster at Carthage, Ind., in place of Enos Coffin. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

Cash M. Graham to be postmaster at South Whitley, Ind., in place of Cash M. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

Robert B. Hanna to be postmaster at Fort Wayne, Ind., in place of Robert B. Hanna. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1910.

William H. Hathaway to be postmaster at Aurora, Ind., in place of Will H. Conway. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1910.

John Lynn to be postmaster at La Fontaine, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Joel F. Martin to be postmaster at Bourbon, Ind., in place of Joel F. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1911.

Frank R. Morrison to be postmaster at Galveston, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1909.

William O. Nash to be postmaster at Jasonville, Ind., in place of William O. Nash. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

Luster E. Roush to be postmaster at Bluffton, Ind., in place of James R. Spivey. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1910.

Percy V. Ruch to be postmaster at Mulberry, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

John C. Schleffler to be postmaster at Wolcottville, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

IOWA.

Joseph H. Luse to be postmaster at Mystic, Iowa, in place of Joseph H. Luse. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

Alfred D. McCulloch to be postmaster at Humeston, Iowa, in place of Alfred D. McCulloch. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

Harry Williams to be postmaster at Sheffield, Iowa, in place of John R. Bell, resigned.

MONTANA.

Don E. Schanck to be postmaster at Libby, Mont. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

NEBRASKA.

Will A. Needham to be postmaster at Bloomfield, Nebr., in place of Will A. Needham. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

Roy E. Thomas to be postmaster at Osmond, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

NEW YORK.

George H. E. Aring to be postmaster at Long Beach, N. Y. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

Jetur R. Rogers to be postmaster at Southampton, N. Y., in place of Jetur R. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1911.

John E. Stevens to be postmaster at Spencerport, N. Y., in place of Frank N. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired May 2, 1910.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Menzo M. Burt to be postmaster at Roulette, Pa., in place of Clara E. Fessenden. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

William A. McMahan to be postmaster at West Pittsburg, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

Henry M. Stetler to be postmaster at Wyomissing, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

TEXAS.

Florence F. Kellogg to be postmaster at Carrizo Springs, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

George W. Walker, jr., to be postmaster at Blessing, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

WISCONSIN.

Charles Brown to be postmaster at Montello, Wis., in place of Edward A. Bass. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

Edward Morrissey to be postmaster at Delavan, Wis., in place of Edward Morrissey. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1909.

Henry H. White to be postmaster at Lake Geneva, Wis., in place of Frank S. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1910.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 17, 1911.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Walter L. Fisher to be Secretary of the Interior.

INSPECTOR OF DRUGS, MEDICINES, AND CHEMICALS.

Frederick W. Heyl to be special examiner of drugs, medicines, and chemicals in the district of Philadelphia, Pa.

PROMOTION IN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Louis Schwartz to be assistant surgeon in the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service.

MEMBER OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Col. Curtis McD. Townsend to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Charles J. Badger to be a rear admiral.
Commander Charles C. Marsh to be a captain.
Commander Thomas W. Kinkaid to be a captain.
Commander Louis S. Van Duzer to be a captain.
Commander Wilson W. Buchanan to be a captain.
Commander William J. Maxwell to be a captain.
Commander William S. Smith to be a captain.
Commander John A. Hoogewerff to be a captain.
Commander Edward E. Capehart to be a captain.
Commander Henry B. Wilson to be a captain.
Commander Kenneth McAlpine to be a captain.
Commander Emil Theiss to be a captain.
Commander Spencer S. Wood to be a captain.
Lieut. Commander Urban T. Holmes to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander Matt H. Signor to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander Charles B. McVay, jr., to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander Lucius A. Bostwick to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander Julian L. Latimer to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander De Witt Blamer to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander John K. Robison to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander Arthur L. Willard to be a commander.
Lieut. Commander Henry C. Kuenzli to be a commander.
Lieut. Charles P. Nelson to be a lieutenant commander.
Lieut. Allen Buchanan to be a lieutenant commander.
Lieut. Edward B. Fenner to be a lieutenant commander.
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Sylvester H. Lawton, jr., to be a lieutenant.
Ensign John E. Pond to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):
William C. Barker, jr.,
Robert L. Ghormley,
William L. Calhoun,
Walter W. Lorsbough,
William A. Glassford, jr.,
Herbert B. Riebe,
Thomas Withers, jr.,
Leo F. Welch,
Harry L. Pence,
Ferdinand L. Reichmuth,
Wolcott E. Hall,
Fred M. Perkins,
Frank H. Roberts,
Lewis D. Causey,
Francis M. Robinson,
Randolph P. Scudder,
Charles C. Hartigan,
George A. Alexander,
Edwin B. Woodworth,
Wilson E. Madden,
James P. Olding,
Sherwoode A. Taffinder,
John S. McCain,
Ronan C. Grady,
Harold Jones,
Albert S. Rees,
Frank N. Eklund,
Claude A. Bonvillian,
William B. Howe, and
Jefferson B. Goldman.
Midshipmen Francis J. Comerford and Paul E. Speicher to be ensigns.
Surg. Albert M. D. McCormick to be a medical inspector.
Passed Asst. Surg. Ulys R. Webb to be a surgeon.
Passed Asst. Surg. Charles M. Oman to be a surgeon.
Passed Asst. Surg. Robert A. Bachmann to be a surgeon.
Asst. Surg. Dallas G. Sutton to be a passed assistant surgeon.
Naval Constructor Henry M. Gleason, with rank of lieutenant, to be a naval constructor, with rank of lieutenant commander.
The following-named assistant naval constructors, with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be assistant naval constructors, with rank of lieutenant:
Allan J. Chantry, jr.,
Whitford Drake, and
Harry G. Knox.
First Lieut. Arthur B. Owens to be a captain in the Marine Corps.
First Lieut. Gerard M. Kincade to be a captain in the Marine Corps.
Tracy G. Hunter, jr., to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.
Capt. Norman G. Burton, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps, with the rank of major.
First Lieut. Jeter R. Horton to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of captain.
First Lieut. Bennet Puryear, jr., to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of captain.
Boatswain Frank Miller to be a chief boatswain.
The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains:
John Danner,
Harry Williams,
James F. Hopkins,
Charles Schonborg,
Alexander Stuart,
William Derrington, and
Frank D. Blakely.
Gunners Richard H. Cheney and Constantine Clay to be chief gunners.
Gunner Roderick M. O'Connor to be a chief gunner.
Machinists George Growney and John R. Burkhart to be chief machinists.
Machinist Louis R. Ford to be a chief machinist.
Midshipman William H. Walsh to be an ensign.
Passed Asst. Paymaster Edwin M. Hacker to be a passed assistant paymaster.
Asst. Engineer Michael H. Plunkett, with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to be a passed assistant engineer, with rank of lieutenant, on the retired list.
Chief Gunner Charles B. Magruder to be a chief gunner on the retired list.
Commander Gustav Kaemmerling to be a captain.
The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders:
Carl T. Vogelgesang,
John R. Edie, and
Clark D. Stearns.
The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants:
Halford R. Greenlee, and
Charles M. Austin.
Ensign Alexander S. Wadsworth, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade).
Commander Hugh Rodman to be a captain.
Commander Guy W. Brown to be a captain.
The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns:
George E. Brandt,
Cary W. Magruder,
Joseph S. Hulings,
James G. Stevens,
William A. Hodgman, and
Carleton M. Dolan.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Joe V. Prochaska, Miami.
Esther A. Snider, Winkelman.

CONNECTICUT.

Lewis B. Sutton, New Canaan.

FLORIDA.

Henry O. Brown, Lake Butler.

ILLINOIS.

Thomas C. Grotevant, Forrest.
J. Stewart Lamont, Apple River.
William F. Temple, Fairmount.

IOWA.

J. C. Davenport, Clear Lake.
Henry S. Ferris, Lorimor.
John J. Heverly, Center Point.
Clarence A. Muehe, Dyersville.
John Stevenson, Jefferson.

MAINE.

Jarvis C. Billings, Bethel.
Luther W. Stanley, Springvale.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Elmer W. Hallett, Yarmouth Port.

MICHIGAN.

Samuel Fuller, Lewiston.

MINNESOTA.

L. O. Haugen, Harmony.
George M. Kaupp, Blue Earth.
Oscar Krook, Marshall.
Martin L. Murphy, Browerville.
N. C. Nelson, Two Harbors.
Emma C. Taylor, Chaska.

MISSOURI.

Joseph H. Harris, Kansas City.

OHIO.

John W. Beckett, North Baltimore.
Elmer C. Jesse, Mineral City.
Homer S. Kent, Chagrin Falls.
Earl W. Mauck, Gallipolis.
Joel P. De Wolfe, Fostoria.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles S. Harter, Elk Point.
May A. Knappen, Sisseton.
Hiram A. Mason, Bowdle.
William A. Schwichtenberg, Kadoka.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 17, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Our Father in Heaven, we thank Thee that the English-speaking people all over the world are pausing at this time from the busy whirl and turmoil of life's activities to celebrate the tricentennial of the King James version of the Bible, a light which shone out of the darkness, the basis of our civilization, food for the hungry, water for the thirsty, strength for the weak, rest for the weary, comfort for the sorrowing, and hope for the dying, a very present help in every trouble.

Grant, O most merciful Father, that it may bind us so closely together that war between us will be forever impossible; that we may march forward shoulder to shoulder in the peaceful pursuits of life to the higher civilization which waits on those who serve the Lord. And Thine be the praise forever, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 15, 1911, was read and approved.

THE PRAYER.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there are any words uttered within this Chamber that are more worthy of preservation or of more benefit to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than those which fall from the lips of our Chaplain every morning. It will take but a stickful of space in the RECORD to print the invocation of our beloved blind Chaplain, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that hereafter during the Sixty-second Congress the morning prayer be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair agrees with the gentleman and directs that the prayers be published in the RECORD.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. STACK, of Illinois, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SMOKING.

The SPEAKER. Several Members have requested the Chair to have read the last sentence of subdivision 7 of Rule XIV, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair directs the officers of the House to see that that rule is enforced.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Canadian reciprocity, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am somewhat reluctant in attempting to make any remarks at this time on this measure. This bill is in the same form, with the exception of an added amendment, as it was when before the House only a few weeks ago, and at that time I expressed myself somewhat fully as to my opinion of the merits or demerits of the measure. The bill in its present form provides further than was provided for in the original bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], that the President of the United States shall have the power to further consider and, if possible, arrange further trade treaties with Canada with a view to placing other articles upon the free list than those mentioned in the proposed bill or treaty. It will be remembered that in the Dingley tariff law there was a provision, section 3, of that law, which gave the power to the President of the United States to make trade agreements with France and other nations when, in his judgment, he thought it might be wise to lower certain rates of duty on certain imports mentioned in that law. It will be well remembered by every gentleman present that the treaties were put upon our statute books. Such treaties were arranged between Germany, France, and other nations of the world by the President, the provisions of which were disastrous to the people of the United States. All of those treaties were repealed when the present Payne tariff law was enacted. All those treaties were abrogated; that is to say, the President of the United States was directed to give notice to all those nations which had entered into treaties with the United States that at a certain time those treaties should be discontinued.

I want to call the attention of some gentlemen present, because it applies to this bill, that in these trade treaties it was provided that goods coming into this country should pay a rate of duty based upon the foreign value of such goods when imported, and great frauds under those treaties were perpetrated upon our Government by undervaluation, and it is, perhaps, a matter of common knowledge to all gentlemen present that under existing laws that practice has been carried on, and only recently some great sugar-refining companies of this country were convicted by the Government for frauds upon the United States Treasury, and some New York firm was prosecuted (and I am not certain but that case is now in court) for undervaluations on valuable works of art. The matter was called to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means when they were preparing the tariff law that on one article alone, a certain kind of china cups and saucers, it had been found by the manufacturers of that class of goods in this country that there had been a very large importation of that kind of chinaware from Europe, which was being sold at a lower price than that class of goods could be made for by Americans, and upon investigation a gentleman before our committee stated that he had been sent abroad by the china manufacturers of this country and, after long effort, located the manufacturers of these goods in Belgium. It was found that the manufacturers of these goods in Belgium had a house in Paris, France, which was really a branch house, or a part of the institution, although under another name. It was found that the concern in Paris was shipping those goods to some one in America, really a member of the firm that manufactured the goods, and at the time the investigation was made it was found that the actual cost value of the importation of cups and saucers alone, as I now remember, was eight and a half million dollars, yet the import value, as given by the importer, was $5,000,000; and, therefore, this Government had been robbed of its fair rate of duty on three and a half million dollars' worth of goods out of a total value of eight and a half million dollars.

Therefore, gentlemen, I wish to warn you against voting for further continuance of such practice, against placing in the hands of any one individual in this country the power to make our trade treaties. But I must add that in this bill that section provides, however, that before those treaties can become effective they must be approved by Congress. That is a saving clause. But, gentlemen, when you deal with treaties of that kind it is like a child playing with fire. I want to caution you against it. I would vote against the Canadian trade agreement because of that provision alone, even if I had no other objection to the treaty.

I want to say in the beginning that I am an admirer of our President, William H. Taft. He will be the Republican candidate for reelection, if he lives until that time. [Applause on the Republican side.] If I am alive at that time, I will give

him my most hearty support, as I have in the past. I am frank to say, gentlemen, that I disagree with his views on Canadian reciprocity. I have a right to disagree with him on that proposition, or with any other, or all men. I am exercising my judgment as my conscience dictates as to what is right and best for the American people; and upon that platform I am going to stand.

There is no question in the mind of any man within the sound of my voice, or beyond the sound of my voice, but that conditions in Canada to-day are as good, if not better, than ever before in the history of that country. Before I conclude my remarks I will try to give you some of what, in my judgment, I consider good reasons why the people of Canada are prosperous to-day. I may say in the beginning, however, that they are a protective nation. They believe in protection, not only for Canadian labor but Canadian capital as well. And they are carrying that out to a greater extent than the people of the United States are to-day carrying out that policy so long cherished by the Republican Party in this country. In order to preserve to Canadian labor the right to produce the things in that country that under their protective-tariff system they claim would be most beneficial to their laboring people and to their capital, let me say to you that they are protecting to the extreme all their raw materials.

In the enactment of the Dingley law of 1897 a clause was inserted providing that an additional duty on lumber should be added to any country that put an export duty on logs, the raw forest material. Canada was quick to find a way to get around that feature of our law, because at that time we were importing into this country from Canada large quantities of saw logs and the sawmills around the Great Lakes were manufacturing annually 400,000,000 feet of lumber cut from Canadian saw logs imported from Canada. Canada quickly saw the wisdom, as I have said, in the policy of retaining for Canadian capital and Canadian labor the manufacturing of that 400,000,000 feet of lumber in Canada. And what did they do? Instead of placing an export duty upon logs, they put an embargo upon them. They put a provision in their license, a license to cut timber from public lands, and all lands, practically, in Canada are owned by the Provinces, which license expires the 1st of May every year, that provided that the holder of the license when cutting timber from those lands should manufacture that product in Canada, preserving thereby to the labor of Canada the right to put from five to eight dollars of labor upon every thousand feet of lumber taken from their woods—a very wise provision, indeed. And from that day to this, my friends, practically no logs have been imported into the United States from Canada, except in the great Northwest, on Puget Sound, under a law which permits the officer in charge to remove that embargo at will by giving 30 days' notice in certain papers. From time to time, when their log market in the Northwest has become congested by an oversupply of logs, that embargo has been removed and they have dumped their surplus of logs at times upon our markets and then immediately put back the embargo. But no American, no owner of a sawmill in the United States, under any law, is warranted in beginning a logging operation in Canada with the view of bringing his logs to a sawmill in the United States. It is prohibited in every Province in Canada. But I say in that respect, my friends, Canada has been exceedingly wise in protecting her home industry and home labor.

Some gentleman on the floor of the House made some remarks about barbed fencing wire. That article is mentioned in this trade treaty. Upon an examination of the records I find that no barbed wire has come into this country from Canada at all.

You are not honest with the farmers of this country when you say to them, "We are going to give you free barbed wire from Canada."

Now, my friends, the farmer is no young bird to be fooled on chaff. You can not flimflam the farmer by any such provision in this or any other law.

I find, on the other hand, that we shipped into Canada last year seven hundred and some odd thousand dollars' worth of barbed-wire fencing. The factories of this country produced that much of wire fencing and shipped it into Canada. I am delighted indeed to know that an institution in this country can send its product to Canada and sell it at a profit.

It is proposed in the farmers' free-trade bill, introduced by our Democratic friends, to put barbed wire for fencing from the whole world on the free list and bring it into this country. Look up the records and find out how much has been brought in under existing law. Practically none. But it is true, in order to protect that industry in this country, in existing law there is a duty of three-quarters of a cent per pound on that class of wire.

I am one of the committee who voted for that law. I am ready at all times to preserve not only the American market for American manufactures, but I am ready at all times to protect every institution, every mill, every factory, every forge in this land, whether it be in the Southland or in the Northland, against the cheap labor of the world. I want to see all the barbed wire or any other wire fencing that is consumed in this country produced from the iron mines of the United States and converted into finished product by American capital and American labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But let me go further and say that there is no change in the existing law on wire in this trade agreement. Our wire went into Canada free of duty before this treaty was ever thought of. Why, then, is it put into the law at all? Perhaps upon the assumption that hereafter Canada is going to produce barbed wire cheaper than we can produce it. Then some day in the far-off future our farmers can buy from Canada barbed wire cheaper than they can buy it from the manufacturers in this country.

You are focusing your range at a very long distance when you throw out a sop of that kind to the American farmer.

Now, there is a document known as Senate document No. 862, introduced in the Senate by ex-Senator Carter, of Montana, a gentleman for whom I have the highest admiration. He is an estimable gentleman, an intelligent man. I regret exceedingly on seeing him go out of the Congress of the United States. He was one of the great legislators of this country. But upon an examination of that document which I have here—and I am sincere in that statement—it would appear that instead of Senator Carter having prepared that document, he never read it; never read its contents. It says, "Mr. Carter presented the following." That is the only place in the document that you can find the slightest semblance of Mr. Carter's name, or his intellect or his politics in it. It was undoubtedly prepared by somebody who is a gatherer of statistics.

In that article, which I have not the time to analyze fully, you will find that the writer says by opening up our markets to Canada's wheat and removing our duty of 25 cents per bushel, the flour mills of the United States can control the market of flour for the world; that by giving the flouring mills of this country free trade in wheat from Canada they can monopolize the flour market of Europe; that we have the milling capacity at the present time to supply all Europe with flour.

The average man to-day is preaching against monopoly, but here is a man who would monopolize the flour market of the world by our giving free trade in wheat. I know some stories that would work in well here, but I am too busy trying to quote to you actual facts to inject any nonsense into my remarks. The gentleman argues that if the duties on wheat are removed, the mills in the United States can purchase Canada's wheat and then supply England and all Europe with flour.

How weak and flimsy is such an argument! The writer evidently does not know the terms of existing law. I presume every man here knows the existing law on wheat as well as I do, but fearing someone might not know the terms of existing law will say there is no bar to-day against mills in the United States supplying Europe with flour under practically free trade conditions. There are two provisions in our tariff law. One provides that the manufacturers of flour in this country can import wheat from any foreign country, and when exporting the finished product of that wheat can go to the Treasury of the United States and draw back 99 per cent of the duty paid.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. Where the Canadian wheat and the American wheat are mixed, as I understand they are in these large mills, is it practicable then to get this drawback?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. I thank the gentleman for the question. It is as practicable to get that drawback on the imported wheat in that barrel of flour as it is to get the drawback on the imported lumber in a door made partly out of Canadian lumber and partly out of American lumber, because all that is necessary is for the miller to furnish satisfactory affidavits to the Treasury of the United States as to the amount of foreign imported wheat that a barrel of flour contains, and that is very easy. Now, let me go just a little further on that, and say to you that I was engaged in the manufacture of flour at one time just long enough to lose all the money I put into the industry, but to get some education in the business. I was interested for five years in the manufacture of flour. I found that by economical methods and modern machinery and the proper kind of bolting cloths a barrel of flour, 196 pounds, can be produced from 4 bushels and 40 pounds of wheat. There are

280 pounds of wheat in 4 bushels and 40 pounds. That leaves 84 pounds of offal, bran, and middlings, or shorts, as some people call it. In the manufacture of foreign imported wheat that is exported, on which the miller is entitled to a drawback, he must either export the offal or pay duty on it. But I contend, gentlemen, that when he sends abroad only the flour and markets the bran and middlings in this country, which come in competition with the same article manufactured from American grain, he ought to pay duty on that which he markets in the United States. On 4 bushels and 40 pounds of wheat the duty at 25 cents a bushel is $1.16⅔, or nearly that fraction. With a drawback of 99 per cent of that it leaves the duty cost to the American manufacturer 1⅛ cents per barrel. Is that going to prevent any miller in this country from importing wheat from Canada and then exporting the manufactured product? If so, I would like to have some man figure it out to me.

Again, there is another provision in our law that permits the American miller to import wheat in bond and take it to his mill sealed in the car. The Government will either break the seal or authorize the miller to break it and take that wheat into his mill and convert it into the finished product, put it back into the car, and send it abroad, without the payment of any duty at all. If the statements I have made are true, can you tell me any bar to the American miller right now bringing in all the Canadian wheat his mill can grind, converting it into the finished product, and then sending it abroad?

But, my friends, when our present tariff law was being prepared by the committee, mill men appeared before that committee and demanded free trade on Canadian wheat, because they said they are so handicapped by red tape in getting back this 99 per cent of duty. Ah, my friends, the "nigger in the fence" is that they want the offal put upon the free list, because they want to market it in the United States. Now, on the other hand, I have told you what the existing law is. Do you believe it is possible to take down our tariff wall, invite competition from the whole world on competitive products, and under that system raise the price of our products in this country? I never knew but one man who claimed to be a great man who used such an argument. As to his being a great man, he and I differ. He is an ex-Senator from Indiana. He said he was in favor of a law that would increase the wages of American laboring men and also decrease the price of the product of such labor. He reminds me of a man who once said he could do anything on God's green earth that any other man could do. Some one who doubted him said, "There was a gentleman here yesterday who lifted himself by the ears of his boots. Let us see you do it." He spent the balance of the summer in trying and finally failed.

Mr. Carter introduced this bill. He is a great man, but evidently introduced it without due consideration.

He reminds me of a piece of attempted legislation introduced by a member of the legislature of one of our States. He, too, evidently introduced a bill which had been sent to him by a friend and without his reading it at all. When read, it was found that it provided for the improvement by deepening and widening the alimentary canal. [Laughter.] There is just about as much sense in this proposition as there was in that.

That wheat is cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States no intelligent man will dispute. Some argument has been made here that the price of wheat on both sides of the line does not vary much, if any. But the gentleman making that argument forgets that the grade of wheat mentioned or the price of wheat in the various markets is based upon the value and the grade of the wheat. All grades of wheat are not of the same value. So when the price of wheat is stated to be the same in Canada as in the Dakotas and Minnesota or at Minneapolis and St. Paul markets, you may mark down in your memorandum books that it is not the same grade of wheat, because there is a difference in the value in our markets for the various grades of wheat.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Is it the gentleman's contention that the higher price of wheat in the United States, conceding that it is higher, is due to the protective tariff on wheat?

Mr. FORDNEY. It is, and I will try to give the gentleman my reason. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee, with all courtesy. I will answer all questions asked me to the best of my ability.

Mr. SIMS. I know the gentleman will, and that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will give you some figures that will explain that which I have taken from the records. During the four years prior to the last Democratic, and the only Democratic, administration we have had since the Republican Party was born, the years 1890, 1891, 1892, and 1893, we produced in this country per year 480,000,000 bushels, in round numbers. The price of that wheat for those four years averaged the farmers of the country 71 cents per bushel, or $1,383,000,000. For the four years during the life of the Wilson bill, or its anticipation rather, it was only on the statute books 36 months, as I remember—for the four years during the agitation of that question and the life of the law, we produced in this country 471,000,000 bushels of wheat per year. The value of the wheat in this country at that time was 63.4 cents per bushel. The value of the wheat in this country, based upon the price for those four years compared with the previous four years, brought a loss to our farmers of $180,000,000.

I have gone further, my friends, and have followed the statistics for four years following the repeal of the Wilson bill—and, by the way, the Wilson bill did not admit wheat free of duty; the rate of duty in that law was 20 per cent ad valorem—and during the life of that bill was the time I had my experience in the milling business. I purchased wheat in the State of Michigan at my mill for 48 cents a bushel delivered at the mill. During the four years succeeding the life of that bill, which placed wheat upon the protected list at 20 per cent ad valorem, the production of wheat in this country amounted to 625,000,000 bushels per year and the price 69.9 cents, a difference to the farmer, as compared with the four years of Democratic tariff laws, of $200,180,000.

Now, my friends, let us go further. It is contended by the friends of this treaty that by placing wheat on the free list our exports will increase. How much truth or fact is there in that argument? I believe a fair comparison with our exports during the life of the Wilson bill would be a good test. Let me state what our exports were under that bill and for four years prior and the succeeding four years.

Our total exports for the four years prior to the adoption of that bill were 417,000,000 bushels. And during these four long, lean, lank years, when the duty had been lowered on wheat to 20 per cent ad valorem, we exported only 364,000,000 bushels.

Now, for the next four years, with an increased rate of duty to 25 cents a bushel, there were 582,000,000 bushels exported. Is there anything in that argument that will lead any man of fair mind to contend that by lowering the duty on wheat we are going to increase our exports? If so, furnish me with the proof. While I am not from Missouri, I am a protectionist.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. If increasing the tariff increases the exports, how does it increase the price of wheat in this country?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, by protecting American institutions and American capital the wheels of industry in this country run full time. The people are encouraged under prosperity [applause on the Republican side] and they languish under free trade. We produced less wheat in the country then than we did before or since. Because of the price the farmer was depressed and he resorted to the production of some other article upon his farm from which he made some profit, and I contend that under a protective system when our institutions are running full blast we can produce at a lower cost than when running on half-time, as I will try to show in another line of industry which I can, perhaps, make a little clearer than I can the question of wheat. But all know that the farmer of this country at that time was in poverty—not in good standing, but in poverty—during those four years; and again during those four lean years the statistics show that we consumed in this country but 3½ bushels of wheat per capita per annum, where, under existing law—and this condition has existed now for 12 years—the American people are consuming to-day nearly 6½ bushels per capita per annum. A great orator once said upon the floor of this House in arguing for a protective tariff—

> Give work to the laboring man and you furnish him employment for his teeth.

We consume more to-day than we did then, and that is reasonable, because our purchasing power is greater to-day than it was then. It is perfectly reasonable when a man's wages are $2 per day, as compared with $1 per day, that his purchasing power is just double, but his purchasing power is measured to a large extent by the prices paid for the articles that he consumes. Lower prices prevail to-day for all farm products in this country than have prevailed now for several years.

All will admit that for the last few years prices of farm products have been abnormal, but during all that time manufactured products have gone on only at a reasonable price in this country. Labor has been advanced further than has the price of the manufactured product, but not quite in line with the advance

in the prices of agricultural products; but with declining prices in all agricultural products to-day, we do not hear of any reduction of wages in any institution in the country, or at least but very few.

My friend Mr. McCALL, a gentleman for whom I have the very highest regard, in an article in the Independent, published as of April 6, said that the way to increase or aid our markets is to aid the customer; that if you increase the purchasing power of the customer you will increase the markets for your own products. I agree with the gentleman fully in every respect in that statement, but when the gentleman from Massachusetts made that statement he was talking about Canada, about increasing the purchasing power of the Canadian, and therefore, he said, giving to our farmers in this country a better market for their products. The gentleman evidently overlooked the fact that when he was talking about increasing the purchasing power of seven and a half or eight million people in Canada, he was striking a deathblow at 35,000,000 farmers in the United States. The gentleman is overlooking the important fact that when you are aiding the Canadian in his purchasing power by opening up our markets to him for his products, the farmers of the United States are the greatest purchasers of all products, both manufactured and agricultural, on the face of the globe.

The gentleman from Massachusetts would cast aside the 35,000,000 men, women, and children on farms in this country and look solely to the interest of the Canadian in order that we might sell a little more barbed wire over there. Again, the gentleman from Massachusetts states in that article that on wheat and flour we are sending to Canada more than we purchase from Canada. The gentleman is absolutely wrong in his figures. It is true that a great deal of exports of wheat and flour from this country enter Canada and leave Canada on their way to Europe, and I think the gentleman obtains his figures from such exportations, giving credit for all of that to Canada. But let me call his attention to the figures set forth in this trade treaty, in which he will find that last year we exported to Canada in round numbers less than 55,000 bushels of wheat. We imported from Canada during that same time nearly 153,000 bushels of wheat. At the same time we exported to Canada, in round numbers, 31,000 barrels of flour and imported from Canada 144,000 barrels of flour. Where does the gentleman from Massachusetts get his figures? When I was in the flour-mill business, like Mr. CARTER with his argument that he introduced, I went into the business because I had more money than brains, and very little of either, perhaps. I purchased a mill in my home town, and after getting into the business I found that we had in that city a milling capacity for 700 barrels of flour a day in a town with but 45,000 people, and the consuming capacity of the people of that town was less than 200 barrels per day, so that in order to run our mill for 10 hours a day we were obliged to export from the city 500 barrels of flour per day, and we had to go out into the world to find a market for that much surplus flour manufactured in my home town.

The question of exporting flour came up, and I examined the rates of freight abroad. We were at that time exporting a fair share of our product to Providence, R. I., on which we paid 73 cents per barrel freight from Saginaw, Mich., to Providence, R. I. I found that the great flour mills of Duluth, Minn., and Minneapolis and St. Paul were at the same time sending flour to London, England, for 50 cents a barrel, and as soon as my supply of money ran out I went out of the flour business; and I would advise all of my friends to keep out of the business unless you have very cheap fuel, such as water power, for you can not succeed beyond the limits of the county in which your flour mill is located unless you have very cheap power or cheap fuel.

Mr. SIMS. Would it annoy the gentleman if I interrupted him?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; the gentleman would not annoy me.

Mr. SIMS. Is it a fact, then, that we do lose on the wheat and flour we ship abroad?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no; I do not say that; I do not think so.

Mr. SIMS. If flour is higher and wheat is higher here than abroad, how can we sell abroad at a profit?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell you this much, my friend. It is an old argument, but I believe it is a correct one on the question of selling our stuff abroad cheaper than we sell at home. For illustration, my friend, I am in the lumber business, and during the period of low prices which prevailed in 1907 we found we could not run our mill for 10 hours a day without piling up a very large amount of lumber on hand, with a large amount of capital invested, at a great risk of fire, and with no market for your lumber.

In addition to that you will understand that in that business a man insuring his lumber is a coinsurer to the extent of 20 per cent of the value of the lumber, so you can not get the full rate of insurance in this country on the value of your lumber and it is a great risk to pile up unlimited quantities. The important thing is where does your money come from. We found that we could perhaps market what lumber we could produce in an 8 hours' run instead of 10 hours. We reduced our hours from 10 to 8 per day and for 3 months we proceeded to try out that plan. We could not dispose of a superintendent, we could not dispose of a bookkeeper, we could not lessen our taxes, we could not lessen our insurance, we could not lessen the depreciation of our property. In other words the overhead or dead expense goes on just the same whether you run 8 hours or 10 hours or 12 hours per day, and we found after running for 3 months under the best management we could have that it cost $1 per thousand feet more to manufacture our lumber running 8 hours than it did to run 10 hours and we were obliged to abandon that plan. Therefore I say, my friends, if you are engaged in an industry, be it farming or any other industry, by running to the fullest capacity is when you produce at the lowest possible cost and by running your institution, be it a farm or factory, and selling at a reasonable profit to the home consumption you can afford to export your surplus at cost, and still employ American labor and make more money than one could by closing down.

Therefore, when we learn of goods being exported at a lower price than they are sold at home for, it is my candid opinion it is under such conditions, because when you are piling up a surplus and your warehouse is filled to the roof there is but one of two things to do—you must either unload that surplus or you must close the institution. And I ask you, in all spirit of fairness, whether under such circumstances it would be best for the proprietor to send abroad that surplus, emptying his warehouse and continue running, employing American labor and American capital, or to close down until the surplus is worked off? My business schooling, which has not been a short one, has taught me to believe that it is best to keep the wheels of the industries of this country running and employ American labor, because that labor is the best purchaser for our goods in the world. It furnishes us the greatest market for all our manufactured and agricultural products. As an illustration—and I am not making a political speech, but I believe the argument fits in on this treaty—we sold abroad last year $1,800,000,000 worth of American farm and manufactured products. The whole world consumed less than $14,000,000,000 worth of imported products, while here at home, Americans, citizens of the United States, consumed nearly $30,000,000,000 worth, or more than twice the total imports of the whole world outside of the United States. By opening up our tariff gates and letting into this country the cheaper products of all foreign countries, are you going to curtail that production at home and supply the citizens of the United States with articles made abroad rather than made at home? If so, you and I differ in our opinions, because I contend that any article, no matter what it may be, consumed in this country, that is imported from abroad—that is, a competitive article—is exceedingly high priced to the American people, because it displaces just that much capital and just that much labor at home.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is the gentleman going to discuss the lumber question before he takes his seat?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to ask you one or two questions in regard to it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be glad to answer you.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENDALL. Has the gentleman concluded as to one of his propositions there?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENDALL. Of course the gentleman understands, as all Republicans do, that our last platform declared for a tariff measuring the difference in productive cost in America and abroad. I want to inquire of the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, whether in the preparation of the pending measure any report of the Tariff Commission, which has been created to ascertain those facts, was in possession of the committee?

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman for the question. There was absolutely none at all. If so, it was in the hands of the majority. That is the first time I have had the pleasure

of using that term on the floor for 12 years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KENDALL. I want to inquire further of the gentleman if the Committee on Ways and Means undertook to revise the tariff on all the agricultural products of the country without availing itself of the information as to productive cost at home and abroad, which we supposed would be furnished by this Tariff Commission?

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman now refer to the proposed free-trade bill?

Mr. KENDALL. I refer to this bill and the companion measure, popularly designated as the "farmers' free-trade bill."

Mr. FORDNEY. So far as I am informed, not one word of information came from the Tariff Board or anywhere else to the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of this or the other or any other bills.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has always been opposed to constituting a Tariff Board, I believe, has he not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, no. The gentleman misunderstands me. I have always been opposed to the creation of a tariff commission, because I could see a difference between a tariff commission and a tariff board, and while I have not been very enthusiastic for a tariff board, I have contended that if there is any information that Representatives of this great people could have that they do not have in the preparation of those great laws, we should have it, no matter what channel it came through. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Would the gentleman like to have more time?

Mr. FORDNEY. I would like to. Do not limit me. I will try to get through as quickly as I can.

Mr. DALZELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman without limit for the present.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It so happens that the subject of the cost of production of farm products in Canada and the United States is one of the subjects on which this so-called Tariff Board has made a report, as is evidenced in Senate Document No. 849, printed on March 1, 1911; and if the gentleman desired to obtain any information on that subject he could have consulted that report.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman. I did not know that there was such a report. If so, it was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. Is it possible that the Committee on Ways and Means in preparing this important bill has utterly ignored that official report?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman that I asked the question when the committee was reporting this bill, and some other gentleman asked the question, if some one were not going to call upon the Tariff Board for information on this subject, and it was said by some one of the gentlemen of the majority that they would have no hearings unless someone should have additional information to present; that they thought they had a sufficient amount of evidence and information on file during the hearings that was presented to the Ways and Means Committee when the committee were preparing the Payne tariff law.

Mr. BUCHANAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will in a moment. I then said to the gentleman that I understood that the Democratic Party were very anxious to have a tariff commission appointed in order that they might have better and more information on the subject of our tariff laws than had been obtained under present conditions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask the gentleman why it is that the representatives of the steel interests and the lumber interests claim they are interested in the American workingmen when tens of thousands of foreign workingmen are working in the mills, while tens of thousands of American workingmen are walking the highways seeking employment?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to my friend that I know of no law that discriminates against any man seeking employment and getting a fair day's wages for a fair day's work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman, then, is not informed.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, there are a lot of things that the gentleman from Michigan does not know. I admit that. [Laughter.] The things that I do not know would make a great deal larger book than the things that I do know. But then there are a few things that I do claim to know, and those are the things that I am trying to express myself on here. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CONNELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait just one minute, if you please, sir. I will say now to the gentleman [Mr. BUCHANAN], who has mentioned the steel company, that I infer he has reference to the United States Steel Corporation. Let me say to my friend that I had occasion to ascertain not long ago the number of men employed by that one concern—the great United States Steel Co. I had occasion to make inquiry, and learned the amount of money paid out by that one company to their labor last year, and I will give to you the astounding figures. I find that while it was stated by the president of that company—Mr. Gary, president of the United States Steel Co.—that they could produce steel cheaper than any other company in this country, because nearly all other manufacturers of steel purchase more or less pig iron from them, on which the United States Steel Co. make a profit, yet they did not want to crush out competition; they could run their institution without any protection at all, but in doing so their smaller competitors would be obliged to go out of business and they themselves would be compelled to reduce the wages paid to their labor. I found that last year that company had in their employ, in round numbers, 225,000 men, and their pay roll reached nearly $175,000,000, or an average of about $2.70 per man per day. I do not want to see any law upon our statute books that will lower the price paid for labor in this country, whether that law is intended to protect a corporation, a copartnership, a farmer, or a laboring man, because when you lower the price paid to labor, as I have said, you are curtailing the purchasing power of your best customer in the land. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Can the gentleman give us the amount of dividends declared by that United States Steel Corporation for that same year?

Mr. FORDNEY. I never owned a share of stock in the United States Steel Corporation, or in any other steel company, in my life. I know nothing about it, and I care less. I want to be courteous to the gentleman, but I do not know anything about it. I presume they pay good profits. If they do not, they are the biggest fools on earth. You and I would not be long in their shoes until we would try to make a reasonable profit upon our investment. If not, we would soon go out of business.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Would we kick if the profits were more than reasonable?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know. I have never seen profits too high to suit me.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is not that also true of the Steel Trust?

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to ask the gentleman, or any other man within the sound of my voice, was there ever a time in your life, or do you ever expect to see the time, when your profits will be so high that you object?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That being true, ought the law to give to me or any other person a right to gratify cupidity, and collect more than a fair profit through the instrumentality of a law that was created to enable that to be done?

Mr. FORDNEY. My good friend, if you believe that the United States Steel Corporation, or any other corporation in this land, is exacting from the people a greater profit than it is entitled to, we have antitrust laws upon our statute books to stop it immediately by proper proceedings, by the proper authority, and not through a revision of our tariff laws, in my opinion.

Mr. CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman; but I will ask the gentleman to make his question brief, as I am consuming too much time.

Mr. CONNELL. I understood the gentleman to say that he went into the flour business at the time of the Wilson law, lost all his money, and made a failure of it. I want to ask him if he would have succeeded in that business except for the Wilson law, and if that was the reason why failure came to him in his experiment in the flour business.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, I have learned long ago never to cry over spilt milk. I am not crying because I lost my money. The experience was well worth it, and I have been a died-in-the-wool protectionist ever since. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am going to stick to it. I believe, sir, our tariff laws at that time had much to do with low prices, because as a result of that law our industries were depressed in this country at that time. We were in poverty, sir.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; if the gentleman will pardon me, let me go on just a little while.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] frequently referred to me in his speech on Saturday. I did not interrupt him, because I seldom interrupt anyone who is making a speech on the floor of this House. I knew I would have an opportunity to answer him. I never saw or heard such a physical effort from any man in my life as he made on Saturday. I will say to him that if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] will go in the Northern States and repeat that speech word for word, so that all the people north of the Mason and Dixon line may hear him in that great exhibition, I will guarantee him that there will not be a Democratic Member of Congress returned to this House from that part of the country in the next two years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman said that with lower prices we are more prosperous. He is in favor of free trade. I never heard of anything that had the word "free" attached to it that I did not believe the gentleman from North Carolina would be in favor of. But let me call his attention to this fact: We had a Democratic administration in 1894, 1895, and 1896 and up to March 4, 1897. What were the prevailing conditions at that time? We had lower prices then. We had lower prices on everything produced and consumed in this country. Were we in a more prosperous condition then than we are to-day? Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact. He tried to taunt the Republicans for failing to pass certain legislation, and said that a Republican President had called the Democrats together to undo that which a Republican Congress had done. I ask the gentleman from North Carolina, who called Congress together in 1897 to undo what the Democratic Party had done the only time they had an opportunity to enact our laws for over 50 years?

Let me tell you what you did. You bankrupted the Nation, or nearly so. Horses never were so cheap in this country as they were in 1894, 1895, and 1896, and yet every poor devil in the land had to go on foot. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. In just a minute. Beefsteak never was so cheap since Adam came on earth. I happened to be an alderman in the town in which I lived, and during those lean years laboring men came to me in numbers and asked me to vote for a higher rate of wages for street laborers in our city because they said they could not afford meat but twice a week. Gentlemen, you never knew a time in your life, and I hope you never will know a time, when liver was in such great demand. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me finish this paragraph first. I am dealing with an answer to the gentleman from North Carolina. Clothing never was so cheap since the Republic was created, and our laboring men and their wives and their children went in tatters and rags, and you know it. We never were in need of clothing so much in our lives as we were during the four years when everything was so cheap. Can you deny it? If so, furnish your proof. Every laboring man in the land went about the country, and there were 3,000,000 unemployed laboring men, every one wearing a Democratic badge, a patch 8 by 10 inches on the seat of his pants. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

You never knew a time when there were as many farm mortgages spread on our records in this country as there were during the life of that bill. What caused it? Low prices and poverty to the farmer. The farmer is just exactly like a great nation. When his bank account runs low and he does not produce the farm articles that he can convert into money for his necessary running expenses, he must (just like this Nation did when your party was in power) put a mortgage on his farm.

But there is a day of reckoning when the mortgage must be paid. We are paying the interest, my friends, on the mortgage that your party put upon the Federal farm during your last administration. You will remember that you issued through your Executive $262,400,000 worth of Government bonds and sold them in Europe to get gold to put into the Treasury of the United States to pay the running expenses of this Government, upon which there was a premium of $30,000,000, or thereabouts, received, a total of $290,000,000 or more.

That money was put in the Treasury not for any improvements in the land, because the President had vetoed a river and harbor bill carrying an appropriation of $80,000,000, and when the people called Congress together to undo what your party had done, that money was gone and but a little of it left in the Treasury of the United States.

We undid the things that you had done during your administration. We brought prosperity back to the country again, and the wheels of industry have rolled all over the land from that day to this, and if you will let us alone they will continue to roll. During these four years, in addition to the farm mortgages that I have referred to, there was railroad property in this country in the hands of receivers to the tune of $1,800,000,000. The like has never been found in the history of the world before or since, when all industries languished as they did then.

Mr. HOBSON. Does the gentleman care to yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. With pleasure.

Mr. HOBSON. It is merely in connection with the gentleman's reference to the issue of bonds by the Democratic administration. I merely wish to ask the gentleman if that was not the result of the Sherman silver-purchase bill, a Republican measure, and if relief did not finally come with the repeal of that bill by a Democratic Congress?

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps the gentleman is right. Whether he is or not I do not know, but I do know this, Mr. Chairman, that the Democratic Party issued the bonds to get the money, and it was all expended before our party again come into control.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Certainly.

Mr. POU. Is the gentleman talking about those same bonds for which the plates were made and ready when Mr. Cleveland came into office?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know when the plates were made. I know when they were put into execution. [Laughter.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Cleveland has stated in his book, over his own signature, that, as a matter of fact, those plates were all prepared before his predecessor went out of office.

Mr. FORDNEY. I believe that statement has been denied time and time again; but I admired Mr. Cleveland, I believe, more than the average man in his party did.

Mr. POU. Then the gentleman is willing, I imagine, to accept the late President's statement as to the proof of that fact.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, let me tell you this much. You know, and so do I, that the Wilson tariff bill did not bring sufficient revenue to this Government to pay our running expenses, and the present tariff law does. There are no such conditions existing to-day warranting the calling of Congress together in an extra session to undo something that the Republican Party has done, as existed then, and I will leave it to the world to decide. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I must get along a little faster. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] to one thing. They are very earnest in their efforts to bring about the adoption of Canadian reciprocity. They are both protectionists. Just whether they can see beyond the limits of the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts at this time I am not going to say. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. FORDNEY. Just one moment. Let me say to you, you wanted free trade in leather, and you voted for protection on shoes. I have repeatedly said, and I repeat now, that any step toward a reduction of our duties was only a step toward free trade. You are in favor of Canadian reciprocity, and here comes a full-born child of free trade, a bill that puts shoes on the free list and leather on the free list, and I do wish it also put other things produced in New England on the free list. [Applause and laughter.] I am going to ask you if you are going to vote for that bill. I am going to introduce a bill, and I give notice now, and no better protectionist has ever lived than is found in me—and I hope my Democratic friends will support it—to put ships on the free list, so that American goods may be carried between two American ports by any foreign ship, and we will see how New England will like that.

Mr. HILL. New England men have fully as good eyesight as the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not doubt that.

Mr. HILL. And can see precisely as far into the tariff system, and I challenge him now to vote with me in accordance with the principles laid down in the Republican national platform, that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and if he does it once, it will be the first time he ever did it in his life. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, my friend is an elegant gentleman; he is a splendid fellow, no better lived—though some people do not know it—but let me ask him to reason out this. I happened to be a member of the committee on resolutions at the last Republican national convention——

Mr. HILL. Then the gentleman ought to be bound by the declaration.

Mr. FORDNEY. Are you?

Mr. HILL. I am. On manufactures from New England and lumber from Michigan, and on wheat also and every other product that we have in the United States.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, now, do not get excited, because you are in error. That platform says that the Republican Party proposes to give protection to American industry a tariff wall sufficiently high to offset the difference in the cost of production here and abroad and in addition thereto a fair profit.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Where in the name of God is there any protection for a profit in the free trade for which you vote?

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman wish an answer now?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; come on, I am not afraid.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the gentleman whether the figures on the other side do not also include a fair profit for them?

Mr. FORDNEY. Suppose the cost there was identical with the cost here?

Mr. HILL. Then I would have no duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute. Where is your profit? Figure it out if you can.

Mr. HILL. Where is their profit? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Let them keep their own market and we will keep ours. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HILL. We would with the addition of from $3 to $5 a ton in our favor across the ocean.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, you wanted to reduce the duty on wool, did you not? I had some wrestling with you, and one day you got angry—— [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. I think we were both a little excited.

Mr. FORDNEY. You excited everybody in your presence. [Laughter.] You said that you had paid $12,000 losses on an industry in the last 90 days. You said that much to me.

Mr. HILL. That is small.

Mr. FORDNEY. And you wanted the duty changed so you might not incur further loss.

Mr. HILL. Not at all.

Mr. FORDNEY. What the devil did you want it changed for, then? [Laughter and applause.] Now, let me go further; let me show you the lack of wisdom in that resolution in the Republican platform adopted at Chicago, which I as a member of the committee protested against. I have always tried to be fair, just, and equitable, and have stood by the majority of my party, and I will continue to do so except on some measures which I protest against and refuse to go in caucus to be bound upon.

Mr. HILL. I will stand——

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait until I finish this sentence. That resolution provided for a duty sufficiently high to offset the difference in cost here and abroad, and in addition thereto a fair profit to our producers. Let me call the gentleman's attention to this fact: There is an abundance of evidence on file, sir, that labor in Germany, France, and England receives about one-half the pay the same class of labor receives in this country. We will say when labor receives $1.50 a day in our factories such labor receives but 75 cents in England, Germany, and France for the same class of labor.

Mr. HOBSON. Will the gentleman yield——

Mr. FORDNEY. In a minute; and I have in my possession a consular report where the American consul in Belgium had gone to the cotton mills in that country and found that the average laborer receives an average pay of but 18 cents a day. Now, then, going across the water the other way, what do you find? You find Japanese labor working for from 6 to 15 cents a day and Chinese labor from 3 to 10 cents a day in gold. Tell me, sir, how you are going to fix a tariff wall the same for all the nations of the world to offset the difference of cost here and abroad, unless you legislate against the cheapest paid labor in the world and under such circumstances then, sir, your tariff wall is prohibitive to England, France, and Germany. It is an impossibility. It sounds well to the ear of a man who does not give consideration to these facts. I protested against it as being unwise legislation, and I would like to have the gentleman in his time in his speech, and he will have all the time he wants, to answer that question.

Mr. HOBSON. I do not wish——

Mr. FORDNEY. I will answer a question. When I get through with my remarks I will answer any questions that may be asked me.

Mr. HOBSON. I merely desired to ask the gentleman in connection with that much-discussed proposition of the relative cost of labor in America and abroad, whether it is not a fact that the American laborer produces more than the laborer abroad, and for what he produces to-day receives less, broadly speaking, in most of the wage-earning departments of labor, receives less per unit of product, than the laborer abroad does, and is therefore the poorest paid laborer in the world?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think the gentleman is away off in his conclusions. I have not the time to furnish you statistics here to that effect, but if you will give me time I think that I can convince the gentleman absolutely that he is incorrect. If he will pardon me, I will go on.

Now, then, upon the question of hay I wish to say a few words. Let me take up a few of the items mentioned in this bill. There is a duty at the present time of $4 a ton on hay. The State in which I live is a great producer of that product. Some $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 worth of hay was produced in the State of Michigan last year. I have here a hay trade journal, published at Canajoharie, N. Y., April 7, and I have several copies as well, and the prices given in each copy are practically the same, varying not more than 25 or 30 cents per ton on hay in our markets for several weeks. But I want to call the attention of the gentleman here to the fact that on April 7 the price of hay in Boston was $22 per ton; in New York, $21.50 per ton; in Jersey City, $21.50 per ton; in Brooklyn, $21 per ton; in Philadelphia, $20.50 per ton; in Pittsburg, Pa., $19.25 per ton; and in Montreal, Canada, mind you, the same grade of hay is quoted at $11 a ton. The duty is $4 per ton, and the freight on hay from Montreal, Canada, to Pittsburg is 23 cents per 100 pounds in carload lots of 10 tons, making $4.60 freight, and freight and duty together are $8.60. This deducted from $19.25, the price of hay in Pittsburg, left the Canadian farmer $10.65 a ton for his hay f. o. b. Montreal.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman now yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; if the gentleman will make it short.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Is the gentleman aware that upon hay No. 1 the price on January 2 at Toronto was $18 and in New York $16?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I am not.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is a fact.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, there were some conditions of the roads or scarcity of the article in the market that caused it, and it must have been due to some abnormal condition, because the price here in this trade journal runs about the same, running along week after week, just as I have given it to you, and any man will find by searching the record that the price of hay in Montreal is always below our price in this country just about the amount of the duty and the freight. Then will any man in favor of this measure contend that by removing the duty of $4 per ton upon hay it will not reduce the price of hay in our market or increase it in Canada?

It has been stated time and time again, and by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], I believe, on Saturday, that this bill will not cause a reduction of prices in this country on farm products; that it will not injure the farmers. There is only one way, in my opinion, that this bill could injure the farmers, and that is by lowering the price of his farm products, and if the importation of Canadian products into this country does not lower the price of the products of the farmer, it certainly will not lower it to the consumer. And then, who is benefited? And if the friends of this measure who stand here and contend that it is not in any way going to injure the farmer, I ask who are you legislating for? You are legislating for the Canadian absolutely.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. I am much interested in the gentleman's speech, and if he will permit me I desire to ask him a question on the topic which he discussed a moment ago—the question of reasonable profits guaranteed by the platform of the Republican Party. I am a protectionist, and always have been, and the

gentleman is a very strong protectionist. I believe that the first time that principle ever was enunciated in the platform of the Republican Party was in the Chicago convention of 1908—that is, the provision for a reasonable profit. It never was in our national platform until 1908. Is not that true?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know, sir; I presume that is right.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I think the previous platforms simply provided for an equalization of competitive conditions by the imposition of a tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman, please make your question as short as you can. I will appreciate it.

Mr. COOPER. Now, then, after we have established the cost price abroad and the cost price here, and imposed the tariff to equalize conditions, how much of a tariff is to be imposed in order to yield a reasonable profit? And is the reasonable profit to be 5 per cent, or is it to be 6 per cent, or is it to be 8 per cent, or is it to be 10 per cent upon a particular business? Is it to be the same on all businesses? How is that to be adjusted?

Mr. FORDNEY. My idea is this: That since 1897 we have had a tariff law upon our statute books under which the American people, both labor and capital, have been prosperous. I am old enough to remember back—my memory is not so short that it does not run back to 1894, 1895, and 1896—when conditions were different, and when we operated under a different tariff law, when we all suffered financial loss, while labor was the greatest sufferer in the land. I believe that our tariff laws which have been on our statute books since August, 1897, are sufficient to warrant a fair profit to the American people. I contend and insist that we should continue under that policy until we have been fully convinced that other conditions are necessary.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit just another question right there?

Mr. FORDNEY. In just a minute. I had not finished on hay. I want to complete my answer to the gentleman. Under the Wilson bill the duty on hay was $2 a ton. Under existing law and under the law known as the Dingley tariff law the duty has been $4 a ton. Under previous laws the duty was, as I remember it now, $4 a ton, which was the rate under the McKinley law.

Some gentlemen say that if this tariff law is abrogated it will not injure the farmer or his products. For three years during the life of the Wilson bill—four years, including a year of suspense—we imported 625,000 tons of hay from Canada, and for the last three years we have imported only 113,000 tons. The rate is $4 per ton. It was $2 per ton then. There was a great increase of importations under free trade—no; not under free trade, but under a lower rate of duty—a much greater importation then than now. Do not those figures show that by reducing the duty we shall certainly have increased importations? And if Canada does not expect to send more of her goods to our market in consequence of the reduction of these duties, why is she in favor of this reduction? She can change her tariff laws on our goods going into Canada at any time without our having anything to say about it at all, as we can change the rate of duty on her goods coming into this country.

Now, my friends, another great and important industry in our State is the production of beans. We produced some $15,000,000 worth of beans in the State of Michigan last year. Under the Wilson bill the duty on beans was 20 per cent ad valorem. That is my recollection now. Under existing law the rate of duty is 45 cents per bushel. For the first year under the Wilson bill we imported 1,160,000 bushels of beans from Canada. How much was it last year? For the last three or four years we imported less than 150,000 bushels a year. Will any man, then, contend that by lowering the duty on beans Canadian beans will not be brought into competition with American-grown beans—that great and magnificent crop grown in this country?

England produces beans for export for almost the whole world, and she has a preferential rate of duty into Canada below that which is given to us. I ask you, my friends, what will prevent Canada from purchasing for home consumption English-grown beans and dumping into our market her whole bean crop? Oh, it is absolute nonsense, it seems to me, to say that a reduction of the duty on beans will not increase the importation of beans from Canada, and thus lower our prices.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman know that the Massachusetts Cost of Living Commission found that beans brought a higher price in the markets of Canada than in the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not know it.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It is a fact.

Mr. FORDNEY. If so, how, then, can Canadians send to our markets 150,000 bushels a year and pay a duty of 45 cents a bushel? Explain that, if you will. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] spoke about cotton. Somebody on this side of the House said to him, "If you will vote for free lumber, I will vote for free sugar." He said, "Why, I will vote for both of them." Did you ever see anything that had the word "free" attached to it that he would not vote for?

Let me call his attention to cotton. Although it is not in this bill, it is discussed in this Senate Document 862. Let me say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I know this much about the cotton industry in the South, that before there were any cotton mills in the Southern States raw cotton sold down there at 5 cents a pound. I was there and I know what I am talking about. In 1892 and 1893 there were practically no cotton mills in the South, and the southern farmers, for a normal crop of 10,000,000 bales, received 5 cents per pound, or $300,000,000. What is the price to-day and what are the conditions down there? There are in the South to-day nearly 11,000,000 spindles at work in the cotton mills, employing American capital and American labor. In speaking of the New England States the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] said they were going to transfer the cotton mills from New England to the South, or words to that effect. There are 15,000,000 spindles at work in the cotton mills of New England, a total of 26,000,000 spindles in the United States. The price of cotton to-day is high, largely, I contend, the result of competition between American cotton mills and the foreign demand for cotton. Ten million bales, a normal crop in the South to-day, instead of bringing $300,000,000 to southern farmers as it did when the price was 5 cents per pound, now bring to those farmers $900,000,000. [Applause.]

There is a cotton mill in a little town in Mississippi that I am familiar with. I went through that mill and saw every part of it to familiarize myself with it. There are 20,000 spindles at work in that mill. Based on that number of spindles, there are more than 500 cotton mills in the South to-day working on raw cotton raised in this country, employing American labor, that was not employed in the South 20 years ago or 17 years ago.

In the face of the fact that there are 26,000,000 spindles working in the cotton mills of the United States to-day, we exported from this country directly to Europe and to Japan a large quantity of raw cotton and purchased back from those countries last year $86,000,000 worth of cotton fabrics. Do you believe it is a good plan for a farmer in Jones County, Miss., who raises cotton on a farm adjoining the city limits of a town where there is a cotton factory, to send his raw cotton abroad and employ Belgian labor that receives 18 cents a day, and then purchase a pair of overalls when they come back to this country, made by that cheaper labor in Belgium, instead of encouraging the production of cotton or the building of another factory in this country and keeping the money at home? Oh, my friends, if you will go down South and preach to the southern cotton growers what you preached here on Saturday, and give them the facts and figures, you will make a Republican of every southern white man.

The gentleman from North Carolina said he would vote for free sugar. Sugar is not in the bill, but it bears upon this subject. We have but one trade treaty upon our statute books to-day, and God forbid that there ever be another like it. That is Cuban reciprocity. I have talked so much about that subject that I am called a crank on sugar, but let me call your attention briefly to a few facts and figures. I was in Congress at the time that bill became a law. I protested against it and voted against it then. Thank heaven it never became a law by my vote. The balance of trade between this country and Cuba at that time was $8,000,000 a year in favor of Cuba. Last year it had grown to the enormous sum of $70,043,000. Let me tell the gentlemen on this side and on that side of the House what you did when you voted for Cuban reciprocity. You lowered the duty on sugar coming from Cuba 20 per cent below the rate paid on sugar coming from all other countries, which are all countries except our insular possessions. You reduced it 20 per cent. We have imported from Cuba during the life of that treaty 11,500,000 tons of sugar. This reduction of 20 per cent below the Dingley rate on that sugar sums up $77,510,000 the 1st day of January last lost to the United States Treasury.

Have the consumers of sugar in this country purchased their sugar for any less money than they did before? No; notwithstanding the fact that the world's supply of sugar before and

after the adoption of that treaty has been plenty, notwithstanding we have never had a famine on sugar or a short crop, so that the country's supplies would be advanced on that account, we have not bought sugar for a fraction of a cent less.

This is a step in the same direction. Do not forget when you voted for a reduction of the duty on sugar coming from Cuba, and when you vote for the reduction of the duty on goods coming from any country in the world, instead of voting in the interest of the consumers of this country you are voting money into the pockets of foreigners or some one other than our consumers.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield, yes.

Mr. KAHN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that under the reciprocity treaty with the Hawaiian Islands, which was entered into during the seventies, sugar was brought in free from those islands. The duty was removed entirely. The result was that the sugar was not reduced in price to the consumer a fraction of a cent, but a number of men who did the importing became multimillionaires as a consequence.

Mr. FORDNEY. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. In this country we have produced from cane and beets sugar as follows: Taking the same value for the total of all the crops mentioned from 1879 to date, about $4.70 per hundred pounds, we produced $8,535,000 worth. Ten years later, in 1889, we produced $14,000,000 worth. In 1899 we produced $20,000,000 worth. Just then the great beet-sugar industry took hold under protection guaranteed in the Republican platform adopted at the St. Louis convention in 1896, and the next four years, 1904, our crops had grown from $20,000,000 worth to $63,000,000 worth, and in 1909 to $76,655,000. It costs, in round numbers, to produce sugar from beets $3.90 a hundred pounds. It costs more in the Northern States than in the arid-land district to produce a pound of sugar from beets. In Michigan it costs about 4 cents to produce a pound. I have figures that will show what, under free trade, if the gentleman from North Carolina could have his way, the Sugar Trust could produce refined sugar for per pound if made from foreign imported raw sugar.

On the 13th of April, according to Willett & Gray's Trade Sugar Journal, sugar in bond in New York is quoted at $1.91 a hundred pounds. The duty on that imported sugar from duty paying countries, except Cuba, is $1.68½, and it costs 40 cents per hundred pounds to refine this sugar, or a total cost of $3.99½, practically 4 cents per pound. But, my friends, our imported sugar from duty paying countries comes principally from Cuba. We imported about 1,750,000 tons last year, while three-quarters of it came from Cuba. Deducting 20 per cent of this duty from the Dingley law, which rate we give to Cuba, and the Sugar Trust can produce a pound of refined sugar and put it on the market in the United States for $3.65 per hundred pounds, or about one-third of a cent below what it can be produced for in this country. Remove the duty on sugar altogether and the great American Sugar Refining Co. and the Arbuckles and others in the refining business can import from foreign countries all the sugar we consume, reduce the price below what sugar can be produced for in this country, and refine enough to wipe out of existence their competitors, and up will go the price again as of old.

And so when the gentleman from North Carolina says that he will vote for free trade on sugar, I am safe in saying that the sugar-refining companies in this country would pay a million dollars a head for men of the same opinion, until sugar is put on the free list. I impute no dishonest motives to him or any other man at all. Do not so misunderstand me, but men who will vote for free sugar are misguided. That is the point. It is well known that the Sugar Trusts of this country have been recently prosecuted for dishonest methods, and I say anything that will give them an advantage over the domestic industry they would move heaven and earth to bring about. So I criticize my friend from North Carolina for being a free trader on sugar. I am not.

Now, I am going to close. I have detained the House altogether too long, much longer than I had intended, but I have tried in my plain way to express to you my judgment about the enactment of this law, to show that if it is put upon our statute books it means the death knell to the farmers of this country.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman stated awhile ago in answer to an inquiry of mine that he would touch upon the lumber question before he concluded.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I had forgotten. I will do that briefly. Let me say that in this treaty it is proposed to put rough lumber coming from Canada upon the free list, and, again, the treaty reduces the duty on dressed lumber, according to the amount of work done upon it, below the prices fixed in the Payne tariff law. If you will take last year's prices of the imports of lumber from Canada, you will find that the rates fixed in this treaty are about 5 per cent ad valorem, while our lumber of the same grade going into Canada, with the same amount of work put upon it, must pay 25 per cent ad valorem. Canadians do not change their rate on lumber at all by the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i." Gentlemen, I say that it is absolutely unfair to put the product of that great, magnificent industry, the product of the mills, upon the free list unless you are going to help the consumer, and I ask you whether or not the reductions recently made inured to the benefit of the consumers?

I have information in my possession from a gentleman in Pittsburg whom I know well, a lumber dealer, who recently went into Canada and contracted for 10,000,000 feet of lumber, white pine, to be brought to this country, and before the parties in Canada would close their contract with him for this lumber they insisted upon and did write into that contract a provision that if this treaty becomes a law he shall pay $1.25 per thousand feet more for his lumber. I can produce a copy of that contract if necessary.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have heard it frequently contended that the kinds of lumber produced in Canada and shipped into the United States, or that would be under free lumber with Canada, will not compete with the grades of lumber produced in this country.

Mr. FORDNEY. There is not a grade of lumber made from any tree cut in the forests of Canada that does not come directly into competition with the same grade of lumber produced in this country and in nearly every State in the Union where lumber is produced.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman not think, then, that if this treaty goes into operation it will necessarily depress the price of lumber in the United States?

Mr. FORDNEY. It will do one of two things, as I have contended all along in my argument. It will either lower the price of the article to the consumer in this country or it will not. If it does lower the price to the consumer in this country, then it injures the industry and the twelve hundred thousand men employed in the sawmills of this country. If it does not lower the price to the consumer, no one will be benefited but the Canadian.

Mr. LANGLEY. Just one more question. Was that not the effect upon the lumber industry in the United States under the free-lumber provision of the Wilson bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, whether that bill was responsible for it or not I will not now attempt to argue, but it is my belief that it was. Prices were low, and the lumber industry was in bad shape. A great many concerns in the country went into bankruptcy or into the hands of a receiver. Labor employed in the camps received $16 per month and board, whereas labor now receives $40 and $45 per month and board. It was the same in every other industry in the country.

Let me go a step further. In this bill it is proposed to put print paper and pulp on the free list. At the same time every Province in Canada has placed an embargo upon her pulp wood. There are 824 paper mills in this country with $400,000,000 capital invested. There are thousands of men employed in those paper and pulp mills. They produced last year nearly $300,000,000 worth of product. Many of those mills largely depend now for their supply of wood upon Canada, yet in this treaty Canada absolutely refuses to permit the changing of her laws in a single Province to let us have her raw material for our paper mills in this country, but at the same time this bill proposes to put print paper on the free list.

Take out that provision of the law which puts print paper on the free list and there is not a Republican newspaper or magazine in the broad land that will not oppose it. Every one of them would rise up in arms against the treaty. I have been reliably informed that William R. Hearst, of New York, a prominent newspaper publisher, purchases 300 tons of paper daily. If he believed that the removal of the duty on print paper, which is about $4.90 per ton—say, for easy figuring, $5 per ton—if he believes that he can buy his print paper for just that much less money, the amount of the duty, which would be $1,500 per day on his raw material, do you expect him, Mr. Hearst, to oppose Canadian reciprocity? No; he is no such philanthropist. Every newspaper in the land has a selfish interest. They are striking a blow at the agriculturist to get their print paper free and discriminating against one of the most important industries in the land.

Gentlemen, I thank you, and I have detained you already too long. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman occupied?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied 2 hours and 2 minutes, making a total for that side of 3 hours and 27 minutes occupied.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an act passed by the parliament of New Brunswick and approved by the governor of that Province on Thursday last. It goes into effect on October 1 next. The title of this measure is as follows:

An act respecting the manufacture of spruce and other pulp wood cut on Crown lands.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may print this act in the RECORD in connection with the few remarks that I may make.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Florida forces me to read the act.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All right; read it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I shall first take the opportunity of commenting upon it.

As you all know, the New Brunswick forests are principally owned by that Province, and all rights to cut timber are leased from time to time to private parties. By the terms of the new act every license to cut spruce or other soft wood, trees or timber, except pine and poplar, "shall contain and be subject to the condition that all such timber cut under the authority or permission of such license or permit shall be manufactured in Canada; that is to say, into merchantable pulp or paper or into sawn lumber, woodenware utensils, or other articles of commerce or merchandise as distinguished from the said spruce or other timber in its raw or unmanufactured state."

In other words, at the very moment when our political necessity is forcing us to make one-sided concessions to Canada, at the very moment when we are engaged in reducing our agricultural and other tariff schedules under the specious pretense of reciprocal agreement, that is the time chosen by a great Province of Canada for striking a blow at our manufacturers. After October 1 next we shall no longer be able to import our wooden raw material from New Brunswick. What a comment this is on the doctrine that this reciprocity agreement will give us cheaper raw materials! Its first result is to forbid us raw materials altogether.

No one knows better than I that these remarks are falling on deaf ears. No one knows better than I that New Brunswick lumber is not manufactured in the South, whose relentless grip has been fastened on this branch of the Government. History, however, has an unpleasant way of repeating itself. Already at least one great Province of the Dominion has adopted the Canadian policy which existed during the continuance of our reciprocity treaty of 1854. To those of you who heard the debate in this House two months ago I need not recall the fact that by unfriendly legislation throughout the continuance of the Elgin treaty Canada contrived to render valueless the concessions which she made us.

Now, I shall read the act:

An act respecting the manufacture of spruce and other pulp wood cut on Crown lands.

Be it enacted by the lieutenant governor and legislative assembly as follows:

1. All sales of timber licenses by the surveyor general, which shall hereafter be made and which shall convey the right to cut and remove spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, other than pine and poplar suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, and all licenses or permits to cut such timber on the limits and berths so sold, and all claims entered into, or other authority conferred by the said surveyor general, by virtue of which such timber may be cut upon lands of the Crown, shall be so made, issued, or granted subject to the condition set forth in the first regulation of schedule A of this act, and it shall be sufficient if such condition be cited as "the manufacturing condition" in all such licenses, permits, agreement, or other writing.

2. The resolutions set out in schedule A of this act are hereby approved and confirmed and declared to be legal and valid to all intents and purposes, and the sale shall apply to all licenses or permits hereafter issued, whether for the first time or in renewal of licenses or permits heretofore issued or granted.

3. The lieutenant governor in council may make any further or additional regulations necessary to enable the surveyor general to carry into effect the object and intent of the regulations contained in schedule A.

4. No licensee of any timber license or permit shall hereafter sell, assign, or in any way transfer to any other person or company the interest of such licensee therein under such license until such licensee shall have paid to the Province the sum of $4 per mile.

5. The first three sections of this act and the regulations thereby approved shall not come into force until the 1st day of October, A. D. 1911.

SCHEDULE A.

1. Every timber license or permit conferring authority to cut spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, not being pine or poplar suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, on the ungranted lands of the Crown shall contain and be subject to the condition that all such timber cut under the authority or permission of such license or permit shall be manufactured in Canada; that is to say, into merchantable pulp or paper, or into sawn lumber, woodenware utensils, or other articles of commerce or merchandise, as distinguished from the said spruce or other timber in its raw or unmanufactured state; and such condition shall be kept and observed by the holder or holders of any such timber licenses or permit who shall cut or cause to be cut spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, not being pine or poplar, suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper under the authority thereof, and by any other person or persons who shall cut or cause to be cut any of such wood trees or timber, under the authority thereof, and all such wood, trees or timber, cut into logs or lengths or otherwise shall be manufactured in Canada as aforesaid. It is hereby declared that the cutting of spruce or other soft wood trees, or timber, not being pine or poplar suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, into cord wood or other lengths, is not manufacturing same within the meaning of this regulation.

2. Should any holder of a timber license or permit, or any servant or agent of such holder, or any person acting for him or under his authority or permission, violate or refuse to keep and observe the condition named in the preceding regulation, then, and in such case, the license or permit to cut spruce or other softwood trees or timber not being pine or poplar on the limit or berth, territory, lot or lots included in the license or permit, and on which or on any part of which there was a breach of such regulation, or a refusal to observe or keep the same, shall be suspended and held in abeyance and shall not be reissued, nor shall a new license or permit issue unless and until so directed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and then only upon such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may impose.

3. The surveyor general, his officers, servants, and agents may do all things necessary to prevent a breach of the aforesaid condition and to secure compliance therewith and may for such purpose take, seize, hold, and detain all logs, timber, or wood so cut as aforesaid, and which it is made to appear to the surveyor general it is not the intention of the licensee, owner or holder, or person in possession of, to manufacture or cause to be manufactured as aforesaid in Canada, or to dispose of to others who will have the same so manufactured in Canada until security shall be given to His Majesty satisfactory to the surveyor general that the said condition will be kept and observed and that such logs, timber, or wood will be manufactured in Canada as aforesaid; and in the event of the refusal on the part of the licensee, owner, or holder, or person in possession of such logs, timber, or wood to give such security, within four weeks after notice of such seizure and demand of security by or on behalf of the surveyor general, then the surveyor general may sell or cause to be sold such logs, timber, or wood by public auction after due advertisement to some person or persons who will give such security to His Majesty as the surveyor general may require that such logs, timber, or wood shall be manufactured in Canada. The proceeds of such logs, timber, or wood shall, after such seizure and sale, and any sum due and owing to His Majesty for or in respect of any timber dues, ground rent, or on account of the purchase of any timber or timber berths by the owner, licensee, or holder of a permit, or other person who has cut or caused to be cut such logs, timber, or wood, or who is the owner or holder of the same, to be paid over to the person entitled to the same.

4. *Provided, nevertheless,* That nothing in the preceding regulations which requires spruce or other timber, not being pine, suitable for manufacturing pulp or paper, to be manufactured in Canada as aforesaid shall apply to logs, timber, or wood cut and in use in Canada for fuel, building, or other purposes for which logs, timber, or wood, in the unmanufactured state are or may be used.

5. After seizure the burden of proving that the timber is to be manufactured in Canada shall be on the owners of such timber.

6. Where the timber to be seized is mixed up with other timber, the whole of the timber may be attached and dealt with accordingly until satisfactorily separated.

During the reading of the above the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not understand the gentleman. We do not know what he is reading. I will make the point of order the gentleman must read so that we must understand it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, is the point of order sustained?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am going to insist that this House do not degenerate into a circus, even if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is playing the chief rôle.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] who has issued tickets for admission to that circus. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I insist that I have a right to hear what is going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled that there is no rule by which the Chair can compel a Member of the House to read in any other manner than he himself sees fit. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the Chair mean to hold that Members can get up on this floor and read a document or make a speech in some jargon that is absolutely unintelligible, under the rules of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair means to hold what the Chair has already stated, that there is no rule by which the Chair can control the manner in which a gentleman reads a paper in his own time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Whether it is intelligible or not?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do not suppose that the gentleman from Florida means to be annoying in objecting to printing this telegram in the RECORD, but I maintain it is an important thing that the House should have in its possession to-morrow a full statement of that act, passed by the New Brunswick Legislature on Thursday. For that reason, inasmuch as I am allowed only five minutes, I am reading rapidly, so as to get the matter into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, was not my time taken up in the discussion of the parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman had that in mind, and permitted the gentleman to go beyond the strict five minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more.

After the reading:

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time has the gentleman occupied?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] now yield some time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, two months ago the Canadian reciprocity agreement went through this House with an overwhelming majority, only to meet an untimely end in the august body at the other end of this Capitol, done to death by the standpatters, and by them unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

When I voted for this bill, as a member of the minority, I did so because I believed it was the most that we could hope to obtain from a Republican administration. But now that we are members of the majority, I shall vote for it because it is the first step in the Democratic plan of tariff reform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am glad of an opportunity to follow my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. From sitting two years on the Ways and Means Committee with him I have learned that whenever I am on the opposite side of an economic question from the gentleman from Michigan I am bound to be in the right, so that when I follow him upon this floor, taking the opposite side of this question, I know that I am standing upon solid and substantial ground. The gentleman from Michigan is the highest protectionist of them all. He is the author of the now historic phrase that for him "the best tariff revision would be to make the Dingley rates the bottom and the blue vault of heaven the top." Now, after the Napoleon of the standpatters, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], shall have fled from the field with his broken and disheartened cohorts, the gentleman from Michigan, playing the part of Cambronne, will stand there with the last remnants of the Old Guard, ready to die, but never to surrender.

He has favored us to-day with a rehash of all the old protection arguments to which we have listened for now these 10 years past—arguments which the country repudiated at the last congressional election.

Chief among his arguments was the threadbare, time-worn Republican claim as to the effect of the Wilson tariff law upon the articles protected by the present tariff. He says that the price of wheat went down under the Wilson law all on account of the tariff protection being taken off, but he neglects to state that in those days the price of cotton was down to 6 cents, and cotton had no tariff tax upon it. He neglects to state, what so often has been stated from this side of the Chamber, and much better than I can formulate it, that the financial depression of those days, in so far as it was due to any legislation whatever, was due entirely to the conduct of affairs by the preceding Republican administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And he fails to call attention to the oft-stated fact that the issue of bonds debited against President Cleveland was an inheritance that fell to President Cleveland from the preceding Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who left a bankrupt Treasury and had the plates already engraved from which those bonds were to be printed and issued.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan, in coming down to a discussion of the present tariff act in comparison with the Wilson tariff law, states the Wilson tariff law did not bring in enough revenue to run the Government. The reason why that is so is because an integral part of the Wilson tariff law was the income-tax provision, passed at the same time, but the income-tax law was then declared unconstitutional. At the present moment the movement throughout the United States to enable us to amend the Constitution so as to place an income-tax law upon the statute books is pressing to a triumphant conclusion, and in my belief it will be the best means of accomplishing a genuine tariff reform that this country has ever seen.

But the gentleman from Michigan went further and made the bold statement, by way of contrast, that the present tariff law, the Payne-Aldrich Act, does produce enough revenue to run the Government. If the gentleman would look over the most recent receipts at the Treasury, he would find that the present tariff law is running some $12,000,000 behind what was expected, and that there would be a present deficit in the Treasury if it were not for the increase in receipts from internal-revenue taxation, amounting to about $16,000,000 in round figures.

On Saturday afternoon we had the pleasure of listening to the maiden speech of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], and I think that every Member of the House wishes him well in his new position in this House. But it struck me, in listening to the academic discussion of the history of farm protection by the gentleman from Maine, that he has served so long at the right hand of the Speaker that he has grown a little bit out of touch with the farmers of the United States. The gentleman from Maine rehearsed for our benefit the experiences of Germany and England, which he says we should follow. He recited for our benefit the tariff law of Germany, which he says protects the agricultural products of that nation, and he represented to us the benefits that that had brought to the German farmer.

But the gentleman from Maine, in describing the dramatic manner in which Bismarck gave up his free-trade position and gave himself over hand and foot to the agragrians, failed to say that he did so, not at the demand of the farmers of Germany, but at the demand of the agragrians, as they are called—the great noblemen of Prussia, the great landed proprietors who control all the farming lands of the Prussian kingdom, and who, while retaining all the profit that they can make out of the tariff law or other restrictive measures for themselves, grind down their tenant farmers in sweat into the soil of that land. And I will tell the gentleman from Maine that the restrictions placed upon Germany by the agragrians are the chief cause of the present economic discontent in the German Empire.

Now, as to England. The gentleman from Maine advanced an argument, recently prepared and presented by the tariff commission of England, in favor of placing a tax upon agricultural products. Why, the gentleman from Maine is evidently not aware of the fact that protection is as dead as a doornail in England to-day, and has never been more so through the whole history of the British Empire.

He seems to make use of the recommendations of the British tariff board in very much the same way that standpatters in this country hope to make use of the recommendations of our so-called Tariff Board. Our Tariff Board is devised to continue the reign of protection. Let me show you what I believe would be the effect of the application by the Tariff Board of the principle announced in the last Republican platform of the proper method of establishing tariff rates. This says that it should be the difference in the cost of production here and abroad plus a reasonable profit for the manufacturer. Now, I will tell you exactly where that would lead you. If you applied that strictly, if you ascertained exactly the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, and then added a reasonable profit for the American manufacturer, what you would bring about would be an absolutely prohibitive protection; because if you have eliminated the difference in cost of production here and abroad you have destroyed the ability of anybody outside of the United States to send anything in here, and then you have driven the thing home by adding a reasonable profit for the American manufacturer.

Now, certainly if this so-called Tariff Board of ours, which is operating at enormous expense, with great delay and with complete secrecy, is to carry out the dictates of that principle, we will not be able to collect any tariff revenues whatever, because everything manufactured here will be nourished behind a prohibitive protection in the United States.

Now, to return just a moment to the argument of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS]. Coming down from general statements of policy he selected two industries which he was particularly interested in seeing retained under what he believes to be proper protection. One of them was cheese and the other one was potatoes. Now, as a matter of fact, in the year 1910 we exported to Canada over $45,000 worth of cheese, and the same year we only imported from Canada $27,000 worth of cheese. Now, why do you suppose Americans sent their cheese

to Canada? Because they got a better market there. That is why they sent it there. They did not send it there for fun, or to amuse themselves, but to make more profit, and the movement of cheese toward Canada was three times as big as the movement of cheese from Canada toward the United States.

Here is what has been happening in cheese. In 1850 the cheese produced on farms and ranges in the United States amounted to 105,000,000 pounds; in 1860, 103,000,000 pounds; in 1870, 53,000,000 pounds; in 1880, 27,000,000 pounds; in 1890, 18,000,000 pounds; and in 1900, 16,000,000 pounds. The fact is that so far as the farmer is concerned cheese making is going out of existence.

Mr. MADDEN. Does that include the so-called cheese factories?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. No; I am just about to come to that. The production of cheese in the United States is passing out of the hands of the farmers and into the hands of the factories. In 1905, which was the last year for which we have the statistics, the cheese factories in the United States produced 317,000,000 pounds, of which we exported 10,000,000 pounds. Under that system will you tell me how the farmer of Maine or New England is going to be injured by free trade in cheese with Canada?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FINLEY). Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, the factory gets the product from which the cheese is made from the farmer, does it not?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. And the profit is divided between the farmer and the factory in the cost of the manufacture?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The farmer can not both eat his cake and have it, too. When he comes to complain about the difference in duties between cattle and meat, then the farmer says the meat is the product of the manufacturer and not the farmer's product. And so it is with cheese. As a matter of fact, free trade in cheese with Canada is not going to hurt the New England farmer one cent.

Mr. MALBY. Will my colleague give way for a question on that?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. MALBY. Is the gentleman able to state to the House the difference of the market price in the United States, for instance, New York and Canada, during the last few years?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will be glad to have the gentleman furnish the figures with which he is evidently brimming. It is difficult to obtain comparative prices, because the two countries make different kinds of cheese.

Mr. MALBY. I mean the great bulk of cheese, the usual American cheese. It is that to which I refer, and it is that to which the figures refer. Is it not a well-known fact that the difference in price between Canada and the United States is substantially the amount of the tariff?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If that were the case, the consumers would benefit very much in the United States by taking off the tariff, but I believe the gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] has kindly handed me the report of the cost of living by the Massachusetts commission, in which the prices of cheese are given, as between Detroit and Windsor, Boston and Montreal, Bangor and St. John. It is 18 cents in Detroit and 18 cents in Windsor.

Mr. MALBY. Will the gentleman give way for another inquiry?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will.

Mr. MALBY. For what year is that?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Nineteen hundred and ten.

Mr. MALBY. Is that the price that the farmers held it for?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That is the price to the producer.

Mr. MALBY. That is a higher price than it is ever sold for——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I see it is the price to the consumer.

Mr. MALBY. Oh, well, I know nothing about that; I am talking about what the farmer gets.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me on this proposition?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman has given the prices between Detroit and Windsor.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes; I would have quoted the other prices, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] said that he had no interest whatever in the prices to the consumer.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish the gentleman would quote the prices of the Tariff Board on cheese between Detroit and Windsor.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I would be glad to, but I have not looked it up. The gentleman can put them in the RECORD.

Mr. LENROOT. I will read them. The wholesale price in Detroit was 15½ cents and at Windsor 10 cents. At Detroit the price was 17½, but at Windsor it was 12½.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. That illustrates the difficulty in depending on these statistics, because any man going from Toronto to Quebec and from Chicago to Bangor to ascertain the price of farm products will find about 25 or 30 different prices of the same commodity at the same time on either side of the line. The Massachusetts cost-of-living statistics directly controvert statistics produced by the Tariff Board.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman has been referring to the retail prices, and these statistics refer to the wholesale farmers' prices. They make no contradiction, one of the other.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now, to resume the argument which I was making against the statement of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Before the gentleman leaves this matter, I would like to ask one question.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Very well.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. The gentleman stated that the manufacture of cheese has passed from the farmer to the factory; that the farmer was no longer interested in the effect of this treaty.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, no; the gentleman from New Jersey is mistaken; I did not make any such broad statement as that.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Since the farmer has found it more profitable to sell the material from which the cheese is made to the factory than to make it himself, is he any the less affected by free trade in cheese than if he used his own materials to make the cheese?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will say to the gentleman, I did not attempt to make the distinction between the time when he made it himself and between the time when the factories made it, but I said the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] in making his plea for the cheese farmer probably forgot the industry was now in the hands of the manufacturer of cheese, who makes it in factories.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. How does that affect the farmer less than when he made it himself, since he supplies the factory with the raw material? If free trade in cheese destroys the business of that factory, then what is the farmer to do with his raw material? And if the answer be to make cheese with it, the question is, where will he sell it?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I agree neither with the gentleman's premise nor with his conclusion, and if he had listened to my figures he would not have made that argument, because I stated a few moments ago that the cheese factories of the United States were making 317,000,000 pounds of cheese and exporting 10,000,000 pounds of cheese.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. True, but the simple point I wanted to make——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I regret to seem discourteous, but I think I have yielded long enough on this subject.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I do not want to take the gentleman's time——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I beg the gentleman will now allow me to proceed.

Mr. MALBY. Will the gentleman give way for one question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further on this point. Now, as to the question of potatoes, about which the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] seemed so much concerned, he evidently had not investigated the figures or he would have discovered that in 1910 we imported from Canada $36,000 worth of potatoes, and in the same year we exported to Canada $213,000 worth of potatoes. Now, if we have a surplus of potatoes from this country to export into Canada, how are the potato growers of the United States to be injured by free trade between Canada and the United States in potatoes? The fact of this thing, in my judgment, is that the farmer is being made the cat's-paw in this matter. Gentlemen on either side of the Canadian border line are making use of the farmer to pull their chestnuts out of

their fire. The farmer is not going to be injured. The American farmer is not going to be injured when there are 12 American farmers to 1 Canadian farmer. The American farmer is not going to be injured when the productions of our principal crops are in such overwhelming proportions in favor of the American.

Crop production in 1909.

WHEAT.		
United States	bushels	664,602,000
Canada	do	166,744,000
OATS.		
United States	bushels	1,007,353,000
Canada	do	353,466,000
BARLEY.		
United States	bushels	170,284,000
Canada	do	55,398,000
RYE.		
United States	bushels	32,239,000
Canada	do	1,715,000
HAY.		
United States	tons	64,938,000
Canada	do	11,877,100
CORN.		
United States	bushels	3,125,713,000
Canada	do	18,726,000
POTATOES.		
United States	bushels	376,537,000
Canada	do	99,087,200
BUCKWHEAT.		
United States	bushels	17,438,000
Canada	do	7,806,000

Crops exported in 1910.

Wheat	bushels	46,679,876
Oats	do	1,685,474
Barley	do	3,052,527
Rye	do	219,756
Hay	tons	55,007
Corn (of which 6,000,000 bushels went to Canada), bushels		44,072,209
Potatoes	bushels	1,001,476
Buckwheat	do	158,160

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. In saying that the American farmer will not be injured by this proposed agreement, if it becomes operative, does the gentleman mean to say that he will not be injured because he will receive as much for his products as he now does?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I firmly believe he will receive fully as much for all his products.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Then the gentleman, I take it, does not subscribe to the doctrine that the passage of this bill will reduce the cost of living.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will answer the gentleman in two ways. First, by stating what I stated before, that he who deludes himself into the belief that this is going to produce an immediate reduction in the cost of food is very much mistaken. I do not see how any gentleman can successfully maintain that proposition on this floor.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Then the gentleman does not subscribe to that idea, but rather to the other, that this will not reduce the cost of living.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Eventually it will, but now it can not.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Eventually, when it does, will it also lower the cost of the farmer's product?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It will not, as I stated, and as I will state again, for in my judgment the effect of increasing the sources of food supply will be to prevent the corner of any product on any produce exchange in any city of the United States, and will prevent the middle man from raising the prices to the consumer.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. This bill does not reduce the price to any considerable extent upon what the middle man has, the completed product, dressed beef and flour.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Oh, yes, it does. The gentleman is mistaken. He evidently has not examined the bill. If he will permit me, I will come to that in a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, I would not read these figures, excepting for the fear I have that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] may be present in the room. I would like to print them in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to print these and other tables in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print certain tables in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, in order thoroughly to understand the extraordinary campaign which has been waged against the reciprocity agreement on both sides of the border line it is necessary to look no further than the thirty-fifth page of the Canadian reciprocity agreement as printed for the use of the Ways and Means Committee.

Read down at the bottom of page 35 and it will appear that the present rate is $1.25 per thousand feet on lumber, which duty is to be removed and that article is to be made free. The whole source of the agitation on the American side of the line comes right from the United States Lumber Trust. It has been urging the farmer into the belief that this reciprocity is going to hurt the farmer, whereas the sole interest that the lumberman has is not for the farmer of the United States, but for himself. A few years ago I was down at Jacksonville, Fla. I was driving along that magnificent drive there, the water front, and I asked the old negro driver who it was who owned a fine house we were passing. "Why," he said, "that is Mr. Jones's house, the lumber king." We drove about another hundred yards and there was another magnificent dwelling on the St. Johns River. I said, "Who owns that house?" "Why," he said, "that is Mr. Smith's, the great lumber king." And then we went a little farther and there was a palace of another lumber king, and you could take all over the United States wherever there is any timber and you will find out that that is the case in each one of those cities. Now, these gentlemen are important, they are powerful, they are rich, and they have come into the arena to do battle with this measure of tariff reform. If they can, they will do it to the death, but so far as the Members of this House are concerned, the Democratic Party is ready to do battle with the Lumber Trust for the rights of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the Canadian side of the line the opposition has been just as bitter as it has been on ours, and on their side of the line it proceeds from exactly the same kind of people, the highly protected interests. Now, I have here a few copies from some of the Canadian newspapers showing the frame of mind of the Canadian, whom the farmer of the United States supposes to be chortling in his glee at the prospect of the magnificent advantage that Canada is to derive over the Yankee from this agreement. One man says that "reciprocity is going to split Canada in two." Another speaker says that it is "the worst possible distortion of democracy." Another member of Parliament announces that this is an "outrageous thing." A Canadian newspaper says that Canada is about to "turn aside from her high destiny and become the lumber camp and dumping ground of the proud and prosperous American Republic." Another Canadian newspaper has an editorial which says, "Reciprocity scotched, but not killed. The snake is scotched, but not killed. Congress has expired without passing the reciprocity resolutions, but an extraordinary session has been called for April 4." Now, here is what one of the leading members of Parliament said in the House of Commons there. He said, "Everybody is really laughing at the Canadian commissioners, they being such fools as to go over to the United States and bring back what is in reality a pinchbeck, an imitation treaty," and here he says in the presence of the prime minister:

> Let me tell the minister exactly all about all that. If you look through this treaty you will find that a long, lean, dark——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman 30 minutes additional.

Mr. HARRISON of New York (reading)—

> A long, lean, dark, hairy hand has manipulated every part of it. I wonder whose it is?

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague give way for an inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. With pleasure.

Mr. MALBY. I notice the gentleman is reading a great many extracts from Canadian papers against the so-called treaty. Assuming he has concluded his reading, I wanted to inquire whether he had found any of them who are in favor of it?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Why, I have not any here handy to quote, but I will assure the gentleman that the Canadian protectionist on his side of the line is much more terrified at the prospect of reciprocity even than the American farmer on his side of the line.

I have here a letter which was written by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], in which he addresses his constituents with some very edifying information about the balance of trade in agricultural commodities between the United States and Canada, and in the absence of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], I am going to announce that I shall also print this in the RECORD. Briefly, he says that of horses during the last five fiscal years we sold to Canada $14,000,000 worth and Canada sold to us $2,500,000 worth, being a balance in our favor of $11,600,000

worth. Of cattle, we sold to Canada $1,500,000 worth and Canada sold to us $1,100,000 worth.

The balance in our favor is $384,000. Of meat and dairy products, we sold in Canada $17,000,000 worth and Canada sold to us $904,000 worth, being a difference in our favor of $16,000,000. Of breadstuffs, we sold to Canada $31,500,000 worth and Canada sold to us $6,600,000 worth, being a difference in our favor of $24,916,000.

Now, from these figures the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] argues to his constituents:

Of these items, which are largely produced in Missouri, we sold to Canada $53,030,755 more than Canada sold to us. Upon these articles we had to pay the Canadian tariff. But for this Canadian tariff our balance on these items would have been still larger. Reciprocity would relieve us from that hindrance to our trade. How, then, could reciprocity hurt the Missouri farmer?

Again, here is another newspaper statement of a Canadian reason for opposing reciprocity, and it sounds exactly like the same argument on behalf of the same kind of people on our side of the line. This is Sir Edmund Walker, of Toronto, president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce. He said:

I am opposed to this proposition, because Canada has nothing to gain by it and everything to lose. We are the largest purchasers of goods from the United States, and we sell comparatively little. What can we gain by free trading with this country when we have little of our raw products to sell? Canada consumes 80 per cent of her food products, and this home consumption is growing at a rapid rate. A few years ago we sold to Great Britain $25,000,000 worth of cheese and $7,000,000 worth of butter annually. To-day our cheese exports to Great Britain have fallen off to $17,000,000 and we export no butter. Canada is building up an independent nation, and we have a struggle before us. We do not want to create a market for our agricultural products in their raw state, for we have all the customers we need at our own doors, who pay the farmers prices as high as those of the United States.

Now, I will very cheerfully corroborate his statement about the prices by reading here a table of prices of standard cattle, both in Toronto and Chicago, from 1901 to 1910:

Table of prices, 1901 to 1910.

	Toronto.	Chicago.
May 4, 1901	$4.25	$3.95
May 14, 1902	5.25	5.00
May 13, 1903	4.90	4.06
May 12, 1904	5.20	4.90
May 9, 1905	5.70	5.50
May 10, 1906	5.10	4.00
May 17, 1907	5.12½	4.00
May 15, 1908	5.50	5.00
May 25, 1909	5.75	5.10
May 13, 1910	7.00	6.25

And also a table of prices of various commodities in Toronto and New York, January 2 of this year, as follows:

	Toronto.	New York.
Bran, per ton	$24.00	$24.00
Hay, No. 1	18.00	16.00
Dressed hogs	10.00	11.72½
No. 1 dairy butter, per pound	.30	.22
Eggs, new laid, per dozen	.50	.35
Ducks, per pound	.17	.10
Chickens, per pound	.16	.12½
Turkeys, per pound	.22	.18½
Geese, per pound	.14	.14
Apples, Spy, per barrel	4.50	3.50
Onions, per bushel	1.00	.75
Potatoes, per bag	.90	.73

In view of that statement it is hardly surprising that on March 18 the resolution introduced by Premier Whitney in the Ontario Legislature protesting against the ratification of the agreement for reciprocity with the United States was carried last evening by a vote of 75 to 17.

Again, the Toronto Mail and Empire of February 15, 1911, says:

The markets of Britain and Germany swallow up United States farm produce, and as for the Dominion, it is a pretty good customer for Uncle Sam, even though duties are collectible upon what he has to sell. Last year—that is to say, the year ending on March 31, 1910—we bought from the United States of agricultural products the following:

Animals	$681,000
Grains	268,000
Hay	141,000
Potatoes	179,000
Tomatoes	165,000
Other vegetables	486,000
Fruit	1,120,000
Butter	16,000
Cheese	45,000
Eggs	177,000
Honey	20,000
Clover seed and timothy	748,000
Fruit and other seeds	250,000
Fresh meats	106,000
Bacon and hams	$816,000
Beef, salted	75,000
Pork, barreled in brine	930,000
Meats, dried or smoked	85,000
Meats, salted	50,000
Canned meats	45,000
Lard	1,347,000
Lard compounds	62,000
Canned vegetables	69,000
Wheat flour	156,000
Prepared cereal foods	240,000

If the United States is the paradise for farmers, how does it happen that all these products from the United States come to us despite the adverse duties? While the reciprocity scheme is represented to be a great concession by the United States Government to the Canadian farmers, for whom that Government has suddenly developed an affection, the truth is that it is really a plan for the improvement of the condition of the United States farmers, and for the thwarting of the British preference for Canada which the Unionists in Britain are advocating. The United States farmer will get under reciprocity a larger share of the Canadian fruit market, the Canadian meat market, and the Canadian market for early vegetables. He will also be assured of the continuation of free trade in Britain for his surplus. But the Canadian farmer can not derive a corresponding advantage from the bargain. Everything we can produce is also produced in the States, and in quantities that are far in excess of the consumption.

Mr. KENDALL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENDALL. Is it the tendency of the gentleman's argument to establish that agricultural products are really cheaper in America than they are in Canada?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. In many cases they are. There is no general rule which can be observed.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] submitted some figures upon the price of hay in the United States and the price of hay in Canada, and he evidently had not examined the report of the Tariff Board on this subject, because instead of being able to tell me that my figures on hay were isolated examples, he would find that all along the line and in almost every instance hay is more expensive in the Canadian market than it is in the markets of the United States. If he will go further and examine this report, and the report of the Massachusetts commission to investigate the cost of living, he will find that beans, peas, beets, and onions, as well as other vegetables, are uniformly or almost uniformly, higher in the Canadian markets than they are in the markets of the United States. I will submit to the Committee, and print in the RECORD, the prices of eggs, which along the Canadian border line are more expensive in Canada than they are in the United States, causing a natural export from our country to Canada of 750,000 dozen last year, while we imported from Canada only 39,000 dozen:

Wholesale prices January, 1911, in Buffalo, 36 cents a dozen; Toronto, 40 cents a dozen; retail prices, Buffalo, 36 cents a dozen; Toronto, 50 cents a dozen. In Bangor, Eastport, and Calais, Me., wholesale prices, 26–30 cents a dozen; in St. Stephens, New Brunswick, 33 cents. In Manchester, N. H., wholesale, 27 cents; retail, 30 cents. In Sherbrooke, Quebec, wholesale, 35 cents; retail, 35 cents. In Ogdensburg, N. Y., wholesale, 30 cents; retail, 35 cents. In Prescott, Canada, wholesale, 32 cents; retail, 36 cents. In Burlington, Vt., wholesale, 27 cents; retail, 30 cents. In Montreal, wholesale, 35 cents; retail, 40 cents.

Now, there is one great exception to my belief that the cost of food products will not be immediately lowered by the passage of this act, and I refer to the question of fish.

Undoubtedly the admission of fish free from Canada will be a great boon to the eastern cities along the Atlantic seaboard. At the present time we import $13,800,000 worth of fish altogether, of which 35 per cent comes from Canada. Now Canada exported $16,000,000 worth of fish last year, and I hope and believe a considerable proportion of the Canadian export of fish will henceforth come to the people of the cities on the Atlantic seaboard, where the high prices of meat have made it all the more desirable for the people of those cities to have cheaper fish.

The United States Bureau of Fisheries has estimated that Canada can supply us, if given a chance, with twice as great a supply of cod, haddock, and hake as she does now, and with an immensely increased supply of halibut, mackerel, salmon, and smelts. According to their estimates, Canada could supply us with 20,000,000 pounds fresh cod, 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 pounds fresh haddock, 5,000,000 pounds fresh hake, and 12,000,000 pounds of fresh halibut.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like to know where the gentleman gets his figures on the fish products.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Those were the figures given out by the United States Bureau of Fisheries about three weeks ago.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I simply wish to say that in this book, which is put out for our credence on reciprocity, it is shown that Canada shipped into the United States, all told, fish to the value of $73,000,000, as against less than $4,000,000 worth shipped into Canada by the United States.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman is talking about salted fish. I was not talking about salted fish. I was talking about fresh fish entirely.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was talking about all kinds of fish.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Now, to take up one other point in this argument; the farmers of the United States have been made to believe that while their products have gone on the free list the products of manufacturers have been left at the former high rates. In other words, the farmers have been made to believe that they are not getting a square deal, and in that belief they are encouraged to assert that the negotiators of this treaty have betrayed the farmer for the sake of getting free food from Canada; that they put his products on the free list and keep high taxes upon manufactured articles. Now, the most brief and cursory examination of the provisions of this agreement will show that manufactured articles have been immensely reduced in duties, not all along the line, but in many articles in which the farmer himself is interested. I will print these in the RECORD instead of detaining the committee at this time by reading them:

RECIPROCITY CONTAINS REDUCTIONS ON MANUFACTURED GOODS.

Many agricultural implements, 45 per cent to 20 per cent: Hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, manure spreaders, windmills, parts for repair.

Portable engines and traction engines, 30 per cent to 20 per cent.

Pocketknives, scissors, shears, and cutlery, 40–60 per cent to 27½ per cent.

Clocks, watches, etc., 40 per cent to 27½ per cent.

Farm wagons, 35 per cent to 22½ per cent.

Also, flour from 25 per cent to 50 cents per barrel. Canned vegetables, 40 per cent to 1½ cents a pound. Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound to 50 cents per 100 pounds. Prepared cereal foods, 20 per cent to 17½ per cent. Mutton, lamb, and fresh meats, 1½ cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound. Bacon and hams, 4 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound.

Also, carbon electrodes, 30 per cent to free. Brass in bars and rods, 45 per cent to free. Cream separators, 45 per cent to free. Tinplates, 1.2 cents per pound to free. Crucible cast-steel wire, 35 per cent to free. Galvanized iron and steel wire, 1.2 cents per pound to free. Type-casting and typesetting machines, 30 per cent to free. Barbed fencing wire, ¾ cent per pound to free. Rolled round wire rods, 0.6 cent per pound to free.

But it is a fair question to ask why there were not more manufactured articles either reduced in duty or put on the free list. The farmer thinks that the people who negotiated this treaty did it because they meant to make a drive at him, and as one of those who is in favor of the treaty, I feel some concern that he should entertain such a supposition. I will therefore read, for the benefit of the committee, a brief explanation made by the Canadian premier, Sir Wilfred Laurier, as to exactly why the treaty was drawn up in the shape it is now in. Speaking in the Canadian House of Commons on March 7, 1911, he said:

This agreement is concerned chiefly with natural products. There are no manufactured products dealt with in it, except agricultural implements. In negotiating this agreement we have adhered strictly to the terms of the resolution which was adopted at the Liberal convention of 1893, in which the Liberal Party declared for a treaty of reciprocity in natural products and a carefully considered list of manufactured products. Why did we put this restriction in our resolution? Why did we state in so many words that the reciprocity which we would negotiate, if it ever became our lot to do so, would be general for natural products, and would be confined to a carefully prepared list of manufactured products? Because, sir, there is a vast difference between reciprocity in natural products and reciprocity in manufactured goods. This is the reason we have acted with this prudence. I do not know who was present at the conference which took place between our two friends besides me and Mr. Knox; but it is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products; but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

So that gentlemen can plainly see, from the statement of the Canadian premier himself, that the Americans were not trying to keep all manufactured products on the dutiable list; that it was the Canadians themselves who were doing that; that they were unwilling to have our manufactured products come into Canada at greatly reduced rates.

Now, so far as Democrats are able to correct this inequality, we propose to do so by a bill which will come treading fast upon the heels of this one, for the moment that the reciprocity agreement has passed the House the Democrats will offer the House a bill placing upon the free list a great many manufactured products which the plain people and the farmer folks of the United States have to purchase. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But the farmers should understand that the treaty drawn in the form in which it is, which is substantially the form of the Democratic reciprocity treaty of 1854, was not drawn with any dark or cunning design on the part of privileged interests in this country pulling the strings behind the scenes, but was the result of the refusal of the Canadians themselves to let more of our manufactured products come into their country.

But, as the gentleman from North Carolina well said the other day, it is impossible to measure the benefits of this treaty by any figures of dollars and cents. There is a bigger question here than any question as to whether a peck of onions costs more in Canada or in the United States. It is a question of principle that goes to the very roots of our economic policy. It is a principle which, I am glad to say, the Democratic Party is standing almost solidly behind. I believe it is the entrance to a new era of economic prosperity. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], in boasting about the effects of his protective system, entirely overlooked the panic of 1907–1909. He had a singularly agile memory when he transported us back to the days of 1894–1896 and entirely neglected to call our attention to the Roosevelt panic, under high protection, which struck hardest of all in the highly protected district of Pittsburg, where most men were thrown out of employment. Overlooking that panic, the gentleman from Michigan believes that the protective system has built up the prosperity of the United States. Gentlemen on this side of the Chamber believe that our prosperity has gone forward by leaps and bounds in spite of that prohibitive protection, and they believe that this reciprocity agreement will produce the greatest prosperity that this country has ever known. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McMORRAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will ask the gentleman not to interrupt me. I am about to conclude. I believe our economic prosperity will advance by the greatest strides this country has ever seen as soon as this treaty with Canada goes into effect, and that it will lead inevitably and with unerring aim to absolute free trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the immediate effect upon our business affairs of striking down these unnatural barriers between our sister country and ourselves will be magical. By the treaty of 1854 half of the Canadian carrying trade was immediately transferred, the very next year, into the hands of the United States, and as soon as this treaty goes into effect every line of industry and every occupation in the United States will at once reap the benefit of a sound, healthy, and sane economic administration of affairs between ourselves and the Dominion of Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I yield back the balance of my time and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from New York consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York consumed 47 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS].

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on the subject of Canadian reciprocity last February and I now wish to urge again its consideration.

This is the identical measure which at the last session of Congress passed this House by an overwhelming majority. The opposition in the Senate prevented its consideration in that body and now the House is preparing to again pass the measure, and by their action and the renewed urgency of our President force the consideration of the reciprocity bill on the Senate.

Since the days of the Revolution the subject of closer commercial relations with Canada, a country situated on our same continent and populated by people of similar tastes and standards, has ever been before our people, but at no time has the popular demand for an extension of our trade relations with our neighbor on the north been so universal as it is to-day.

With the ever-increasing cost of living and the hindrance of our industries by a tariff policy which raises the cost of production of American goods, the manufactories of our country are demanding wider markets and the people of our cities are demanding cheaper goods. Our industries, unequaled in power and production by any in the world, can no longer demand the entire surrender to them of the American market, and a reduction of the price of necessities can be accomplished only by an extension and widening of our commercial relations. The first step to check the increasing cost of living is offered by reciprocity with Canada. Further steps will be taken as rapidly

as possible, for the Democratic Party, elected on pledges for a lower tariff, proposes to keep those pledges by revising the tariff in the consumer's interest. Mr. Chairman, had the Nation listened with more patience to those who a century ago urged closer commercial relations with the Provinces to our north, both countries would have developed along natural lines of commerce, and to-day we would not hear the complaints of that small proportion of our population who believe that this agreement will prove injurious to them. We have also, Mr. Chairman, the illustration before us of the workings of a previous treaty of a similar nature with our neighbor.

THE ELGIN TREATY, 1854–1866.

Although the reciprocity sentiment has always been felt in the councils of this Nation, but one really comprehensive reciprocity agreement with Canada has become a law. This agreement—the Elgin treaty—was in force from 1854 to 1866. It dealt with three subjects—navigation of the St. Lawrence, trade relations, and the fisheries question. Of these the subject of trade relations is alone germane to the present discussion. The question of the fisheries, recently settled by The Hague, now interests us only in its commercial aspect, and the navigation question is a thing of the past.

The sentiment toward establishing a reciprocity agreement with Canada was very strong in the late forties. In 1848 such an agreement passed the House, but went no further and failed to become a law, because of complications as to the St. Lawrence which were of such a nature that they could never have been unraveled by legislative action alone.

In 1850 another bill to establish Canadian reciprocity passed the House, but was again halted by the complexities and doubts as to the attitude of Canada, and this attempt also failed.

In 1853, therefore, Congress passed a resolution authorizing the President to arrange reciprocity by means of a treaty, and under this authorization the treaty was drawn and was later passed by the House and ratified by the Senate. The Elgin treaty thus enacted provided a much more complete free list than that here presented. It provided for free interchange of natural products from farm and sea, forest and mine. The free list contained wood, cotton, coal, wool, raw tobacco, meats, and manufactured lumber. This extensive free list met with almost universal approval, and although it put on the free list many more products of the farm than are included in the list before us now, yet it was not considered to have injured the agricultural interests. No complaint was heard from the American farmers as to the workings of the Canadian agreement, and, in fact, their only criticism was that more products were not placed on the free list.

The feeling against the Elgin treaty, which resulted in its repeal in 1866, can not be attributed to its economic failure, and a study of its effect on our commercial relations with Canada is the strongest argument in support of the Canadian reciprocity agreement of to-day.

SUCCESS OF ELGIN TREATY.

In answer to a resolution of the House the Secretary of the Treasury communicated to the House of Representatives February 21, 1864, a letter which gave tables which furnish us with information as to the working of this treaty. The total imports into Canada from the United States in 1850 are shown by this table to be $6,594,860, on which we paid in duties the sum of $1,069,814. The exports from the United States into Canada were at this time gradually increasing each year, though at a very slow rate; but in 1855, the year after the ratification of the treaty, our exports to Canada alone amounted to $20,828,676, and increased yearly until in 1862 they amounted to $25,173,157. So under the operation of this treaty the exports from the United States to Canada increased from $6,000,000 to $25,000,000 annually, more than quadrupled.

At the same time the value of the free goods which we sent into Canada from the United States increased from $791,128 in 1850 until they reached $19,444,374 in 1862, the last year in which there was return, or from considerably less than one million up to nearly twenty millions.

It can not be claimed that the Canadian duties were unfairly raised, because during all this time the Canadian rate of import duty, which in 1850 was 18.43 per cent, increased in 1861 to 19 per cent, which was only a small fraction larger than when the treaty was commenced. To Canada and its Provinces the total exports from the United States increased to $28,629,110 in 1863 and the imports from Canada and the Provinces from $490,704 to $19,299,995. The total trade between the United States and Canada increased from $24,182,103 in 1854 to $40,908,887 in 1862, and shows the marked success of the treaty. The figures for the last few years of the treaty are misleading, because the war between the States created an unnatural demand for Canadian goods. The minority in their report protest against the measure because "it renews a trade agreement with Canada similar to one which heretofore existed, from 1854 to 1866, and the operation of which proved disastrous to the United States." The effect of that treaty is one of the strongest reasons for the enactment of this present measure, and the figures I have just given indicate that commercially the previous treaty was successful, and we are confident this treaty will prove so as well. All the conditions which made that treaty successful exist to-day in greater force. The fact that the total trade with Canada almost doubled in less than 10 years may show to those opposed to the measure that it was a failure, but I am confident that the people of this country will regard such a fact as the best evidence of its success.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH CANADA.

Since 1892 the United States has sent each year to Canada an amount constantly increasing in excess of our imports from the north, until in the fiscal year of 1910 our Canadian exports were more than double our imports—$206,611,517 to $96,357,998.

WHERE CANADA TRADES TO-DAY.

In proportion to her population Canada is the best market for our products, and her purchases from this country of $223,521,800 are over twice what she purchased from Great Britain and compose half of the entire imports of the Dominion. Her exports to us amount to $104,199,675 as against exports of $139,482,945 which she sends to England. Hence, while supplying half her imports, we only purchase from her 37.3 per cent of her exports. Our exports to the German Empire are but $258,000,000, or but little in excess of those to Canada. Without the item of cotton our exports to Germany amount to $120,000,000. Enormous as is this trade with Canada, with the artificial barriers of the tariff removed it would undoubtedly, if we may judge by our previous experience with Canadian reciprocity, greatly increase our commercial relations with the Dominion. Since the unwise termination of reciprocity in 1866 Canada's exports to England have increased 527 per cent, but her exports to this country only 62 per cent. Here at a glance is the result of high protection—an invisible, unnatural, political border line made nearly nine times as obstructive as 2,000 miles of salt water.

THE EFFECT OF OTHER RECIPROCITY TREATIES.

We have seen that the effect of the previous reciprocity treaty was to immensely enlarge the business and commerce between the United States and Canada. That such enlargement was to the mutual profit of the people of both countries no one can deny. Commercially and politically it served a most important purpose. In considering the effect which this proposed treaty with Canada may have, it will be particularly important to see the effect on our trade relations which other reciprocity treaties which are at present in existence have produced.

Trade with the Philippine Islands shows tremendous growth under the stimulus of the reciprocity agreement, as is shown by the following tables:

Exports from United States to Philippine Islands, 1909	$11,189,441
Imports from Philippine Islands	9,433,986
Total trade for year 1909, before free trade	20,623,427
Exports from United States to Philippine Islands, 1910	16,832,645
Imports from Philippine Islands to United States	17,317,897
Total trade for year 1910, after free trade	34,150,542

An increase of 70 per cent during a single year.

Porto Rico, with which we have free trade, shows by its imports and exports an equally strong argument for reciprocity:

Exports from United States to Porto Rico, 1898	$1,505,946
Imports from Porto Rico to United States, same year	2,414,356
Total trade for year ending June 30, 1898	3,920,302
Shipments of merchandise from United States to Porto Rico, 1910	27,097,654
Imports from Porto Rico to United States	32,095,897
Total trade for year 1910	59,193,551

Cuba, with which we have a reciprocity agreement, shows the advantages of this trade, as follows:

Imports from Cuba to United States, 1903	$62,942,790
Exports from United States to Cuba, 1903	21,761,638
Total trade for 1903, before treaty	84,704,428
Imports from Cuba to United States, 1910	122,528,037
Exports from United States to Cuba, 1910	52,858,758
	175,386,795

The arrangements above show absolutely that in all three instances both countries have profited immensely by their trade,

and can anyone doubt that in obtaining for the people of the United States the food products from these islands we have made a distinct advance in retarding the ever-increasing cost of living? To the people of these islands themselves we have given the power to purchase our manufactured articles, which purchases have stimulated our manufactures and increased the demand for labor in this country.

COST OF LIVING.

The increased cost of living is one of the principal problems faced by the people of to-day. The purchasing power of the workingman's wages has grown constantly less. The United States Senate has made an investigation of the cost of living. Many States have done the same thing, and it is a problem which we are making every effort to solve. My own State of Massachusetts appointed a commission on this subject, and I quote from its report (Mass. House, 1910, Doc. 1750, p. 384):

But the tariff was never meant to apply seriously to the food of the people, save for the development of such industries as the growing of fruit in Florida or beets for sugar in the West. From the first it was designed to create and preserve manufacturing industries. The odium of the corn laws need but be suggested to show how obnoxious would be a serious tax on food. If we have reached the point where it is of real importance to us to have the product of the farms of the North, as well as that of the farms of the West, no tariff hindrance can be endured.

As this country approaches the point where it will cease to export many of its food products, the tariff on food will force up the prices, and, in addition, will enable speculators, by cornering the market on food products, to engage in the worst form of speculations on the daily demands of the necessaries of the people.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I take it from the gentleman's argument that his belief is that this agreement will tend to reduce the cost of food.

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman believe also that it will reduce the price of materials from which food is made, which will be received by the farmer?

Mr. PETERS. I will say, if the gentleman will allow me, that the consumption of food in this country is increasing faster than its production and that we are closely reaching the point where we will cease to produce in America sufficient food products for the American consumption. When that point is reached, then I believe that we must have some food imported from other countries. I do not think to-day in many food products they will be affected one way or the other by the passage of this agreement.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Then, if the food products are not affected, I suppose the prices of the products to the consumer will not be affected by this bill?

Mr. PETERS. I think the food prices to the consumer will be somewhat affected, because it will allow an interchange of food products from points in Canada to the United States where they can be exchanged with a less cost of transportation and that the expense of the middle man in placing the food in the hands of the consumer will be reduced; and I do think that in certain articles of food there will be a reduction, and a material one in certain cities. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. To what commodities does the gentleman refer, may I inquire for information?

Mr. PETERS. I am coming to it, and I have tables to show the difference in prices of food between American cities and those in Canada.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Can we have from the gentleman what particular food commodities he claims will be reduced in price in cities as a result of this legislation?

Mr. PETERS. I was about to present the statistics on this when the gentleman interrupted me. In proof of the general proposition that the consumption of food products in this country is outstripping the production of the country I want to quote to the House certain statistics of imports of food for the last few years. I invite the consideration of the House to some facts in the conclusion of the Cost of Living Report I referred to, on page 530, and ask them to bear in mind that this food report was made by a commission the majority of whose members are believers in a protective tariff. The report says:

It is not probable that the removal of the duty on farm products would diminish by a penny the wage rate of farm laborers anywhere in the United States. That rate is determined by the competition of the mill and the attractiveness of the city. * * *

It is not our belief that removal of the tariff on the staple articles of food would speedily and greatly reduce the cost of living. The same causes are making food high in all the civilized world, and the difference between wholesale prices is not enough to warrant the expectation that a policy of what, for brevity's sake, would doubtless be called "free food" could change international transactions greatly and at once. Its importance comes from the fact that we are soon going to buy a material part of our food outside our own limits. It would further have the very beneficial consequence of removing what chance may now exist to "corner" food products—a chance that puts the public at the mercy of the speculator and the trust. To some extent, also, it would lessen our dependence on the seasons and the weather. Bad harvests rarely occur over all the world.

We submit, therefore, that it is a wise economic policy to give the people free access to those articles of food that call for the bulk of the expenditure of the masses. For purposes of revenue, it may be wise to tax somewhat the comforts, and the heaviest duties should be levied on the luxuries, but the food necessities of life should be "free."

Now turn to statistics in support of the above statements. First consider wheat.

WHEAT.

Wheat is the most important product of the Dominion of Canada, of which product Canada exported 57,000,000 bushels, out of a total crop of 166,744,000. This bill removes the duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. At the present we export 144,000,000 bushels of wheat, but our amount is constantly diminishing, while that of Canada is rapidly increasing, and at no distant day our exportations from this country will probably cease. The price of wheat is largely determined, not by local conditions, but by the markets of the world in Liverpool, where the wheat grown in Russia, Asia, Canada, and the United States compete.

In 1910 the United States exported into Canada $55,139, or 54,964 bushels, and there was imported from Canada $135,441, or 152,441 bushels.

THE AMERICAN FARMER.

If the American farmer could stand the whole Canadian output in the fifties, surely he can stand the portion that would be diverted from England by the operation of the agreement now before us, an agreement not nearly so comprehensive as that of 1854.

CONSUMPTION IS INCREASING FASTER THAN PRODUCTION.

In proof of the proposition that consumption is increasing faster than production let me first quote from the Report on the Cost of Living (p. 265) of the Massachusetts commission:

The home demand for the products of the soil is outstripping the home supply.

Imports for consumption.	1899	1909
Breadstuffs	$940,366	$5,190,354
Meat and dairy products	1,950,835	6,503,775
Vegetables	2,170,959	8,029,748
Wood, and manufactures of wood	8,241,250	30,642,780

Not only do we import more for consumption—we export less of food products and produce, in the main, less per capita from year to year. In proof of this statement, let us consider a few statistics. First in regard to wheat:

	Per cent.
Since 1880 population of the United States has increased	80
Since 1880 production of wheat in United States increased but	50
For the decade ending 1890 United States exported of its wheat (average)	27
For the decade ending 1900 United States exported of its wheat	25
For the last 6 years United States exported of its wheat	17
For the year 1909 United States exported of its wheat	12
	Bushels.
In 1880 United States produced per capita	9.9
In 1909 United States produced per capita but	8.3

Contrast this rate with that of Canada:

In 1909 Canada produced per capita	23.7

Nor has the United States cut down its rate of consumption:

	Bushels.
In 1900 per capita consumption of United States	4.74
In 1909 per capita consumption of United States	6.22

The report of the Massachusetts commission, page 367, draws the obvious conclusion:

Eliminating the factor of the variations of crop, it looks as if we were lessening our exports by about 2 per cent a year, so that it is not at all impossible that we shall be in the world's market for wheat in the course of a dozen years. Of course when we begin buying wheat it will be from Canada.

Other examples beside wheat.

CORN.

	Per cent.
Since 1880 population of the United States has increased	80
Since 1880 production of corn has increased but	66
In 1900 United States exported of corn and corn meal	10.3
In 1909 United States exported of corn and corn meal	1.4
	Bushels.
In 1900 United States per capita consumption	24.4
In 1909 United States per capita consumption	20.7
In 1880 United States produced per capita	34.2
In 1909 United States produced per capita	31.4

Cereal crops that have been practically constant for the last decade.

	Bushels each year.
Rye (about)	30,000,000
Buckwheat (about)	15,000,000
Oats (about)	900,000,000

Over this same period population has increased 25 per cent, which means that in 1900 there were 5 bushels of these grains per capita, now but 4 bushels. Barley alone of the great cereal crops has kept pace with growing population.

Two other interesting examples of actual and comparative decline in production.

LUMBER.	Thousand feet.
1900	34,780,513
1907	40,256,154
1908	33,224,369

COTTON.

(Production practically stable since 1897.)

	Bales.
1897	10,897,857
1909	10,386,209
1904 (the bumper year)	13,697,301

Drain of population from the land.

(Percentage increase of urban and rural population.)

Years.	Total population.	Urban.	Rural.
1870-1880	30.08	40.0	27
1880-1890	24.6	61.0	15
1890-1900	20.7	36.8	13

The Massachusetts commission, in its report on the cost of living (p. 529), mentions the drain of the population from the land as one of the main factors in restricting supply and enhancing the cost of commodities.

The percentage of increase of our urban to our suburban population shows also the fact that we are having fewer and fewer people producing the products and we are having more and more people desiring to consume them in our cities. With demand constantly outstripping supply, it will not be long before we cease exporting food products altogether. The ever-increasing growth of our cities is hastening that end.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this is a desirable condition, and if he thinks that subjecting the farmers' products to the competition of Canada will tend to decrease it?

Mr. PETERS. I fail to see what effect the competition of the Canadians would have on either increasing or decreasing the tendency toward the concentration of the population in our cities. I believe that that is caused by other circumstances which are entirely beyond and outside of those to be affected by the agreement which is before us.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that this relative rapid increase of population in the cities is due to the fact that we have not the agricultural land on which to raise the products, or does he think that the inducements of manufactures and other industries are so large and so much greater that the farmers are turning to them? It must be one way or the other.

Mr. PETERS. Why, as I replied before, the general social conditions, the general circumstances of life in the country, the general opportunities that are offered in the cities all tend to affect it. It is too large a question, if the gentleman will excuse me, for me to take up and make a reply to in the few remaining minutes which I have granted to me at the present time.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. It seems to me it is a most important question at this point.

Mr. PETERS. To the same report I will refer you in regard to this effect of the concentration of population in our cities.

OBJECTION OF THE MINORITY TO RECIPROCITY.

It appears from the views of the minority set forth in the report (H. Rept. 2150), and from the speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] on February 15, that those opposed to reciprocity with Canada have three main objections to the proposed treaty.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], who signs the report, calls attention to the objections to this agreement and sums them up in three heads. The first objection is that we should vote against this agreement because it is un-Republican. Gentlemen, I am afraid the Members of this body will to-day place the welfare of the American people above the force which the gentleman from Pennsylvania gives to that argument. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The second point: It is class legislation. It discriminates against the farmer. In Mr. DALZELL's words:

> His corn, his wheat, his potatoes, his hay, his oats, his live stock are all put on the free list. His reaper, his harrow, his plow, his farm implements are all taxed.

In the first place, I have just shown you that the production of all our great cereal crops, except barley, is not increasing at a rate anything like population.

Secondly, farming implements, together with a number of other things, are going to be put on a free list which is already reported by the Ways and Means Committee to the House, against the objection of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but there is the danger, of course, that when this matter comes up for discussion the minority will find it convenient to use farm implements to support a different argument, namely, that to put these articles on the free list would be "class discrimination of the most obnoxious character"—it would give the farmer an unfair advantage over the protected manufacturer. It is in this manner that the protectionists hold themselves out as the savior of all classes.

The third point made by the minority: It involves a trade agreement with Canada similar to the one that existed from 1854 to 1866, and the operation of which proved disastrous to the United States.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania in his speech in the House on February 15, 1911, makes much of the point that this is the reciprocity agreement of 1854 over again, with comparatively little change. He then attempts to establish the fact that the 1854 treaty was disastrous to the United States, and he then concludes that the proposed treaty will be accompanied with the same bad results as that of 1854.

In the opening sentence of his speech Mr. DALZELL declared it was not his intention to go into details, nor would I attempt to estimate exactly what will be the actual amount of trade in each or any articles upon the passage of this reciprocity treaty, but like Mr. DALZELL I will attempt to draw some conclusions from our previous experience with reciprocity. I have already given you some statistics which pointed out the growth of trade between Canada and the United States. Mr. DALZELL in his speech of February 15 admits this growth of trade between the two countries, but greatly laments the effect it had on the balance of trade and, with Mr. Blaine as his authority, states that in the last year and three-quarters of its (the treaty's) life the balance of trade was against us in the sum of over twenty-eight millions.

The last year and three-quarters of this treaty were coincident with the closing years of the war between the States, a period when we were producing an abnormally small amount both on the farm and in the shop. We had to buy abroad, and I would ask if it was not a matter of good fortune rather than otherwise that we had a source so near at hand—where could we have obtained food and other supplies more quickly or cheaply?

To-day the balance of trade is not the "bugbear" it was in the middle of the last century; but if a point is to be made of it in judging the success of the 1854 reciprocity treaty, would it not be more to the point to take the statistics of trade other than those which show the trade of this country with Canada when we were in the most unnatural condition imaginable?

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman does not contend that those figures are not correct, does he?

Mr. PETERS. I do not, but I do contend that the inference should be drawn only from the time the Elgin treaty started, in 1854, up to the time the abnormal conditions began to affect our trade with Canada, in 1862 and 1863. And the figures of that time will show such a condition that the gentleman himself will come to a very different conclusion from that which he seeks to present to this House in his argument in February last.

Now, on page 117 of Extracts from Congressional Debates on the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, House Document 1350, you will find a table showing our imports to and exports from Canada from 1854 to 1862, and inasmuch as the gentleman asked me a question, I will ask him if he considers these figures show the Elgin treaty to be a failure?

	1854	1862
Total exports to Canada	$15,533,101	$25,173,157
Total imports from Canada	8,649,002	15,063,703
Balance in favor of the United States	6,884,099	10,109,454

A gain of over $3,000,000, or of 50 per cent, in our excess export balance.

The only year down to 1862 in which we did not have a favorable balance of trade with Canada was in 1860, when Canada exported more than she imported by the insignificant sum of $250,000—and it will be recalled that 1860 was a year of commercial and financial instability in the United States.

As late as May 24, 1864, Mr. Sweat said in the House:

By a report of the Secretary of the Treasury recently made it appears that our exports to the British Provinces were $26,445,683 more than the amount imported from them by the United States.

He also states that with all the defects of the present treaty the balance of trade for the last 10 years has been in favor of the United States.

It would seem, then, that Mr. DALZELL's argument against the success of the treaty of 1854 was unfortunately based on figures that were really not representative. It therefore follows that that gentleman's gloomy predictions, which are based entirely upon results which seem to be misleading, can have little weight in the consideration of what will result from the proposed treaty.

Mr. DALZELL frankly says that we "have everything coming our way"—that is to say, the balance of trade with Canada to-day is decidedly in our favor; in fact, it is abnormally in our favor. Judged from the statistics given by Mr. DALZELL, it would seem that we would lose this balance. I have shown you that such a conclusion is unwarranted. Also, Mr. DALZELL seems to entirely overlook the fact that if Canada can buy our goods to-day in great quantity she would be able to do so to a much larger extent if she could pay for them with her products instead of with gold.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, may I have a moment more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, as this seems to me an opportune moment, and as I have some tables which I wish to present to the House, I will ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PETERS. I am evidently mistaken as to the opportunity. [Laughter.]

Mr. KENDALL. The gentleman should not have asked for unanimous consent in so loud a voice. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want to insert some figures in the RECORD?

Mr. PETERS. Yes; tables of figures covering prices.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. PETERS. I do.

Mr. MANN. I wish to inquire, without taking it out of the gentleman's time, whether the objection of the gentleman from Florida goes to the extension of remarks, or to the ordinary insertion of figures and tables, such as are not ordinarily included in a speech as it is delivered on the floor, and whether there is any objection to the request that that privilege be granted to the gentleman?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I ask whether the objection of the gentleman from Florida to the extension of remarks goes simply to the extension of remarks, or to the right to insert tables of figures and papers that are correlated with the argument?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state, for the benefit of the committee and to answer the gentleman from Illinois, that I do not care. My object is to try to force, if it can be done, an amendment to the rules—such an amendment as I introduced this morning—to stop this indiscriminate printing of prepared speeches in the RECORD that were never delivered.

I do not intend to object, and I want to put the committee upon notice now that I do not intend to object to the request of any gentleman during this tariff debate, to print in the RECORD statistical information, but I do intend to object whenever I am here—I can not be here every minute—to the extension of remarks by which some gentlemen write out long-winded arguments that were never delivered, because I regard that practice as a fraud upon the public and an unnecessary tax upon the Treasury. That is my position.

Mr. MANN. In the main I fully agree with the gentleman, and I thought the gentleman would not wish to object to inserting tables of figures, and such things.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not, and shall not object to that during this debate.

Mr. PETERS. Then, I will submit the request again, that I may print in the RECORD, in connection with my speech, certain tables which are taken from the report that I hold in my hand, and which are pertinent to the subject before the House at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to include with his remarks certain statistical reports just referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. PETERS. And the words of explanation which naturally precede them.

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. Gentlemen, we are not claiming that this reciprocity agreement is going to revolutionize the cost of living, but I have tried to show you here to-day, and the import and export figures do show conclusively, that, in the first place, the Elgin treaty, to which this is similar, was financially and commercially a success for this country. Trade increased under it to a tremendous extent. I have shown here, also, that the consumption of agricultural products is increasing in America far beyond the increase in their production. It is admitted that the cost of living is going to be an ever-quickening problem that must be faced, that all the people of our country are facing. We do not come before the people to favor one class of consumers as against another, and you will have the best of evidence before this session is over that the Democratic Party, which has been placed in control of this House, proposes to carry out to the people of the country to the letter the pledges that it made before election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe that we are getting dangerously near the point where the duty on food products will raise the price or render easy a corner in the market. To carry out this agreement this body will act in accordance with an overwhelming public sentiment, and will show that it is actually what it is in name—the House of Representatives of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HARDWICK having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD with my remarks the statistical tables to which I referred in the course of those remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] asks unanimous consent to print with his remarks certain statistical tables. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time did the last gentleman consume?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has used 4 hours and 12 minutes in all, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] 3 hours and 37 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to state that I will yield five hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], to be consumed on that side by gentlemen favoring the bill. I will arrange with him as to the time when that shall come in. I will say that we should like to have the debate run this evening until 6 o'clock.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday last this debate was opened by one of the greatest orators and perhaps the readiest debater in this House—my friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. In his opening remarks he congratulated the Democratic majority upon the auspicious beginning which they had made in the carrying out of their platform promises. He did well so to congratulate them, for that was the first time within the memory of any man within the sound of my voice when anyone could congratulate the Democratic Party upon carrying out any promise.

He referred to two measures which have already passed this House: First, the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the election of Senators by a direct vote, and I join with him in congratulating the Democratic majority upon

the passage of that resolution. [Applause.] I congratulate this side of the House upon the fact that that resolution received almost the unanimous support of the Members on this side of the Chamber. The second measure that he referred to was the measure that passed this House last Friday with reference to publicity of campaign contributions, and the gentleman said that that, too, was a fulfillment of the pledge of the Democratic Party in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to read the promise of the Democratic Party made in its national convention in 1908 with reference to campaign contributions, and consider for a moment how near that bill complies with the promise of his party. That plank reads as follows:

We pledge the Democratic Party to the enactment of a law preventing any corporation contributing to a campaign fund.

Was there any line in that bill on prohibiting corporations from contributing to campaign funds? No; but the Democratic Party is not chargeable with any neglect for that reason, because at the time this platform was written there had been written into the statute books of the United States, 12 months before by the Republican Party, a law prohibiting corporations from contributing to campaign funds. [Applause on the Republican side.] And therefore the Democratic majority should be acquitted from any charge of violation of their platform in that regard.

As I listened to the gentleman from North Carolina Saturday, listened to the wealth of misinformation that flowed from his lips—not intentionally misleading, of course, because the gentleman would not do that—but as I listened to him and his carelessness, not to say recklessness of statement, I wondered if the gentleman from North Carolina, perhaps, had not written this plank in the Democratic platform pledging the Democratic Party to the enactment of a law that had already been enacted by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina had not had the time for a serious study of the question which he discussed Saturday, and perhaps he may be excused for the same reason for writing, if he did write, this promise into the platform of his party.

But that is not all. The pledge goes further:

We demand the enactment of a law preventing any corporation contributing to campaign funds and any individual from contributing an amount above a reasonable minimum.

Mr. Chairman, was there anything of that kind in the bill which passed this House last Friday? Was that pledge of the platform carried out?

But there is more of this:

And providing for the publication before election of all such contributions above a reasonable minimum.

Was there anything in the bill that passed this House last Friday carrying out that pledge of the Democratic Party? There was such an amendment offered to that bill upon this side of the House, and you remember that it was adopted and placed in the bill through the courage and independence of a sufficient number of Democrats voting with the minority upon this side to place it there. And then we remember how the party lash flew across that side of the Chamber, and inside of 15 minutes, without any intervening debate or any discussion, a sufficient number of Democrats reversed themselves to defeat that amendment. Upon that amendment, offered by this side of the House, squarely carrying out the pledge of your own party, 165 of the Democrats upon that side of the Chamber voted "no."

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman does not mean to be understood to say that there was not a publicity plank in the law that we passed last Friday?

Mr. LENROOT. A publicity plank; yes.

Mr. CULLOP. To publish the contributions 15 days before election and every 3 days thereafter until election day, of all sums over and above $10.

Mr. LENROOT. To whom?

Mr. CULLOP. To the world.

Mr. LENROOT. Contributions to the political committees.

Mr. CULLOP. No; it must be filed with the Clerk of this House and then published. It then becomes public property.

Mr. LENROOT. Contributions only to the national political committees, and not contributions to individuals, while your platform promised publicity of all contributions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CULLOP. This new law gives publicity of all contributions.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the time to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] one question. If contributions are made to you, as a candidate for Congress, and not to the national committee, where is your law requiring publicity?

Mr. CULLOP. I have no contributions made to me as a candidate; I do not need them. The Democrats can run their campaigns without contributions from special interests, and State laws regulate this matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill in the form reported by the committee, because it is unjustly discriminatory against the farmers of this country, and favors the great trusts and monopolies. It will not reduce the cost of living to the consumer, because a high tariff remains on practically all food products that he uses. This bill can not be defended from a Republican standpoint, from the declarations of the last Republican platform, and I say further, Mr. Chairman—and I shall have something to say about it a little later on if I have the time—this bill can not be defended from a Democratic standpoint, from the last platform of the Democratic Party. But I propose in my discussion of this bill to discuss it from the standpoint of a Republican, believing in the doctrine of protection, the principle that duties should cover, and cover only, the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. The Republican Party in 1908 made a solemn pledge to revise the tariff in accordance with that principle. We all know what happened, and because the Payne-Aldrich law failed to fulfill that promise, progressive Republicans all over this country, with voice and pen, condemned that law and insisted that the pledge of the Republican Party, that duties should cover only the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, should be kept, and that there should be further reductions of tariff until that promise should be fulfilled to the letter.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman does not state all the platform, does he, with reference to the tariff? Did it not also provide that there should be a reasonable return to the manufacturer upon the money invested?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a new departure.

Mr. LENROOT. It was; and it did not comply with the pledge with that clause put upon it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will admit that it was recreant in all of its pledges, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. LENROOT. It is now sought in many quarters to show that progressive Republicans are inconsistent in opposing this bill while at the same time demanding lower tariffs upon manufactured articles. They are not inconsistent, but, on the contrary, it is the advocates of this measure who are inconsistent. Progressive Republicans have never been free traders. [Applause on the Republican side.] I challenge anyone to point to any speech made by a progressive Republican in Congress or elsewhere advocating free trade. As a progressive Republican I stand to-day where I have stood in the past, for a protective tariff, measuring duties by the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. It is true that our demand for reductions has been confined very largely to manufactured articles, and in that we have been consistent. The evils of exorbitant tariff rates, as a general rule, are felt only where the product affected is controlled by a trust or monopoly. Until comparatively recently——

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I noticed that he stated he agreed with that part of the last Republican national platform which provides for a tariff equaling the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Does the gentleman indorse the remainder of that platform which provided that the tariff should also be levied sufficient to insure a reasonable profit to the manufacturer?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I do not.

Mr. CULLOP. Does the gentleman indorse his party's action in passing the Payne tariff bill?

Mr. LENROOT. No; and neither did I in the campaign.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman did not indorse that part of the Republican Party's procedure that passed and advocated the Payne tariff bill?

Mr. LENROOT. I did not.

Mr. CULLOP. Do you indorse the action of your party in passing the Payne-Aldrich bill?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not indorse the action of my party in passing the Payne-Aldrich bill. I thought I made that clear.

Mr. CULLOP. Does the gentleman claim that it is a violation of the party pledge?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. CULLOP. Then, the gentleman's party has not always been keeping its pledges. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. No; it has not. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.] And neither has yours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend for a moment. The galleries are admonished that they should not applaud or show any evidence of approval or disapproval.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say if my party had kept its pledge, there would have been a minority upon that side of the Chamber to-day instead of a majority. [Applause on the Republican side.] As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the evils of exorbitant tariff rates are, as a rule, felt only where the products are controlled by trusts and monopolies. Until comparatively recently it made little or no difference how high tariff rates were, provided they were high enough to protect the American industry from excessive competition by foreign countries. With full and free competition at home, domestic prices were not measured by the foreign price plus the duty, and prices were kept upon a reasonable level. But great economic changes have taken place in recent years. Nearly all of the great industries have combined into gigantic corporations controlling our markets. Competition is gone and prices to the consumer are arbitrarily fixed by a few men. We have the Woolen Trust, the Cotton Trust, the Steel Trust, the Beef Trust. I will not attempt to enumerate them all. These conditions are familiar to every Member of this House and the country.

Destroying competition at home, they are able to dictate the prices upon their products, and there are only two limitations upon the prices which they may fix—first, the ability of the public to buy and, second, the foreign price plus present tariff rates. When we impose a tariff rate of 100 per cent, when a rate of 25 per cent would be sufficient to cover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, then we give these trusts a license to plunder the American people. This is what progressive Republicans have been fighting; this is what they will continue to fight until justice is done.

We stand for a consistent policy applied alike to all classes of our people. We insist that if the protective theory shall prevail, the 6,000,000 farmers of this country are just as much entitled to the application of that theory to their products as the manufacturers are to their products. [Applause on the Republican side.] If, on the other hand, the theory of free trade is to be applied to the farmers, they insist, and rightly so, that that theory shall also apply to the manufacturers. [Applause.]

The President of the United States two years ago pronounced the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill the best tariff law ever enacted and criticized but one schedule, the wool schedule. To-day he has completely reversed his position and advocates free trade in agricultural products with Canada, our only competitor, but at the same time proposes a higher protection for many manufactured products than does the Payne-Aldrich bill, which has been condemned by the American people. I think that I shall be able to demonstrate before I get through that upon certain important manufactured products the rates proposed in this bill give their manufacturers from 50 to 75 per cent higher protection than the Payne-Aldrich law.

The President in his message to Congress says this bill—

> is not a violation of the protective principle as that has been authoritatively announced by those who uphold it, because that principle does not call for a tariff between this country and one whose conditions as to production, population, and wages are so like ours, and when our common boundary line of 3,000 miles in itself must make a radical distinction between our commercial treatment of Canada and of any other country.

If free trade in agricultural products with Canada is not a violation of the protective principle for the reasons stated by the President, then the high rates upon manufactured products proposed in this bill are for the same reasons a violation of the protective principle.

If the President is correct in his statement, then every tariff rate in this bill upon every manufactured product is a violation of the pledge of the Republican Party that tariff rates should be based upon the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

On the President's own statement, how can the rate proposed upon beef in this bill, of 1¼ cents per pound, be sustained, or 50 cents per barrel upon flour, and so with every manufactured product? If there is a difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada, the farmer is just as much entitled to protection as is the manufacturer, and this bill is a violation of the pledge of the Republican platform because it fails to give the farmer that protection. If there is no difference in the cost of production, then there should be free trade in manufactured products, and the bill is a violation of the pledge of the Republican platform because it proposes high tariffs upon those products. This country can not prosper, Mr. Chairman, and it has no right to prosper, if we adopt one policy as applying to one class of our people and a directly contrary policy as applying to another class. [Applause on the Republican side.] Let us have protection for all, or let us have free trade for all. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. LENROOT. I do.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will say that I am very much interested in what the gentleman has been saying as to the equality of protection. How do you reconcile the fact of 75 per cent to 100 per cent in different farmers' products?

Mr. LENROOT. That is true to a certain extent, and it is——

Mr. HILL. If equality is to be applied to all, why should not the woolgrower and wheat grower have the same equal percentage of duty? Why should not the lemon grower of California and the potato grower of Maine be put on the same basis?

Mr. LENROOT. Because the cost of production varies.

Mr. HILL. Does not the same principle apply to the cost of production between manufactured goods and farmers' products that applies between one farmer's products and another's?

Mr. LENROOT. It does; but the principle of the difference in cost of production should apply to all. I want to say to the gentleman from Connecticut that if there is no difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada in agricultural products, I am willing to vote for free trade in them, but if there is a difference I insist that we apply the principle of protection to them, and I wish the gentleman from Connecticut would do likewise.

Mr. HILL. But the gentleman said a moment ago that the bill now pending is a violation of the Republican platform, because it levied a duty on manufactured products and took it off from the farmers' products. Would not that be governed entirely by the difference in the cost of production, and how, if there was such a difference, could the platform be violated?

Mr. LENROOT. I am glad the gentleman brought that out. I was basing that statement solely upon the President's message, stating that there was no difference in cost of production, both as to manufactured products and as to agricultural products. And what I insisted was, with that premise, that both classes should be treated alike. [Applause.] I am aware of the fact that it is claimed that upon manufactured products Canada refused to agree to any lower tariff on imports into Canada. I do not question that statement, but it was entirely feasible to provide for absolute free trade with Canada upon all imports coming into this country upon Canada's making concessions by way of lower tariff upon imports into Canada from the United States, and if that had been done the agreement thus made would have been just as free from the claim that other countries would be entitled to free trade, because of the favored-nation clause in our treaties, as is the pending bill.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman in what he says about manufactures, but I want to ask him this question: Even though it be admitted that this bill is violative of your idea of protection as to manufactured articles, that they can be manufactured in this country, as I think they can, as cheaply as in Canada, does that affect, as far as it goes, the fact that farm products can be raised as cheaply as in Canada, and are you not violating your principle of protection when you insist, on any account, that the farmer should have a duty on wheat when he can raise it here as cheaply as he can in Canada?

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say to my friend from Texas that I do not for one moment insist that a farmer should have a duty on wheat if he can raise it as cheaply as a farmer in Canada, but I shall be able to show that the contrary is true, and that he can not do so; and that is my whole contention in this debate.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman was objecting to the bill because it did not give the farmer the same protection that it does the manufacturer.

Mr. LENROOT. It does not.

The President in his message based his entire contention on the assumption that conditions were so similar in Canada that there was no difference in cost of production either in manufactured articles or agricultural products. If that is so, then we should apply the same principle to both manufactures and agricultural products.

Mr. HARDY. I agree with the gentleman on that proposition; but, as I understand it, the gentleman opposes the bill on the ground that the cost of production of wheat in this country is greater than in Canada.

Mr. LENROOT. It is greater.

If we now amend this bill by providing for free trade with Canada upon imports coming into this country, if it should be found to conflict with the favored-nation clause in our treaties—and I deny that it will—then it is only because the President has seen fit to make an agreement that did not provide for free trade, and no man has been heard to say, and no man will be heard to say, that Canada would not have been as ready to make the agreement if these greater concessions had been included.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], upon Saturday, made the statement that amendments to this bill would kill the agreement, and gave as his authority a statement of one of the Canadian commissioners. Now, I am sure that upon reflection neither the gentleman from Alabama nor any other lawyer in this Chamber will undertake to claim that by so amending this bill as to provide for free trade in imports from Canada to this country will in the slightest degree affect that agreement. I do not know how many Members are familiar with the Canadian bill. I hold a copy of it in my hand, and I want to say to the Democratic majority that you can place your free list that you propose in a separate bill as an amendment to this bill, and it will not affect one line or one letter of the bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament. Let me read one paragraph:

That it is expedient to provide—

I am reading now from the Canadian bill—

that the act proposed to be founded on the foregoing resolutions shall not come into operation until a date to be named by the governor in council in a proclamation to be published in the Canada Gazette, and that such proclamation may be issued whenever it appears to the satisfaction of the governor in council that the United States Congress has enacted, or will forthwith enact, such legislation as will grant to Canada the reciprocal advantages provided for in certain correspondence dated Washington, January 21, 1911, between the Hon. P. C. Knox, Secretary of State, for the United States, and the Hon. W. S. Fielding, minister of finance, for Canada, and the Hon. William Patterson, minister of commerce, for Canada.

Now, will any gentleman claim that if we choose by amendment here to give to Canada greater concessions than she has asked Canada is going to object to that bill for that reason? No; no one will claim any such absurdity as that.

But, Mr. Chairman, if the policy of protection had been adhered to by the President, then the construction of this bill would have been radically different from what we find it. I assert, and shall be able to prove from the report of the President's own tariff board, that the cost of production of agricultural products is much less in Canada than in this country. And, on the other hand, I think I shall be able to show that the information at hand fairly establishes that the cost of manufacture of manufactured products is less in this country than in Canada.

First, as to the cost of production of agricultural products.

THE COST OF PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IS LESS IN CANADA THAN IN THE UNITED STATES.

Let me say a word here with reference to this tariff board, whose figures I shall use. It was a matter of great satisfaction to me to find in the report of this tariff board, appointed to ascertain facts, that those facts were ascertained and presented to the Congress regardless of whether they sustained the President of the United States or not. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the debate that we had here a few months ago upon the creation of a tariff commission the sole contention upon the part of those who opposed it upon the other side of the Chamber was that the members of this Tariff Board, being appointed by a Republican President, would be the creatures of the President. But in the first report that we have from that Tariff Board we find that that report sustains the President of the United States in scarcely a single one of his contentions. And now that we have this conclusive evidence of the independence of that Tariff Board, I shall hope that during this session of the Sixty-second Congress you gentlemen upon that side will be patriotic enough to reverse your positions and favor the creation of a permanent, nonpartisan tariff commission. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The report of President Taft's Tariff Board shows that the yield per acre of spring wheat in 1910 averaged 11.7 bushels per acre in the United States and 15.53 bushels per acre in Canada. In barley the yield in Canada was 24.62 bushels per acre; in the United States, 22.4 bushels. In oats the yield in Canada was 32.79 bushels per acre; in the United States, 31.9. In flaxseed the yield was 4.8 bushels per acre in the United States, while in Canada it was 7.97 bushels. In hay the yield in the United States was 1.33 tons per acre; in Canada it was 1.82 tons.

THE VALUE OF IMPROVED FARM LAND IS LESS IN CANADA THAN IN THE UNITED STATES.

I submit the following table contained in the report of the Tariff Commission, page 84:

Comparative values of farm lands in Canada and the United States.

	Average value per acre of improved land, 1900.	Average value per acre of improved land, 1910.	Per cent of increase.
United States:			
Maine	$15	$25	67
New Hampshire	19	26	37
Vermont	18	24	33
Rhode Island	51	62	22
Connecticut	42	63	50
Pennsylvania	46	56	20
Delaware	32	51	59
Illinois	54	108	101
Indiana	39	75	92
Missouri	25	50	100
Iowa	50	109	117
Wisconsin	35	57	63
Michigan	33	46	39
Minnesota	25	46	77
Canada:			
British Columbia	55	73	33
Manitoba	13	29	123
New Brunswick	11	24	120
Nova Scotia	11	31	181
Ontario	35	50	43
Prince Edward Island	19	32	70
Quebec	24	43	80
Saskatchewan	7	22	201
Alberta	7	20	185

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Can the gentleman explain to us why it is that the Canadian farmer's land is worth so much more and sells for so much less?

A MEMBER. Produces so much more.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not quite get the gentleman's question.

Mr. CARLIN. His question is, Why, when it produces so much more, it sells for so much less?

Mr. LENROOT. Because they have not the advantage of our markets; and you propose to give them that advantage, and when you do the price of their land will be the same—ours lower and theirs higher. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Is it the gentleman's contention that they do not sell any wheat in Liverpool?

Mr. LENROOT. They sell wheat in Liverpool.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Where do we sell ours?

Mr. LENROOT. We sell some wheat in Liverpool, but we use most of it ourselves.

Mr. CULLOP. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman is referring to the report of the tariff experts who have been in use by the President now for about two years?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman understands that the President made up his reciprocity measure from the report of that board, does he not?

Mr. LENROOT. I understand directly the contrary.

Mr. CULLOP. What was he having them for, if he was not using them for this purpose?

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman must ask some other person than myself.

Mr. CULLOP. Can the gentleman tell anything that this board has ever done in the two years that the President has had it, with an appropriation of over $500,000 to maintain it?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I hold in my hand a report from this Tariff Board, full of information——

Mr. CARLIN. Republican information.

Mr. LENROOT. And if you gentlemen would read this information your action on this reciprocity bill might be different.

Mr. CULLOP. The action of the President, I understand the gentleman to say, was to run away from his own Tariff Board.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not go aside into a discussion of that question.

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman will yield for another question, do I understand him to say that the price of farm products in the United States is higher than in Canada?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; I do.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman regards Chicago as one of the leading wheat markets of this country?

Mr. LENROOT. I regard it as the greatest.

Mr. CULLOP. Was not the quotation on wheat in Winnipeg Saturday 2½ cents per bushel higher than it was in Chicago?

Mr. LENROOT. It might have been.

Mr. CULLOP. And more than 5 cents higher than it was in St. Louis and more than 6 cents higher than it was in Kansas City?

Mr. LENROOT. I would say in answer to the gentleman that that is not true so far as the same grades are concerned.

Mr. CULLOP. Was not the quotation of No. 1 wheat in Winnipeg at 91 cents a bushel and 88 cents in Chicago?

Mr. LENROOT. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CULLOP. That was the report in yesterday's papers, and is the correct quotation of the price.

Mr. LENROOT. I should be very glad to have the report put in the RECORD. The gentleman can not find it.

Mr. CULLOP. If the gentleman will look in the Chicago papers of yesterday which came here to-day he will find that to be true, and I will only be too glad to put the report in the RECORD. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a further question.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further unless I can have more time. I want to say in reply to that before I forget it, with reference to the price in Chicago of wheat and the price in Winnipeg, that they are entirely different grades of wheat. The Winnipeg price is all on Nos. 1 and 2 Northern, the best wheat grown in the wide world, while the Chicago prices are on contract grades, or No. 2 red, as a rule.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman submit to a correction, or does he prefer I should wait?

Mr. LENROOT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of historical accuracy alone and at the gentleman's suggestion, I want to call attention to the fact that he entirely misquoted the productions in the other country on wheat. He quoted spring wheat in the United States at 11.73 bushels yield and spring wheat in Canada at 15.53. As a matter of fact, the great bulk of wheat in the United States is winter wheat, in which we excel Canada in the production per acre, and the great quantity of wheat in Canada is spring wheat. I have the figures from the Government report. It is 11.73 bushels, as he stated, on spring wheat, but it is 15.8 on winter wheat, our larger product, and it is 15.53 in Canada, her almost exclusive product, or about three-tenths bushel per acre less than the United States.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further. I wish to correct the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. I have here the Yearbooks.

Mr. LENROOT. I have the report of President Taft's Tariff Board, and I am sorry, indeed, to find that the gentleman from Connecticut, who has struggled as hard as any Member in this House to secure the creation of a tariff board, is unwilling to abide by the figures submitted by that board. I find from the figures of the Tariff Board that the production of winter wheat in Canada is very much greater per acre than the production in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. I admit it; but I say that very little winter wheat is raised in Canada; it is spring wheat which they raise. I will give the figures to the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. LENROOT. The report shows that the yield is greater in spring wheat and winter wheat in Canada; greater in both. I have just introduced a table, Mr. Chairman, showing the values of improved farm lands in this country and Canada.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. For a question?

Mr. HARRISON of New York. On the matter of prices of farm commodities.

Mr. LENROOT. I have not got to that yet.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman has discussed the prices of wheat.

Mr. LENROOT. I was discussing the yield, and not the prices. Mr. Chairman, immediately following this table in the report of the Tariff Board we find the following:

> In the great farming States of Iowa, Indiana, and Illinois the values of farm land are very much higher than in any of the Canadian Provinces. In Illinois and Iowa they are a little over twice as high as in Ontario.

From the table I have quoted it will be observed that in Wisconsin the value of improved farm land is given at $57 per acre, while in the great Province of Manitoba it is only $29.

THE COST OF FARM LABOR IS HIGHER IN THE UNITED STATES THAN IN CANADA.

I will submit a table taken from a report of the Tariff Board, page 85, which I ask leave to insert in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks permission to put in his remarks certain tables which have been referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Average wages of agricultural labor, with board, in specified States, eastern Canada, and British Columbia, 1909.

	By the month.		In harvest.[1]
	Hiring by the season.	Hiring by the year.	
United States:[2]			
Maine	$27.60	$23.17	$1.63
New York	26.00	22.08	1.77
Michigan	25.10	21.57	1.75
Minnesota	29.25	23.98	2.23
Wisconsin	28.57	24.39	1.79
North Dakota	33.34	27.01	2.58
Iowa	28.93	25.63	2.08
Ohio	22.11	19.19	1.67
Vermont	26.86	24.03	1.73
Montana	39.29	35.00	2.23
Washington	36.39	31.32	2.34
Missouri	21.10	18.85	1.50
Canada:[3]			
Prince Edward Island	17.25	10.87	(4)
Nova Scotia	21.20	15.90	.40 / .50
New Brunswick	22.59	9.96	
Quebec	23.33	17.58	.30 / .35
Ontario	21.52	17.63	.30 / .35
British Columbia	30.50	20.69	[5].35 / .50

[1] Wages by the day.
[2] Advance figures from unpublished bulletin on agricultural wages by Department of Agriculture.
[3] From Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly, Jan., 1911, p. 2.
[4] Wages by the month.
[5] Includes only lodging.

Mr. LENROOT. This table shows conclusively that farm labor is much more costly in the United States than in Canada. In Wisconsin the cost per month runs from $24.39 to $28.57, while in the neighboring Province of Ontario it is only from $17.63 to $21.52.

Mr. LOBECK. How about Saskatchewan?

Mr. LENROOT. That is much higher, but compared with the States of Washington and Montana it is higher in the United States.

Mr. LOBECK. The price of farm labor in Saskatchewan——

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield further.

Mr. LOBECK. I would like to say something on that.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman will have to do it in his own time.

THE PRICE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS IS MUCH HIGHER IN THE UNITED STATES THAN IN CANADA.

According to the report of the Tariff Board, the average price of spring wheat received by the farmer in Canada in 1910 was 73.8 cents per bushel, while our farmers received 89.8 cents per bushel, or 16 cents per bushel more than the Canadian farmer received. According to the report of the Tariff Board, for his barley the Canadian farmer received 47.4 cents, while our farmers averaged 57.8 cents per bushel, or 10.4 cents more per bushel than the Canadian farmer. For his flaxseed the Canadian farmer received $2.07 per bushel, while our farmer received $2.30 per bushel, or 23 cents per bushel more than the Canadian farmer.

For his hay—and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] is in the Chamber—the Canadian farmer received $9.66 per ton, while our farmers received $12.26 per ton, or $2.60 per ton more than the Canadian farmer. It is true a few moments ago that the gentleman from Massachusetts did take certain figures out of the report of this Tariff Board with reference to a difference in favor of Canada, but if he had looked at the table showing the general averages and conclusions of the Tariff Board he would have seen that upon the average the farmer in this country received $2.60 per ton more for his hay than did the Canadian farmer.

From this report it appears, then, that in the raising of wheat the Canadian farmer has the advantage of a yield of 3.83 bushels per acre more than our farmer, in barley his yield is 2.22 bushels per acre greater, in oats 0.89 bushel per acre greater, in flaxseed 3.17 bushels per acre greater, and in hay his yield is 0.49 of a ton per acre greater. The cost of his land is from one-third to one-half less than ours, and the cost of his help is from 15 to 40 per cent less, and yet it is proposed to compel our farmers to compete with him upon a free-trade basis without giving to our farmers any compensation in substantially lower duties upon the things that they must purchase.

Upon Saturday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] called as witnesses Senators GALLINGER and LODGE, members of the Senate committee who made the report upon the cost of living.

It will be remembered that he told us that that report conclusively showed that in prices the farmers of this country had no advantage over those of Canada, and that especially with reference to the price of wheat the price of wheat in this country was controlled by the world's market. In proof of that he read from the report, that upon a certain day or in a certain year wheat was 2 cents higher per bushel in Liverpool than it was in Chicago. That was true, but if the gentleman had turned to another page of the report he would have found that this same committee reports that the transportation rate from Chicago to Liverpool was 17 cents a bushel on wheat, so that when wheat is worth 2 cents more per bushel in Liverpool than it is in Chicago, it means that there is a difference in favor of this country, or a higher price, in other words, of 15 cents a bushel, the difference between the transportation rate of 17 cents and the higher price of 2 cents in Liverpool. The gentleman can not be allowed to impeach his own witness, but I will be fairer than he was. As a general rule I would not care to call those gentlemen as witnesses and abide by their conclusions, and I want to be entirely fair and say that the transportation rates that they give of 17 cents a bushel from Chicago to Liverpool is too high. The actual rate is about 11½ cents, and let me say this, that the transportation rate on wheat from Chicago to Liverpool is less than it is from Chicago to New York, showing conclusively that as in the case of lemons, after the Payne-Aldrich bill was passed, the railroads proposed to secure for themselves a portion of this higher price of grain in this country.

You remember how the gentleman from North Carolina drew a word picture of the insurgents and standpatters joining hands and waltzing around and singing hosannas and hallelujahs to the farmer. We remember that. I will ask you, Who is going to receive the benefit of this reciprocal agreement? I will tell you some of the people who will receive it. When this bill passes, the Beef Trust, upon the basis of their shipments into Canada last year, will save $239,213 in duties, increasing their profits to that extent when you pass this bill. The Agricultural Implement Trust will receive, from the reduction of tariff rates upon their exports into Canada, $218,488 annually. And, Mr. Chairman, I might draw another picture of the Democrats upon that side of the House joining hands with a Republican President and singing hosannas and hallelujahs to the Beef Trust and to the Agricultural Implement Trust. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I assert that the cost of manufacturing is, as a rule, less in this country than in Canada.

As to manufactured articles we have no report from the Tariff Board, presumably because there has not been sufficient time for the board to make an investigation of this question. We have, however, information of a general nature tending strongly to show that the cost of manufacturing is less in this country than in Canada. It is a significant fact that the Canadian Government has refused to permit free trade in manufactured articles imported from the United States. If the cost of manufacturing is greater in Canada than in this country, why this refusal on the part of Canada? She favors free trade in agricultural products, because it is shown that the cost of production is less in Canada than in this country. She opposes free trade in manufactured products presumably because the cost of manufacturing is greater in Canada than in this country.

But stronger evidence is at hand than conclusions to be drawn from the action of Canada. In 1910 our manufacturers shipped into Canada agricultural implements to the value of $3,900,000, upon which they paid a duty of from 17½ to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Portable engines to the value of $1,799,000 were shipped into Canada and paid a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem.

Automobiles to the value of $1,569,000 were shipped into Canada and paid a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem.

On the other hand, there were imported into the United States from Canada of these articles, agricultural implements to the value of $84,000; portable engines, none, so far as our records show; and automobiles, none. This, Mr. Chairman, in the absence of direct evidence as to the costs of production, must, I think, convince any impartial mind that the cost of manufacturing is, generally speaking, less in the United States than in Canada. I do not wish, however, to be understood as saying that the price to the consumer is less in the United States than in Canada, for I believe the contrary is true. I believe that an investigation will show that many manufactured products are shipped to Canada, the duty paid, and the price paid by the consumer there is less than the price paid by the consumer here.

If manufactured articles were admitted free from Canada it would compel our manufacturers, when they monopolize our markets, to lower the price to the consumers in the United States to the point where Canadian manufacturers could compete with and undersell them if they did not.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that I would try to demonstrate that the degree of protection granted to American manufacturers is greater in this bill than they now enjoy under the Payne-Aldrich law. In other words, as to many manufactured articles the protective duties are actually higher in this bill than in the Payne-Aldrich law.

I will first take wheat and the product of wheat, which is flour. The present tariff upon wheat is 25 cents per bushel. It requires 4½ bushels of wheat to produce 1 barrel of flour.

Now, it is a fact familiar to all who have studied tariff rates that we have two classes of rates, known as compensatory and protective rates. When a tariff is levied upon raw material, in considering the rate to be levied upon the manufactured product, the first question to be determined is how much of a duty shall be levied to compensate the manufacturer for the duty upon the raw material.

For instance, when we levy a rate of 25 cents a bushel on wheat, the manufacturer of flour is first entitled to a duty equal to that which would be laid if the flour was imported in the form of wheat. That duty in the case of flour is four and a half times 25 cents, or $1.12. This is only imposing a duty of 25 cents a bushel on the wheat in the flour, and thus far the manufacturer has received no protection whatever in the $1.12. This is the compensatory duty, and added to that is, or should be, a protective duty, covering the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, if there be any such difference.

In the Payne-Aldrich law, while the duty on wheat is 25 cents per bushel, the duty on flour is 25 per cent ad valorem. The flour that we exported into Canada in 1910 was valued on the average at $5 per barrel. Twenty-five per cent of this sum is $1.25, which would be the duty upon a barrel of flour. This includes both the compensatory and the protective rate. The compensatory rate is, as I have shown, $1.12, leaving, under the Payne-Aldrich law, 13 cents per barrel as the protection to the manufacturer.

Now, what is proposed in this bill? Wheat is made free; so there is no compensatory rate to be considered. Therefore, if no higher protective rate was imposed than is contained in the Payne-Aldrich bill, the rate upon flour would be 13 cents per barrel. But what do we find? It is proposed to grant the flour manufacturer a tariff rate of 50 cents per barrel, or nearly 300 per cent more protection than he enjoys under the Payne-Aldrich law. [Applause.] I could go on and make the same demonstration as to beef, and every other manufactured article in the bill, where the raw material is admitted free, but I will not take the time to do so. Any Member can figure it out for himself, for it is merely a matter of computation.

Upon the question of flour, too, I would observe this, that this proposed rate of 50 cents a barrel is more than twice the entire cost of the manufacture of a barrel of flour. During the vacation I was at home. My own city of Superior, Wis., is a large milling center, destined, I believe, to become the largest upon the continent. I asked one of the mill experts there whether he could tell me what the cost of the manufacture of a barrel of flour was. He took his pencil and figured for a time, and replied that with a mill running fairly continuously the cost was 18 cents per barrel. I asked him if that included interest on the investment, because I wanted to get at this reasonable profit that has been spoken of. He said, "No." I asked him to figure that, and he did. He replied that it would be 3 cents a barrel. So he gave the entire cost of the manufacture of a barrel of flour, including interest on the investment, as 21 cents per barrel. And yet you are asking us to vote, and you Democrats are proposing to vote, for a tariff upon flour of 50 cents a barrel, or more than twice the entire cost of manufacture. It is just such things as these, Mr. Chairman, that endanger the whole policy of protection. Those who vote for this bill will be under the necessity of making some explanation of why they voted for free trade for one class of our people and a tariff rate of more than double the entire cost of manufacture for the manufacturer.

I understand that you gentlemen on the other side claim that you have another bill coming in here that is going to take care of that; that you propose to put those things upon the free list that we are criticizing now. Well, if you are in good faith in that, if you want to legislate for the country instead of trying to make political capital, why do you not put it as an amendment upon this bill? [Applause.] You can not be heard to say that it will endanger this agreement if you put that free list as

an amendment to this bill, because there is no intelligent man upon that side of the Chamber—and I think most of them are intelligent—who will undertake to say that that will invalidate the agreement. Now, why do you not do it? What do you propose and what is your hope? Your hope is that you can pass that free list bill through this House, and that it will be vetoed by President Taft.

If you do not want that, put it as an amendment on this bill, and if the reciprocity bill is signed, as it would be, this would go with it, and then you would be entitled to some credit for legislating for the people of the United States instead of merely playing politics with great measures. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to have 10 minutes more.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this bill will not reduce the cost of living, and that, I think, is now admitted on both sides of the Chamber. The people do not eat cattle upon the hoof, that are admitted free. They do eat beef, which will have a tariff of 1¼ cents a pound. The price of beef to the consumer will not be reduced. The Beef Trust will have an excuse for reducing the price of cattle to our farmers because of the increased supply, but there will be no reduction of price to the consumer, and the only result will be to increase the profits of the Beef Trust.

Wheat is free; but, as I have shown, there will remain a tariff of 50 cents a barrel upon flour.

Flaxseed is free, but linseed oil, which is controlled by the Oil Trust and is a product of flaxseed, will have imposed on it a tariff of 15 cents per gallon still. What is true with respect to the articles that I have named is true also of practically every other article of manufactured food products.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been a bill proposed before Congress upon which there has been so much misrepresentation as this bill. In the cities throughout the country this bill is being urged upon the ground that it will reduce the cost of living. In the country the attempt is being made to convince the farmer that it will not reduce the price of his products. In my judgment, neither statement is true. It will not reduce the cost of living, for a high tariff remains upon practically all food products that the people use. It will reduce the price to the farmer of agricultural products by means of the increased supply, but the only beneficiaries will be the manufacturers of food products, enabling them to pay still greater dividends upon their watered stocks.

When a Republican President joins with the foes of the protective system in forcing free trade upon a large class of people, I, so far as my conduct is concerned, shall insist upon a consistent policy and shall vote for free trade upon those articles of necessity which the farmer must use. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will have more confidence in securing that compensation to the farmer if you will submit your free list, as I have indicated, as an amendment to this bill, and I challenge any Member on the other side of the House during this debate to furnish some good reason why you should not.

When a spirit of justice and equal treatment of all of our citizens shall again prevail, and it surely will, then I shall be ready to take up all of these questions and vote to place duties upon all products, whether of soil or factory, that are naturally produced in this country, based upon the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 50 minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, if the trade arrangement negotiated between the United States and Canada in 1854 had not been abrogated, in my humble judgment there would not be one man in a thousand on either side of the line to-day who would not earnestly oppose its abrogation. If the Louisiana Purchase had not been consummated and the Mississippi River had remained the western boundary of the Republic, there would have been a tariff wall along that boundary from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico; and if a proposition were to be made now to establish more liberal trade relations between the people on the east side and those on the west side of that line there would be frantic objection to it on both sides. The people on the east side would protest that they could not compete with the pauper labor and the cheap lands with fabulous producing capacity in Iowa and other sections in the West. The people west of the river would proclaim with as much vehemence that free competition meant disaster and ruin to their industries. It is safe to make these assertions, Mr. Chairman, because nobody can disprove them. I make them for the purpose of suggesting to the House the disposition of many people to protest against any change in existing conditions. Many seem to act upon the theory that the existing situation can not be improved, and they conjure up in their imaginations fears of all kinds of evil at the mere suggestion of a change. This seems to be true of some Members of this body in the consideration of the great measure that is pending before Congress at this time. They see in it all kinds of certain disaster, without a single beneficent aspect. This has been true of every great, progressive movement in the world's history. If, centuries ago, the people of the world had admitted that the earth was round, they surely would have fallen off into space when their heads were downward turned. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that some of the debates upon this question justify the criticism I have suggested. I read in the American Economist a few days ago a letter from my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who recently paid a visit to the Dominion of Canada with a view, I presume, of investigating conditions there, so that he might vote intelligently upon this proposition. In that letter he said they were successfully raising wheat at this time as far north as 70° north latitude, about 200 miles north of the Arctic Circle, closer to the North Pole than to the boundary line between Canada and the United States. Perhaps he is right, but if I am correctly informed in relation to the geography and development of Canada, there is not a railroad within 600 miles of the seventieth degree of north latitude. It is possible that we can now find some excuse, some justification for the claim that Dr. Cook made to having discovered the North Pole. It may be that he got lost in a Canadian wheat field and what he found there was not the North Pole, but a big stack of wheat, waiting in cold storage for the reciprocity bill to go through in order that it might come down and create havoc in the wheat market at Minneapolis and Chicago. [Laughter.]

RECIPROCITY AND PROTECTION.

Mr. Chairman, this is a practical question to be determined from the standpoint of the two countries, and there are certain fundamental things that we may know as a matter of common knowledge. It is not necessary to go to the North Pole to find out whether wheat can be raised there successfully. It is not necessary to travel to the moon to understand the law that holds that luminary in its orbit. I think we know as much about that law as even the man in the moon knows. We should take a broad view of this measure and consider it from the standpoint of the whole country and not settle it altogether because of its bearing upon the production of codfish in Massachusetts or beans in Michigan or hops in Oregon. We should consider it from the standpoint of the future as well as of the present.

It is charged that this measure is un-Republican; that it is not in harmony with the Republican position upon the policy of protection. I hope I am a Republican. I think I am. I am a firm believer in the policy of protection, but my understanding of that policy is that it is designed to promote industrial development in our own country, designed to increase to the highest degree the opportunities for the employment of American capital and American labor. No person or class of persons has any vested right to protection against foreign competition. Protection can not be justly applied simply to increase the prices and profits of any class of producers. One industry has no right to claim protection simply because as a matter of public policy protection may be extended to another industry. The sole question should be the public welfare. Whenever and wherever reasonable customs discrimination in favor of a line of industries will promote the general good, that discrimination ought to be made, but when it will not promote the general good, either directly or indirectly, the discrimination should not be made. The wise application of the policy of protection will promote industrial growth and advance the public interests. While an unwise application of that policy may benefit a special class, it will retard industrial progress and operate against the common good. I believe that the best friends of the policy of protection are not those who insist upon the maintenance of

unnecessarily high duties nor those who regard it as a special favor to any class of producers, but those who contend for duties only high enough to cover the difference in cost of production here and abroad, imposed only for the advancement of the common good.

I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who just addressed the House, that the same policy should be applied to the products of the soil as is applied to the products of the factory; that no distinction ought to be made in favor of one class as against another class, and that protective duties are justified only from the standpoint of the common welfare. If I did not firmly believe that the farmers of the United States can produce wheat, oats, barley, hogs, cattle, and every product of the farm as cheaply as they can be produced in Canada, I would not support this measure. Agriculture is the first industry in every country, and when the farmers are prosperous that prosperity is shared by every other line of business, and when the farmers are in hard lines general prosperity is impossible. The railroads, the factories, and the merchants depend primarily upon the farmers for business.

Our Democratic friends say this bill is one of their brood. Of course their progeny, like Laban's flocks, are so motley and variegated, so "ringstraked and spotted," that it is difficult to say what they may legimately lay claim to in the way of tariff legislation. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] If I remember correctly, under the McKinley tariff law a Republican administration negotiated a number of reciprocity treaties with foreign countries, lowering the rate of duties, and when the Democrats came into control of the Government under Grover Cleveland in 1893 they enacted a law that repealed every one of those treaties and made no provision whatever for such international trade arrangements as is embodied in the pending bill.

I have never understood that reciprocity was a part of the policy of a tariff for revenue only. This bill gives up nearly $5,000,000 of revenue a year; so it would be a contradiction in terms to call it a tariff for revenue only measure. Where does the revenue come in? Reciprocity is a corollary of the policy of protection. They neatly and logically dovetail into each other.

RECIPROCITY AND THE FARMER.

A great deal has been said, and a great deal more will be said, in the course of this discussion respecting agricultural conditions in the United States and in Canada and the relative cost of farm products in the two countries. Wheat seems to be occupying the spotlight in this discussion. Farm products are controlled more by the law of supply and demand and less by the cost of production than any other commodities. I have noticed that whenever any attempt has been made to liberalize our trade relations with the people in tropical countries we have been met with the argument that the standard of living is necessarily low in the Tropics; that generous nature supplies most of the food; that no fuel, little clothing, and comparatively little shelter are required, and therefore the people of the United States can not successfully compete with tropical people because of these vital differences in conditions.

Now, on the other hand, the assertion is made that we can not successfully compete in production with those who live to the north of us, where the climate is much more rigorous, where they require warmer clothes, more expensive shelter, more food, and more fuel. Judging from the character of the debates in Congress on this class of measures, one might naturally conclude that our country is the most unfortunate spot on God's green earth; that we can not compete with anybody or anything, anywhere, at any time. [Laughter and applause.]

While I am not willing to accept any such conclusion, I do not think we can successfully compete in many lines of production with densely populated countries where wages are low, labor efficient, and the standard of living greatly below our own. But consider the fundamental conditions as they exist in Canada in relation to agriculture.

I have no doubt you can go to Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta and with a pad and a pencil reckon the price of land, the cost of labor, seed, tools, and implements, and the yield of a quarter section of wheat, and by the process of mathematical reckoning ascertain the cost of production of wheat there by the bushel. By the same method the cost of production of wheat on a quarter section of land can be ascertained in Minnesota, Oklahoma, or Missouri, and it is possible that the farm cost will be slightly less in Canada. It will be discovered that the cost of living, labor, implements, and machinery is as high in the three Canadian Provinces as it is in this country, but land is cheaper there. Production, however, includes marketing and our advantage in that respect more than offsets the cheapness of Canadian land. The farmers of Kansas and Nebraska can produce and deliver wheat in Liverpool, the world's market, at a smaller cost than can the farmers of Manitoba or Saskatchewan. But the American farmer has other great advantages over the Canadian farmer aside from facilities for transportation and marketing. When I speak of the Canadian farmers in this connection I refer to the farmers in the prairie Provinces west of the Red River of the North.

BENEFITS OF DIVERSIFIED FARMING.

In this country farming is diversified. Our farmers raise wheat, oats, corn, cattle, and hogs. Crops grow in this country eight months in the year and cattle and hogs grow all the year through. Our farmers have something growing into money all the time. They find employment on the farm, more or less, 12 months in every year. On account of the climate the Canadian farmer raises only small grains. He can not raise corn and of course can not raise cattle and hogs with great success on that account. His crop is planted, harvested, and marketed within five months, and during the other seven months he has little employment on the farm. He has little, if anything, growing into money. Many Canadian farmers leave their farms during the long winter months and work for wages in the forests and the coal mines. In diversified farming each crop is raised at a smaller cost than is possible where only one kind of grain is raised. They say land is cheap in Canada. It is as compared with some land in the United States.

But there is a great difference in the value of lands in the United States. Some lands in this country can be bought for $2 an acre, while there are great areas of farm lands that are worth $200 an acre. Why is this difference? It is because of the difference in the producing capacity of the lands. Canadian lands will never be worth anything near as much as the lands in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and some other States in the Union.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. WARBURTON. Is it not a fact that in the same longitude, 5 miles on either side of the boundary, the land on the United States side is worth twice what the same quality of land is on the other side?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, that is possible; that is very likely. It is not altogether the difference in producing capacity that makes the difference in the value of the land in this country and in Canada. I will be frank. Western Canada is sparsely settled and poorly developed as compared with this country. Under its last census the density of population in Canada was a man and a quarter to a square mile of area. It is not organized, and there are some other reasons. It has not the market facilities that we have.

Mr. WARBURTON. Is it not just as necessary for the farmer along the boundary line in the United States to go to the mines in the winter as it is for the farmer on the Canadian side to do that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The closer to Canada the greater is that necessity, I conceive.

Mr. WARBURTON. And the fact is this——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I guess the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. WARBURTON. That in the Dakotas and in Montana and all along that line those same conditions prevail, and the farmers, just like the Canadian farmers, must farm to wheat and nothing else, practically.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; and that is one reason why the lands in the United States along the Canadian border are not worth much and they will never be worth much, compared to lands better located. Take any country that can produce only small grains and experience has demonstrated that in a comparatively few years of successive cultivation the capacity of the land to successfully produce is greatly reduced. Last year the average yield of wheat in North Dakota was 5 bushels to the acre. They raised a little flint corn in that State, and the average yield was 14 bushels to the acre.

Mr. CLINE. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether in a combination of crop raising like we have in this latitude they do not raise the crop that they raise in a one-crop country like Canada cheaper and make more money on it, though if raised alone here it would cost more than in the one-crop country?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is exactly my contention. They raise all of the crops at a smaller cost because of the diversification. If one crop only is cultivated, its failure means distress; but if that crop is a success, much time and money are lost, because the tenant is employed only for that one crop. He and his land must be idle more than if his farming consisted of several kinds of crops and the raising of meat and dairy animals besides. Different kinds of crops permit of

rotation and the consequent keeping up of the fertility of the land. Canada is a one-crop country.

A quarter section of good prairie land in the State of Illinois will produce more, one year with another, and is worth more than two average sections in the prairie area of western Canada. Canada is poorly developed; there is much uncultivated land in its western Provinces. I read a recent history of Canada, written by an Englishman. He said that after successive cultivation of five years in small grains the producing power of the western lands begins to decline. They can not rotate with corn, they can not raise clover, and the wise farmers in Manitoba and Saskatchewan advertise and sell their improved lands after five or six years of cultivation and buy new and unimproved lands, to get the benefit of their virgin fertility.

Mr. HELGESEN. I live in North Dakota. The gentleman from Indiana has stated the yield of wheat and corn last year, and I would like to know if he wants the people to believe that is the average of North Dakota in raising wheat and corn?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I just referred to last year. I have the crop report of the Agricultural Department to support the statement.

Mr. HELGESEN. I want to tell the gentleman that I have lived there for 25 years, and there has never been a year that we did not raise more than double that quantity until last year, which was an exception.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. But you do not raise any corn.

Mr. HELGESEN. The corn crop is increasing every year.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. You only planted two or three hundred thousand acres last year, while your neighbor, South Dakota, planted between two and three million acres in corn.

Mr. HELGESEN. Twenty-five years ago they did not have any more than we have.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It seems that the further you get away from Canada the better your lands will produce.

Mr. HELGESEN. We will discuss that later.

SCOPE OF THE MEASURE.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would be glad if this measure were broader in its scope. I have no doubt that we can manufacture commodities as cheaply in the United States as they can in Canada along almost every line. We ought to be able to do so. Our industrial organization is infinitely better than the industrial organization of Canada. We can employ machinery in manufacturing to the very highest possible advantage and Canada can not because her market is more limited. I would be glad to have substantially all manufactured commodities on the free list between this country and Canada. But it takes two to make a bargain, and the Canadian representatives refused to make further concessions on manufactures. They looked across the line into this country and saw what wonderful progress we have made under the policy of protection; how we have built up our magnificent home markets and maintained the highest standard of wages and the highest standard of living of any people on earth, and it seemed good to them. Several years ago Canada adopted the same policy, and one result has been to cause a large number of American establishments to build branch factories in Canada to supply the market there and escape the Canadian tariff. Those branch factories employ Canadian labor and are building up the Canadian home market for the benefit of the farmers, railroads, and producers there. While the reciprocity agreement is not as comprehensive as I would like to have it, it is a large step in the right direction and doubtless will lead to a still more liberal policy.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. COOPER. Just for a question. The gentleman said he would have been glad to have seen farm implements put upon the free list. The gentleman was on the committee, I think, and he ought to remind the House of this fact, which he remembers, that the Payne tariff law put agricultural implements on the free list that come from other countries that admit them into their ports free of duty.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. And the tariff is only 15 per cent, and the reason they have not gone on the free list is that other countries will not consent to it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is a pertinent statement to put in my remarks at this juncture, and I thank the gentleman for it. We have now reciprocal free trade in agricultural implements with the world, and the only reason we have not been able to get into Canada with our implements free of duty is because Canada will not make the concession.

PRICES IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Much has been said about the comparative price of commodities on this side of the line and on the Canadian side, and the price of wheat has been quoted in Winnipeg, Minneapolis, and Chicago. It is true that for the last six or eight years the price of wheat in Minneapolis, for instance, has been on an average about 8 cents a bushel above the price in Winnipeg. It is about 8 cents on the average, but at times it has been as high as 14 cents, and at other times the price has been on an absolute level, with possibly a fraction of a cent in favor of Winnipeg. But what does that mean; what does it signify? How much does it cost to ship a bushel of wheat from Winnipeg, the center of the wheat market in Canada, to Minneapolis, 600 or 700 miles distant? The cost of transportation may cover the difference in the price and more.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. May I be permitted to suggest that Winnipeg has no market?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It has the same kind of a market as Chicago, on a smaller scale.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is the lake ports, Port Arthur and Port William.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Winnipeg is the register; it is like Liverpool and Chicago. The price in the country, in the elevators, is the Winnipeg price plus what it would cost to get the product there, though it never goes to Winnipeg. Winnipeg is simply a barometer which registers prices; that is all.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Did I understand the gentleman to say the price is fixed, with regard to wheat, at Winnipeg?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why, of course; if wheat is worth a certain price at Winnipeg, it means that anybody who has wheat can sell it to a Winnipeg merchant and get the Winnipeg price for it, but out of that price he must pay the cost of getting the wheat to Winnipeg. Let me give some prices in our own country. I quote from the Crop Reporter, issued by the Department of Agriculture, showing the farm price of corn, wheat, and barley in the several States on the 1st day of December, 1910. The price of corn in North Dakota was 58 cents a bushel and in South Dakota it was 40 cents a bushel, a difference of 18 cents a bushel in these two States lying side by side. Did the tariff make that difference?

On the same day the price of wheat in Nebraska was 80 cents a bushel and in Minnesota it was 94 cents a bushel. Did the cheap wheat in Nebraska demoralize the wheat market in Minneapolis?

On the same day the price of barley in Nebraska was 45 cents a bushel, while in South Dakota the price was 57 cents a bushel. These differences in prices of grain in adjoining States were as great as the difference in the price of wheat on that day between Winnipeg and Minneapolis, and yet it is claimed that the higher price in Minneapolis over Winnipeg was the result of the tariff. There are many other instances in the Crop Reporter as striking as those I have quoted. They are chiefly due to local conditions.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I might suggest that Winnipeg does not deal in wheat except the wheat that is in store at lake ports, and the price in Winnipeg is the price at the lake ports.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Locate the market, then, on the lakes. I do not care. I am using it for the purpose of illustration. I do not care where it is located. I am quoting now the Winnipeg prices, because they are the prices that are quoted in all the price lists. I believe the tariff does have something to do with it. I believe prices would be somewhat higher in Winnipeg on an average under free trade in farm products, but they would not be appreciably affected in this country. I will tell you why.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES.

Canada has not the transportation facilities nor the elevator advantages nor the commercial and industrial organization that this country possesses. With a larger area than the entire United States, including Alaska, Canada has only 24,000 miles of railroad, while this country has 240,000 miles. We have great trunk lines of railroads running from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf, with feeders going out into every fertile valley, into every good producing section all over the country, with abundant elevator facilities. The American farmer has a tremendous advantage over the Canadian farmer in these conditions, and they affect the prices of products and have a powerful bearing upon the prosperity of the farmer.

Another thing. The remarkable decrease in the cost of transportation in this country in modern years has brought the farm price of wheat and of the staple food products and the Liverpool price closer and closer together each year, until to-day wheat on the farm is worth relatively more than it ever was before in the history of the country. In 1868 it cost 42 cents a bushel to ship wheat by rail from Chicago to New York; it

cost about 50 cents to send that bushel of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool. To-day wheat can be carried from Chicago to New York by rail at 10½ cents a bushel, and to Liverpool for 2½ cents more. Yes; for less than that, because a small differential is made by the railroads in favor of the export product, and wheat can be shipped from Chicago to Liverpool for 12 cents a bushel. The average freight rate in the country is 7½ mills, or just a trifle over, per ton-mile. The railroads carry wheat from Chicago to New York for less than 3 mills per ton-mile. Why do they do it? In the early seventies there occurred that great railroad-rate war between the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., the New York Central Co., and the Baltimore & Ohio Co.—one running into Philadelphia, one into New York, and the other into Baltimore. A differential rate was finally agreed upon in favor of Philadelphia and Baltimore large enough to overcome the port advantages of New York City in the foreign trade, and the exporters in those cities were placed upon an equal footing. The contest then became a battle of enterprise and economy on the part of the merchants in New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and as the contest continued every unnecessary element of cost was eliminated and the western farmer received the benefit. The conditions developed by that rate war are largely entitled to the credit for the high price of lands in the Western States to-day.

COMPETITION BETWEEN SEABOARD AND GULF.

Then railroads leading to the Gulf ports were extended and ramified, and west of the Father of Waters, and even east of it, farm products secured the benefit of competition between the Gulf and the Atlantic seaboard. Some years ago the eastern and western railroads gave a rate on grain from the Mississippi River to the seaboard of 85 per cent of the Chicago rate. They had to make the concession to meet the competition to the South. And I tell you, Mr. Chairman, the competition in transportation in this country, East and South, has given us rates and other facilities that from the nature of things can never be had in Canada, except in a limited measure through the operation of free commercial intercourse between the two countries. Suppose we should abolish the tariff, what would be the effect? Would our wheat go down in price? No; our wheat would not go down; but the Canadian railroads and steamboats, that have practically no competition now in carrying the Canadian wheat from the western wheat fields to the market at Liverpool, would be compelled to meet competition by way of Duluth, Chicago, and New York, and even to the Gulf. Rates of transportation would go down in Canada or Canadian lines would lose that trade. The result would be that the Canadian wheat grower would get better prices for his wheat, without in any manner affecting the price of American wheat. He would buy more American-made products to his advantage and our benefit.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In that case will the consumer get bread any cheaper?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why, he may not get bread any cheaper. I am not advocating cheaper bread. I am advocating a policy that will increase the ability of the American consumer to buy bread and all the other necessaries and comforts of life.

I am advocating the upbuilding of our home market and the expansion of our foreign trade, and I am not worrying now about the price of bread. It does not enter into my philosophy just now.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is not this proposition predicated upon the theory that the consumer will be benefited by cheaper prices?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is my privilege to arrange my own postulates.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Yes, and the gentleman is arranging his postulates to suit himself.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is immaterial. I want to submit some figures about prices which will——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My question is pertinent to the question the gentleman is now considering. I want to ask if the railroads of this country would do a greater business by reason of the increased amount of freight that would come to them from the Canadian market?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It would increase some. It would compel the Canadian railroads and the Canadian ship lines to reduce rates and take care of their own products or lose the business, and the result would be higher prices in Winnipeg and that part of Canada.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman spoke of a reduction of freight rates on railroads and steamboats. I was curious to find out whether in his judgment he believed the railroads and steamboats would reduce their rates under reciprocity.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My opinion is that Canadian transportation companies would be compelled to reduce rates or lose much of their carrying trade.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I want to know if the introduction of Canadian wheat into this country would have a tendency to keep the Minneapolis price anywhere near the Liverpool price?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know that it would affect the Minneapolis price appreciably.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. During the year 1910, for about three months during that year, is it not a fact that Minneapolis prices were above the Liverpool price?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That may be true, and it was probably the result of local conditions growing out of gambling operations on the boards of trade, generally after the farmers have marketed their crops. The gentleman must excuse me from yielding further. I must proceed along my own line of thought.

RELATION OF FOREIGN PRICES TO HOME PRICES.

I had the Secretary of Agriculture prepare this table, giving the price of wheat in Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, New York, and Liverpool for the last five years—the average price during each month of each year, beginning with 1906. In that table I find there is substantially a fixed relation between the average Liverpool price throughout the year and the prices at the cities I have mentioned. The price in this country is generally about 5 or 6 cents a bushel higher in relation to the Liverpool price than the Winnipeg price is, showing that American farmers get their wheat to Liverpool cheaper than the Canadian farmers can get theirs there, for wheat from both countries sells at the same price at Liverpool. If we open up this channel of trade, Winnipeg can get her wheat to Europe about as cheaply as we can get ours there.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will ask the gentleman if that will do any good to our people?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It will enable Minneapolis millers to mix Minnesota soft wheat with Canadian hard wheat, and in that way improve the quality of flour, for one thing.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I would say to the gentleman that our wheat is a hard wheat, and the gentleman is mistaken as to the character of our wheat. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, I promise I will not say anything more that is not polite about Minnesota or her products. [Laughter.] I have heard, however, that they do buy hard wheat in Canada to mix with soft Minnesota wheat, to improve the quality of the flour. The gentleman need not answer that aspersion, as what I heard was doubtless gossip. [Laughter.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. If the gentleman will allow me——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will admit that the gentleman is right if he will allow me to go on without interruption. I do not know what he is going to say, but I will admit it in advance. [Laughter.] Wheat prices in this country always have depended principally upon wheat prices in Liverpool. This will be the case as long as we export any substantial portion of our annual product. For some years our exports of wheat have averaged about 100,000,000 bushels a year. Canada exported about 50,000,000 bushels last year. We can not relieve ourselves from competition with the Canadian surplus. We may keep it out of our own markets, but we must meet it in Liverpool, where the world's price is registered.

There have been times when the price in this country was too high for export, depending upon local conditions. Conspiracies by grain gamblers on the boards of trade to "corner" the markets have even raised the prices here, temporarily, above the prices in Europe. Just before harvest in 1902 oats sold on the Board of Trade in Chicago at 16 cents a bushel above the price at any market within a radius of 500 miles from Chicago. That price was the result of a "corner" operated by Patten Bros., and like most all operations of that kind it occurred when the oat raisers had none to sell. One of the most beneficent features of the reciprocity measure is that it will tend to stableize grain markets and minimize the evils of grain gambling.

The total yield of wheat in this country for 1910 was 737,189,000 bushels, of which 464,044,000 bushels were winter wheat and 231,399,000 bushels were spring wheat. Canada's total yield for the same year was 149,989,000 bushels, of which 16,610,000 were winter wheat and 133,379,000 bushels were spring wheat. The winter wheat was produced chiefly in the Province of Ontario.

OUR TRADE WITH CANADA.

In 1910 the United States sold to Canada $34,432,000 worth of farm products—sold that value of farm products into the country of cheap labor and cheap land with great capacity for production. Over 16 per cent of all our sales to Canada consisted of farm products. We sold over $7,000,000 of breadstuffs, $4,000,000 of animals, $3,000,000 of meats and dairy products, $5,000,000 of fruits and nuts, $8,000,000 of raw cotton, and so on down the line. Canada sold to us in that year $9,000,000 worth of farm products. Only 9.3 per cent of her exports to the United States were farm products.

Those figures are significant, Mr. Chairman, showing that under existing conditions, with a substantial tariff on the Canadian side on all farm products excepting corn, we can invade her markets and sell our products there in large quantities.

We bought $33,000,000 worth of lumber from Canada and sold her $7,000,000 worth. Her total foreign trade last year was $571,000,000 in round numbers. Her trade with us was $285,000,000, leaving only $286,000,000 with all the balance of the world, $232,000,000 of which was with the United Kingdom.

Our total sales to Canada in 1909 were $192,661,000, and Great Britain's sales to Canada that year were $86,257,000. We sold to Canada $106,000,000 worth of goods more than she bought from the mother country, notwithstanding the fact that Canada extends to the mother country a preferential tariff rate 33⅓ per cent below the rate she imposes against the United States.

What does it mean? It means that it will require a tariff wall higher than any that has yet been established to overcome and destroy the natural disposition on the part of the people of these two countries to cooperate, to do business back and forth, to exchange commodities when it is to their mutual advantage to do so. Canada is the third best customer we have in all the world, and, taking cotton out of account, she ranks second. With her 7,000,000 people she bought more from the United States last year than we sold to all the Republics in South America and all the countries in Asia combined, with their 700,000,000 aggregate population! Progressive, increasing in population, developing as she is and will be, the higher the tide of her prosperity the better customer she will become for the United States and the more valuable our intercourse will become to her. When she reaches the 20,000,000 point in population, at the present ratio of business, she will be the best customer the United States has in the entire world.

Trade is generally profitable to both parties, as it should be. Canada raises very little corn. There was produced last year in all the Provinces only about 25,000,000 bushels, as against 3,000,000,000 bushels produced in this country, and Canada's only corn Province is Ontario. The western farmers of the United States are not concerned about Ontario, nor Quebec, nor the maritime Provinces, but they do feel some concern about Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. But a country that can not raise corn can not successfully raise beef cattle or hogs, and a country, I repeat, that can not grow clover to fertilize its land, that can not rotate its small grains with corn, can not for any considerable length of time keep up that fertility of the soil that is necessary to produce large yields of wheat and other small grains.

Ah, gentlemen of the House, the fear of Canadian competition on the part of the American farmer, it seems to me, is altogether fanciful. If you go to the Illinois farmer or the Iowa farmer and ask him what he thinks about the danger of competition with a country that can not produce corn, hogs, or cattle, he will look upon you as a freak.

CANADIAN LAND BOOM.

But there are boomers in Canada. They are advertising the wonderful fertility of their soil and the cheapness of the land and the salubrity of their climate. A few years ago fertile lands in the State of Mississippi were advertised in the part of the country where I live at ridiculously low prices, and many of my neighbors disposed of their property and went to Mississippi and bought lands. Those lands felt the effects of the boom and increased in price somewhat, but after a few years of experience every investor that I know of, excepting one, disposed of his Mississippi purchase and came back to good old Indiana a wiser, if not a wealthier, man. It was another Mississippi bubble—a will-o'-the-wisp excursion.

Of course the Canadian lands will all be cultivated in the course of years, and they will support a considerable population, but I want to emphasize the fact that from no standpoint can the Canadian farmer be a dangerous competitor of the American farmer. He is handicapped by both drouth and frost and by the inevitable depreciation of soil fertility characteristic of all small grain regions. This is especially true where the chief crop is spring wheat. Experience in this country shows that when the virgin fertility of the soil is exhausted in spring wheat cultivation, and it only requires a few years of successive cultivation to do that, the land can never be recruited to successfully produce spring wheat thereafter. The first few crops yield abundantly and then the inevitable depreciation begins. This has been the experience of all our prairie States. That is not the case with winter wheat, however. Land in the valley of the Danube that has been farmed for a thousand years produces winter wheat as abundantly as it ever did. Its strength is maintained by rotation of crops and by artificial fertilization, methods that have never succeeded in spring wheat growing.

Talk about raising cattle and hogs in Canada! They have no corn to feed them. They feed all the oats they raise to their horses and sheep. Oats, hay, and barley are all the feed they have. The winters are two months longer in Canada than they are in the part of the country in which I live, and they have to feed stock that much longer every year. Is Canada a dangerous competitor of ours under these conditions? Ah, Mr. Chairman, these conditions are fundamental. They are vital, and they can not be gotten rid of. I was a farmer when I was a young man, and I know something about raising corn and oats, and wheat and cattle.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That was a long time ago.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; a long time ago.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman made his money early.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; I am past 35 now. The Tariff Board appointed by the President under the Payne tariff law made an investigation of relative conditions in this country and Canada recently touching farming and stock raising. Their report was submitted to Congress on the 1st day of last month. The report shows that wages of farm hands are fully as high in western Canada as they are in the United States. The report also shows that prices of farm animals are higher in Canada than they are in this country. I read, in this connection, extracts from the report, showing the prices of horses, cattle, hogs, and sheep in the two countries:

HORSES.

Prices of horses range from $106 to $125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho, and Washington from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices of horses range from $107 to $139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from $107 to $156. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa prices range from $120 to $124. In all the Canadian Provinces, except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia, the prices are higher than in any of our States.

As to horses, Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario. The agricultural development of the northwestern Provinces has put prices of work stock and heavy draft teams at a premium in the territory tributary to Winnipeg. During the spring of 1910 it is stated on good authority that not less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time. The five Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta combined have but 1,863,744 head, as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the State of Iowa alone.

DAIRY COWS.

Prices of dairy cows range from $33 to $39 a head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is practically the same. In the western border States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50. In eastern Canada prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48 and in western Canada from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario, as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

CATTLE AND SWINE.

Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of prices is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.

Prices of swine are slightly higher in Canada than in the United States. In our eastern border States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York—they range from $10 to $11.10. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa prices of swine vary very little from those already quoted. In eastern Canada the range of swine prices is from $10 to $13 and in western Canada from $12 to $13. The highest American price is $11.80 a head in Wisconsin, as against the highest Canadian price of $13 a head, which is quoted for Quebec, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

SHEEP.

Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada, due to the fact that Ontario specializes on pedigreed flocks, as appears later on. In the United States they range from $2.90 per head in Texas to $5.30 in Illinois and Iowa, while in Canada the range is from $4 in Nova Scotia to $7 in Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

While the sheep industry in Canada at the present time is a minor one, the feeding of lambs for market has been an important business in Ontario, as many as 125,000 head having been exported as late as 1907 to the United States and 33,000 in the same year to Great Britain. The surplus has now dwindled, however, to such an extent that practically none was received at the Buffalo stockyards during 1910. In fact, it is reported that a few American-fed lambs have been shipped from Buffalo to Toronto, indicating that Ontario at the present time is scarcely supplying her own wants in this regard. This is, however, an abnormal condition.

I will insert in my remarks a table showing sales to and purchases from Canada of horses, cattle, meat and dairy products, and breadstuffs for the last five years:

Government statistics for five years ending June 30, 1910.

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Meat and dairy:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672

BENEFITS OF RECIPROCITY.

The question is asked, "Where are the benefits of reciprocity with Canada?" I will endeavor to suggest some of them. It will enable people on this side of the boundary line and the people on the other side to trade along natural channels. We should not artificialize markets where it is not necessary to do so. Take the item of coal. Canada has a duty of 53 cents a ton on coal, and we had a duty of 67 cents until the Payne law, and now it is 45 cents.

That duty shuts Nova Scotia coal out of some of the markets in New England. They are now supplied by coal chiefly from West Virginia, but the duty enables Nova Scotia to ship coal 200 or 300 miles farther west than could be done otherwise, and it takes from Pennsylvania and Ohio and Indiana their natural market for coal in Ontario and Quebec. If we had free coal with Canada, Nova Scotia would sell a little more coal to New England—not much; her dutiable coal is inferior in quality to the coal of West Virginia. We would sell more coal to the Provinces north of us, and the consumers of coal in Ontario and Quebec would obtain better coal at a lower price. It would help on both sides of the line. The advantage would be largely with us, because we have better industrial organization and better facilities for transportation. It would operate that way in a great many channels and along a great many lines. Unnecessary transportation is an economic waste. This arrangement would save much unnecessary transportation. These two peoples do not need the trade barrier between them that has existed for a century. It serves no beneficent purpose to either country.

Who are opposing this bill? Every "standpatter" and every friend of "special interests" in the country are against it. These patriots have suddenly become the champions of the "downtrodden" farmer. Whence this new-born zeal for the tiller of the soil? The bill provides for free lumber, a provision that ought to be hailed with delight by every fair-minded man in the country.

The high price of lumber has become a great burden to the people, and the bill, if it becomes a law, will afford some relief. The Bureau of Corporations recently investigated the subject of timber holdings in this country and discovered an alarming condition of things. It was found that a few wealthy syndicates now own and control millions upon millions of acres of the most valuable timber in the country. Those syndicates do not manufacture lumber, but they hold the timber until they can get their own price for "stumpage" from the millmen. They have made hundreds of millions of dollars from the increase in the price of stumpage. These timber barons confer no benefit upon society. They add nothing to the wealth or welfare of the country, but they grow rich off the necessities of the people. They are now making frenzied appeals through the press and other agencies for the protection of the farmers against the baleful Canadian reciprocity movement. Their hearts are wrung with anguish lest the farmer may suffer an injustice. Great patriots they surely are!

Placing lumber on the free list will alone compensate for every concession made by our Government.

Horses in the western Canadian country are higher in price than they are in the United States. Reciprocity will open up a market for American horses, a market for fruits and vegetables, especially early fruits and vegetables, and many other things. There are a great many things that we can obtain from Canada and many things Canada may obtain from us to the advantage of both countries. There are a great many advantages which I have not time to enumerate, and I do not see any serious disadvantage to either country.

I believe when I cast my vote for this measure I will have voted to advance the welfare of the farmers and all classes of producers in the United States. The talk about discrimination against the farmer is without justification. No sane man in America would purposely discriminate against the farmer. The chief benefit the American farmer derives from the policy of protection is an indirect one. The chief benefit he gets under the policy of protection is in the stimulation it gives to factories and the employment of American laborers at good wages, who buy and consume the products of the farm and thereby make good prices.

What was our campaign slogan in 1896, when the country was in distress? The Democratic leaders said, "Open the mints to free coinage of silver." Our leaders said, "Open the mills and give labor employment." [Applause on the Republican side.] Put money in the pocket of the toiler, so he will be able to buy and consume of the products of the farm and the factory. The people accepted the advice of the Republican Party. McKinley was elected President, the Dingley tariff went into operation, the mills were opened, and they have been open from that day to this. Labor throughout the country was steadily employed at good wages and has been steadily employed ever since. Wage earners bought and consumed, and prices went up naturally in obedience to the law of supply and demand. There are those who say we overdid the prosperity business and created too much demand and prices have become too high. It is hard to satisfy some people.

The Republican Party is now committed to the policy of fixing duties on competitive commodities only high enough to cover the difference in cost of production here and abroad, allowing a reasonable profit to the American producer. It believes in the creation of a tariff commission to ascertain that difference with practical certainty. It believes in adequate protection to legitimate American producers on the one hand and protection of the American consumer against unjust exactions by monopolistic combinations on the other hand. Its great, patriotic leader, President Taft, initiated this historic measure through his negotiations with the Canadian Government. He recommends its enactment by Congress because it is in harmony with the industrial policy of the country and the best traditions of the Republican Party.

Mr. Chairman, these two countries are neighbors. Their people are of the same race, they speak the same language, they have similar traditions and institutions. They are both capable, self-governing peoples devoted to liberty and order. The long land boundary separating them, several thousand miles in extent, is marked by no frowning forts, is guarded by no standing armies. The placid bosom of the great inland seas which are the common property of both countries, is vexed by no battleships or armed cruisers. Gentlemen, this is the most sublime object lesson in the world's history, teaching us it does, that two intelligent, self-reliant, progressive peoples, may live side by side under different flags, with nothing to safeguard their relations but the spirit of justice and fraternity. [Applause.] Let us consecrate that relation, let us strengthen the bond of unity between these peoples, so that we under the Stars and Stripes and they under their own national emblem may be one people in all things that make for our common good, and tend to promote the welfare of mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Canadian reciprocity measure (H. R. 4412) and had come to no resolution thereon.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 813, 61st Cong., 3d sess.), which was read and, with the accompanying

papers, ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 31 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith copies of the acts and resolutions enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico during the session beginning January 9 and ending March 9, 1911.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 17, 1911.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi for 10 days on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 18, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Willis River, Va. (H. Doc. No. 16); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Detroit River, Wyandotte Channel, between Fighting Island and city of Wyandotte, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 17); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Patents was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4125) for the relief of the heirs of Benjamin S. Roberts, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5595) to establish a fish-cultural station and mussel hatchery on the Wabash River, near Vincennes, Ind.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 5596) to provide local rates of postage on parcels on rural routes emanating from the same post office or station; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5597) to prevent the employment of children under the age of 14 years performing manual labor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 5598) to establish a fish hatchery and biological station in the first congressional district of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5599) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5600) authorizing the construction of national highway from Fort McPherson to the United States penitentiary, Fulton County, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5601) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 5602) authorizing the Leo N. Levi Memorial Association to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the corporation on lots Nos. 3 and 4, block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5603) to amend section 15 of an act passed May 30, 1908, and being an act entitled "An act to amend the national banking laws," and provide for payment of interest on public deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5604) to determine the jurisdiction of circuit and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5605) to determine the jurisdiction of United States courts in matters of contempt, and to regulate the trial and punishment of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5606) defining combinations and conspiracies in trade and labor disputes and regulating the granting of injunctions therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5607) for the erection of a public building at Central City, Muhlenberg County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5608) for the erection of a public building at Glasgow, Barren County, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 5609) to authorize the coinage of 2½-cent pieces; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5610) to repeal a portion of an act heretofore passed relating to the alienation of the title of the United States to land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5611) to retire enlisted men, either in the Army or Marine Corps, after 25 years' service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5612) to adjust the lineal and relative rank of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5613) for the relief of volunteer officers and soldiers who served during the War with Spain and beyond the period of their enlistments; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5614) to acquire the Rancho del Encinal, known as the Henry Ranch, located in San Luis, Obispo County, State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5615) granting to the city and county of San Francisco, Cal., rights of way in and through certain public lands of the United States in California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5616) to amend section 2746 of the Revised Statutes, relating to additional compensation to the appraisers, deputy collectors, etc., at the port of San Francisco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5617) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a suitable building or buildings for marine-hospital purposes at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5618) to confirm the name of Commodore Barney Circle for the circle located at the eastern end of Pennsylvania Avenue SE., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5619) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia regarding corporations; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5620) to amend section 4514 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5621) to confer jurisdiction upon the Circuit Court of the United States for the Ninth Circuit to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration of Paris and to render judgment thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5622) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Claims," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, approved February 24, 1855; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5623) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States for destruction of private property"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5624) to provide for payment of interest on judgments rendered against the United States for money due on public work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5625) for the relief of water users on reclamation projects in certain instances; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5626) providing for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Washington, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 5627) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5628) to amend an act entitled "An act for the sale of timber lands in the States of California, Oregon, Nevada, and in Washington Territory," approved June 3, 1878; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5629) to amend section 2301 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5630) to repeal section 17 of the United States Statutes, volume 14, enacted July 20, 1866, relating to the mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Mileage.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5631) for the relief of the nonenlisted officers and members of the crews of the Mississippi Ram Fleet, Marine Brigade, or the Mississippi Squadron; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5632) to pension Army teamsters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5633) requiring railroads to make reports; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5634) to amend section 4004 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, passed March 3, 1873, and entitled "Additional pay for postal cars"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5635) fixing the mileage of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Mileage.

By Mr. HAY: Resolution (H. Res. 98) calling for information as to the number of officers added to the Army under the act of March 3, 1911; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 99) amending rules; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 100) for appointment of special committee to investigate certain commissions, boards, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: Resolution (H. Res. 101) to authorize the chairman of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress to appoint a clerk to said committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 102) to provide for an investigation of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 103) instructing committees to examine affairs of departments; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5636) granting an increase of pension to James W. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5637) granting an increase of pension to John B. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5638) granting an increase of pension to Elisha L. Larowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5639) granting an increase of pension to John Ingerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5640) granting an increase of pension to Mingo Williams, alias Mingo Hinds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5641) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Might; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5642) granting an increase of pension to William Mereness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5643) granting an increase of pension to Christian Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5644) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5645) granting an increase of pension to John Latham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5646) granting an increase of pension to James W. Longbon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5647) granting an increase of pension to John T. Hatch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5648) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5649) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Schickedantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5650) granting an increase of pension to David Rizor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5651) granting an increase of pension to James M. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5652) granting an increase of pension to Marion Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5653) granting an increase of pension to Hunter Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5654) granting an increase of pension to Nehemier C. Hilford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5655) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5656) granting an increase of pension to David Vestal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5657) granting an increase of pension to James Milton Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5658) granting an increase of pension to Alfred T. Tallman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5659) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Spring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5660) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Stouffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5661) granting an increase of pension to William G. Shute; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5662) granting an increase of pension to Louis Siples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5663) granting an increase of pension to William Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5664) granting an increase of pension to James M. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5665) granting an increase of pension to William N. England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5666) granting an increase of pension to Simon E. De Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5667) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5668) granting an increase of pension to Laura I. Curry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5669) granting an increase of pension to John H. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5670) granting an increase of pension to James K. Polk Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5671) granting an increase of pension to Martin Barnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5672) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Boger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5673) granting an increase of pension to Peter Boger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5674) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Barnd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5675) granting an increase of pension to William Cagney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 5676) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Flagg, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5677) granting a pension to Andrew M. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5678) granting an increase of pension to George A. Easterley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 5679) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 5680) granting an increase of pension to Moses M. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5681) for the relief of John W. Fairfax; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5682) for the relief of John Mann; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5683) for the relief of the Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5684) for the relief of Emma C. Franner, George W. Seaton, Hiram K. Seaton, Howard Seaton, Mary Seaton, Blanche Seaton, George W. Taylor, Edward Taylor, and Catharine Pomeroy; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5685) for the relief of Gordon Jones, administrator of the estate of William M. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5686) for the relief of the heirs of Philip Houser, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5687) for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Binns, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5688) for the relief of Mason Shipman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 5689) granting a pension to Charlotte McConnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5690) for the relief of John Donnelly, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5691) for the relief of David Kirch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5692) granting an increase of pension to John Eslinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 5693) granting a pension to Rosa Drumm Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5694) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5695) granting an increase of pension to Lithco S. Van Anda; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5696) granting an increase of pension to Arthur T. McLean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5697) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) granting an increase of pension to John Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) granting an increase of pension to Ardon P. Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5700) granting an increase of pension to Henry Babb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5701) granting an increase of pension to Hill C. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5702) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5703) granting an increase of pension to Alberton F. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5704) granting a pension to William Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5705) for the relief of Henry W. Anderson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5706) to refer to the Court of Claims the claim of John S. Armstrong for compensation for loss of wheat in 1862; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5707) granting an increase of pension to William Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 5708) granting a pension to Julius Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5709) granting an increase of pension to John W. Werts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) granting an increase of pension to William Higginbottom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5711) granting an increase of pension to Julius Demele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5712) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 5713) granting a pension to Hattie Brauda; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5714) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. C. L. Fogarty; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 5715) granting an increase of pension to William Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5716) granting a pension to Garfield Lay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5717) granting an increase of pension to John F. Dailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5718) granting an increase of pension to Henry Conine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5719) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5720) granting an increase of pension to James L. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 5721) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5722) granting an increase of pension to Junius G. Loggins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5723) granting an increase of pension to Enos Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5724) granting an increase of pension to Wallace R. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 5725) granting an increase of pension to Clarence McBratney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 5726) for the relief of the legal representatives of Isabella E. Cooper, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 5727) granting an increase of pension to Albert Kampman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 5728) granting an increase of pension to Luther Stephenson, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 5729) to authorize the reconveyance of certain lands to Abel Ady and wife in Klamath County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5730) for the relief of C. A. Sprinkel; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) for the relief of Wesley Rankins; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5732) for the relief of James W. Nickens; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5733) for the relief of the heirs of James Bowles, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5734) for the relief of the heirs of James F. Rinker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5735) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas A. Crow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5736) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 5737) granting an increase of pension to Ida C. Emerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5738) granting an increase of pension to Mark T. Shrote; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5739) granting an increase of pension to John H. Edge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5740) granting an increase of pension to Edward Skahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5741) granting an increase of pension to Grace Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Harvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Sponogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5744) granting a pension to Lillie G. Daggett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5745) granting an increase of pension to Carrie W. Dibble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5746) granting a pension to Shepherd Plummer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5747) granting a pension to Catherine J. Asmussen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5748) granting a pension to Mary Burnet; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5749) granting a pension to Lillian P. Beaudin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5750) granting a pension to Ellen Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5751) granting a pension to Katherine M. McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5752) granting a pension to Julius Oppenheimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) granting a pension to Samuel R. Thurston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5754) granting a pension to Charles Alpers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5755) granting a pension to Ella Whiteside; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to James Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5757) granting a pension to Ella M. Gaines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5758) for the relief of Joseph L. Donovan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5759) for the relief of James Green Geoghegan, alias James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5760) for the relief of former occupants of the present military reservation at Point San Jose, in the city of San Francisco, and to repeal an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Fremont to certain lands and improvements thereon in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," approved February 10, 1893; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5761) for the relief of the legal representative of the estate of the late Gen. Oliver Duff Greene; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) for the relief of George W. Bell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of William K. Harvey, alias William K. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5764) for the relief of Bernard Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5765) for the relief of the American Biscuit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5766) for the relief of Mary Jordan, widow of Dennis Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5767) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Ormond M. Lissak; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5768) for the relief of H. Liebes & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5769) for the relief of Frank Klein; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5770) for the relief of Helen Wakefield; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5771) for the relief of Piper, Aden, Goodall Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of John Rothchild & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5773) for the relief of Arthur G. Fisk; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) for the relief of the widow and children of John W. Geering; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5775) for the relief of the estate of Julius Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5776) authorizing the appointment of Maj. W. R. Smedberg, United States Army, retired, to the rank and grade of brigadier general on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) for the transfer of certain land to the Mission Rock Co., of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5778) to reimburse the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, for moneys paid by said city and county to various persons upon judgment claims recovered by them against said city and county for damages inflicted to their property by soldiers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 5779) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Darnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 5780) to grant honorable discharges to the quartermaster volunteers who served in the military service in the Civil War, and including their names in the roster of the Union Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 5781) for the relief of Clarence B. Schenck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: A bill (H. R. 5782) granting an increase of pension to James Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 5783) granting an increase of pension to Patrick J. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5784) granting an increase of pension to W. O. Hartshorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5785) for the relief of John Bartholomew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 5786) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5787) granting a pension to Timothy McCarthy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 5788) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5789) granting an increase of pension to John Breneman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5790) granting an increase of pension to Michael M. Stuckey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5791) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5792) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5793) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5794) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5795) granting an increase of pension to Owen Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5796) granting an increase of pension to David H. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5797) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. McCain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5798) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Garlits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5799) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Marsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5800) granting an increase of pension to George Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5801) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Dillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5802) granting an increase of pension to John H. Modrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5803) granting an increase of pension to T. Elwood Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5804) granting an increase of pension to George O. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5805) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Boling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5806) granting an increase of pension to John McCray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5807) granting an increase of pension to John Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5808) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Currier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5809) granting an increase of pension to Irwin R. Layton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5810) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Willard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5811) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Fessler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5812) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gravel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5813) granting an increase of pension to Morgan T. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5814) granting an increase of pension to Levi B. Wightman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5815) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Collett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5816) granting an increase of pension to Henry Muntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5817) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 5818) granting an increase of pension to Oliver F. Chester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5819) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim Romine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5820) granting an increase of pension to James C. Mynatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5821) granting a pension to Nellie V. Cornelius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5822) for the relief of Laura J. Dills; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 5823) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Nolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 5824) granting a pension to Peter Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5825) granting an increase of pension to William Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5826) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5827) granting an increase of pension to Green M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5828) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Francis M. Sheppard; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 5829) granting an increase of pension to William R. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 5830) granting a pension to Nettie B. Shores; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5831) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Ewing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 5832) granting an increase of pension to Richard Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 5833) granting a pension to Rebecca Cordell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 5834) granting an increase of pension to William Cavins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5835) granting an increase of pension to William R. Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5836) granting an increase of pension to Melvin B. Dimmick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5837) granting a pension to Sarah A. Lovelady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 5838) granting an increase of pension to John W. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5839) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5840) granting an increase of pension to Edward J. Hurley, alias John Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5841) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Travis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5842) granting an increase of pension to Phillip Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5843) granting an increase of pension to Washington C. Shannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5844) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5845) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Phifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5846) granting an increase of pension to James A. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5847) granting an increase of pension to John T. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5848) granting an increase of pension to James Loving; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5849) granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5850) granting an increase of pension to Percy H. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5851) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Beauchamp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5852) granting an increase of pension to Clement Brawner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5853) granting an increase of pension to Granville Corley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5854) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Clack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5855) granting an increase of pension to John A. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5856) granting an increase of pension to John K. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5857) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Cates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5858) granting an increase of pension to James W. Cannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 5859) granting an increase of pension to McHenry Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5860) granting an increase of pension to George W. Doss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5861) granting an increase of pension to C. A. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5862) granting an increase of pension to David Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5863) granting an increase of pension to John W. Gillum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5864) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Grubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5865) granting an increase of pension to Eliza F. Greenwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5866) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan C. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5867) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5868) granting an increase of pension to Susan J. Hendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5869) granting an increase of pension to Nard B. R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5870) granting an increase of pension to William Jessee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5871) granting an increase of pension to Abner J. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5872) granting an increase of pension to James Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5873) granting an increase of pension to Isaac T. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5874) granting a pension to Parnesia M. Walton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5875) granting a pension to Alice C. Weir; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5876) granting a pension to Russella J. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5877) granting a pension to Millie Sweatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5878) granting a pension to Vesta V. Spears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5879) granting a pension to Lydia Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5880) granting a pension to Edward A. Poag; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5881) granting a pension to Eugene U. Proctor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5882) granting a pension to Jereasy E. Odell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5883) granting a pension to John Wesley Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5884) granting a pension to J. F. Napier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5885) granting a pension to Laura E. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5886) granting a pension to Sarah Mallory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5887) granting a pension to James Mesker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5888) granting a pension to America McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5889) granting a pension to Laura B. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5890) granting a pension to Anna Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5891) granting a pension to James Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5892) granting a pension to Thomas Blythe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5893) granting a pension to Frederick Bailor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5894) granting a pension to William W. Cravens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5895) granting a pension to Susan Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5896) granting a pension to A. J. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5897) granting a pension to John W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5898) granting a pension to Kate C. G. Ewing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5899) granting a pension to Maggie Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5900) granting a pension to Mahala Fant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5901) granting a pension to Sarah Wade Garnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5902) granting a pension to Lizzie Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5903) granting a pension to Margaret E. Hazel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5904) granting a pension to William H. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5905) for the relief of Kate Oakes Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5906) for the relief of George M. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5907) for the relief of Green B. Stewart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5908) for the relief of Mrs. Repsay Rowan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5909) for the relief of Benjamin F. Proctor; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5910) for the relief of J. M. Phelps; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5911) for the relief and benefit of Eli W. Owens; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5912) for the relief of Josiah Morris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5913) for the relief of E. F. Miles; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5914) for the relief of R. P. Breeding; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5915) for the relief of Morton B. W. Camp; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5916) for the relief of J. D. Campfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5917) for the relief of James R. Evans; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5918) for the relief of Temple D. Harreld; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5919) for the relief of George R. Harbison; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5920) for the relief of the heirs of George Wright; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5921) for the relief of the heirs of Wilson Ryan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5922) for the relief of the heirs of J. C. Kennerly; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5923) for the relief of the heirs of Anderson Crenshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5924) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Gray; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5925) for the relief of the heirs of Henry H. Johnston; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5926) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund P. Lee; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5927) to correct the military record of James Mesker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5928) to correct the military record of William Lacy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5929) for the relief of the estate of Herman Whitney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5930) for the relief of the estate of H. R. M. Taylor, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5931) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. O. F. Moore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5932) for the relief of the estate of Rev. James Breeding, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5933) for the relief of the estates of George W. Chatfield and William E. Curd, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5934) for the relief of the estate of W. R. Decker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5935) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John H. Winkfield; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5936) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert N. Stewart, and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5937) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Granor Owens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5938) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of T. J. Caskey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5939) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Woodford Dunn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5940) appropriating $300 to the heirs of Howard Newman, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5941) appropriating $4,500 to the heirs of Campbell Glover, deceased; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 5942) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Kelsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5943) granting an increase of pension to Kate A. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5944) for the relief of the heirs of Jenkins and Havens; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5945) granting a pension to James H. Sutherland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 5946) granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5947) granting a pension to Louie E. Read; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., urging passage of reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petitions of Carrie V. Sheldon and other members of American Woman's League, of Blue Rapids, Kans., and Mrs. Frances Larimer, president, and other members of the American Woman's League, of Leavenworth, Kans., protesting as to action taken by the Post Office Department against the Lewis Publishing Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Papers to accompany bill for special relief of William T. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of S. Blamer & Son and 56 other farmers, of Johnstown, Ohio, against any reduction of the tariff on wool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., and by Shanesville, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES: Extracts from minutes of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, requesting all bagging and ties used in baling of cotton to be placed on free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Petition of James T. Brown and others, of Sheffield, Pa., requesting withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of George A. Easterly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Farmers Educative and Cooperative Union of Pierce County, Ga., asking for the levy of a duty on Egyptian and other long staple cottons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of La Grange County Farmers and Horticulture Society protesting against reciprocity bill, without reduction of tariff on manufactured goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: Resolutions of mayor and common council of Manitowoc, Wis., favoring postal savings bank law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DODDS: Petitions of citizens of Isabella County; Wilson Grange, Antrim County; and Liberty Grange, No. 391, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of William Henderson, favoring an increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Resolution of New York Chapter American Institute of Architects, favoring monument to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution adopted at mass meeting by the Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, against the enactment of a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Dunham Post, No. 141, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, of Decatur, Ill., favoring the enactment of the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Clarence McBratney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: Memorial of Tennessee Legislature, requesting refund of cotton tax; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Tennessee Society of Sons of the Revolution, requesting publication of all the archives of the Government relative to the War of the Revolution; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition for the passage of legislation preventing interstate transmission of race-gambling odds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, requesting the passage of House bill 25791, increase for rural-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. F. Hutchinson, La Moure, N. Dak., against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Pasadena, Cal., favoring the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Petition of the Tyrone (Pa.) Branch of the Socialist Party of Pennsylvania, requesting the recall of troops from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Cambria County Pomona Grange, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of James Green Geoghegan, alias James Green; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bills granting pensions to Lillian P. Benudin, Catherine Asmussen, and Mary Burnet, and an increase of pension to Mark T. Shrote; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills granting increases of pension to Carrie W. Dibble and Margaret J. Harvey, and pensions to Lillie G. Daggett and Ella Whiteside; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers accompanying a bill for the relief of W. K. Harvey, of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Bernard Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Joseph L. Donovan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KONOP: Petitions of Joseph J. Plank and Wisconsin Wire Works, of Appleton, Wis., and Brown County (Wis.) Buttermakers' Association, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB: Resolution of Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., favoring Federal law for the inspection of dairy and meat animals and their products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT: Petitions of numerous citizens of Carthage, N. Y.; Perch River Grange, No. 626, Patrons of Husbandry, Perch River, N. Y.; and Oswego County Fruit Growers Association, Oswego, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Indian River Grange, No. 564, Patrons of Husbandry, Antwerp, N. Y., relative to cold storage of food products (S. 7649); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Carthage Coal Co., Carthage Oil Co., the Eager Electric Co. of Watertown, and of 13 citizens of Carthage, all in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of Graniteville Branch, Quarry Workers' International Union of North America, protesting on the part of the United States in the affairs of Mexico, and Quarry Workers' International Union, Barre, Vt., protesting against intervention by the United States in the affairs of Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, vote of Saxton River Grange, Saxton River, Vt.; unanimous vote of Orion Grange, South Woodstock, Vt.; and petition of citizens of Putney, Vt., protesting against the reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Resolution of Buffalo (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturing Club, favoring Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODDENBERY: Petition requesting the withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHARP: Resolutions of Local Lodge No. 453, International Machinists, in favor of enactment of the reading or illiteracy test to exclude undesirable immigration and importation of cheap labor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of Richard Smith, relating to granting increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, urging that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of citizens of Buffalo and the Niagara frontier, favoring the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWITZER: Petition of Springfield Grange, No. 210, Gallia County, Ohio, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Cheshire, Orange, Seymour, North Haven, Wallingford, Totoket, Indian River, Waugumbary, Suffield, Good Will, Somers, No. 105, and Columbia Granges, favoring a parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of Wethersfield Business Men and Civic Association, Wethersfield, Conn., protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of citizens of Waterbury, Conn., protesting against the new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Hillstown (Conn.) Grange and West Hartford Grange, No. 58, protesting against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of C. P. Frazer and 136 citizens of Mount Victory, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 18, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, ever ready to hear and answer the prayers of the faithful, help us to pray and work that we may become factors in the world's great fields of endeavor, workers in Thy vineyards, that we may build for ourselves characters Godlike, in imitation of the world's Exemplar, that Thy kingdom may come, and Thy will be done on earth as in heaven. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I spoke on this subject in the last session of Congress at some length. I have no desire in any sense whatever to make a speech now, but I have some additional facts bearing on the matter which I desire to present, believing that possibly they may be of use in the further progress of this debate.

In discussing the question of reciprocity with Canada in the last session of Congress I tried to show that no harm would come to this country if the terms of the agreement were enacted into law, and that it would be in full accord with the practice of the Republican Party in the past and also with the provisions of the national Republican platform at the present time.

I pointed out—

First. That in every case where we had made reciprocity agreements with other countries the result had been beneficial to both parties.

Second. That the pending agreement was in no sense a general tariff revision, but simply a straightforward business arrangement with a single adjacent country for the reciprocal exchange of such articles as the negotiators of both Governments believed, after most careful consideration, could be made with safety to each other and for the mutual advantage of both, and that the special rates so made had no necessary bearing upon the general tariff relations of either Canada or the United States with the other countries of the world; and

Third. That the racial characteristics of the respective peoples and the climatic conditions of the two countries fully justified an entirely different course of action of one toward the other from that which ought to control our relations with the peoples on the other side of the two oceans, where like conditions do not prevail. I laid down the fundamental principle that competition can not exist between the products of two nations except with reference to their exportable surplus, and showed the statistical position of the principal crops of Canada and the United States in this respect.

I think I demonstrated beyond dispute, for no reply has yet been made by anybody to the proposition, that the higher cost of living which now obtains in this country was due to an enormously increased demand for food products and a proportionately decreased productive power on our part, and that this great change, due largely to immigration and a transition from agriculture to manufacturing, had begun on the Atlantic coast and was steadily moving westward until now its influence was effective and controlling in the central West.

I pointed out, also, that the transference of millions upon millions of the food-producing classes from the nations of Europe into the manufacturing industries of this country had made the tendency to a higher cost of living world-wide, and I expressed my sincere belief that the continuation of high prices for food products was inevitable, and that the only possible effect of complete freedom of exchange of all natural products between the United States and Canada would be to temporarily retard the rapid advances and to steady the fluctuations of the prices of the fast-diminishing export surplus of many of the food products of both countries, and that a considerable period

of time would be necessary for a permanent readjustment of the present world-wide conditions of the cost of living.

I showed that the land values differed in the different Provinces of Canada as they did in the United States, but that taking all occupied farm lands in the Dominion, the average value was $38.60 per acre, as against a value of $23.38 of all occupied farm lands in the United States.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HILL. I will yield just for a question. I have only one hour, and I will take it all.

Mr. FERRIS. Where does the gentleman get those figures?

Mr. HILL. I get them, in the first place, from the Census Bureau of the United States, and in the second place from the census bureau of Canada. You will find the one in the Canadian Yearbook. Mr. Durand will give you the figures which he gave to me.

Mr. FERRIS. I only asked for information.

Mr. HILL. I quote now from the report of the Tariff Board of March 1 on that subject, specifying where the main differences are found, for the prices of farm lands are based on the yield per acre and selling price of the product; and that question is a vital one in the problem of the cost of living to all of our people.

I would be glad, if any of you have that report before you, to have you follow me in these quotations. These quotations which I shall read are summaries of the Tariff Board, not isolated extracts of prices across the border line, but the summaries of the whole investigation.

On page 84 of that report the board says:

In the great farming States of Iowa, Indiana, and Illinois the values of farm lands are very much higher than in any of the Canadian Provinces. In Illinois and Iowa they are a little more than twice as high as in Ontario.

The increase of land values between 1900 and 1910 has been marked in both countries. In certain of the Provinces the rate of increase has been higher than in any of the States. The highest rates of increase in the States are found where the highest land values obtain, namely, in Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa. But, on the other hand, Ontario, while reporting the highest Canadian land value, shows the lowest Canadian rate of increase. It is worth noting that Ontario is feeling the competition of western Canada, just as some years ago the eastern part of the United States felt the competition of our western lands.

It is impossible to make any significant comparative study of land values in western Canada and those in the United States. Western Canada is a virgin region; railroad lands have been sold to settlers at low prices and on liberal terms of payment; the Government has given away millions of acres under a liberal homestead law. In Manitoba the value of land per acre is $29, or $7 less than in Minnesota and Michigan; but owing to the recent settlement of Manitoba the rate of increase during the last 10 years is much greater than in those States.

Concerning wages in the wheat-producing sections, I quote from pages 85 and 86, as follows:

In general, it may be said that the wages of experienced season hands (hands employed for a period of seven, seven and a half, or eight months, beginning about April 1) are on the same general level in Manitoba and Minnesota, and also on the same general level in Saskatchewan and North Dakota, and they are higher in the last-named localities than in the two first named. Where North Dakota and Manitoba join each other the wages for season hands are about $5 higher in North Dakota than in Manitoba. The wages of harvest hands are practically the same throughout the two Provinces and the three States included in this investigation, with the exception of certain large farms in the States, where the rate is about 50 cents per day below the prevailing rate on the smaller farms.

So far as production per acre is concerned, the official reports show that of winter wheat, in which we excel, our land produced in 1910, 15.8 bushels per acre, and of spring wheat, in which Canada excels, her land produced 15.5 bushels per acre.

We produced 460,000,000 bushels of winter wheat as against 230,000,000 bushels of spring wheat. Canada produced 16,000,000 bushels of winter wheat and 133,000,000 of spring wheat. These are in round figures in both cases, for I am quoting from memory in this matter.

While these statements of land values, wages, and acreage product show clearly that there can be no appreciable difference in the cost of production, the fact of real importance is found in Tables 9 and 10, on pages 94 and 95, that in both countries, while the aggregate production has increased, the home consumption has increased still more rapidly—the United States exporting 6 per cent of its product in 1910 as against 10 per cent in 1909 and 15 per cent in 1908.

During the last three years of great immigration into Canada not only have its land values increased more rapidly than ours, but its percentage of wheat exports has fallen from 38.84 per cent in 1908 to 36.17 per cent in 1909 and 33.16 per cent in 1910.

I now call attention to the board's summary of other products. On page 107 it says of oats:

The highest American yields per acre, each about 42 bushels, are reported from the border States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Washington. This yield is not equaled by any of the Canadian Provinces. The next highest yields are those of the great oat States, Illinois and Iowa, each of which produces 39 bushels per acre. This is also the yield of Montana.

The yields of Nova Scotia and Ontario exceed this by about 1 bushel.

The highest American farm prices, 50 and 51 cents, are reported from New Hampshire and Vermont, respectively. The highest Canadian prices, 45 and 49 cents, are reported from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, respectively. Ontario receives 36 cents, as against 42 cents received by the New York farmer. The lowest Canadian price quoted is that of Saskatchewan—28 cents. The lowest American price is that of Iowa—27 cents. It is to be noted that the farm prices of more than half of the oat crop of the United States range from 27 to 35 cents a bushel, and that the farm prices of about the same proportion of the Canadian crop range from 28 to 36 cents.

HAY.

The highest American yield per acre, 1.4 tons, is reported by Montana. Maine, New Hampshire, New York, and Vermont each report a yield of about 1¼ tons per acre. The yields of the great hay States of the Middle West range from 1 ton to a little more than 1½ tons. In Canada the average yields range from 0.87 ton, in Alberta, to a little more than 2 tons on Prince Edward Island.

What is Prince Edward Island? I have been all over it, from one end of it to the other, and the crop of hay is insignificant, compared with the requirements of either Canada or the United States.

Ontario, which produces more hay than New York, reports an average yield per acre of 1.84 tons, as against New York's average yield of 1.32 tons.

The highest American farm price, over $15 per ton, is reported from New Hampshire and Wisconsin. The highest Canadian price, $14.58, is that quoted for Alberta. The Ontario price is $10.21, as against the New York price of $13.70. It should be noted that, owing to crop shortage, American hay prices were unusually high in 1910.

HORSES.

Prices of horses range from $106 to $125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho, and Washington from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices of horses range from $107 to $139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from $107 to $156. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa prices range from $120 to $124. In all the Canadian Provinces, except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia, the prices are higher than in any of our States.

As to horses, Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario. The agricultural development of the northwestern Provinces has put prices of work stock and heavy draft teams at a premium in the territory tributary to Winnipeg. During the spring of 1910 it is stated on good authority that not less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time. The five Provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta combined have but 1,863,744 head, as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the State of Iowa alone.

DAIRY COWS (p. 109).

Prices of dairy cows range from $33 to $39 a head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is practically the same. In the western border States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50. In eastern Canada prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48 and in western Canada from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48, in Ontario, as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

CATTLE AND SWINE (p. 110).

Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of prices is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.

Prices of swine are slightly higher in Canada than in the United States. In our eastern border States, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York, they range from $10 to $11.10. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, prices of swine vary very little from those already quoted. In eastern Canada the range of swine prices is from $10 to $13 and in western Canada, from $12 to $13. The highest American price is $11.80 a head in Wisconsin, as against the highest Canadian price of $13 a head, which is quoted for Quebec, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

SHEEP (pp. 110, 118).

Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada, due to the fact that Ontario specializes on pedigreed flocks as appears later on. In the United States they range from $2.90 per head in Texas to $5.30 in Illinois and Iowa, while in Canada the range is from $4 in Nova Scotia to $7 in Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

While the sheep industry in Canada at the present time is a minor one, the feeding of lambs for market has been an important business in Ontario, as many as 125,000 head having been exported as late as 1907 to the United States and 33,000 the same year to Great Britain. The surplus has now dwindled, however, to such an extent that practically none was received at the Buffalo stockyards during 1910. In fact it is reported that a few American-fed lambs have been shipped from Buffalo to Toronto, indicating that Ontario at the present time is scarcely supplying her own wants in this regard. This is, however, an abnormal condition.

These are the general conclusions drawn by the Tariff Board from their investigations. So far as retail prices in various localities are concerned, comparisons are of no value as a rule, for they are almost always affected by local conditions, such as methods of distribution and business customs. But I call attention to the fact shown on page 128, that new-laid eggs retail at 30 cents per dozen in Burlington and 40 cents in Montreal; that milk sells at 7 cents per quart in Burlington and 9 cents in Montreal; cream at 45 cents per gallon in Burlington and

50 cents in Montreal; and that butter sells at 32 cents per pound in Burlington and 35 cents in Montreal.

I submit herewith also the table found on page 132, giving the prices on dressed meats both at wholesale and retail in Chicago, Toronto, and Montreal, showing in every case higher prices in Canada than in the United States:

Comparative prices of agricultural products, January, 1911—Dressed meats.

WHOLESALE PRICES PER 100 POUNDS.

	Chicago, Ill.	Toronto, Canada.	Montreal, Canada.
No. 1 beef carcass	$9.50	$9.50	$9.50-$10.75
No. 2 beef carcass	8.00	9.00	
Lamb	$8.50- 9.00	12.00	
Mutton	6.00	9.00	8.00- 8.50
Pork	10.00-12.00	10.50	12.00- 13.00

RETAIL PRICES PER POUND.

	Buffalo, N. Y.	Toronto, Canada.
Beef:		
Rib roast	$0.14-$0.18	$0.15-$0.25
Rump	.12- .14	.10- .15
Steak, porterhouse	.18- .24	.25
Steak, sirloin	.16- .20	.18- .25
Lamb:		
Leg	.12- .16	.20- .25
Chops	.16- .22	.20- .22
Veal chops	.18- .22	.30
Pork:		
Loin	.16	.17- .20
Fresh shoulder	.11	.11

This investigation and report of the Tariff Board, published since I spoke in February on this question, fully justifies the claim I then made, that the treaty was in strict accord with the Republican national platform declaring that "the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad."

Over and over again since this treaty was made public the reduction in the price of wheat has been quoted as proof that the coming of reciprocity was casting its shadow before, and some Members on this floor wore into shreds and tatters telegrams tending to prove that wheat would soon become almost valueless, because Canadian restrictions were not taken off from logs and pulp wood to be manufactured on this side of the boundary at what has always been claimed to be a higher cost of production. As a proof that the law of supply and demand is still in operation, I quote from the market reports of the New York Tribune of March 27 concerning wheat:

Exports of wheat and corn are growing, and as the price of flour has reached an export basis, increased shipments may be looked for. The visible supply of wheat in the United States is 10,000,000 bushels more than at this time last year, while the world's supply is 30,000,000 bushels larger, the two factors, with favorable prospects for big crops in the current year, apparently precluding the possibility of a return of quotations to the high levels of 12 months ago.

I also quote a dispatch from Chicago, published in the New York Journal of Commerce, with reference to barley:

BARLEY HITS RECORD HIGH LEVEL.

CHICAGO, *March 23.*—Barley made an entirely new price record in Chicago to-day. Up to $1.13 a bushel was paid. The rise to-day reached 2 to 4 cents, making a total gain of more than 20 cents in the last couple of weeks. Scarcity of the grain has developed sharp competition between malsters and brought about a boom excelling anything of the kind previously known in the trade.

Is it not manifest that if the proposition for reciprocal trade in these commodities is responsible for these changes, it is working both ways at the same time?

But that is not all, for it is claimed by some gentlemen here that the policy of reciprocity in competitive products is not only a wrong economic one, but that it is "un-Republican" and "ruinous to the protective system." And yet only two years ago the bituminous coal interests of Pennsylvania petitioned the Ways and Means Committee for complete reciprocity with Canada in one of the great products of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—bituminous coal—and every Republican on this floor who voted for the Payne bill as it passed the House was guilty of this heresy to Republican principles, for if it is a heresy now, it was just as much so then.

But agricultural implements, which are also competitive products and essential to farming, furnish a still more glaring inconsistency. Our Democratic friends have just reported a bill which will be acted upon in a few days putting these things on the free list, and yet every one of them who voted against the Payne bill voted against not only Canadian but world-wide reciprocity then, and our Republican friends who voted for the tariff bill and now oppose reciprocity with Canada in other competitive articles will have much difficulty in adjusting their conscientious scruples, for paragraph 468 of the Payne bill puts plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins on the free list from any country in the world which will admit ours free.

If any American farmer chooses to pay a higher price for any of these things than he can buy it for at home and so put himself on a parity with the Canadian farmer, he can get them to-day in England, as the Canadian does, and import them here absolutely free of duty.

The only trouble is he can buy them cheaper at home, and so far as these things are concerned the proposed Democratic bill will be of no benefit to him.

It is only fair to state that this challenge to a world-wide reciprocity in the Payne bill was flung out to all nations at the request of the manufacturers themselves. I defy any Republican or Democrat to gainsay that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will yield—if the interruption is short—for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman inform us whether or not agricultural implements are produced in Canada?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; a few; but I guess not so many as we send over there.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman give us a comparison of wages paid in that industry in Canada and the United States?

Mr. HILL. There is no difference between the wages paid in Canada and the United States. I will stand upon that.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him just a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]?

Mr. HILL. I can not yield. Of course there are different rates of wages. One employer will pay liberal wages, while another will squeeze the life out of his employees. But in a general way I will state that there is no difference in the wages between like people, living in a like climate, under similar conditions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman has just stated that in some respects the cost of living is higher in Canada than in the United States. If the wage earner has to pay a higher cost of living, is not that an important factor in considering his situation when his wages are the same?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will answer the gentleman, and say that the cost of living is higher in eastern Canada than in South Dakota.

Now, I commend to the gentleman the next sentence that I am going to read: "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The opponents of Canadian reciprocity may not see the force of this interjection, but they will if they study their Bibles and familiarize themselves with Paul's experience in Ephesus. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HILL. I can not yield. I have only a few minutes more.

The site of the former Temple of Diana, which I visited three years ago, is now nothing but a great mudhole, and that also is suggestive of many things. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Nor can our Democratic friends congratulate themselves that they are walking now in the paths which their fathers trod, for most of these food products which will come in free under reciprocity with Canada were dutiable at an average of 20 per cent in the Democratic Wilson bill and at from 40 to 20 per cent in the Walker bill of 1846; and about the only thing found in the infinitesimal free list of that still sacred achievement of Democratic revenue legislation among the many made free in this bill are shrubs, seeds, and fish.

Now, if you ask me my idea of protection to a farm product I will give you an illustration. Canada produces about 73,000,000 bushels of potatoes per annum; the United States about 336,000,000 bushels annually. The production is under like circumstances in both countries and in like climatic conditions. Indeed, in many cases the boundary line runs right through the potato fields. The freights to the great markets of this country are substantially the same. I have them here,

given me by the Interstate Commerce Commission, by rail and by the Hamburg-American and North German Lloyd steamship companies from Germany, yesterday, by telegraph:

Railroad rates on potatoes, carload lots, to New York.

From—	Cents.
St. Paul, Minneapolis, Oshkosh, Manitowoc, Green Bay, Wis.; Escanaba, Bagley, Mich.....per bushel	21.68
Fredericton, St. Johns, Morrison, New Brunswick...do	15.53
Caribou, Daggett, Presque Isle, Me.....do	17.87
Houlton, Me.....do	15.53
Van Buren, Me.....do	17.58
Ashland, Me.....do	16.99
Greenville, Me.....do	14.65
Hamburg and Bremen, Germany, by steamer.....do	9.80

The freights to the great markets of this country are substantially the same. Whatever difference there is, possibly 1 cent a bushel, is in our favor. No duty is needed from Canada, because there is no difference in the cost of production. But across the ocean is a country of small area, with a population of 60,000,000 people—Germany—which produced last year 1,800,000,000 bushels of potatoes, six times as many as we did with our 30,000,000 more population. With the cheap labor of Germany, she can do it at an average cost of at least 10 cents a bushel less than we can. More than that, Germany can put those potatoes into New York City by water at a freight of 5 cents a bushel less than the rail rate from any producing points in the United States. I would ascertain, through a careful investigation by the Tariff Board, what the average difference in the cost of production is and would make a duty to fully cover it. That is my idea of protection. That is the competition from which I would protect the American farmer, and that is Republican protection, as I understand it.

The fact of the case is that Canadian reciprocity is not in any sense a tariff question, and I am profoundly glad, gentlemen, that it is not a party one [applause], for it has been negotiated by a great Republican President and, in my judgment, will receive the approval of a majority of both parties on the floor of this House. [Applause.] In its very essence—and I shall discuss it from this point hereafter—it is a question of the future cost of living in this country, and that problem vitally affects every individual in the land. It goes into every home, not only, as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] said, the home on the farm, but into the tenement house as well, into the humble cottage of the poor and the palace of the rich likewise. It is as insistent and compelling in the great city as in the country village, and it demands the anxious thought of every nation on this new continent, as it has already become the despair of every nation on the old one.

Three years ago I visited a great factory in Berlin, and was shown through it by an intelligent foreman who could speak a little English. "What do you pay for meat here," said I, "roasting and boiling pieces?" "Meat! Workmen know no meat. Potato and cabbage, cabbage and potato," was his reply. And I understood the significance of a country of 60,000,000 people raising 1,800,000,000 bushels of potatoes every year. "What is the price of butter?" I asked. "No butter can buy. Oil," he answered.

I have traveled for a month in the Orient, with an educated, cultivated gentleman as a guide, and his continuous diet was boiled rice, with a little dried fish added on feast days only.

Half of the population of the world to-day are struggling for a bare existence, and I never want to see on this continent such a civilization as that kind of sustenance compels.

The political complexion of Great Britain to-day is determined by the size of a loaf of bread, and the socialism of France and Germany is in reality a protest against scanty nourishment and the inability of the masses to obtain those things which make life tolerable and give to men ambition and hope of better things in the future for themselves and those dependent on them.

The increased cost of living was the dominant factor in the last election in this country, and mistaken as I think the people were as to the underlying causes of higher prices, they were not mistaken in the fact of their existence, for they were faced with the proof of it every day.

They did not stop to think that every year a million immigrants are added to our population beside its natural increase. They did not realize that eight-tenths of these settled in the manufacturing and mining sections, and that in the last decade nearly 10,000,000 of people, most of whom were food producers across the ocean were changed to food consumers here, and, besides that, the cities were growing enormously at the expense of the farming sections, making more food consumers and less food producers still.

They saw the splendid development of the West and the prosperity of the South and wondered at the resulting conditions as they were affected by them, forgetting the fundamental fact that no matter how much supply may increase, if demand increases more rapidly still, prices are bound to advance in proportion; and so they voiced their protest at the polls, and you gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber are now politically responsible for a situation which a Republican system of taxation did not cause, and which a Democratic system can not change, for increased demand for food products pressing upon the same area of production is certain to advance the price of the product and the increased return on the investment means higher land values, which in turn compels higher cost of production in the future. There can be no remedy except in a larger area of production or a reduced standard of living which will lessen demand.

In the last Congress I set forth in some detail the change from agricultural to industrial conditions in the States east of Indiana, and I call further attention now to the increase of manufacturing in the South and the limitation of the productive power of that section to the single crop of cotton, and I am satisfied that the present census of the United States will show that, with possibly two or three exceptions, the States east of the Mississippi River are nowhere near self-sustaining so far as food products are concerned.

In the two decades from 1880 to 1900, while this great industrial change was going on in the Eastern States, the value of all farm property in New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio decreased to the amount of $325,800,779, and in the same decades the value of all farm property in Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Missouri increased $4,773,031,222. The addition to the wealth of those great States was enormous, and yet it can be easily accounted for by the fact that in a previous generation the value of much of that land had been merely nominal and had come into the possession of the owners at very low prices, much of it by the payment simply of the homestead fee of $1.25 an acre and that the increment was the result of long and hard struggles in subjecting it to cultivation, and with the low prices then prevailing securing the improvements which now make life enjoyable to the present possessors.

But the new census will show a wholly different condition of affairs. The natural movement to higher prices which a constantly increasing demand has caused, while it has affected all agricultural sections throughout the country, has given to these great cereal-producing States of the Central West by the greatly increased prices of their products an added wealth in increased land values which I do not believe has been equaled in any like period of time and in any similar territorial area in the history of the world.

In making this second comparison, I have not been able to get the census returns of the State of Ohio, but I have no doubt that State has shared in the results of these changes in equal proportion with the neighboring Eastern States of New York and Pennsylvania as it did before.

I will insert in the RECORD the changes in the land values alone, not including buildings and live stock, in order to show the added wealth of agricultural investments in the East and West in the single decade of 1900 and 1910. During that time the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania show an increased value of land alone in the sum of $328,515,000, thus practically bringing them back to conditions which obtained 30 years, ago, and substantially recouping the previous loss.

Eastern States—increase of land value, 1900 to 1910, farm land alone.

	Value.	Gain.	Per cent.
Maine	$85,923,000	$36,569,000	74
New Hampshire	44,327,000	8,828,000	25
Vermont	58,255,000	12,441,000	27
Massachusetts	104,273,000	17,348,000	20
Rhode Island	14,837,000	1,415,000	11
Connecticut	71,527,000	19,086,000	36
New York	703,214,000	152,040,000	28
Pennsylvania	627,185,000	51,792,000	9
New Jersey	122,357,000	28,996,000	31
Total	1,831,898,000	328,515,000	.....

Over against this increase I call attention to the remarkable showing of the eight States of the Middle West—Illinois, Indiana, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Missouri—which in this single decade, now existing as settled communities, and with conditions in no way arduous and burdensome as those which had prevailed in their previous history, find themselves now in the possession of an investment increased, so far as land value alone is concerned, in the sum of $7,140,534,000.

Western States—increase of land values, 1900 to 1910, farm land alone.

	Value.	Gain.	Per cent.
Illinois	$3,061,584,000	$1,567,450,000	104
Indiana	1,825,475,000	637,842,000	93
Nebraska	1,613,077,000	1,126,471,000	231
Kansas	1,534,552,000	1,002,364,000	188
Iowa	2,709,025,000	1,542,273,000	122.7
Wisconsin	591,032,000	60,489,000	11
Minnesota	1,016,889,000	467,587,000	82
Missouri	1,441,529,000	746,058,000	103
	13,403,143,000	7,140,534,000	

In addition there was an increase of buildings and farm implements of $1,584,837,000.

The entire increase in the manufacturing industries of the whole United States for the first half of this decade, as shown by the census of 1905, was $3,707,440,473, so that it is fair to assume that in addition to a means of livelihood, and over and above the accumulations of live stock this 10-year period has given to the agricultural population of these eight States an increment of land value and buildings far greater than shown by the entire manufacturing industries of the whole United States for the same period. Note the added value of the farm lands of a single State like Illinois, aggregating as it does $1,566,450,000, an increase of 104 per cent, or 9 per cent annual addition to the investment over and above good dividends every year. Indiana shows 93 per cent; Nebraska, 231 per cent; Kansas, 188 per cent; Iowa, 122 per cent; Wisconsin, 11 per cent; Minnesota, 82 per cent; Missouri, 103 per cent. What that means to Illinois, the third manufacturing State in the Union, is shown by the fact that it is more than double the entire investment of that State in manufacturing, at the beginning of this 10-year period, and that the increase in manufacturing capital during the first 5 years on which we have the census figures was less than one-third of the value added to farm lands alone.

Now, I do not cite these figures with any feeling of envy or anything else but sincere rejoicing at the great prosperity which has come to this section of our common country, and by no vote or act of mine would I knowingly or willingly do anything which would detract from it. The men of the West have built up great empires there which have added to the glory of the whole land and to the prosperity of every section of it, and I am thoroughly confident that their present achievements, great as they are, are but promises of a still more glorious future.

But in this great industrial change which is surely coming to them, as it has already come to Ohio and the East, a new basis of cost of production of food products of the land must in the very nature of things be reckoned with, and it is hardly fair in looking into the future to say that the present movement is an attack upon the farming industry, in view of the fact that these enormous additions to the agricultural wealth of the country have been the result of the irresistible movement toward higher prices, which have affected all alike, but which have been far from being equally distributed in the respective industries. I call attention to the statements made in the United States Crop Reporter for January, 1911, which, I think, will be somewhat of a surprise to many people in this country, especially those who have been in receipt of sundry and various circulars with which the country has been flooded during the last two months, some of them anonymous and some of them bearing the imprint of the agricultural associations of the country. This governmental report shows an average increase in the money return per acre in the United States of the crops of corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, tobacco, and cotton in 1909 of 72.7 per cent over and above the like return per acre in 1899, the unit increase on corn being 96.7; wheat, 69.5; oats, 62.7; barley, 37; rye, 44.8; buckwheat, 25.5; potatoes, 40.7; hay, 46.1; tobacco, 53; and cotton, 92.

On the other hand, the same documents will show as bearing on this all-important question of the cost of living that the department made at the same time that the other figures were tabulated a comparative statement of the prices of 85 articles purchased by farmers in 1909 and 1899, and in explanation of both tables I submit the conclusions drawn by Mr. Victor H. Olmstead, chief of the bureau, who says:

> From the foregoing data it appears that whereas the acre of the farmers' crops of 1909 was 72.7 per cent more than in 1899, and the cost of the articles purchased by them increased about 12.1 per cent, the purchasing power of the produce of 1 acre in 1909 was about 54 per cent greater than the purchasing power of the product of 1 acre in 1899. An acre of corn having increased 78.6 per cent, its purchasing power increased 60 per cent. An acre of wheat having increased 114 per cent, its purchasing power has increased 91 per cent, and an acre of cotton having increased 65.6 per cent, its purchasing power has increased 48 per cent.

I commend these tables in the Crop Reporter of January, 1911, to your consideration.

Under these circumstances it hardly seems to me that the circulars to which I have referred have fairly stated the situation to the farmer. I do not think that this was intentionally done, nor do I think that many of the other statements made in these circulars were intended to be misleading, although that is unquestionably the fact. For example, I find in one of them a statement as follows:

> The farmers receive much less protection than the manufacturers, for, while farm products are taxed on the average of about 25 per cent, manufactured articles are taxed on the average of about 45 per cent—

clearly showing an effort to convince the agricultural community that manufacturers as a distinct class are specially favored in the tariff law, and this I emphatically deny. I do not now wish to argue the question as to whether the export products of the soil are the direct recipients of the benefits of the protective system or not, but I will publish as a part of my remarks a table showing the ad valorem equivalent of the duty on 47 of the principal articles produced on the farms in the various sections of this country, and I make the assertion now, that if wool, tobacco, and sugar were classified as farm products in the agricultural schedule, as they should be, that schedule would show a higher rate of duty than any other schedule in the Payne tariff bill, except wines and spirits.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. HILL. I have not the time. If I have time when I get through, I will answer any questions.

Some duties in the agricultural schedule, applying Payne rates to 10 years' importations, 1898 to 1907.

	Per cent.
Bacon and hams	21.65
Beef	20.18
Mutton	17.85
Pork	13.39
Veal	24.78
Poultry	42.97
Lard	15.10
Tallow	10.05
Wheat	26.62
Wheat flour	25
Oats	35.71
Corn	22.52
Buckwheat	31.32
Barley	61.16
Hay	52.93
Hops	49.51
Honey	51.29
Butter	28.83
Cheese	41.62
Milk	17.54
Eggs	64.04
Lemons	69.36
Apples	31
Zante currants	67.48
Biscuits, sweet	50
Rice	80.45
Onions	54.38
Potatoes	42.13
Figs	41.01
Oranges	69.20
Dried fruits	45.38
Green olives	27.13
Orange and lemon peel	58.58
Raisins	39.81
Preserved fruits	47.20
Almonds	57.31
Preserved citron	55.09
Filberts	56.78
Walnuts	50.77
Peanuts	21.08
Sugar, 96°	85.15
Leaf tobacco	70.88
Wrapper tobacco	209.02
Wool, class 1	59.35
Washed wool	88.04
Scoured wool	62.19

I will also print the ad valorem equivalent rate of duty on each schedule covering the importation of the first six months of the Payne bill, and thus permit the agricultural population of the land to draw their own inferences as to the correctness of the statements in the circulars referred to.

Percentage of ad valorem duty for six months, Oct. 1, 1909, to Mar. 1, 1910, on actual importations under the Payne law.

Schedule—	Per cent.
A. Chemicals	23.5
B. Earths	49.7
C. Metals	31.8
D. Wood	12.6
E. Sugar	51.9
F. Tobacco	77.4
G. Agriculture	29.55
H. Spirits	68.7
I. Cottons	49.0
J. Flax	47.4
K. Wool	59.6
L. Silk	51.1
M. Pulp and paper	18.9
N. Sundries	14.21

And sundries, or Schedule N, includes a greater volume of importations than any other two schedules put together.

I cite these figures also as a clear and distinct reply to another statement in one of these circulars, which says:

> We hold that the farmer should receive exactly the same measure of protection as is given the manufacturers, and that there must be no reduction of duties on farm products, either by reciprocity or tariff revision, unless the duties on all manufactured articles are at the same time correspondingly reduced.

I find this same theory of the protective system set forth in a circular issued by the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, in which it is claimed by the residents of that overwhelmingly Democratic State that import duties, whether levied as a protective tariff or as a tariff for revenue, or on any other basis, should be so levied that their industries would receive an equal share in whatever benefit may flow therefrom.

Now, this is a theory of protection which is entirely new to me, for I had supposed that the whole system was based on an equalization of differing costs of production in this and other countries, and hence, where no difference exists, no duty would be collected; but this claim would suggest a wholly different idea—that hereafter it is to be a system of favoritism shown by a bountiful Government to all of its people on a basis of share and share alike. My suggestion is that no greater inequalities in effective duties will be found anywhere in the law than in the rates in the agricultural schedule which I have heretofore cited, and that the adoption of such a new system as an exact equalization of them would wholly do away with the necessity in the future of the services of a Tariff Board and would make the enactment of such tariff law an easy task, for it would consist of but one single rate applicable to all importations. I do not think that such a claim needs further consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCALL. I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. HILL. No people on earth will render a more unbiased judgment on any great question of this kind than the intelligent and thoughtful people of the United States, and I am sure that time only is needed to correct the mistake which, in my judgment, was made last fall in giving to the Democratic Party the control of the future revenue system of the country.

I have spoken of the necessity of reckoning with the new basis of investment in estimating the cost of food products in this country in the future, and I now call attention to a most remarkable confirmation of my fears, found in a speech made by a Senator from a wheat-producing State, and which has come to me through the regular mail, and from which I have, therefore, no hesitation in quoting. I refer to a speech made by Senator GRONNA, of North Dakota, on February 28, 1911. He says:

> We do not now produce all the wheat of which we are capable. There is still land left which will produce wheat, and although this land, or much of it, will not grow wheat profitably with low prices, it will produce a large amount of wheat if the owners are assured that the price will remain high enough to make it profitable. This applies not only to land which is at present owned by private individuals, but also to considerable public land still remaining. Most of the increase in our wheat production, however, must come from increased yields rather than from increase of acreage. More intensive cultivation will increase the yield per acre, and with the increase in price which will follow the overtaking of our production by our consumption such intensive cultivation will be brought about. If the tariff on wheat is removed, however, such improved cultivation of our wheat lands will be delayed. Agriculture is an industry of diminishing returns; after a certain point in cultivation of land has been reached, although additional cultivation will increase the yield, each additional unit of crop so produced will cost more in capital and labor expended than did the preceding units. Consequently those additional units will not be produced until the price received for the product has reached such a point that it will be profitable to expend this additional amount of capital and labor in producing them. With our markets thrown open to Canadian wheat, the production of which is less expensive than that of most American wheat, the price will be prevented by the Canadian wheat from reaching the level making it profitable to raise the additional bushels per acre.

I ask the thoughtful consideration of Members of this House in both parties to this plain proposition thus clearly stated that no action should be taken by the Congress which should in any way even temporarily retard the increase in the cost of production of this greatest of all food products, an increase which the Senator candidly admits to be inevitable in the future.

If the claim was made that no harm should be done to land investments honestly and laboriously acquired, as practically all of the tillable public lands of the United States have been, until no more now remain for homesteading, and that prices of wheat should be maintained to give a liberal return on such investments now with a fair chance of future increment, I should admit that the claim was just and reasonable, whatever I might think of the possibilities of such legislation. But I do not believe that the people of this country will deliberately enter upon any course of action which they know in advance will for all time continually increase their cost of living, until they are forced to it by conditions from which there is no possibility of escape.

Assuming present prices for both lumber and wheat to at least continue, and probably to advance, as I believe they must, yet I can see no more justification for free lumber from Canada for the Northwestern States than I can for free wheat from Canada for the rest of the country.

All through those States the demand is insistent for the extension of the area of forest products to take in all of Canada and give us her lumber and logs and pulp wood free of duty and other restrictions. The demand is justified on the ground of conservation of material resources.

I stand for the same extension of food production and plead the conservation of human life as at least equally entitled to your consideration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The speech I have quoted demands the development of unprofitable areas here and the intensive cultivation of our own soil, and it is admitted that both can be secured only at a higher cost of food to the masses of the people. I stand for complete freedom of trade with Canada, if need be, to retard the advances in food products, which all concede must come.

The Senator from North Dakota pleads for dollars, I plead for humanity. Not for the rich; they can take care of themselves; but for the poor and the needy, in the years to come. Not for the manufacturer, but for the wage earner; not for the great landowner, but for the day laborers upon the farms and in the mines, and for the plain people of the land in every section, East and West, North and South—the men who carry the burdens in time of peace and fight our battles in war. [Applause.]

Within the natural lifetime of your children and mine, yes, of one-third of the people now living, these United States will have a population of 200,000,000 souls.

The opportunity is ours to provide for their welfare now.

The meat products of this great Nation, and a once possible competition from the Argentine Republic, are already controlled by a few great capitalists. I will not, in face of increasing prices for cereals, vote to limit the God-given possibilities of this whole continent and so subject those who shall come after us to a like monopoly in grain, let the consequences be what they may. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he will consume some of his time.

Mr. DALZELL. What time did the last gentleman occupy?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania on his side has used 4 hours and 41 minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] has used 2 hours and 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] 4 hours and 12 minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time did the last speaker occupy?

The CHAIRMAN. He occupied 1 hour and 10 minutes, which is included in the statement just made.

Mr. McCALL. I think the Chair has stated a greater amount of time than was yielded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield 1 hour in the first instance and 10 minutes in the second.

Mr. McCALL. Yes; but yesterday I yielded only an hour, which was not all occupied.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] used an hour and five minutes. To-day the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has used 1 hour and 10 minutes, making a total of 2 hours and 15 minutes.

Mr. McCALL. I think the Chair is mistaken, but I accept the statement of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the record at the desk.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] one hour. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the President condensed the scope of this proposition into a single sentence in his message of January 26 last, when he said:

> Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products.

That is, reciprocity with Canada so called will have little or no effect on manufactured products, but will be "confined in its effect" to farm and forest products.

So far as lumber is concerned, I voted for free lumber, when the Payne bill was under consideration, and we would have had free lumber if Democrats representing timber interests had not prevented it.

This agreement proposes, first, a free list of farm and some other products.

Second, a conditional arrangement as to pulp and print paper.

Third, it proposes an arrangement for the mutual protection of the manufactured products of both Canada and the United

States on terms agreed upon, subject to Canada's preferential arrangement with certain foreign nations.

Both Canada and the United States are protection countries, both have prospered under protection, and both propose to continue to protect their factories upon an agreed basis, but they mutually agree that the agricultural products of both may enter the markets of either duty free.

CANADA'S WHEAT AREA.

Let us consider the farmers' relation to this transaction. Let us consider it, Democrats and Republicans, so far as possible, in a nonpartisan way.

Canada has a population of about 8,000,000 and an area of about 4,000,000 square miles. Of that area about 2,000,000 square miles lie within the so-called unorganized Northwest Territories, which reach from Labrador to Yukon and from Ontario to the polar regions.

To the south of the western sweep of the Unorganized Territories lie the organized Territories of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Manitoba has an area of about 74,000 square miles, about the size of North Dakota. Saskatchewan has an area of about 250,000 square miles. Alberta has an area of about 253,000 square miles; and each is almost big enough to hold North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Michigan combined. It can not be definitely stated, but there is probably more wheat land in Canada lying west of the Red River of the North than there is in the United States west of the Mississippi, and the Canadian wheat land yields an average of 22 bushels to the acre, while the wheat land of the United States yields an average of 15 bushels to the acre.

The most authoritative statement I have been able to obtain as to the wheat-growing area of Canada is contained in an article contributed to the August, 1910, number of a periodical called Science, by Prof. M. A. Carlton, cerealist in the Agricultural Department.

The article is called "The future wheat supply of the United States." I will read a part of it:

A careful study of the conditions in Canada reveals a possibility in increased production far ahead of any other present exporting country. Outside of Manitoba, wheat production has only fairly begun, and yet the entire production can be made as large as that of the United States at present.

The undeveloped resources of Alberta and Saskatchewan are very great. These two Provinces and Manitoba are of chief present importance in grain production. The available farm area of the two larger Provinces, based upon reports of provincial officials, is about 250,000,000 acres out of a total land area of 310,000,000 acres. This farm land would furnish a similar proportion for wheat as now employed in Minnesota and Kansas, or about one-ninth of the area. This should be particularly capable of attainment because of the impossibility of any considerable corn production. One-ninth of this farm area will furnish a wheat area of almost 28,000,000 acres. Manitoba employs now almost 3,000,000 acres. A conservative estimate therefore may be made in round numbers of 30,000,000 acres as the possible wheat acreage for these three Provinces in 1950.

The present average yield per acre of both spring and winter wheat for the three Provinces, calculated from previous 10-year records, appears to be about 22 bushels, which should increase to at least 25 bushels. This rate of yield would allow a total annual production of 750,000,000 bushels, of which over 600,000,000 bushels would be an increase over present production. This possibility leaves out the increases that will occur in older Provinces and the probable production in northeastern British Columbia and the Northwest Territory.

A possibility of wheat cultivation, even in northern Alberta, is not a matter of theory, but has been fully tested. In the year 1908, 35,000 bushels of wheat were already grown in the vicinity of Fort Vermilion, at an average yield of 24 bushels per acre. Two stone mills and a modern roller mill are established at this point, which is 350 miles north of Edmonton. The wheat grown is probably not the best, but appears to be of fair quality and has a fine appearance.

DAMAGED BUT NOT INJURED.

It is proposed by this trade agreement to permit millers and shippers to buy wheat on both sides of the international boundary line free of tariff interference.

Now, it will scarcely be claimed by anybody that the American farmer will be benefited by the free importation of Canadian farm products into the United States in competition with his own. But it is claimed that things which the farmer sells will be bought cheaper, and since things which the farmer sells will be bought cheaper, it follows that it is deliberately intended that the farmer shall be compelled to sell cheaper; and the means whereby it is deliberately intended that the farmer shall be compelled to sell cheaper is Canadian competition, to be created by this agreement.

But we are told that in some way, not involving the reduction of the middleman's profit, the people who live in large cities will be permitted to buy things cheaper, and the farmer will be compelled to sell things cheaper, but that the farmer will suffer no injury by reason thereof.

We are told that wheat will overrun from Canada into the United States and that the American farmer will have to take less for his wheat, but that he will be all the better off. [Laughter.]

We are told that bread will be cheaper, and the only man of all the 35,000,000 engaged in "gainful occupations" in this country required to contribute to that result is the farmer, and the farmer is expected to enjoy it. [Laughter.]

We are further told that in order to facilitate this agricultural contribution system wheat should be free and flour protected at the rate of 50 cents a barrel.

Now, the purpose of this agreement in its relation to the miller is made perfectly clear on page 28 of Senate Document 862, which I think I have a perfect right to call an inspired document, inasmuch as I think it is generally understood that it was prepared by one of the commissioners who negotiated this treaty. On page 28 it says:

The millers will be enabled to regain in large part the enormous losses they have suffered in recent years with respect to their foreign sales.

Excellent! But who is going to recoup the farmer for recouping the miller [laughter and applause] and enabling the baker and the packer and the brewer to make large profits out of the consumer?

It is said the millers are to recoup themselves for "enormous losses." That means, of course, that the millers must make enormous gains, because they are to recoup themselves for "enormous losses." And how are the millers to recoup themselves? Obviously, out of the farmer on the one hand and the consumer of bread on the other hand.

LOOKING AT THINGS FROM A HIGH PLANE.

Inasmuch, however, as we are "linked together by race, language, and geographical proximity," and because Canada has never cost us anything for gunboats or military equipment, the President invites the farmer to look at this thing "from a high plane" [laughter] and to recognize the equity and breadth of international comity of an arrangement that will injure him financially, require him to divide his home market with Canada, and sell the balance of his crop abroad subject to the toll of the miller and the shipper.

Gentlemen, the farmer would be able to view this transaction from a higher plane if his view were not obstructed by the discrimination against him and in favor of the miller of 50 cents a barrel on flour, while his wheat is made free *in the interest of cheaper food.*

The farmer would be able to see this transaction from a higher plane if his view were not obstructed by the discrimination against him and in favor of the brewer by a duty of 45 cents a hundred on barley malt, made from barley which the brewer is permitted to buy of the farmer free, *in the interest of cheaper food.*

The farmer would be able to view this transaction from a higher plane if his view was not obstructed by a discrimination against him and in favor of the packer of a cent and a quarter a pound on dressed meat cut from the carcasses of animals which the packer is permitted to buy of the farmer free *in the interest of cheaper food.* [Applause on the Republican side.]

HOW LIVERPOOL "FIXES" THE PRICE.

In order to see this thing from a high plane, we are invited to consider that Liverpool fixes the price of wheat anyway; but, on page 27 of this inspired document, we are told that "the price of wheat in the United States generally averages, as to the northwestern crop, fully 10 cents per bushel and sometimes so much as 15 cents per bushel higher than in the corresponding sections of Canada."

Does Liverpool "fix" it that way, and if Liverpool "fixes" it that way, what has the duty got to do with it anyway?

Of course if Liverpool fixes it that way, the duty would make no difference, and if the duty makes no difference, there would be no reason for removing the duty.

This Liverpool-price idea has been in circulation so long that a great many people accept it without reasoning upon it; but Liverpool does not "fix" the price. The price does not stay "fixed." It never did stay fixed. Gentlemen around on this floor here in debate for the last two days have been quoting all sorts of simultaneous prices. The price fluctuates from day to day. It goes up with the report of an unseasonable frost, and it goes down with the report of a timely rain.

But the farmer is invited to welcome Canadian crops and to market his own abroad. If Liverpool is a good market for us, why is it not a good market for Canada? Besides, Canada is "linked" with Liverpool "by race, language," and political institutions. Now, if this is not a better market than Liverpool, why should Canada want it? [Applause on the Republican side.] And if it is a better market than Liverpool, why should we give it to Canada? [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE FARMERS' WELFARE VITAL TO THE WELFARE OF THE COUNTRY.

Gentlemen, for years we have been telling the farmer that his welfare was vital to the welfare of the whole country, have we not, Democrats and Republicans alike? For years we have been telling the farmer that the prosperity of the country depends in a great measure upon the prosperity of agriculture.

Were we hypocrites when we told him that, or was it true? And if it was true, and it was, is it any less true now than it was in 1908, when we told him that last?

While yet the grain fields of Canada were unplowed we told the farmer that while protection to his grain was of little value, protection as a policy was of immense value to him, because it built up a market at his door, and now that he is beginning to receive some benefit from direct protection shall we take it away from him while leaving every other class protected?

While yet the grain fields of Canada were unplowed we told the farmer that the more people there are employed in factories the bigger the town; that the bigger the town the better the market for the farmer, and that the better the market for the farmer the more valuable the farm.

We told him that the more people there are employed in the factories the more people there are to buy what the farmer grows to sell, and that the more people there are to buy what the farmer grows to sell the more the farmer gets for what he grows to sell.

We told him the more the farmer sells of what he grows to sell the more the farmer buys of what the manufacturer makes to sell, and we told him the more the manufacturer sells of what he makes to sell the more men he employs to make more goods to sell to everybody; and the more men there are employed to make more goods to sell to everybody the more money they have to buy of everybody.

We told the farmer that men out of work buy less and less at the store, and that when men out of work buy less and less at the store the store buys less and less of the wholesaler, and the wholesaler buys less and less of the factory, and the railroad hauls less and less to everybody and for everybody.

We told him that the more men there are out of work the less money there is in use and circulation, and that the less money there is in use and circulation the lower the price of everything.

And this is all eternally true; but manufacturing New England, which is as much indebted to protection as any part of the Union, wants a special dispensation in her own behalf [applause and laughter on Republican side], so that she can buy food of the Canadian farmer free and at the same time be permitted to go on selling her protected manufactured products to the unprotected farmer of the West. [Applause on the Republican side.] How broad, how generous, how altruistic, how characteristic! [Prolonged applause and laughter on Republican side.]

My friend Cushman, now dead, once applied an old story to New England, and invited her to let go of the tariff teat or quit kicking the cow. She is likely to do both if this thing goes through. [Applause and laughter on Republican side.] There are a great many people west of the Hudson. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen talk about low prices. The quickest and surest way to get low prices and hard times and industrial rust and cobwebs and industrial stagnation, and empty dinner pails and smokeless chimneys, and wheels that stand still while the unused current sweeps by is just to turn the management of business over to the political successor of the architects of the Wilson bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] Then the consumer will be able to buy things cheap. But, gentlemen, the bun in the grocery window is never more remote than when you have not a nickel to buy it with. [Applause on the Republican side.]

BUILDING ROADS AND BRIDGES FOR CANADIAN COMPETITORS.

Now that we have built up here on American soil a market of $25,000,000,000, with trade tributary to it traveling over our own rivers, lakes, and railroads—and we are proud of it as Republicans, because it has been built up under Republican policies—it is now proposed to invite Canada in to participate with us and compel our farmers to seek a foreign market.

For years it has been our theory that inasmuch as the foreigner contributes nothing for the maintenance of our schools, churches, roads, bridges, and internal improvements, he ought to be required to go down in his pocket and produce something to contribute to our tariff fund for the privilege of selling here. Now, it is proposed to compel the farmer to tax himself to build roads and bridges for the convenience of his Canadian competitors to travel over and compete with him in our markets. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CLASS DISCRIMINATION.

Lately we have been congratulating the farmer on the fact that he is receiving just fair prices for what he has to sell, and it is the first time for years that we have been able to do that. But whatever the American farmer plants from this time on he must plant on shares with Canada. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This agreement, stripped of all verbiage, is a proposition to cheapen American farm products. By it it is proposed that the farmer shall receive less, in order that the people who live in large cities may pay less.

Let us consider this. We have a population here of about 92,000,000, and of that population about 35,000,000 are engaged in so-called gainful occupations. Of these 35,000,000 engaged in so-called gainful occupations about 12,500,000 are engaged in agriculture, about 8,500,000 in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, about 6,000,000 in trade and transportation, and about 8,500,000 in professional and domestic service, and we are all interdependent.

For years we have argued that you could not strike a blow at any one of these industrial divisions without striking a blow at our whole industrial system, and it is true. But by this you propose to levy upon the farmer for contribution to all the rest. Is it fair to levy upon one industrial class for the benefit of all the rest?

"EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL; SPECIAL PRIVILEGES TO NONE."

Some years ago somebody paraphrased a statement made by Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural message into the expression, "Equal rights for all and special privileges to none," and Democrats have been quoting it ever since under the mistaken impression that they were quoting Thomas Jefferson. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to protect every other industrial interest in this country and leave the farmer exposed to competition?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's wheat and protect the miller at the rate of 50 cents a barrel on the flour he makes of the wheat he buys of the farmer free?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's oats and protect the manufacturer at the rate of 50 cents a hundred pounds on the oatmeal and rolled oats he makes out of the oats he buys of the farmer free?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's barley and protect the brewer at the rate of 45 cents a hundred *in the interest of cheaper food?*

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to remove protection from the farmer's cattle, sheep, hogs, and "all other live animals," and protect the beef trust at the rate of a cent and a quarter a pound on dressed meats cut from carcasses of the cattle, sheep, hogs, and "other live animals" it buys of the farmer free?

Is it "equal rights for all; special privileges to none" to protect the distiller at the rate of $2.60 a gallon on whisky made out of rye which he is permitted to buy from the farmer free *in the interest of cheaper food?* [Applause on the Republican side.]

Is the proposition to protect every large industrial division and leave the farmer exposed to competition "equal rights for all; special privileges to none"?

You southern gentlemen: Suppose Canada grew cotton, how many of you would oppose protected cotton; and if Canada grew cotton and there was a protective tariff on cotton, would you be in favor of taking the duty off cotton; and if Canada grew cotton and there was a protective tariff on cotton, would you gentlemen be in favor of removing the duty from the planters' cotton and permitting the New England manufacturer to be protected in the fabrics he would make from the cotton he bought of the planter free?

How would that square with your theory of "equal rights for all; special privileges to none"—on paper? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The line of discrimination runs through this transaction as straight as a gun barrel, and you Democrats are going out of your way to help to perpetrate it.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] the other day talked about fooling the American farmer. Well, I reckon that the farmers of North Carolina are a heap easier fooled than the farmers of Michigan. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The farmer of Michigan understood the drift of this transaction instantly.

You gentlemen hope to carry the next election. Do you expect the aid of the farmer? I admit he is going to be between the devil and the deep sea.

You can not make loose change of the American farmer in your dickers with foreign nations or in your schemes for political power without the farmer finding it out. We have the free rural mail delivery nowadays.

Gentlemen, I would not be at all surprised to discover that this special session will become known in the next campaign and known in history as the "antifarmer session." [Applause on the Republican side.] And, my Democratic brethren, your relations to it will be a good deal like that of the man who drew an elephant in a raffle. [Laughter.]

THE FARMER'S PATRIOTISM.

Gentlemen, the American farmer is patriotic. From the days when the "embattled farmer fired the shot heard 'round the world" at Concord he has been fighting the battles of the Republic. Half clad, half fed, and poorly armed, through cold and privation, sometimes with bleeding feet, he followed Washington to Yorktown and to victory.

The first time the American flag, Mr. Chairman, ever challenged an enemy or inspired a patriot in battle he followed it at the Brandywine and he has been following it ever since.

Its stripes are red with the blood of patriots shed that its stars might shine together, and farmers' blood has helped to dye it red. [Applause.]

He has built his home upon the frontier, and sometimes in the silence and stillness of the forest he has listened for the tramp, tramp of coming millions. And as soon as the advance guard has arrived he has built the American schoolhouse and hoisted the Stars and Stripes above it.

The American farmer is patriotic. If it were necessary to make a sacrifice for the good of his country, he would do it again and again as he has done it before, even to the last supreme sacrifice of his life.

FAIR PLAY.

But, Mr. Chairman, the American farmer, like every other manly man, likes fair play. He likes it in your country just as he likes it in mine. Even the intermediate dealer, when he takes his rake-off out of this assessment of the American farmer, will scarcely respect himself the more for taking it, or his Government the more for giving him the chance to take it. [Applause.]

Why, gentlemen, if it were proposed to levy exclusive contributions upon them the newspapers of this country would break out in scare heads and double-leaded editorials immediately. But the great metropolitan dailies of the country, to whom is being held out the hope of future benefits, view the somewhat hopeless and inarticulate efforts of the farmer to avert this injury to him with a tolerant and languid interest.

If the railroads were to be specifically assessed for the benefit of every other industrial class in this country, they would cut down wages, lay off labor, and lay off trains. But Mr. James Hill's railroads run into the wheat fields of Canada, I understand, and Mr. Hill and his fellow haulers are content.

If it were proposed specifically to assess labor and capital and manufactures for the benefit of all the other industrial classes, this Capitol would be besieged. And yet the farmer is expected to take his loss and smile, smile, and keep on smiling. Well, gentlemen, he may not smile much right now, but he has been studying the meaning of reciprocity, and he will know how to reciprocate. [Laughter.] He has been studying discrimination, and he will know how to discriminate—in November, 1912. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE FARMER COMPELLED TO SELL LOW AND BUY HIGH.

The reason for this discrimination against the farmer is said to be the high price of food.

Times are good and prices are high, and good times and high prices generally go together, and bad times and low prices generally go together. When times are good they are good for everybody, and when they are bad they are bad for everybody.

We all like high prices, but we like them for what we have to sell; and we all like low prices, but we like them for what we have to buy. We all like high prices and we all like low prices—Democrats and Republicans—but we like them when they are coming our way. But this is the first time in the history of our country when it has been deliberately advocated as a policy that one great industrial class of our population should be required to both buy high and sell low for the benefit of the other industrial classes.

What are the causes of high prices? One cause, by common consent of scientific investigators, is defined by the so-called quantitative theory of money.

That theory imagines that the commodities of the world are in one pile. It imagines that the money of the world is in another pile, and it balances the money of the world against the commodities of the world, and as money increases in quantity in its relation to commodities it is correspondingly decreased in value in its relation to commodities. Therefore it takes more money to buy commodities, and therefore more money makes higher prices. That is the so-called quantitative theory of money.

Fifteen years ago the annual production of gold the world over was $202,000,000. In 1910 it was $454,000,000. Prices are up the world over—up in Europe, up in South Africa, up in China and Japan, up in South America, up in the United States, and up in Canada.

Where there is a universal condition it is reasonable to look for a universal cause, and the increased production of gold is said to be that cause.

THE LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND AS AFFECTED BY MONOPOLY.

With universal high prices caused by the increase of money in its relation to commodities other causes may conspire. For illustration, the law of supply and demand.

The law of supply and demand may operate normally, it may be affected by monopolistic methods, or it may be affected by sociological conditions.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that this Nation has ever proposed, directly or indirectly, to recognize and, by implication, to sanction monopolistic methods.

The millers of Canada and the United States are protected from the rest of the world, first, by geographical location, and, second, by the tariff laws of their respective countries.

By this agreement they are given free range of the wheat fields. Themselves being the only American market for wheat, and themselves being the only American producers of flour, they can within certain limits fix the price of wheat when it goes into their mills, and fix the price of flour when it comes out of their mills.

They know that as a rule the farmer is obliged to sell soon after harvest to save storage, shrinkage, and wastage and to stop interest on his mortgages. They will give him the opportunity of selling at their price then or later on.

When wheat goes into their mills they control the flour and bread market of North America, and they participate in the control of the world's supply of wheat.

Minneapolis, the milling center of the universe, is on this side of the line and dictates terms to lesser mills.

On the other side, according to Senate Document No. 862, there are now in operation mills at Fort William, Winnipeg, and Keewatin, with a capacity of from 4,000 to 10,000 barrels daily. One Montreal concern, with a chain of mills from Montreal to Winnipeg, claims to be the largest millers in the British Empire, with a daily capacity of 17,500 barrels; another, with offices at Montreal and Winnipeg, is making 10,500 barrels of flour daily; another, whose head office is Toronto, with mills at Winnipeg, Goderich, and Brandon, claims a daily capacity of 7,000 barrels.

Knowing the modern tendency of corporations to organize themselves into combinations, it is difficult to believe that these strong Canadian milling companies have not an understanding among themselves as to prices.

Knowing the methods of corporate combinations, it is impossible to believe that "the largest millers in the British Empire" would permit small competitors to grind long except on terms agreed upon.

Knowing the modern method of international trade combinations, it is difficult to believe that the milling center of the universe on this side of the line and the "largest millers in the British Empire" on the other side of the line do not understand one another.

They themselves are a part of the so-called Liverpool market, because through them and their cooperators the surplus finds its way abroad subject to their toll. To assume that these milling companies have not taken advantage of this opportunity, and to assume that they will not continue to take advantage of this opportunity, is to assume that the millenium has arrived in the milling business, and of this we have no evidence.

Human nature is selfish, and it is never less selfish when organized into corporations; and corporations are never less selfish when organized into trusts.

EXPROPRIATION.

I said a moment ago that the law of supply and demand might be affected by sociological conditions.

There has been a constant movement of our population from the country into the cities. Fifty per cent of our population has become congested in the great cities of this country, and the undisguised purpose of this arrangement is to require farmers to furnish cheaper food to the people who live in large cities.

Such a thing as to select one grand division of our industrial life for compulsory contribution to all the rest has never been done before.

Now, setting aside the question of the justice or the injustice of this proposition in a government of supposed equal rights for all and special privileges to none, would this "ex-

propriation"—to adopt a socialistic term—of the proceeds of the farmer's toil for the benefit of the people engaged in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, for the benefit of the people engaged in trade and transportation, for the benefit of the people engaged in professional and domestic service, accomplish the results expected?

This means that twelve and a half million people engaged in agriculture are to be levied upon for the benefit of the other 80,000,000, among whom are organized colossal corporate combinations which have challenged the attention of the world and contested the power of courts and legislatures to control them.

The Minneapolis price of wheat from January, 1910, to January, 1911, inclusive, ranged from 10 to 16 cents higher than the Winnipeg price.

It is a scientific fact that when two fluid bodies standing at different levels flow together, they tend to reach a state of equilibrium at a common level.

Imagine two ponds of equal size, one 10 feet higher than the other, separated by a narrow neck of land. Remove the barrier and the higher pond will fall and the lower pond will rise until they are exactly at the same height.

Apply this to the wheat areas of Canada and the United States. It is clear that the price of wheat will range lower in the United States and higher in Canada, by reason of this agreement, and that a price equilibrium will be reached. Who will get the benefit of it? It is certain that the farmer will lose it—that is foreordained by this agreement—but who will get the benefit of it?

If the people who live in the great cities will not get the benefit of it, then this agreement is utterly indefensible from any standpoint.

THE EVOLUTION OF A LOAF OF BREAD.

From the best information I have been able to obtain, about 72 per cent of a bushel of wheat becomes flour and about 28 per cent becomes shorts and bran. It takes, on an average, a trifle less than 5 bushels of wheat to make a barrel of flour, depending on the character of the season and the quality of the wheat. The wholesale millers' price of a barrel of flour ranges from $5.50 to $6.50 per barrel, and the price of bran ranges from $22 to $26 a ton. Bakers buy flour at jobbing prices, close to the millers' wholesale prices.

A bushel of wheat, according to the best estimates I can get, and I have gone to scientific sources to obtain this information, will make 60 loaves of bread as bread is commonly baked in this country.

I know it was stated in the Senate that it would make 75 loaves, but I looked that up and I am satisfied that the Senator was wrong when he made that statement. Now, assuming that the farmer will lose 10 cents a bushel—and the less he loses the less the consumer will be benefited, of course—divide 10 cents a bushel by 60 loaves, do you suppose that the consumer of a loaf will get the benefit of that one-sixth of 1 cent after the bushel of wheat has traveled from the wheat field to the table of the consumer?

Suppose the farmer loses 5 cents a bushel, and divide 5 cents by 60 loaves. Do you suppose the consumer will get the benefit of that one-twelfth of 1 cent?

Follow the bushel of wheat from the wheat fields to the miller, from the miller to the baker, and from the baker to the consumer.

I assume that before that bushel of wheat has become 60 loaves of bread it has first been sold to a wheat buyer, who gets his percentage for handling. Next, it has been stored in an elevator, which gets its percentage for storing. Next, it has been carried, say, to Minneapolis by a railroad, which gets its percentage for hauling.

Next it has been sold to a miller, who converts it into flour and makes his profit for handling and grinding, and in addition to that he has taken out the bran and shorts.

Next the flour has been sold by the miller to a wholesaler, who makes his profit for handling.

Next it has been carried by a railroad, which gets its percentage for hauling.

Next it has passed into the hands of a wholesale baker, who transforms it into 60 loaves of bread and makes his profit for baking.

The loaves have been hauled by a railroad, which gets its percentage for hauling, and they have been handled by a retail grocer, who gets his profit for handling.

The wholesale bakers in big cities ship these loaves along the lines of railroads radiating from the big cities; they go to the little towns along the way, and there the retailers sell them to their customers for 5 cents a loaf.

By the time that bushel of wheat has traveled from the wheat fields of the Dakotas or from Saskatchewan, or wherever it comes from, to the table of the consumer of bread it has paid storage, rent, clerk hire, delivery service, miller's wages, baker's wages, miller's profits, baker's profits, wholesaler's profits, retailer's profits, and railroad, telegraph, and telephone service. Do you suppose the intermediate dealers and handlers along the way from the wheat fields to the ultimate consumer will not absorb the one-sixth or the one-twelfth of 1 cent per loaf? Do you suppose the ultimate consumer is going to get the benefit of that? Certainly not.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course the gentleman has not overlooked the fact that it is doubly provided that he shall not, from the fact that on 4½ bushels of wheat a reduction of 10 cents represents 50 cents, and that is retained on the flour as soon as the miller makes it in Minneapolis.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Precisely.

There is a vast difference between the modern machine-made porous openwork loaf and the bread made by the farmer's wife from the flour made from the wheat that the farmer hauled to the local mill; and there is a vast difference between the mill of to-day and the mill of a few years ago, and there is a vast difference between the population to which the mill was tributary a few years ago and the population to which the modern mill is tributary.

Wheat fluctuates from day to day in the markets, but the price of the commercial loaf never fluctuates.

All that fluctuates is the amount of bread in the loaf, and that fluctuates surreptitiously, and generally fluctuates downward.

Wheat has fallen off in price since this agreement was promulgated.

The farmers are thousands of dollars poorer by reason of it, but not a loaf has been bought cheaper by reason of it, and not an ounce has been added to the loaf.

It is unnecessary to follow the course of a bushel of oats or a bushel of rye from the field to the consumer, or to follow the course of a bushel of barley from the field to the vat of the brewer. The general result of loss to the farmer, no gain to the consumer, and profit to the middleman is the same.

FARM PRICES AND PULLMAN PRICES.

Now, I want to tell a little personal experience. I have the old farm where I was brought up. You gentlemen of the South call it a plantation. I think more of that old farm than any place on earth. I had a law practice when I came to Congress, but I have not any left. I have the old farm left.

Mr. MURDOCK. Good! [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And I am going to keep it unless the sheriff gets it away from me at the end of some of these political campaigns. [Laughter.] Now, a year ago last November my tenant came to me and said, "We have some potatoes to sell." I said, "What can we get for them?" He said, "Twenty-six cents a bushel. They have got to be culled and selected in order to bring that." He said the local market was glutted, but some one was buying for shipment. I said "All right, we might as well sell them." The price did not really pay for the cost of growing and handling. We got 26 cents, less the cost of hauling and handling.

The next day I took the train to come to Washington. I went into the dining car to get my dinner—you call it dinner here, but we call it supper in my country, and I like the name better. I think it tastes better.

I ordered a baked potato and a steak. The steak was $1.25 and I paid 15 cents for that baked potato, more than half of what I got for a bushel of my potatoes the day before. [Laughter.] These are Pullman prices and they are hotel prices, and the same difference between the price to the producer and the price to the consumer ranges all the way down from porterhouse to "chuck steak."

Let me tell you another thing. On the 12th of March I had a letter from a constituent in Allegan County, Mich. He said, "Just think of it; the President says prices are high, with wheat at 85 cents a bushel, eggs at 14 cents a dozen, and potatoes at 25 cents a bushel, and other commodities in proportion." That is within 150 miles of Chicago.

Do you think it is quite fair to assess the men who get these prices for the benefit of all the rest of us, my Democratic brethren? Do you think you are doing a just and patriotic thing? By and by, if you are not careful, it may possibly react on you. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

There are some people who are never satisfied unless they pay more than a thing is worth. They never think they are getting a good thing unless they pay more than it is worth, and the dealer always knows his customer and is ready to accommodate him. [Laughter.]

There is another class of sycophants who can not afford it, but who are always happy to pay a high price for anything they eat or drink or wear, providing they can eat it or drink it or wear it in the upper regions of the financially select.

They are always known, because the dollar always knows its kin by instinct, but they would rather be patronized than not to be present.

There is another class, who live in the regions of too much, where the Pullman car is a connecting link between establishments called homes, where every tick of the clock ticks cost.

There is another class of loafers, parasites, criminals, and others who get rotten before they get ripe. [Laughter.] These people do not need our sympathy and are not entitled to it, but the people who are working for low wages, and low salaries, do need our sympathy, and they ought to have it, and they do have it, and the supreme argument for a protective tariff is that it does protect American labor from the cheap labor of Europe and the Orient.

John Mitchell, in his book on Organized Labor, says:

> The American people should not sacrifice the future of the working classes in order to improve the condition of the inhabitants of Europe.

And he is right. Neither should we sacrifice the farming classes in order to improve the condition of the inhabitants of Canada. The argument is as good for the farmers as it is for the laborers. [Applause.]

THE MOVEMENT FROM COUNTRY TO CITY.

Why has our population been shifting from the country to the city?

One reason is that people work 16 hours a day on the farm and they work 8 hours in town. Another reason is to earn more money. Why, gentlemen, if the farmer is so rich that he ought to be assessed for the benefit of the rest of us, why have his children left the farm?

Another reason is that young men and young women are lured by the glitter and glare and show of the city, and think they will have greater advantages there, but after they get there they find the pavements are hard and monotonous, that rents are high, that food is high, that most people are rated according to their bank account, and that it is more than a hundred miles between the fashionable and unfashionable sides of a brick wall. [Applause.]

I was reading a few days ago a report of a commission appointed in the city of New York on Congestion of Population, and that commission says that in the Borough of Manhattan—and I hope some Representative from the Borough of Manhattan is here—there is a block where the density of population is 1,260 to the acre.

That means a space 6 feet square—a little bigger than a grave—for a human being to eat and sleep and live and die in. Piled up there 10 stories high in those tenements whole families live sometimes in two rooms and take boarders.

That is bad for the health of a community, bad for the morals of a community. Not only are the tenements in these districts crowded, but the streets are crowded.

In his book on Housing Reform, Mr. Lawrence Veiller shows that conditions in New York are without parallel in the civilized world, and he says:

> In no other city are there the same appalling conditions with regard to lack of light and air in the homes of the poor.

The death rate of children ranges from 60 to 92 to the thousand. This congestion breeds crime and disease and poisons the body politic. It causes increasing rents and lower wages.

One-twentieth of the assessed valuation of the Borough of Manhattan is said to be owned by eight families, estates, and corporations. The commission reports that—

> Low wages, high rent, increase of land value, and the cost of construction and labor all seem to work in a vicious circle, the effect of which is indirectly to increase congestion and lower the standards of life in the congested districts.

There are other cities in this country where congestion committees might find conditions to report upon.

Mr. Chairman, this is going on while in the country outside of the smoking, steaming piles of city masonry, where people are stacked up, story above story, there are thousands of acres of land where homes of cleanliness and comfort, pence and plenty await the industry of intelligent agriculture. Do we need to annex Canada? [Applause.]

The Socialist can find no better argument for overturning our present social and political system than right here in the congested districts of New York.

But, after all, why destroy the whole system? Why not reform New York?

The question of whether government of the people and by the people will be able to continue to govern itself is no longer a far-off question, but is here and we are already in the midst of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, there is something more to be done, gentlemen, than to legislate against farmers in the hope that some vestige of what the farmer loses may run the gantlet of intermediate greed and reach these poor people who live in these congested districts.

And one thing to be done is to reform your educational systems, so that city boys and girls may be fitted for something else than city life.

Another thing is to stop crowding your factories into your city blocks, thereby crowding neighboring tenements with laborers who want to be near their work.

Another thing is to keep them nearer the ground, and not to herd helpless employees in city lofts without adequate fire escapes. Such a condition is only little less than barbarous. Every one of these city fires emphasizes the fact that by a certain quality of commercial mind commerce is considered of more importance than human life.

Another thing is in some way to limit the monopoly of land holding which enables a few landlords to collect dividends from squalor, vice, and misery.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

But they tell us the farmer is rich and can afford to be made an exception of, while trusts are undisturbed. Read Secretary Wilson's report for 1910. He shows you that the farmer does not get 50 per cent of the price the consumer pays for agricultural products.

That was before the exigencies of Cabinet service made it necessary for him to modify some of the views that he had before expressed [applause and laughter on the Republican side], and he goes on to say that if the farmer has lately been getting just a little better price for what he has to sell, it is due him for all the years of hardship that he has gone through.

Some of us who have lived a little closer to the farms than some of you city men know something about this, and I say to you that I never encountered a public question since I have been here that touched my heart and conscience like this question has, and I would rather go out of Congress than to stand for it. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I will not have to do it. [Renewed applause.]

He tells us that down to recent times—

> The prices of farm products received by farmers were even less than the cost of production and often little, if any, above the cost of production.

In commenting upon the recent advance in farm products he says:

> That this should have been so was merely a matter of justice to the farmer to equalize the reward of his efforts with the rewards received in other lines of production.

After showing that by a careful, scientific, and exhaustive investigation he has found that the middleman gets over 50 per cent of the price charged the consumer, and in many instances a great deal more, he closes this branch of his report with the statement that—

> From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between the farmer and consumer the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the price he pays. The farmer supplies the capital for production and takes the risk of losses; his crops are at the mercy of drought and flood and heat and frost, to say nothing of noxious insects and blighting diseases. He supplies hard, exacting, unremitting labor. A degree and range of information and intelligence are demanded by agriculture which are hardly equaled in any other occupation.

AUTOMOBILES.

But some one has heard that out in Kansas some farmers own automobiles.

Well, one thing is fairly certain, that when a farmer owns an automobile he has not mortgaged the place to buy it, as many a city parvenu has done.

In 1908 the correspondent of the New York Post thought it was of sufficient importance to telegraph the news across the continent both ways that a circus was in town and that a farmer had been seen following a circus with his family in an automobile.

Why, gentlemen, it was not many years ago that the farmer did not have money enough to buy a ticket to a circus. It was not many years ago that he was selling hogs for $3 a hundred; it was not many years ago that he was burning corn for fuel. It was not many years ago that he was reading Coin's Financial School [laughter] and figuring how he could make 50 cents worth of silver legal tender in payment of past-due debts.

Now he is considered so well off that you, my Democratic brethren, want to assess him for the benefit of the rest of us. [Applause.]

BAD POLICY.

This proposition, in my judgment, is bad industrial policy and bad political policy. It is bad industrial policy because it is bad to discriminate among industrial classes. It is bad political policy because it introduces this trade agreement into an orderly course of procedure which was being evolved by the Republican Party to provide for the levying of duties which should "equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad." That policy proposes an upward limit on duties. Why? To prevent domestic monopolies from overcharging domestic consumers. It proposes a downward limit. Why? To protect American labor from the cheap labor of Europe and the Orient and to maintain the standard of American citizenship.

The first step in that orderly course of procedure was the creation of a Tariff Board for the scientific ascertainment of that difference.

The next step was the report of this ascertainment by the Tariff Board to be used by the Ways and Means Committee for checking and comparison of the testimony of interested witnesses. The next step was the framing of such ascertainment and testimony into law. The effect of this irrelevant, inconsistent, and unfair agreement, in my judgment, will be to indefinitely postpone the execution of this policy.

Gentlemen, I am in favor of reciprocity, but I want reciprocity between the farm and the factory, reciprocity between cotton and corn, reciprocity between the North and the South, reciprocity between the East and the West—reciprocity among ourselves. I do not want reciprocity that will compel the farmer to plant on shares with Canada and market his surplus abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I feel somewhat reluctant to follow two such distinguished speakers on the other side, but my diffidence would be more acute if it were not for the fact that one of them is traveling in one direction and one in the other, both on the same side of the House and of the same political faith. To my mind, as I have been able to study this Canadian reciprocity treaty in my primitive way and in my simple way, for I am not a tariff expert, this contract, or compact, between Canada and this Union of States is nothing more than a simple agreement where each makes some concessions and each will receive mutual benefits. I do not claim that all of the advantages are on the side of the States, nor do I share the belief of the alarmists and the inspired articles—partly inspired by patriotism and, I am informed, partly by cash—that say this agreement when adopted will heap disaster upon us and play havoc with us all.

REDUCES 600 SCHEDULES AND INCREASES NONE.

It deals with approximately 600 of the schedules, and every one of them are either reduced to the free list or reduced from the Payne-Aldrich tariff rate and not a single increase of a single schedule. This compact or treaty places 41 paragraphs of the Payne bill that are now on the dutiable list on the free list and makes marked reductions of the present rate on 59 paragraphs. The compact is so arranged that it does not interfere with any future arrangement of our tariff laws, and it is full of good, wholesome provisions for our people generally.

WHO ARE PARTIES TO THIS TREATY.

Let us pause for a moment and see who the contracting parties to this agreement are. On the one hand the United States, with her 92,000,000 people, who have increased in population in the last 10 years 21 per cent, and as the other party to this contract we have Canada, with her approximately 7,000,000 people, who have increased in population in the last 7 years approximately 33 per cent.

SOME GOOD REASONS WHY TREATY SHOULD BE ADOPTED.

Further, we find that along our northern border we join Canada for a distance of more than 3,000 miles, and the conditions of the people and the country are not essentially different in any respect.

We find the two people speaking the same language, bound together by ties of marriage and blood. We find 600,000 of our Americans residing within their borders, and we find 1,500,000 of the Canadians residing within the States. We find the two peoples carrying on the same business endeavors; we find them with the same hopes and aspirations; and I can not think that two countries where the conditions are so nearly identical should longer be separated by any imaginary line. [Applause.] Speaking for myself, I can not but think that we should have absolute free trade between two such countries the same as we have it between the sister States of the Union. [Applause.]

WILL NOT REDUCE PRICE OF LAND.

We find it charged in the inspired farmers' journals—some inspired by patriotism and some, I am informed, by cash—that this treaty if adopted will reduce the price of land in the States; but such can not be true from any precedent we have to blaze the way. For as we have seen the golden West settled reservation by reservation and State by State, we have likewise seen the price of land both in front and behind the tide of western empire increase in price fifty, yea, one and two hundred per cent. We find by consulting the statistics on this very interesting question that of the occupied land in Canada the average price per acre is approximately $38 per acre, while the average price of the occupied land of the United States is but approximately $23 per acre. It has been called to our attention that the price of land in Minnesota, one of our northern border States, and in Manitoba, one of the border provincial States just opposite, was at variance to the amount of $10 per acre. I am not here to dispute those figures, but am here to dispute the fact that they prove that land is either more or less valuable in Canada than it is in the United States, for, as all of us have often observed, prices vary more than that right in adjoining States, and often without apparent cause. In my own State of Oklahoma, on the Oklahoma side of Red River the land is worth from $20 to $40 per acre, while on the Texas side of the river, in the State of Texas, approximately if not quite the same lands can be had for from 25 to 50 per cent less. It is often caused by press dispatches—abnormal and speculative values built up by booms given it by railroad and real-estate promoters. I think it is safe to say the value of lands in Canada and in the United States of like kind and character are essentially the same in price; so the scarecrows erected by the protectionists and high-tariff adherents are again not trustworthy. It at least is no occasion for alarm and no reason why the treaty which we have before us should not become a law and thereby reduce the exorbitant burdens of the Payne-Aldrich law that was so recently by the people universally repudiated.

WILL NOT REDUCE WAGE SCALE, BUT WILL STIMULATE WAGES.

Again it is asserted by the inspired journals and the protectionists that it will destroy our high-wage scale for the American laborer. Again we find that the wage scale in Canada is essentially the same as in the United States, and, if anything, is a little higher. Instances can be cited where it is higher in the States, and like instances can be cited where it is higher in Canada, usually if not quite always due to the fact that some local condition is playing an active part rather than by reason of any tariff cause, either directly or indirectly. The opposition to the pact on this ground is but the careworn expression or ghost head that the protectionists always drag out when they hope to defeat any reduction in the tariff whatever. They always call to their assistance the tender sympathies possessed by all for laborer to accomplish their own selfish ends.

No one on this side of the Chamber would be a party to any reduction of the wage scale for the American laborer, for, in my judgment, he is not at present being paid too much. [Applause.] No one on this side of the Chamber would be a party to the dragging down of labor in any form, for it is the willing hands that toil that is the very hope of the Republic and the pride of us all. [Applause.] The exception we take is of having the high protectionists make the laboring men carry the load for their high protection schemes when the laboring man gets none of the profit or glory. Labor and her offspring has too long borne the brunt of selfish manufacturers, monopolists, and trusts, and it should not longer prevail or be allowed to endure.

WILL NOT BE DETRIMENTAL TO FARMERS' INTERESTS.

It is charged by certain high-tariff oracles by word of mouth and in print that the enactment of this pact means the reduction of the American farmer to the very dregs. My reply to that charge is that I do not believe it in theory or in fact. I came of a race of farmers, and I love as well to-day as then the traditions of those industrious, good people, and if I did believe it I would fight and vote against it as often as it appeared for passage.

Again, it is asserted that it is unfair on its face; that it does not portray the first principles of fairness. My answer to this is I do not believe it; on the contrary, it seems to me that the burdens and virtues are quite well distributed between the two

countries. It does not in places go as far as I would prefer, but it is a long step in the right direction, and it is my cheerful prediction that the American people will be glad we gave it to them after they really understand what it does for them.

TREATY PLACES LUMBER ON FREE LIST.

In the treaty the United States gets free rough lumber, and the beneficial results that flow from this provision are almost unnecessary of dilation or explanation. Only last year with a sky-high tariff on lumber we imported into the United States from Canada more than the sum of $19,000,000 worth of boards and deals, let alone the $7,000,000 additional for lumber of other denominations. I ask you high protectionists who are opposing this treaty, Will that do the American home builder of the broad prairies good or harm? Will that help the courageous pioneer to subdue the West? Will it not be beneficial to every citizen in all the land save the Lumber Trust? I ask you if the Lumber Trust is expected to lend its hearty support to any treaty which metes out to it tardy justice that has long been delayed by the aid of Representatives who are here in one form and another championing their cause? I ask you if it is any wonder that we find articles in many of the purchasable papers inspired by cash denouncing the pact as unfair and one-sided? It has even been charged, and by men of intelligence, that free lumber would do no good to the home builder, but these figures on a moment's thought belie themselves when we find the amount of lumber imported from there to build homes with, even though bearing an unconscionable duty, to be more than $19,000,000 in a single year.

We have seen the home builders and the pioneers of the West too long struggling beneath their too heavy load in their efforts to erect a little shelter over their heads. We have sat here complacently and seen lumber in 1908 sell at an average price of $11.08 per thousand, and in 1909 we have seen the same lumber sell for an average price of $15.37, and have seen it go up in price each day since that time. We have seen the forests of the country being reduced to underbrush and cut-over lands. We have seen timber lands all held by a few lumber barons while the American people have gone homeless and roofless. We have seen the forests of the country denuded and made bare with no corresponding good effect to the people who build the homes and carry on civilization. This one provision of the treaty will help every home builder in the land. This one provision will beget the respect of all the people who are not financially interested, and they should not be heard to longer defeat plain competition on a subject so vital to all of our people.

REDUCTION ON SHINGLES FROM 50 TO 30 CENTS PER THOUSAND.

Again, we observe that the Payne duty of 50 cents per thousand on shingles has been by this pact reduced to 30 cents. It has even been asserted that this provision would not avail the home builder anything, but this can not be true, for only last year we imported from Canada $1,759,000 worth of shingles to cover our very heads from the sunshine and the rain. Shingles, in my judgment, should go on the free list and remain there, and if we had Democrats in power at both ends of the Capitol, I imagine they would go there; but if we can not get what we want, is it not right to do the next best thing and take the best reduction we can get with a Republican President and Republican Senate to deal with? I can not think this logic is bad. I believe it will be acceptable to the people of this country when they have time to digest and find out the articles they have been reading are inspired not alone by patriotism, but mostly by high tariff campaign managers and cash. [Applause.]

REDUCTION ON LATHS FROM 20 TO 10 CENTS.

The Payne rate of duty on laths to use in plastering our houses is by this pact reduced from 20 to 10 cents. It cuts the rate in half. Some one may say that does not amount to anything, but, my friends, it does, for only last year we imported from Canada into our own United States the sum of $1,802,000 worth of laths.

BARB WIRE ON FREE LIST.

This treaty puts barb wire on the free list. This commodity is used extensively for fencing throughout the length and breadth of the country, and our farmers will appreciate this duty provision, I am sure. It is true that the Steel and Iron Trust may not want the change, and we find the gentleman from Pittsburg [Mr. DALZELL], in charge of the time, yielding it only to Members of this House who are opposed to this bill. We challenge not his right, but we submit it is quite a frank thing for him to do to come here on the floor of this House and oppose this pact on the ground that it is detrimental to the farmers. We can not but wonder if he is not most concerned about the farmer that farms the steel mills in the heart of Pittsburg. His presence in opposition to this bill and his well-known tariff views speak louder of his real views than any open declaration he could make.

WOOD PULP ON FREE LIST.

This pact puts on the free list wood pulp and pulp wood from which print paper is made, of which there was imported into the United States from Canada last year in pulp wood $6,389,553, in cord and wood pulp $3,021,347, to the end that knowledge may be more cheaply and freely disseminated. It places the father in a better position to buy schoolbooks for his children, or will enable him to educate them now, where heretofore he could educate them but partially. It places books and magazines within more easy reach of both rich and poor. It is a step in the right direction and well worthy of the efforts sought in bringing it about.

NEW ENGLAND PAPER TRUST PROTEST.

It is true that we have on our desks of this date and for each preceding day since this session began protests from the Paper Trust of New England, but we must legislate for all as distinguished from the few. We must not maintain monopoly and break down competition when the intellectual advancement of our people are at stake. We must not sit here and allow the few New England selfish paper trusts to fatten at the expense of the many when it strikes at the intelligence and the advancement intellectually of our very Republic. I believe none other than parties directly interested have assaulted the wisdom of the reduction of this schedule. It is so self-evident and so patent to all that this step should now be taken, and it is but tardy justice to the great press of the country, who have more to do with the molding of public opinion than any other agency within our land to-day. I say it is with delight that this schedule is swept away and is now taking its place on the free list. I can not but think the authors of the Payne bill must feel ashamed at their failure to enact it when they were in power and the Payne bill became a law at the last Congress. It played no small part in their retirement at the polls last year, and it will play some part in keeping them retired if they receive their just rebuke.

COTTONSEED OIL ON THE FREE LIST.

This treaty puts cottonseed oil on the free list, and this can not be said to be unfair to the American cotton planter. On the contrary, it is a great help and stimulus to him, for it will open a new field and a new market without any competition whatever, for as all are aware cotton is not raised in that latitude. This will mean much to the cotton section, and the cotton farmer will have gratitude in his heart, for his new and widened market made possible by the enactment of this righteous provision in his behalf.

SALT ON FREE LIST.

It places salt on the free list. This will help the stock raisers of this country and will be of slight benefit to us all, and no one can say it is not in the interest of the citizens of the United States to remove from them the grasp, at least partially, of the Salt Trust.

FISH ON FREE LIST.

It puts fish on the free list, and only last year we purchased $49,000,000 worth of fish, so this will be of help to us and no possible harm to us. It will afford a wider market in which to secure our fish without the payment of exorbitant tariff taxes added on at the customhouse.

REDUCES TARIFF TAX ON ALL KINDS OF AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS.

It reduces the tariff rates on all kinds of plows, harrows, thrashing machines, wagons and buggies, and all kinds of farming implements used on the farm. These articles should, in my judgment, go on the free list, but remember we have a Republican Senate and a Republican President to deal with, and we have to take the best we can get until you give us commission to legislate for you in both ends of the Capitol and at the White House.

WILL NOT AFFECT WHEAT GROWERS.

Again we find the inspired by cash and patriotism journals and oracles contending that we are discriminating against the American farmer because we cut the Payne tariff rate on wheat from 25 cents per bushel to 12 cents. My answer to this charge is that the 25-cent rate nor the 12-cent rate has not in the past and will not in the future have anything whatever to do with the price of wheat in this country or in Canada. There is not a country in this world that can compete with us in the raising of wheat anyway, and the tariff has been but an idle recital on the statute book, without affording the farmer one grain of protection in sheaf, at the granary, the elevator, or the mill. It is charged that wheat is 10 cents higher on our side than on the Canadian side. This is true but partially. Both crops are controlled largely, if not absolutely, by the price in Liverpool, and in some cases from local conditions, usually

transportation facilities, there are variances of 10 or more cents per bushel. It is, however, true that wheat in Winnipeg is higher than in the States for more than one-third of the year. I submit the prices of wheat often vary this much within a single State, and the figures do not prove that generally such is the case, and the safe prediction to make is that, the conditions being practically the same, the price of the land and labor being practically the same, both crops being controlled by the Liverpool market, the prices are not essentially different. This, of course, is not a universal rule, for local conditions vary the prices; also, corners or hoarding oftentimes are causes for wheat going up or down suddenly.

To the end that we may not be mistaken about the matter, let us consult the statistics to ascertain just how much wheat we sent to Canada last year. In 1910 we sent to Canada to get the benefit of the outrageously low price referred to by those opposing this pact 2,111,370 bushels of wheat; and how interesting it is to observe that only 135,441 bushels of wheat came from Canada to get the benefit of our high prices, asserted to be caused by our tariff on wheat of 25 cents per bushel! The charge of the high-protection advocate will answer itself when these figures are analyzed. How refreshing it must be to the American farmer to know that he is no longer to be the cat's-paw that is to shield the greedy manufacturer while he grows rich from legislation and pleads for the farmer to stand by him because there has appeared on the statute book an idle recital of 25 cents a bushel on wheat! Such a proceeding is merely the selling to the farmers razors that will not shave. It is merely deceiving to get the farmer's help to further deceive the poor consumer of this country, who has hunger gnawing at his very stomach and whose poor cupboard is bare. [Applause.]

I tell you, sir, I rejoice to see this mask torn from their insincere faces and let the American producer and consumer come into his own. I am proud that the American farmer is one who neither needs nor asks protection. He merely asks honest, open, frank treatment. He merely asks honest, frank government, economically administered, where every man stands equal before the law. He merely asks fair treatment and no more, and asks no more idle recitals which are only intended to deceive, with no corresponding advantage to him. [Applause.]

CORN SCHEDULE—EXAMINE IT CLOSELY.

High protectionists who are trying to beat this pact by means fair or foul have even gone so far as to assert that when this bill becomes a law that it will reduce the corn growers to poverty and bring want and disaster to their very door.

Pause for a moment and let us ascertain to what extent this charge is true. Last year the United States produced 3,125,713,000 bushels of corn, of which we exported 44,072,209 bushels to Canada. Canada last year produced only 18,726 bushels, of which 5,881 was imported into this country from Canada. Can there be a man so ignorant or unfair as to claim that Canada is any competitor for us in corn? Can there be a man so unfair of mind or thought that would teach or try to teach the American farmer that the 15 cents per bushel provided for by the Payne bill has had in the past or ever will have in the future anything to do with the price of corn? I tell you, sir, this tariff for the farmer has been and is now a delusion and a snare merely to blind his honest and unsuspecting eyes to the end that they may exploit him and the consumer at the same time. Is there a farmer in all the land outside of the city of Pittsburg who fears that the reduction of the duty on corn will affect his future endeavors at raising corn? The question but answers itself, and it is but an humble example of the viciousness and deception of the Payne bill from beginning to the very end. Is it any wonder that they, the Republican Party that tried to father it, were retired last year? Is it not within the realm of respectable prophecy that it will be some time before such an unfair party will be restored to power?

VEGETABLES ON FREE LIST WILL HELP OUR PRODUCERS.

Enemies of the pact, some inspired by patriotism, some by greed, and some by cash, assert that it puts the vegetables on the free list and thereby is a stroke at the farmer. Again we may answer the charge that it is unfair to our people by observing that we exported to Canada last year in vegetables $865,563, while Canada sent us from their borders but $682,455, and the tariff was higher in Canada than in this country. So it can readily be observed that to sweep away the duty on vegetables or to reduce it to any marked degree would be beneficial to our people rather than detrimental. It would be a widening of our market for the producer without any serious competition from them, for if we exceeded them in exports last year with the unfavorable tariff rates against us we can surely compete with them when placed on an equality with them, as per the terms of this pact.

HIGH-TARIFF MEN ALWAYS FIGHT RECIPROCITY AND PROPHESY DIRE RESULTS.

It is not unusual or without precedent to find high-tariff advocates denouncing reciprocity treaties. The same dire predictions were made when we entered into reciprocal relations with Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. Still, in each case we have seen great prosperity and improved conditions spring from them to both countries engaging in them. So eminently true is this statement with reference to Hawaii that under its beneficent terms she became a part of us. Since that era of great denunciation of this pact during the McKinley administration our trade with that country has increased more than fifteen-fold.

Again, we observe that we have reciprocal trade relations with the Philippines, which have a greater population than Canada, and our trade has increased by leaps and bounds, until it has reached the incredible amount of more than 70 per cent in a single year. Upon entering the identical relations with these countries the same hue and cry went up that cheap labor and cheap land and other unworthy conditions would glut our markets and destroy the Republic, but none of their weird prophecies have come true, and I feel that their dire prophecies of to-day will be forgotten on the coming morrow as the stream of prosperity and wholesome results spring from a pact so full of good things and so evenly divided between the two contracting parties.

RECIPROCITY A REAL REVISION OF PAYNE LAW.

I am for the treaty, for it grants the first affirmative relief from the vicious and unconscionable duties of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. This is the first chance to take a step in the right direction, in partially, at least, undoing what the Payne bill did. The Republican Party two years ago promised revision and gave it not. They were at the ballot box justly relieved from power, because they did not keep the faith. We were sent here because we were expected to keep the faith. This pact is a reduction of the tariff, and a marked one at that, and let none be deceived or fail to keep the faith by whim, selfishness, or caprice.

PARTY PLATFORM FOR FREE LUMBER.

Let no Democrats return to their people and say they voted against free lumber, when our party platform bears a solemn command so to do! Let no Democrat return to his people with quibbling excuses that he voted "no" for this reason and for that, when practically every implement the farmer uses is reduced in tariff taxes and not a single one increased! Let no Democrat return to his people and be forced to admit that he voted against the removal of the tariff on cotton-seed oil, barb wire, and sewing machines. Let no Democrat return to his people and answer that he voted against this pact for some trivial reason, when it reduces the tariff on 600 items of the Payne bill and does not raise a single item.

OUR DUTY TO KEEP THE FAITH.

The American people sent us here to keep the faith, and we ought to do it. The man that falls without the breastworks will be caught in the same net as the Republicans were when they failed to revise the tariff and keep the faith.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] in a speech some time ago said he was for this pact because it was not a revision of the tariff at all. My friends, I am for it because, in my judgment, it is a marked revision and accomplishes a great deal strictly along Democratic lines. I rejoice that both he and I arrive at the same goal though we travel entirely different paths. Our faces are both toward Democracy and the light of day, and when the final vote is cast it will be two votes to reduce the tariff from whatsoever cause we may elect to cast them. [Applause.]

PRESIDENT TAFT ENTITLED TO NO EULOGY.

Some are disposed to eulogize the President for his great foresight and broad statesmanship in bringing on this pact. I can not with consistence or sense accord him so generous a treatment. For, as we will recall, he signed the Payne bill after banqueting the hosts that made it repeatedly and thereby helped to perpetrate the fraud, and then, in an effort to conceal the wrong, asserted in his Winona speech, and in other speeches as well, that it was the best tariff law ever written.

After swift and effectual repudiation came from the people of every crossroads in all the land, he then sought the nearest route for the band wagon and mounted himself in the front seat and said, "Come on, Democrats; Betty and I killed the bear." But we of the Democratic faith who believe in lowering the tariff must not be shortsighted in such matters, for the

American people are farseeing people and know his every political prank and ours as well. His political somersaults will not justify faltering on our part. It should but serve us to heed the pitfalls and avoid the embarrassment. If anyone may be said to really be playing the generous rôle to-day it is the Democratic Party. The Democrats passed reciprocity last session, and they will pass it again this session. We find his high-tariff leaders all against it, and we find our party keeping the faith and championing it.

SWEEP ASIDE FEARS AND FOREBODINGS OF DANGER AND KEEP THE FAITH.

It will not hurt the farmers. The expansion of trade will do them good. No nation can compete with our producers. Labor will not be damaged, but benefited, by the new fields of endeavor that this closer relation with our neighbor will bring.

Pass this bill and release the farmer from bondage, where he has been held by the high protectionists as a buffer to pull through their unholy schemes of high protection and robber tariffs.

Do not longer let the greedy monopolist pick the threadbare pockets of the needy behind tariff walls that are unconscionable, outrageous, and unjust.

I tell you, sir, the American farmer neither needs nor asks protection and special laws for his benefit. He occupies the happy station of being able to say, "We can meet any competition that comes, and we welcome it." His industry, energy, thrift, skill, and intelligence will more than cope with all who may come or go.

The passage of this treaty with Canada is a step toward the goal of a revenue tariff with all the countries of the world and free trade with Canada. By voting for this bill we have our faces toward the light of day. We are but keeping abreast of the changing conditions and the advancing times.

We were sent here to keep the faith, and we must keep it. The Republicans failed to keep the faith in making the Payne bill, and how swift their just rebuke! Their fate is but the common fate of all, for in each life some rain must fall. This treaty reduces the tariff on 600 items and does not increase a single one. I say it is the duty of every Democrat to keep the faith and vote for it.

The ravages of hunger and gnawing of stomachs among our citizenship dulls the patriotism of strong men. Bare cupboards, poverty, and pain turn the hands on the dial of this Republic backward rather than forward, and God forbid that this be done now or in the future. Suffering and pain breed socialism, anarchy, and pain. Let us pass this bill and secure what good there is in it, and let us pass more tariff bills and make greater reductions when and where needed.

Let the high-tariff Republicans and a few misguided insurgents walk hand in hand in error, but let us of the Democratic faith keep the everlasting faith. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I want to yield for several short speeches on this side at this time. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KONOP].

Mr. KONOP. Mr. Chairman, I am a new Member here and do not want to take much valuable time from the older Members in the discussion of this important measure. I come from the great Republican State of Wisconsin. I come from a State that, I think, has been largely Republican in name but not Republican in principle. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I come from the great State of Wisconsin, which is strongly Republican; but as long as I have taken any interest in political affairs I have always stood for and believed in the principles of the Democratic Party, and I believe in those principles now. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And more so, Mr. Chairman, do I believe in the principles that I have so long fought for and sought for now, because what occurred last Thursday and Friday proves to me conclusively that the principles of the Democratic Party are right. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, gentlemen, I remember the time when the principle of electing United States Senators by the people was first proposed it was denounced by the Republicans as socialism. I also remember the time when the Democrats proposed to have publication of campaign contributions before election instead of after election, so that the American people might know where the money comes from that pollutes the American electorate, and then the Republicans said "Let us publish contributions after the election."

This bill that was passed for the publication of campaign contributions, to my mind, does not go far enough. I believe the American people will in the near future demand that a limitation be placed on the expenditure of money for campaign purposes, so that any man, be he rich or poor, may run for any office in the gift of the American people. [Applause.]

This Canadian reciprocity to my mind is a Democratic proposition. I can not understand how any Democrat on this side of the House can go back before his constituents and say that he is a Democrat if he votes agninst this proposition. I have always believed in the principle of a tariff-for-revenue only, and I believe in it now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, gentlemen, my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], yesterday said that this Canadian pact was discriminatory against the farmer. It is discriminatory, but I ask the same gentleman if every protective-tariff bill enacted by any Congress has not been discriminatory and class legislation? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Just as you begin to tear down the tariff wall, the highly protective tariff wall, you must commence being discriminatory step by step until you reduce the tariff down to a revenue basis. [Applause.]

It is discriminatory, but if the gentlemen on the other side who are opposed to this pact love the American farmer so much, we will give them an opportunity to love him hard, to love and kiss and hug him before we get done. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There have been different arguments advanced in the discussion of this Canadian reciprocity pact, and one of these maintained by some gentlemen on this side is, that it will not reduce the price of grain but will reduce the cost of living. My colleague from Wisconsin maintains the contrary. He says that it will reduce the price of grain and not reduce the cost of living. I believe, Mr. Chairman, in taking the bull by the horns. I have been born and brought up on a farm. I have worked on a farm and I know the hardships of a farmer, and I believe in being fair and honest with him and tell him the truth.

It seems to me that those arguments are absolutely inconsistent, and you can not reconcile them. If this Canadian pact is going to reduce the price of farm products, it will necessarily reduce the cost of living; and, vice versa, the contrary is true. Now, then, what is the use of quibbling, figuring in a few cents here and a few cents there? Suppose that this pact should reduce the price of wheat, and suppose it should reduce by a few cents the price of other farm products that go to make up the provisions of the people, yet I believe that in this pact there is enough that the farmer will gain by reductions of the tariff on other things that he has to buy, so that he will be fully recompensed. We have been dillydallying and quibbling over a few cents here and a few cents there; but, gentlemen, what of those men who labor in the city, in the mill, and in the factories, men who have been begging and praying for more food? What of their appeal for bread? Go to the home of some our laborers in our cities. Go to that lowly hovel where poverty, grim and relentless, stands on the threshold. Look at the lean and hungry look of mother and children, and ask the farmer if he will deny more bread. I know the American farmer. I know his sympathetic and patriotic heart; it beats in unison with his coworker in the city. It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but it is a matter of justice and right between man and man. My friends, if this Canadian pact is going to partly reduce the cost of living for those people, I am in favor of it, because I hope to God that in this great country of ours no American citizen need deny himself the three essentials of life—food, shelter, and clothing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I come from a farming community, and I want to say right here that I also come from a paper-manufacturing community. I come from a community that has 17 or 18 paper mills and pulp mills; and yet, my friends, I believe that if I vote for this pact I will benefit this country at large, and I would not be selfish and come here and vote against it when it will be a benefit to the country at large simply for the sake of benefiting the paper mills in my district. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I was elected in a Republican district, a Republican district that cast 5,000 majority for the Republican candidate for governor. I had the courage to put in my platform a declaration in favor of free paper, free pulp wood, and free pulp; and yet I was elected in a paper-mill district. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I can not and will not violate that pledge now. I had a meeting before I came to this session of Congress with several paper-mill men in my district, and they told me that they wanted to be fair, and I believe that they are fair. Some here have attacked the Paper Trust, but I want to say that the paper manufacturers in my district are not unreasonable, and they were fair in their demands. They said:

We are in favor of having absolute free trade in paper, pulp wood, and pulp between Canada and the United States; we are able to compete with all the world. We want absolute free trade with Canada,

and if Canada would remove her restrictions on the exportation of pulp wood from Crown lands, we would be in favor of this Canadian pact.

In looking over the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate I ran across some statements made by a paper manufacturer of my own State, Mr. John Strange, a man known in political circles, a former lieutenant governor of our State, and a paper manufacturer. Before that committee he made this statement:

The error which has lodged in the public mind concerning the need of Canadian wood because of a possible depletion of our forests has been the predominant reason for demanding a concession in favor of Canada. I say, gentlemen, without fear of successful contradiction, that we do not now need, nor have we ever needed, nor will we ever need, Canadian spruce or other paper wood, any more than we will need Canadian cucumbers or dandelions.

That is the statement of a paper manufacturer who claims that we have enough pulp wood in our own country never to need the pulp wood of Canada. Further on, on page 7 of this document, he goes on and says:

The Menominee Indian Reservation, over which so much contention has been had with reference to the wisdom of manufacturing under the direction of the Government and employing the Indians, contains approximately 3,000,000,000 feet of virgin timber, and grows enough wood to supply all of the fiber needed for all of the print mills in Wisconsin. As far as the Indian interests are concerned, it would be a matter of good public policy to create a large pulp plant there to utilize that which is going to waste in connection with a sawmill. The Menominee Reservation is quite sufficient to grow at least 500 cords of wood per day.

Minnesota owns enough timber to supply the needs of all of the mills in Wisconsin and Minnesota. The increase will do that, fostered by the State forester. Wisconsin has taken steps to purchase a million acres of old cut-over lands and others; and by reforesting those lands a supply largely in excess of the consumption of the mills of Wisconsin would be provided. Michigan is acquiring title to from two to three million acres. Without any great effort upon the part of the three States I have named, 20 years hence they will have an abundant supply of forests, more than adequate to furnish all the lumber and paper products that the trade will demand.

This is a statement from a paper-mill man of the State of Wisconsin. He says there is enough pulp wood for the manufacturer of Wisconsin, and I suppose the same fact is true more or less in New York and New England. On page 9 of the same document appears the following statement of Mr. Strange:

I can not comprehend, gentlemen, how an error of this extent ever got into the public mind. I have stood single-handedly against all the paper manufacturers from the time this agitation started. I said, "Argue this proposition solely upon the ground of free trade or protection as a fundamental policy. The supply of timber is so superfluous in this discussion that it ought not to enter into it." I can point you to where we have four times as much growing timber as we can possibly consume, without any thought of preservation or protection.

Now, I want to say right here, I hoped and wished that this agreement would have provided for absolute free trade, and it would have provided for absolute free trade if Canada would have consented to it. But, my friends, I believe it is a step in the right direction. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] quoted slightingly the expression, "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." That doctrine is a Democratic doctrine; it is a Democratic axiom; and let us apply it to every measure that this House will enact. Equal rights to all and special privileges to none is an axiom that need not only be applied to tariff legislation but to all other legislation enacted by every legislative body in every country of the world. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have two short speeches on this side, and I would desire to yield to those gentlemen.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman has used about an hour and twenty minutes on his side, and I would now be glad to yield some time. How much time would the gentleman desire to yield now?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to yield 45 minutes, and then I will yield back to the gentleman's side of the House. I desire to yield to two gentlemen.

Mr. DALZELL. Very well.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, mindful of the custom of this House to regard a new Member as a political accident, I rise with humility to address myself to the question of Canadian reciprocity.

In coming here, I came with a mandate of a great constituency to help reduce the high cost of living, and I regard this bill as the first step in that direction. I came here, Mr. Chairman, from a district normally Republican. I came here as a Democrat, but elected, or helped in the election, by, I compute, 10,000 Republican votes, so that I may be regarded as a kind of eclectic in politics.

The question is, What has the tariff to do with the high cost of living? Out of the mouths of the fathers of Republicanism I think we can answer, for, if I remember correctly, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Garfield proclaimed themselves protectionists, but protectionists who believed in a protection that should lead to free trade. Their argument was simple. They asked for a tariff against things from without in order to induce production within. They argued that cutting off competition from without would enable home producers to charge more within; that these increased prices would induce competition among producers within this country; that this competition among domestic producers would reduce domestic prices; and that ultimately these domestic prices would fall so far that they would be no higher than foreign prices, and that then this country could throw down the tariff wall and proclaim free trade with all the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the course of things? It has been just this, that we have piled up a tariff which has increased prices in the United States. Concurrently with that has come the formation of combinations within our country for controlling production here and keeping prices up, and even driving them higher. So that, instead of leading to reduced prices and free trade, the tariff policy has been accompanied by trust and other monopoly combinations and to higher prices.

Therefore, carrying the mandate of my constituency, I rise here to support this Canadian reciprocity bill with a view of breaking down some of these combinations and reducing prices by letting in competition from outside.

I have been in Canada quite recently. How are these Canadian people different from us? I should say that there is little or no difference. I found that on getting close to the Canadian line Canadian money mingled with our own currency. I found after I got over the line that our currency mingled with the Canadian currency; that Canadian and United States money freely passed and without distinction among Americans and Canadians. I found that I could go into a Canadian post office and with United States money buy Canadian stamps. I found that the people on both sides of the line interchange newspapers, and that the whole current of life is concurrent; that the people north of us were practically of us; that the one thing that separates us is the humbug tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We need no protection of forts or arms on either side of the line. We need nothing to make us one people save the opportunity to exchange freely—that same relation that exists between State and State. Therefore I have great joy in supporting this reciprocity bill.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I myself stand upon this side of the House of Representatives in what is perhaps a peculiar relation. I look not only for the time, and I hope it may come speedily, when there shall be no tariff whatsoever north of us, but I look to see no tariff south of us, no tariff east of us, no tariff west of us, but perfect freedom of trade with all the world. [Applause.]

I am the type of American that is not afraid to say he is an absolute free trader. I was so elected, and so long as I live I shall proclaim that truth as I see it. I stand with the Democratic Party now, not because I believe that the Democratic Party believes as I do, or, at least, declares as I do, but because it is, at least, moving in that direction. I am glad to be of the party that has its face toward the light.

I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] talk yesterday on this floor about cotton. He talked of the pathetic condition to which American labor would be reduced from any breaking down of the tariff walls with a people east of us or west of us. He talked about Japanese labor and Japanese cotton mills. Let me tell you that I have been in these Japanese cotton mills; that I visited the cotton mills of Osaka; that I have seen American machinery in their mills, and German machinery, and English machinery, and Japanese machinery; that I have seen the operatives working at these machines. I have verified the fact that American laborers in similar occupations are paid very much higher wages than the Japanese laborers. That would seem to be as far as we need go. It is as far as we are carried, at least, by the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber. But let me explain this, Mr. Chairman: Gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber who produce these facts fail to produce another most important fact that should accompany them, namely, the fact that relates to the productive power of the respective laborers in the two countries. I found on my visit to the Osaka mills that while precisely the same machinery is used in both countries—the same machinery in Osaka as that used in the Carolina mills, for instance—and that while wages in the Japanese mills were one-fourth the rate of those paid in the Carolina mills, the productive capacity of labor in Japan was but one-fourth of that in the Carolinas.

From this fact and facts like it I base the declaration that, while we pay higher wages in this country, we are preeminently

the machine-making and machine-using people of the world. Because of this our laborer produces, dollar for dollar, more than the laborer anywhere else in the world. I assert, and I am ready to prove, that our people, because of their high wages, are not at a disadvantage in production. They are, on the contrary, at a distinct advantage. Because we have higher wages in this country we have the most productive labor in the world. We produce more machines, we get more from them, because we use intelligence with our labor, because we mix brain power with manual power. We have the greatest natural resources in the world and the labor that produces cheapest; and hence we can, if we have absolute freedom of exchange, become the greatest producer in the world.

My colleagues here on this Democratic side, be not afraid. Courage is what our people want now. They will vote for men, they will support parties that have courage. It is what we most need in this time of our history.

For the high cost of living is the greatest of all questions just now. I come from the part of the country that most needs a reduction in the cost of living. New York City is the greatest, the richest, the grandest of all our cities, and yet side by side with these riches is revealed the gauntest poverty. One of the gentlemen on the other side just a few minutes ago spoke of this. He referred to our towering buildings. We are about to put up a 50-story building. But we have buildings with several subcellars. Yet we have conditions there that, alas, beat the world for degredation of mankind. Nowhere is population so congested. We have village populations in square blocks. We have in two contiguous square blocks enough children to fill a whole public school, and that school is made to accommodate 2,500 children. We bury 10 per cent of our people in potter's field at public expense. We have conditions that were never seen in any civilization of the world. God knows that this question of the cost of living is the direst one that can come before a large part of our people. Then, what shall we do about this tariff? I am here to work for a reduction of it. Let it be ever so little as a start, I will work for that. I will patiently serve for that.

But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this is but the beginning. My hope is and my feeling is that it *is* but the beginning. My hope for years has been that once we would raise the tariff issue the whole sham and swindle of it would come tumbling down.

We have the greatest natural resources in the world. We have the most wonderful and potent mingling of bloods. We have the largest homogeneous population. We have the greatest possibilities in production.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in supporting this bill. Though I be the only man in this House to stand as a free trader, I do so here, because I believe that before a great while the predominant political issue in this country is going to be the straight-out issue, not of percentages, not as to a little tariff reduction here and a little tariff increasing there, but as between the principle of protection on the one hand and of free trade on the other. I long to see that kind of freedom of commerce that will knit together the nations of the earth; that will lead us to perceive the folly of great war navies and the wisdom rather of sinking such navies in the bottom of the sea, and of binding ourselves to the other bodies of mankind by bonds of trade. A free commerce will bind us closer than all the treaties in this world. Then will not rise a question of what the Japanese are going to do to us or what the Germans are going to do to us, of what the English are going to do to us. It will be a question of better, larger, wider production and exchange. It will build up our factories as nothing else will build them. It will make real progress in the conditions of labor, as against warfare and increasing hardships under the false system of protection. It will mean a prosperity that this country has never before seen. It will mean freedom, the heritage of our Nation, and it will lead to another great step forward in the great cause of progress. Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time I have not used. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREGG].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it may be of interest to the gentlemen in this Chamber, in view of the position which I take in regard to reciprocity, to inform you that the district I represent is probably one of the most important in the United States. It is known as the twenty-second congressional district of Pennsylvania, and is composed of the counties of Butler and Westmoreland. My home county, Westmoreland, is bounded on the west by the district which the learned and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has the honor to represent. It contains—as a matter of fact, is the second in point of production of bituminous coal in the State of Pennsylvania, its coal fields producing what is known as the great Connellsville coking coal, the Greensburg steam coal, and the Irwin gas coal, which latter is known to most people who live in the cities of Philadelphia and New York for the reason that it is used exclusively as a gas coal. Within the confines of my district there are also several large plants of the United States Steel Co. Within the confines of that district there is located also one of the largest plants of the American Window Glass Co., besides probably the largest tin-plate factory in the United States and one of the largest aluminum factories in the United States and a large wire factory. In Butler County there is located what is known as the Standard Steel Car Co., and, in addition, probably one of the greatest oil-producing territories in the North—what is known as the Butler field. Moreover, it is a distinctly agricultural district, probably more than one-third of its inhabitants being engaged in the honorable, honest, and staid pursuit of farming, and everywhere is seen the fructifying results of honest toil. Consequently you see that probably, from a political standpoint, I should be a protectionist and should be opposed to the question of Canadian reciprocity. But I desire to say here that, although I represent a district having over 310,000 inhabitants, I have not heard one single word of protest from the many interests which I represent.

To my mind, this bill should be passed, first, because of the natural conditions. There is no more reason for a tariff wall between Canada and the United States than there should be between the States lying east of the Mississippi and the States lying west of the Mississippi. It is an economic problem, not a political one. It is a problem which, to my mind, appeals to the broad statesmanship of every individual Member of this House.

Mr. James J. Hill, in an address which he delivered in Chicago on the 15th of February, said:

> The proposed reciprocity agreement is an example of constructive statesmanship. In contrast to many of the matters that come before Congress, it is fashioned to large national ends, and it is inspired by a policy which the greatest minds of the country have approved.
>
> The proposed agreement is only the embodied voice of a mutually beneficial trade intercourse demanding its rightful freedom.

The same people, the same climate, and the same natural conditions exist in Canada as exist in our own country. They speak our language; we theirs. The children of the Canadians are taught the same three "R's" that we learned in our boyhood. They have the same civilization, a civilization that was made possible when the courageous Bouquet and his brave comrades drove Pontiac and his warriors from the wilderness of western Pennsylvania.

Secondly, we have precedent in supporting this bill, because, as has been said here in this House, in 1854 there was enacted a bill which to a very large extent was the same as this one and known as the Elgin treaty. This reciprocal arrangement, which proved very advantageous to the people of the United States, was abrogated in 1866 by reason of political differences between Canada and the United States, growing out of the Civil War.

Turning, then, to the other side of this question, I think I am justified in saying that the opposition to this treaty comes principally, first, from the lumber interests, which have been liberally treated by the Payne-Aldrich bill, and whose chief business seems to be an endeavor to corner all the timber and lumber in our country and increase the cost of the building of an American home; second, from the paper combination, which has been once, and recently, dissolved by a Federal court; third, from those who desire to arouse public sentiment among the farmers of this country in order that they themselves may benefit politically by it. Therefore I say that the opposition to this bill comes largely—in fact, almost exclusively—from those who have selfish motives.

It is conceded, I believe, that the official statistics show that trade is in our favor. I refer now to a document issued by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], taken from statistics furnished by the various departments of this Government, and which I ask unanimous consent to print as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 31, 1911.*

DEAR SIR: On April 4 Congress will take up Canadian reciprocity. It were well for the people to be considering it also. It is a subject upon which there is much misunderstanding.

The Lumber Trust and the Paper Trust are waging a fierce fight against reciprocity. They are making desperate efforts to get the farmers to join them. Wherever possible they have enlisted the papers

which circulate among the farmers. They try to make the farmers believe that, by reason of the tariff, he gets more than the fair market price for his products.

Canada has a tariff which operates against our products sold in Canada; we have a tariff which operates against Canadian products sold here. Reciprocity is an agreement between the two countries to modify both tariffs with a view to more extended trade.

In spite of these obstructive tariffs a large trade has grown up between us and Canada. In five years ending June 30, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

These figures show that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys from us more than it sells to us is a good country to trade with. No tariff wall should stand between us and such a country.

You are from Missouri. Let me show you.

Government statistics for five years ending June 30.

HORSES.

We sold in Canada	$14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874

CATTLE.

We sold in Canada	$1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383

MEAT AND DAIRY.

We sold in Canada	$17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826

BREADSTUFFS.

We sold in Canada	$31,590,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,910,672

Of these items, which are largely produced in Missouri, we sold to Canada $53,030,755 more than Canada sold to us. Upon these articles we had to pay the Canadian tariff. But for this Canadian tariff our balance on these items would have been still larger. Reciprocity would relieve us from that hindrance to our trade. How, then, could reciprocity hurt the Missouri farmer?

You ask why Canada favors reciprocity if it is to give us the best of it on these products? The answer is easy.

First. The Canadian tariff is added to the price which the Canadian consumer must pay. Canada desires to relieve her people from this extra price.

Second. Canada is willing to take her tariff off of the goods which we sell her if in return we will take our tariff off of the paper, wood pulp, and lumber which she sells us. Even with our high tariff against her Canada has, during the period of time under consideration, sold us $98,668,630 more paper, pulp, and lumber than we sold her. If our tariff against these products were removed she would sell us a still larger amount of these timber products. How could that hurt the Missouri farmer?

Who then would be hurt by reciprocity? I will tell you. The Lumber Trust and the Paper Trust. Reciprocity would bring Canadian lumber and paper here to be sold in competition with the American lumber and paper. This would give the American people cheaper paper—the Missouri farmer cheaper lumber to build houses and barns. So you see why it is that these trusts are making such frantic efforts to defeat reciprocity. They desire to hold a monopoly of the American lumber and paper markets.

These trusts are very active now trying to fool the farmer. Every newspaper and farmers' paper which can be controlled will carry scare headlines in an effort to alarm the farmer about reciprocity. The trusts always have money to conduct their campaigns. Let the farmer be of good cheer. He is not the fellow who will be hit by reciprocity. He will be helped. The Lumber Trust and the Paper Trust are they who will feel the weight of this measure.

Let me show you about the Paper Trust. Knowing that I represent an intelligent people, I felt that I would like to call their attention to some of the facts connected with reciprocity, so they could have a clearer understanding of the subject as its discussion progresses. I could think of no other way to disseminate these facts so well as by sending out this letter. I have sent it to over 30,000 people. How much do you suppose I had to pay for simply the plain paper upon which these letters are written? Just $40. That is the sort of prices you pay for writing paper, newspapers, schoolbooks, etc. Reciprocity would cut these prices. No wonder the Paper Trust opposes reciprocity.

Yours, truly, DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania. In this letter it is disclosed, as was stated on the floor of the House yesterday, that in the five years ending June 30, 1910, in goods of all kinds the difference in our favor was $492,503,703, while along certain other lines, largely the products of the farm, we sold to Canada $53,030,755 more than Canada sold to us.

If these are the conditions, then I can see no particular objection to the passage of this bill.

It is argued upon the floor of this House that the admission of certain foodstuffs without duty will increase the supply and consequently be injurious to the producer. It would follow, then, that if the supply was increased the price to the consumer would be decreased.

I would especially appeal to-day for the man who earns his living and supports his family by honest toil and by the sweat of his brow—for the man with the pick in the mine, for the man behind the plow, for the man behind the throttle, for the man in the factory, for the man behind the counter, and the man at the desk. I appeal for the great toiling masses who pay the exacting taxes which support the Government and respond to the call of their country in her hour of danger.

It may be that there are some inequalities in this bill, but if there are inequalities in it and in the schedules as provided in this pact between Canada and the United States, and those inequalities may to some extent affect the people of the district which I have the honor to represent, I know that the same patriotism which has controlled their action in the past will actuate them in the future, to the end that the greatest good may be rendered to the greatest number, that the many may be served rather than the few. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania use some of his time?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to express my indebtedness to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE] for clarifying the atmosphere on one phase of this debate. Selected by the leader of the majority as one of the spokesmen for the Democratic Party in the discussion of this question, we have a right to assume that he, in part, at least, expresses the ultimate aim of his party in respect to the tariff question. I refer to the statement made but a few moments ago on this floor that he is "an absolute free trader," and that he is standing with the Democratic Party because it is "moving in that direction." We on this side of the aisle will be glad to meet that issue now, as we have met it in the years past, for it has been lifted from the arena of controversy before the American electorate by the logic of facts and the wisdom of experience. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Like my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I, too, was interested in the remarkable and eloquent address delivered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], but from a different angle. The gentleman from North Carolina referred to the achievements of his party in this House during this session, pointing to the passage by the House of the resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for the election of Senators by a direct vote of the people and to the measure passed a few days since providing for the publicity of campaign contributions before elections. He seemed to enjoy a peculiar feeling of exultation, joined in by his colleagues, who responded with generous applause at his reference to the passage of these two measures. When I recall the fact that a similar resolution has been passed by the House several times in the past, when the Republicans were in control, and when I recall the further fact that a Republican House during the last Congress passed a publicity bill containing the same provisions as the bill passed at this session, I am prompted in the spirit of good humor that has characterized our partisan repartee to suggest the application of that familiar couplet:

> The lightning bug is a brilliant thing, but it hasn't any mind;
> It stumbles through existence with its headlight on behind.

[Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I rose for the purpose of discussing the measure pending before us. It is perhaps one of the most important measures that has been considered by Congress for many years; one in which the people are deeply interested and which is destined, if enacted into law, to become an absorbing issue in the near political future.

The name given the pact has in itself misled the people into assuming that it is reciprocal in fact as well as in name. It is doubtful if a measure of such importance has ever been presented to the public as one-sidedly as this measure. The metropolitan press, for reasons with which you are all familiar, have to a large extent favored the pact and they in turn have been followed by other papers without an independent examination of the subject. The facts, however, are becoming known and the people are beginning to see that they do not sustain the general statements and conclusions made by those who favor it. Already a strong reaction has set in which will grow stronger as the people study for themselves what it does and what it does not do. It has been held out as a reciprocal trade agreement which implies that Canada is granting to the United States something of equivalent or approximate value for our opening to Canada the best market place in the world for her surplus agricultural products. It has been urged that its effect will be beneficial to our people; that our farmers particularly will not be injured (but when speaking of the farmer they always speak in the negative); that our manufacturers, and especially those engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements, will be benefited by gaining access to Canadian markets on advantageous terms. To those on this side of the aisle it is said to be in harmony with the policy of reciprocity for which our

party has stood in the past and which our great leaders have advocated. In brief, it is held out as a diplomatic victory, the culminating and crowning achievement of long years of effort on the part of the United States, and that those who oppose it are standing as obstructionists in the path of progress.

In his address before the Chicago Association of Commerce, February 15, 1911, the Hon. Philander C. Knox, Secretary of State, said:

This brief outline brings in a general way the history of reciprocity in our trade relations with Canada down to the work of this administration and shows the historical fact that for more than half a century the statesmen of Canada, of Great Britain, *and of the United States* have, by repeated effort, testified and reaffirmed an abiding and fundamental belief in the principle of American-Canadian reciprocity.

The clear inference from the foregoing is that this country for half a century has been striving to secure an agreement *such as is now proposed* from Canada, and that the agreement is in accord with the policy of reciprocity for which our statesmen have stood in the past.

Later on in the same address Mr. Knox said:

The abolition of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 by the United States marked a historical *step backward* in the trade relations of the two countries.

Speaking in the city of Springfield, Ill., on February 11, 1911, our distinguished President said:

We have taken up these things that are involved in the Canadian reciprocity treaty because opportunity offered. Now is the accepted time. Now Canada is in the mood. She is at the parting of the ways.

In other words, that this is the one psychological moment in the past 50 years when Canada has been in the mood to enter into an agreement of this character.

During the progress of this debate a difference of opinion has been expressed relative to the effect of the former treaty. The distinguished Representative from New York [Mr. HARRISON], in his remarks yesterday, observed that the cause of the abolition of the former treaty was not economic.

It seems to me proper that the historical facts should be clearly and fairly presented to the people, not only with respect to the former treaty and its effect, but also as to the attitude of both this country and Canada toward a renewal of that treaty. It is a familiar rule of law, with which our profession is familiar, that the courts will follow the construction which contracting parties themselves give to an agreement. I therefore propose to take up the former treaty and show how the two countries regarded it when the facts were before them, when they could see the conditions at the very time when they were charged with the responsibility of passing judgment upon it, and then I propose to follow it down to the present time and show from the records that there has never been a time in the history of our country since the abolition of the former treaty when any of our great statesmen, or the people themselves, would have supported the proposition that is now before us.

HISTORY OF TREATY OF 1854 REVIEWED—SIMILAR TO PROPOSED PACT—EFFECT DISASTROUS TO OUR PEOPLE AND TREATY IS ABROGATED BY THE UNITED STATES—VIEWS OF PROMINENT STATESMEN FROM LINCOLN TO M'KINLEY—PERSISTENT EFFORTS OF CANADA TO RENEW CONSISTENTLY OPPOSED BY OUR GOVERNMENT ON GROUND NOT RECIPROCAL.

The treaty of 1854 provided for the free interchange of the following articles:

Grain, flour, and breadstuffs of all kinds; animals of all kinds; fresh, smoked, and salted meats; cotton-wool; seeds and vegetables; undried fruits; dried fruits; fish of all kinds; products of fish and all other creatures living in the water; poultry; eggs; hides, furs, skins, or tails, undressed; stone or marble in its crude or unwrought state; slate; butter; cheese; tallow; lard; horns; manures; ores of metals of all kinds; coal; pitch, tar, turpentine; ashes; timber and lumber of all kinds, round, hewed, and sawed, unmanufactured, in whole or in part; firewood; plants, shrubs, and trees; pelts; wool; fish oil; rice; broom corn and bark; gypsum, ground or unground; hewn or wrought or unwrought burr or grindstones; dyestuffs; flax, hemp, and tow, unmanufactured; unmanufactured tobacco.

It will be observed that so far as the interchange of natural products is concerned, and particularly the products of the farm, that Mr. Fielding, the Canadian minister, in making his report recently to the House of Commons of Canada of the proposed agreement, was right when he said that it was "the former treaty with comparatively little change."

I will discuss the question of the slight reductions in manufactured articles later on. That treaty was concluded in June, 1854, and went into effect in March, 1855. Within a few years after the treaty became operative its effect was such that the people began to call upon Congress to pass a resolution giving notice of its termination. Congress took such action in January, 1865, and the treaty was terminated in March, 1866. As I have suggested, the practical effect of the treaty on the prosperity of the people of this country was then before Congress and the people. I now propose to show from the records that the cause of its abolition on the part of our country was *purely economic*, the discussions both in the House and in the Senate being directed solely to the result of the treaty on our interests. In view of the similarity of the treaties, the opinions expressed at that time by men whose names stand forth in history as among our great leaders are of peculiar significance now. I quote briefly from Mr. Elihu B. Washburn, of Illinois, who said:

I am for the unconditional abrogation of the treaty. Every Member must see that the treaty as it now exists ought to be changed, and if it is to be changed I say let us in the first place abrogate the treaty entirely. If Great Britain, which derives, as I contend, all the benefits of the treaty, wants another, let her come and ask us, and do not let us go to her.

Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, expressed himself as follows:

The people of the United States have been uneasy under the reciprocity treaty for several years—I may almost say from its date. There was a feeling that it was more advantageous to Canada than to the United States; that, in short, it was unilateral. This feeling has of late ripened into conviction.

In the present case the feeling is ripening very rapidly into a conviction that the pending agreement is unilateral, and as soon as the facts are known this feeling will become a conviction.

John Sherman, of Ohio, spoke as follows:

The treaty has operated from its beginning against our interests, and it can be plainly demonstrated by the tables which are furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury that from the beginning our trade has fallen off and theirs increased, comparatively. While the goods we receive from Canada come to us duty free, except to a very insignificant amount, they charge us duty on more than half of what we send to them. Can that be said to be reciprocal? Our exports and our imports, our trade with Canada, is about equal; we send to them nearly as much as they send to us, but they charge us duties on one-half of what we send to them. We substantially admit all that they send us free. Such a statement as that—and it can not be gainsaid and can not be denied—shows that the treaty is unequal and that there is no reciprocity in it.

What John Sherman said had been the effect of the former treaty as to the imports from Canada coming in free while our exports to Canada were dutiable we know in advance will be the effect of the proposed agreement.

Senator Chandler, of Michigan, characterizes the treaty as follows:

If instead of a treaty of reciprocity this treaty had been called a treaty to encourage emigration from the United States into Canada, a treaty to encourage production in Canada instead of in the United States, it would have been more justly named.

Those words can be applied with equal force to the agreement before us.

Senator Foote from one of the New England States expressed himself as follows:

I believe it to be very generally conceded that while this reciprocity treaty, so denominated, has proved highly beneficial to the interests of the people of the British Provinces, and has contributed very largely to their interest and prosperity, it has, at the same time, proved injurious and prejudicial to the interest and prosperity of the American States. The very title of the treaty is a misnomer. There is nothing reciprocal about it; there is nothing reciprocal in its operation; it produces no reciprocity of benefits between the two Governments. It is beneficial to one only of the contracting parties and injurious to the other. Such are the practical results of its operation. This, at all events, is the prevailing, if not quite the unanimous, opinion of the American people, who now, after an experience of its effects for 10 years, demand as with one voice the abrogation of a contract which they regard as partial, unjust, inequitable, and one sided, as soon as it can be done through the forms prescribed in the treaty itself.

I want to commend to the Representatives from New England the position taken by another distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, afterwards Vice President of the United States, and a great commoner of the people, Mr. Wilson, who, in speaking on the treaty said:

When this treaty was negotiated, it was believed to be for the general interests of the country, and in Massachusetts it was especially believed to be for our fishing, manufacturing, commercial, and railroad interests. I have ever been in favor of the treaty, and up to this time could never have been induced to vote against it. I am not clear now that it is not for the interests of the State I in part represent to let it stand. I am inclined to think that it is for our interest that the treaty should stand as it now does. For the interests of the whole country, I am of the opinion that it ought to be modified or perhaps abrogated.

Mr. Blaine, who was then in the House, voted in favor of terminating the treaty, and while I do not find in the RECORD any expressions of opinion at that time, he reviews the subject in his Twenty Years in Congress, as follows:

The right in the fisheries conceded by the treaty of 1854—originally ours under the treaty of 1782 and unnecessarily and unwisely renounced in the treaty of 1818—was not given freely, but in consideration of a great price. That price was reciprocity of trade, so called, between the United States and the British North American Provinces in certain commodities named in the treaty. The selection, as shown in the schedules, was made almost wholly to favor Canadian interests. There was scarcely a product in the list which could be exported from the United States to Canada without loss, while the great market of the United States was thrown open for nearly everything which she could produce and export. *All her raw materials were admitted free, while all our manufactures were charged with heavy duty, the market being reserved for English merchants.* The fishery question had been adroitly used to secure from the United States an agreement which was one sided, vexatious, and unprofitable. It has served its purpose ad-

mirably as a makeweight for Canada in acquiring the most generous and profitable market she ever enjoyed for her products.

The resolution calling upon the President to give notice of the termination of the treaty was passed by the Senate *with only eight dissenting votes*, which fairly illustrates the view of the people at that time as to the treaty.

Among those who voted to terminate the treaty were Senators Grimes and Harlan, of Iowa; Mr. Allison, of Iowa, then in the House and afterwards of long and distinguished service in the Senate; John A. Kasson, of Iowa, then in the House and whose eminent career as a diplomatist is known to you all.

The resolution was signed by Abraham Lincoln.

And now I desire to trace the subsequent history of our country and of Canada in respect to a renewal of the treaty, for the attitude of the parties in reference to its renewal is the strongest evidence of how they regarded its effect.

In January, 1866, a delegation came to Washington from Canada with a view of opening negotiations for the renewal of the treaty, but it does not appear that our Government gave them any encouragement. In February, 1866, and before the treaty had, in fact, expired, Sir Frederick Bruce, the British minister, made an effort to reopen negotiations and addressed a formal letter with that in view to our Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, one of the greatest premiers of all our history. In the letter of Mr. Bruce are these significant words, which well expresses the feeling of Great Britain on the subject:

Her Majesty's Government would be well content to renew the treaty in its present form.

He was undoubtedly right, for there never has been a time, as I will show to you, when they would not have been well content to have renewed the treaty either in the then present form or in the form now proposed. I now read from the reply of Mr. Seward:

The now expiring reciprocity treaty constitutes almost the only case in which the Executive Department has by negotiation assumed a supervision of any question of either commerce or finance. Even in that case the Executive Department did little more than to make a treaty, the details of which had been virtually matured beforehand in the Congress of the United States, and sanction was given to the treaty afterwards by express legislation. The question of continuing the treaty involves mainly subjects of the special character which I have before described. Careful inquiry made during the recess of Congress induced the President to believe that there was then no such harmony of public sentiment in favor of the extension of the treaty as would encourage him in directing negotiations to be opened.

Mr. Seward undoubtedly reflected the feeling of the people at that time. I also commend that portion of his letter relative to the initiative of this character of legislation. In brief, that it should originate in the House, as our forefathers contemplated and provided in the Constitution.

In 1867 the confederation of the various Provinces of Canada was effected, and history tells us that one of the chief issues in the campaign in favor of confederation was that the General Government would be in a better position to urge and secure a renewal of reciprocal relations with this country.

In 1868 the Canadian Government, in the first tariff law passed by it inserted a clause to which I called attention on a former occasion, but for the purpose of the continuity of these observations I will now insert in the RECORD. I find that I do not have the tariff of 1868 with me, so will quote from a later tariff, that of 1879, which is substantially the same.

Section 6 is as follows:

Any or all of the following articles—that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees, and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted, or smoked), and lumber may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this act, upon proclamation of the governor in council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada.

It will be observed that Canada under this provision held out a standing offer to this country, so far as free interchange of farm products and the products of the forest, etc., are concerned, substantially the same as that now proposed.

In 1869 Sir John Rose, Canadian minister of finance, came to Washington for the purpose of opening negotiations on the subject, but the records tell us that our Government took no steps at that time in the matter. In December, 1869, President Grant, in his message to Congress, referred to the subject as follows:

The question of renewing a treaty for reciprocal trade between the United States and the British Provinces on this continent has not been favorably considered by the administration. The advantages of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producer. Except possibly a few engaged in the trade between the two sections, no citizen of the United States would be benefited by reciprocity.

There seems to be no equivocation in the language of President Grant on the subject or in his statement as to the attitude of our people.

In 1870 the Canadian Government again offered to negotiate on the subject, and in 1871 Sir John McDonald, who was in Washington on other Government business, again sought to open negotiations, but our Government gave no heed to these suggestions.

In 1873–74 representatives of the British Government again brought up the subject with our Government, a form of treaty was drafted, and submitted to President Grant, who, in turn, transmitted it to the Senate. It was rejected in February, 1875.

The Canadian tariff of 1879 carried the provision before referred to.

In 1890 Canada again sent representatives to Washington to secure a reciprocity treaty with this country; that was during the administration of President Harrison and when Mr. Blaine was Secretary of State. Negotiations were pending for a couple of years. In 1892 the Senate passed a resolution requesting the President to transmit to the Senate all information pertaining thereto. And now I want to read from President Harrison's message on the subject:

The result of the conference as to the practicability of arranging a reciprocity treaty with the Dominion of Canada is clearly stated in the letter of Mr. Blaine, and was anticipated, I think, by him and every other thoughtful American who had considered the subject. A reciprocity treaty limited to the exchange of natural products would have been such only in form. *The benefits of such a treaty would have inured almost wholly to Canada. Previous experiments on this line had been unsatisfactory to this Government.* A treaty that should be reciprocal in fact and of mutual advantage must necessarily have embraced an important list of manufactured articles and have secured to the United States a free or favored introduction—

I ask you to mark the language "free or favored introduction," because I will refer to that proposition a little later on—

of these articles into Canada as against the world; but it was not believed the Canadian ministry was ready to propose or assent to such an arrangement. * * * It is not for this Government to argue against this announcement of Canadian official opinion. It must be accepted, however, I think, as the statement of a condition which places an insuperable barrier in the way of that large and beneficial intercourse and reciprocal trade which might otherwise be developed between the United States and the Dominion.

President Harrison understood clearly the theory of a reciprocal trade agreement, which, expressed in simple form, *is that our country should receive some consideration for concessions granted to Canada;* that when we let Canada into our markets we should be given access to Canadian markets; that access to Canadian markets on the same terms as other nations is not a consideration for opening our markets to Canada, a principle that seems to have been entirely ignored in drafting the agreement before us. President Harrison submits with his message a letter from Mr. Blaine.

The name of James G. Blaine is connected perhaps more than any other great leader of our party with the policy of reciprocity, and I desire that the record show the light in which he viewed the subject at that time, when substantially the same proposition as is now proposed was before him.

I may be pardoned for digressing long enough to say that I was raised in the Republican faith; my belief in the policies of the Republican Party has strengthened as the years have passed. I came into manhood's estate when the "Plumed Knight" was the matchless leader of our party, and I have never ceased my admiration for his leadership or for the policies he advocated. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Blaine says:

At the first conference, on February 10, the commissioners stated that they were authorized by the Canadian Government to propose the renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854—which was terminated in 1866 by the action of the Congress of the United States—with such modifications and extensions as the altered circumstances of both countries and their respective interests might seem to require.

In answer to an inquiry, the commissioners stated that the modifications or extensions contemplated in the schedules of articles should be confined to natural products, and should not embrace manufactured articles.

The commissioners were informed that the Government of the United States would not be prepared to renew the treaty of 1854 *nor to agree upon any commercial reciprocity which should be confined to natural products alone;* and that, in view of the great development of industrial interests in the United States and of the changed conditions of the commercial relations of the two countries since the treaty of 1854 was negotiated, it was regarded of essential importance that a list of manufactured goods should be included in the schedules of articles for free or favored exchange in any reciprocity arrangement which might be made.

The commissioners then inquired if the Government of the United States would expect to have preferential treatment extended to the list of manufactured goods of the United States on their introduction into Canada by virtue of a reciprocity treaty, or whether it would regard the Canadian Government as at liberty to extend the same favors to the manufactured goods of other countries not parties to the treaty on their introduction into Canada.

That identical proposition is presented to us under the proposed agreement, and now let us see what answer Mr. Blaine gave. His reply was as follows:

The reply given them was that it was the desire of the Government of the United States to make a reciprocity convention which would be exclusive in its application to the United States and Canada, *and that other countries which are not parties to it should not enjoy gratuitously the favors which the two neighboring countries might reciprocally concede to each other for valuable considerations and at a large sacrifice of their respective revenues.*

I call particular attention to what Mr. Blaine says as to other countries enjoying gratuitously the privileges which we have purchased by giving Canada free access to our markets.

President Harrison, in his fourth annual message, again discussed the matter, concluding with this sentence:

The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

I now come to one of blessed memory, whose public life and career were intimately associated with the protective policy of the Republican Party, and who was one of its greatest leaders, but whose name, I regret to say, has been used to conjure favor for an agreement for which not one sentence or one syllable ever uttered by him could be construed as in its favor. I refer to William McKinley. [Applause.] In his inaugural address in 1897 President McKinley said:

The end in view is always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor of our own people, but tend to increase their prosperity.

I thought of these words when the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] was making his speech. It was indeed entertaining to observe the labored effort of my good friend from Connecticut to square his present attitude with the attitude of our party and with his former attitude on this great economic question. As he walked back and forth, up this aisle and then up this, his face at times resembling the grim visage of Moloch, and again speaking with such pathos that you could imagine the tears dropping from his words, I was reminded of the description by Tolstoi, in one of his novels, of a character who employed "one half his faculties in deceiving himself and the other half in trying to give an appearance of reason to his illusions." [Laughter.]

And now I want to refer to the last speech of McKinley at Buffalo, which has been so tortured by excerptation, in which he said:

By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established.

What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

It will be noted that McKinley predicated his statement on the foundation stone that whatever agreement is made *must be without harm to our industries or labor.*

In the Republican national platform of 1900 our party declared:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce, in return for free foreign markets.

And in 1904 our national platform declared as follows:

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their further extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

Such is a brief review of the former treaty and the attitude of the United States and Canada in respect to it. It shows that the former treaty was substantially the same as the present pact. It shows that the treaty of 1854 was abrogated by the United States because it was injurious to the interests of this country. It shows that for half a century Canada has been sitting on the doorstep of our Government, repeatedly and persistently seeking a renewal of that treaty. It shows that our country has consistently, during all of this time, refused to enter into such a treaty on the ground that it would not be reciprocal and would not be for the interests of our people. It shows that our greatest statesmen from Lincoln down to the present, including such names as John Sherman, Elihu Washburne, Zachariah Chandler, Justin Morrill (the father of the Republican policy of protection), William B. Allison, William H. Seward, Ulysses S. Grant, Benjamin Harrison, James G. Blaine, William McKinley, and many others have of record repudiated the former treaty and opposed such so-called reciprocity as Canada has heretofore offered and now proposes. In view of the undisputed facts and records of history, the statement of Mr. Knox that the abolition of the former treaty was a "backward step" is indeed most remarkable.

I submit on this branch of the subject that the pact before us is not in harmony with the policy of the Republican Party nor any of its platform declarations, nor with the position of our leading statesmen.

THE AMERICAN FARMER—PACT NOT IN HARMONY WITH POLICY OF PARTY—NEW SOIL IN COMPETITION WITH OLD—WILL BE UNFAIR TO AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF THIS COUNTRY—CANADIAN FARMER SUBSIDIZED—CONDITIONS COMPARED.

I will now turn briefly to its effect on the farmers of our country. During the last Congress I submitted some remarks on this branch of the subject. Other gentlemen who have preceded me have ably covered it. I do not, therefore, feel justified in discussing it with the detail I otherwise would. The effect and, indeed, the very purpose of the bill is to place the products of the farm in free and open competition with Canada. Its advocates on the Republican side, while claiming adherence to the protective policy of our party, propose to exclude the farmer from the application of that policy. Their position and the manifest effect of the bill is an abandonment of the protective policy, so far as the farmer is concerned. When that policy is abandoned as to one-third of our people—one-third of our producers—the policy fails. Our party has never before urged a policy of half protection and half free trade. The Democratic side favor the bill, saying it is a step in the right direction. They say, "Let's have free trade for the farmer first and for all later on."

We have witnessed during the debate on this feature of the bill a most remarkable variety of excuses and apologies. By some it is averred that the cost of living should be reduced, and that this reduction will come from competition of Canadian products with the products of American farmers. Others glide quickly over this phase of the question, and with labored effort seek to show that it will not affect the farmer. It is interesting to listen to the gentlemen from our large centers, whose knowledge of agriculture comes chiefly from looking through the windows of Pullman palace cars, speeding 60 miles an hour, discuss farming. Some, indeed, like the gentleman who is said to have conducted the negotiations with Canada—I refer to Mr. Pepper, whose contribution on the subject was presented as a Senate document—have the temerity to affirm that it will benefit the farmer.

Not only is this measure inconsistent with the protective policy for which our party has stood in the past, but it is in direct contravention of our last national platform and the recent definitely announced policy of our party, both on the part of our President and the Republican side of Congress. We have created a Tariff Board for the purpose of securing information as a basis of applying the measure of protection announced in our last national platform—the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. A partial report has been submitted. It includes the conditions in Canada and in this country on this very subject. It shows a difference in cost of production of farm products in Canada and the United States. It shows conclusively a difference in the price of farm products in the two countries. And yet it is absolutely ignored. I am one of those who have believed and still believe in a tariff board that will investigate and report the facts for the information of Congress. We have an able board, a board that has the confidence of all, and yet it is proposed to proceed headlong, without giving its report any consideration whatever. I protest against such action.

I was much impressed by the description of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] of the decadence of New England farming between the years 1860–1890. It recalled to my mind a conversation I had with a gentleman in my own State just a few months ago. He was born and passed his boyhood days on a New England farm and then joined the movement westward, locating in Iowa. As the evening shadows of life approached, his mind wandered back to the old home and he longed to return once more to the environments of his childhood days. At last he went back, and getting off at the station, his heart full of tender memories as he drew near to the sacred scenes of those early days, with the pictured faces of loved ones before

him, started for the old home; and I shall never forget the touching pathos with which he told how he was unable even to find the spot. Decadence had done its work. The farm, the home, was no more. Nothing but desolation. Sadly he turned his face again to the West. That is what competition with the new soil of the West did to the agriculture of New England. What will that vast empire of new and fertile land in western Canada do to our Middle West if thrown into free competition? I am here to protect the interests of our American farmers and leave solicitude for Canadian farmers to Canadian representatives. [Applause.]

The movement of rural population has always followed the opening up of new soil. You can go back in the history of our own country and trace the movement from New England westward. There is a reason for it. Old soil can not compete with new soil on an equal basis. The cost of production is less on new soil than on old soil. With the use of soil comes the necessity for rotation of crops, for fertilizing, putting back into the soil that which is taken out. This is a material element of cost. The deserted farms of New England, as well as other Eastern States, until recent years tell the story. Right across the Potomac, in Virginia, within sight of our own eyes was once a thriving agricultural section. To-day the country is flooded with literature telling of Virginia farms that can be purchased for less than the value of the improvements—beautiful homes standing tenantless. In recent years, since farm prices have become remunerative, there has been a movement to reclaim the abandoned farms of New England and of Virginia and other places, but if the prices of farm products are not maintained at a relatively remunerative figure this movement will stop. I am in favor of conserving our own lands.

The movement that has taken place in this country has been followed, to some extent, in the movement to western Canada, but it will be greatly emphasized if this measure becomes a law. Fortunately I come from a section of the country that has some knowledge of Canada. We know that the farmers of the West have been lured to Canada by the cheapness of her lands. The friends and neighbors and relatives of our people have journeyed there; some have remained, others have invested. In nearly every town in our State will be found real estate agents advertising Canadian lands. In brief, our people know something about the subject.

If this measure passes, the movement to Canada will be greatly increased. It is admitted that already its influence is being felt. I am not in favor of encouraging emigration from this country to Canada. We need the sturdy farmers of this country; we can not afford to lose them. We want to populate our own soil, intensify our farming, make rural life attractive, and encourage in every fair and legitimate way our agricultural resources. We should not ignore the very basis of our prosperity.

It seems to me superfluous to discuss the proposition that $150 per acre land can not compete with land at from $10 to $25 per acre with equal fertility. The report of the Tariff Board gives the average value per acre of improved land in Iowa in 1910 as $109, in Alberta, $20; in Saskatchewan, $22; Manitoba, $29.

What makes the difference in the value of land? Not soil alone. The character and fertility of soil is, of course, important, but there are other considerations. The settled state of the country brings educational advantages. Schools are maintained where the boys and girls can obtain an education. This affects the value of land. Some of the greatest statesmen of our country and captains of industry and finance began their education in the country school. Every farmer believes in education. Proximity to places of worship and churches also affects the value of land.

Then there is a social value to land—the communal spirit of the neighborhood; opportunity for exchanging visits; forming friendships; the advantages of associations of a social, political, agricultural, religious, fraternal, or other nature; all promoted by the incidents of a settled country, such as good roads, telephones, free rural mail service, railway and interurban service, easy access to numerous cities and towns. Again, there is the question of market accessibility, both for buying and selling.

All of these affect the value of land just as they affect the value of real estate, either business or residential, in the city. The land itself may not be any better or may not be more fertile or more productive per acre than land that does not have these advantages and the value of which is far less. Our lands have this value; the lands of northwestern Canada do not. The farmers there are pioneering, just as our farmers did years ago. Our farmers have helped to develop our country and have contributed their share in payment of these advantages which now give to their land its present value. Is it fair, is it just, is it defensible to place them in open competition as to their products wth the Canadian farmer, with his new and fertile soil and cheap land?

I will insert in the RECORD a table which I prepared showing the average yield per acre in the United States and in Iowa and in Canada of various farm products in the year 1909. The figures in this table are taken from the Canadian yearbook of 1909 and the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture of the United States for 1909:

	Iowa.	United States.	Canada.
Wheat.....bushels..	17.00	15.80	21.51
Oats.....do....	27.00	30.30	38.00
Barley.....do....	22.00	24.30	29.71
Rye.....do....	17.80	16.10	18.78
Buckwheat.....do....	15.00	20.90	27.64
Potatoes.....do....	89.00	106.80	192.96
Hay.....tons..	1.64	1.42	1.44
Flax.....bushels..	9.80	9.40	15.98

It will be noted from these tables that in the articles enumerated the average yield per acre is greater in Canada than in the United States, or even in Iowa, which we think is the best farming State in the Union.

I shall not stop to discuss the question of prices; that there is a difference between the price of farm products in Canada and in the United States can not be successfully controverted; that Canada is already a large exporter of farm products is true, and that her exports will increase is equally true. How can it benefit our farmers to throw her surplus agricultural products into American markets? But they say the price of farm products is fixed in Liverpool, and the old delusion of the markets of the world has been resurrected during this debate. No one has yet reconciled this argument with the difference in price that obtains in towns along the Canadian border. Take Portal, N. Dak., and North Portal, Canada, a street dividing the two, where, as the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA] has pointed out, there is a marked difference in the price of wheat, barley, flax, and other products raised in the same community, on the same soil, with the same transportation facilities—just a narrow strip of 80 feet dividing the two. The farmers of this country know the difference between a home market for the substantial part of their products and shipping them to the seacoast, and then 3,000 miles across the sea to be sold to the underpaid labor of London and Liverpool. Canada knows the same thing. *If not, why has she been knocking at our door for half a century to get into our markets? She realizes their value, even if some of the gentlemen on this floor do not.*

There is one point to which I wish to direct attention before it escapes me. I want to say to the Democratic Members from the North who represent agricultural districts that you will have a hard time explaining to your constituents why you voted for free trade on all the products of the farmer of the North, while the farmers of the South, where the control of your party lies, retain protection on their principal products, such as rice, tobacco, cotton, sugar, and other things. I do not wish to draw sectional differences into this debate, but I shall not sit silently by and permit such discriminatory legislation to be passed without a protest.

Returning after this digression, I will refer briefly to the policy of the provincial governments of Canada in subsidizing their agricultural interests. In the reports of our Consular Service in Canada, in the Daily Consular and Trade Report, are found frequent mention of the steps taken in this direction. The Canadian Provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, are establishing grain elevators. The same Provinces, as well as others, are also subsidizing the dairy industry through Government creameries, and, in addition, farmers living at a distance from a creamery can ship their cream without cost—that is to say, the express charges are paid. Consul General John E. Jones, of Winnipeg, Canada, in a report of recent date, tells of the impetus given to the industry. I read as follows:

> The records show that before the creamery was opened, in 1908, dairy butter was worth 12½ cents in trade; from July 1 to the end of October the lowest price the Government paid was 21½ cents and the highest price 31½ cents per pound of butter fat. This was cash and the payments were made twice a month.

Can anyone doubt what will be the result, so far as the production in Canada is concerned, with the aid of Government subsidy? Can our farmers compete with the cheap lands of Canada aided by Government subsidy? Is it fair that we should expect them to?

This is not a new policy for Canada. She did the same thing for the cheese industry, which developed until Canada is one of

the great cheese-producing countries of the world. In 1909 Canada exported to Great Britain alone 164,090,903 pounds of cheese.

Already Canada is exporting butter. Her export of butter to Great Britain in 1909 was 5,353,770 pounds. Will it not be just as easy to develop the dairy industry in Canada through Government subsidy as it has the cheese industry? To my mind, easier.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. From whom does the Canadian Government get the funds with which they are subsidizing these farmers?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not know. I suppose they get them from the people; but that is immaterial on this point.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I just wanted to know from curiosity.

Mr. PICKETT. It is immaterial to the question so long as they do it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. They tax the farmer to get it, do they not?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not know as to that. I am not familiar with the taxing laws of Canada, but understand the taxes on farmers are very low.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would like to know one other thing. You spoke a moment ago about certain people not being affected by this Canadian reciprocity while the northern farmer was affected by having his protective tariff stricken down. As a compensation for that the Canadian tariff against the northern farmer is also stricken down, is it not?

Mr. PICKETT. Oh, yes; but we are not exporting northern farm products into Canada in any considerable amount.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is there not as much benefit in the one as there is injury in the other?

Mr. PICKETT. There certainly is not. If the percentage in the increase of Canadian production of farm products continues for the next 15 years as it has in the past 8 years, and the same increase obtains in this country as in the past 8 years, the production of Canada will equal the production of the United States in practically all farm products except corn. Canada has a population of less than 8,000,000, while our population is over 90,000,000; therefore her surplus will increase in much greater proportion.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We now produce a surplus, and so does Canada, and will not our exports and hers go to the same foreign market?

Mr. PICKETT. That is the difference between the policy of the gentleman's party and mine. We have been trying for 50 years to build up a home market that will consume the products of the farm [applause on the Republican side], and now that we are reaching that point you propose to destroy the home market by putting the farmer in free competition with other countries. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is it not essential to the welfare of the American farmer that he should be able to reach out and grasp the foreign market for his surplus, and is it not true that the commercial greatness of this country is due to the fact that the American farmer produces a large surplus and sends it abroad? Now, does the gentleman say that we ought to limit the production of the farmers of the United States to home consumption?

Mr. PICKETT. The gentleman does not understand me. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman from Iowa state, if he knows, how many farmers have left the States in the last 10 years and gone to Manitoba?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman. I have no figures as to Manitoba alone. I have seen a statement that some 400,000 Americans have removed to Canada within the past five years. The Canadian Government shows that 72,349 settlers came from the United States to Canada during the year 1909. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] calls my attention to an article in Hampton's Magazine, which states that 500,000 Americans have passed over to Canada during the last nine years.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman from Iowa state how many stayed in Canada?

Mr. PICKETT. I do not have the statistics showing that fact, but the development of western Canada is largely from this country.

Just a word relative to the importation of Canadian cattle. An attempt has been made to show that this bill will benefit our farmers, and before I forget it I want to refer to the remarkable contribution given us on this subject by Mr. Pepper, which, as I have already stated, was ordered printed as a document by the Senate. The gentleman's name does not appear on the document as the author of the article. However, in another publication since issued he is given credit for it. I read from the subdivision of the article entitled "Where the Canadian reciprocity agreement benefits the farmer." It will be recalled that Mr. Pepper was one of the commissioners who were sent to Canada for the purpose of conducting the negotiations which resulted in this agreement. As a fair sample of the fairness with which he discusses the matter, I read from his article as follows:

> The sheep raisers of the United States will be materially benefited by getting their sheep into Canada free. The Dominion, through its department of agriculture, is now taking means to increase the Canadian supply of sheep. Under the present tariff of 25 per cent, sheep to the value of $220,000 imported into Canada from the United States have paid duties in excess of $55,000.

For the year ending March 31, 1910, the United States shipped to Canada 35,844 sheep, of the value of $131,492, with a tariff levied of $32,873; at least, these are the figures submitted by the President in the tables attached to his message. Just where Mr. Pepper secured his figures does not appear. However, he omitted to state that during the same year Canada shipped into the United States 103,519 sheep of the value of $527,687, on which the United States collected a duty of $103,519. Mr. Pepper's statement justifies the application of the old adage of Benjamin Franklin, that "half the truth is often a great lie." [Applause.]

Mr. Pepper also seems to think, and the same argument has been adduced by others, that our farmers will be benefited by the free importation of cattle from Canada.

I do not have the figures on cattle alone, but the Canadian Yearbook tells us that for the year 1909 Canada exported over $51,000,000 of animals and their produce, of which only about $7,000,000 came to the United States. While on this subject, there is another point to which I desire to allude, and that is the treaty entered into between Canada and France just a few years since. The draft of the treaty as originally submitted provided for the import into France at the minimum duty of cattle fattened for slaughter. The French Senate refused to ratify the convention unless cattle fattened for slaughter were excluded, and to this Canada finally acceded. The purpose was to protect the meat-producing interests of France. In brief, the French farmer could replenish his herds for dairy, breeding, or other purposes, but would be protected from competition as to fattened cattle. Will some one tell me why our Government should be less concerned in the protection of the meat producers of this country than the French Government was for the farmers of France? In the one case 3,000 miles of ocean divided the competitors, while in the case before us is the imaginary line we have heard so much about.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the exhaustive debate that has already taken place on this branch of the subject, I will not consume any more time in a further discussion of it.

WHAT DOES CANADA GIVE US?—IOWA—OUR MANUFACTURERS NOT GIVEN ACCESS TO CANADIAN MARKETS—CANADA'S INTERNAL POLICY AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION—OTHER COUNTRIES SECURE SAME CONCESSIONS GRATUITOUSLY.

I now turn to another phase of the subject that bears directly on the question of reciprocity. The debate thus far has been confined almost wholly to the effect on the people of this country of the free importation from Canada of agricultural products. The question of what we are getting in exchange has not been discussed. So far as the free admission of Canadian products is concerned, that could be covered by our own legislation, without respect to Canada or the concurrence of Canada therein. Of course Canada would be glad to have the tariff duties removed from all Canadian articles. If the agreement is to be sustained on the theory that it is reciprocal, then we should look to the concessions granted to us by Canada, and this phase of the subject, as I have suggested, has received little, if any, consideration during the debate. While Iowa is an agricultural State, and I regard agriculture as the basis of our prosperity, it is also true that we are developing along industrial lines, and the people of Iowa of all classes, both urban and rural, are beginning to realize the importance of the dual development. Our farmers realize the value of having a better market near their farms, and, on the other hand, our manufacturers realize the importance of the prosperity of the farmers and are interested in promoting agricultural development. The "booster" spirit is abroad in our State. A movement has been inaugurated for the cooperation of our industrial and agricultural interests. "Booster" meetings are being held, and during the recent session of our legislature a law was placed on the statute books providing an official trade-

mark for Iowa goods—"Made in Iowa." "Iowa goods for Iowa people" is the slogan. I am deeply interested, as a citizen of the State, in this movement. I also believe in the same principle for our Nation.

Iowa is strategically located for the manufacture of many articles, and especially of agricultural implements, and this is particularly true so far as the market of western Canada is concerned. Our manufacturers of the Middle West are as accessible to Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta as are the eastern portions of Canada; and if given access to that section of Canada where great agricultural development will take place, we would undoubtedly rapidly develop the manufacture of agricultural implements.

It has been held out that we are given access to Canadian markets, particularly as to agricultural implements, "on advantageous terms." This, if true, would be in accord with the theory of reciprocity, for if we open our markets to Canada for practically all Canada wants—that is, our markets for her farm products—then we in turn should be compensated therefor by access to Canadian markets.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman said that all Canada wanted in our markets was to find a market for her agricultural products. Does the gentleman think Canada would be averse to selling her timber products in this country, and does the gentleman not really think that to get her lumber and wood pulp and paper here is the moving cause for this treaty? Would that not benefit these very farmers in Iowa that the gentleman is talking about—give them cheaper lumber with which to build their barns?

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri has apparently been giving his attention to other things rather than an examination of the facts relative to this subject. With reference to the desire of Canada to give to our country the products of her forests, I remind the gentleman that the various Provinces of Canada impose an export tax on logs, so that we do not get her forest products unrestricted. The Canadian Government, as its representatives point out in their correspondence with our Secretary of State, have "no power and no desire" to interfere with the Provinces in respect to these restrictions, speaking with special reference to pulp, printing paper, etc. I have here a recent report, dated March 24, 1911, from the consul at Owen Sound, Ontario, who reports as follows:

> There is $3,550,000 capital invested in sawmill plants and the equipments necessary to convert the standing timber into lumber. That as much more is invested by each company in timber and lumber land is a fair estimate. This would make the total investment of American capital $7,100,000 in the lumber industry in this part of Ontario. This investment of American capital is largely due to the export duty on Canadian logs. Before the duty was put on the logs were rafted to the American side and then manufactured into lumber, but after that went into force the American firms were obliged to do the manufacturing on Canadian soil so as to save the export duty on their product.

This same condition exists throughout Canada, and if, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] suggests, Canada is so anxious to unload the products of her forests on us, why does she not adjust her internal laws so as to permit it?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. In that connection I will say that in five fiscal years Canada shipped into this country $98,000,000 of lumber more than we shipped up there.

Mr. PICKETT. That may be true; but under their internal laws they have forced American capital into Canada, for the purpose of manufacturing the lumber. There is no question about that.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If our tariff had not been against it they would have shipped very much more lumber here.

Mr. PICKETT. That may be true. I voted for a reduction of the duty on lumber during the last Congress, when the Payne bill was being considered, and the reduction would have prevailed if it had received the support of the Democratic Members of the House.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. We will be prepared for it once more, and on this agreement too.

Mr. PICKETT. Not under this agreement.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. No; but we will get lumber on the free list sure.

Mr. PICKETT. You do not propose it in the present agreement. Rough lumber is on the free list, but farmers do not use rough lumber.

I was speaking on the question of the access given under this agreement to our manufacturers of agricultural implements in Canadian markets. I discussed this question in the last Congress and do not desire to cover the same phase of it again. I will, however, summarize what I then said. I stated that there is no material concession given to our manufacturers of agricultural implements. On a number of more important articles, like traction, portable, and gasoline engines, manure spreaders, pumps, and windmills, there is no reduction in the Canadian duty. As to some others, there is a reduction of 2½ points, and on others of 5 points; the lowest Canadian duty is 15 per cent, and ranging from that up to 30 per cent, and if it be true, as advocates of this measure urge, that there is no substantial difference in the cost of manufacturing in Canada and this country, then it would follow that these concessions are immaterial, and certainly can not be claimed as an equivalent consideration for the concessions which we have given to Canada.

When I addressed the House on this question during the last Congress I referred to the construction given to the favored-nation clause by other countries, and that under such construction Canada would be compelled to give to every country with whom she has such a treaty the same concessions given to the United States under this agreement and *without any equivalent consideration therefor.* That is to say, gratuitously. It will be recalled that this very question was raised by Mr. Blaine and by President Harrison, from whom I have quoted. The statement which I made at that time was questioned. It is, however, no longer in doubt. It has been eliminated from controversy by a very valuable contribution on Tariff Relations with Canada, by Mr. Frank R. Rutter, tariff expert of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and published by said department as Tariff Series No. 26, from which I now quote:

> The commercial relations of Canada with various countries are based, in part, on unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, in part on special commercial agreements, and, in respect to imports from the United Kingdom and British possessions, on preferential treatment which is not applicable to imports from any foreign country. By virtue of the most-favored-nation clause in a number of British treaties which are applicable to the colonies, every concession in duty to any foreign country is immediately extended to the favored nations. To this group of countries all of the concessions made to France by the 1907 convention were at once granted, and a provision to the same effect is contained in the resolution introduced by the Canadian minister of finance on January 26, 1911, in the case of any reductions in duty to be accorded imports from the United States.

Mr. Rutter then proceeds to name the countries that will receive the same concessions as the United States and without any consideration therefor. The countries are Argentina, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. He also names the colonies that will be entitled to the British preferential: Bermuda, British West Indies, British Guiana, British India, Ceylon, Straits Settlements, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, and other British colonies.

Further, that France, Algeria, and French colonies will receive the lowest rate applicable to articles specified in the Franco-Canadian convention from any foreign country, and that Belgium and Netherlands the rates of intermediate tariff, but not special rates on all articles specified in Franco-Canadian convention.

So that it is now settled beyond controversy that the United States will receive no favored treatment in Canadian markets, but, on the contrary, our country will purchase for all these other countries the same concessions accorded to us and the United States will be entitled to the privilege of meeting the competition of these other countries in Canadian markets.

I will now turn for a few moments to the internal policy of Canada under which Canada has absolute power to render ineffective the concessions granted under the agreement. Thus far in the debate no reference has been made to the Canadian patent laws, to my mind a very material consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield 15 minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKETT. I now read from the patent act of Canada, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906:

> 38. Every patent shall, unless otherwise ordered by the commissioner as hereinafter provided, be subject, and expressed to be subject, to the following conditions:
>
> (*a*) Such patent and all the rights and privileges thereby granted shall cease and determine, and the patent shall be null and void at the end of two years from the date thereof, unless the patentee or his legal representatives, within that period or an authorized extension thereof, commence, and after such commencement, continuously carry on in Canada the construction or manufacture of the invention patented in such a manner that any person desiring to use it may obtain it, or cause it to be made for him at a reasonable price, at some manufactory or establishment for making or constructing it in Canada.
>
> (*b*) If, after the expiration of 12 months from the granting of a patent, or an authorized extension of such period, the patentee or patentees, or any of them or his or their or any of their legal representatives, for the whole or a part of his or their or any of their interest in the patent, import or cause to be imported into Canada the invention for which the patent is granted, such patent shall be void as to the interest of the person or persons so importing or causing to be imported.

Canada uses her patent laws for the purpose of protecting her industries, encouraging their development, and securing new industries. Under her patent laws she is able to force American inventors who secure Canadian patents either to sell their patents or manufacture the articles in Canada. To what extent this has been done I can not definitely state. It is a matter of such importance, however, and of such materiality to this agreement that it is strange the State Department has not investigated it thoroughly and given us information thereon. I do know that a number of manufacturing establishments in my State have been compelled to build branch factories in Canada in order to sell in Canadian markets. I hold in my hand letters from gentlemen representing two separate manufacturing establishments in Iowa, each of which has a branch factory in Canada, stating in substance that they were forced to establish their branch factories in Canada because of the Canadian patent laws. I know the same thing to be true of other manufacturing establishments in my State, and the same condition will be found, I am informed, in many other States.

The reports of our consuls found in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports tell the story of American capital being brought into Canada in the construction of branch factories. In a recent report it is stated that 184 American factories have established branches in Canada, with an estimated capital of $233,000,000. I do not say that all of them have been compelled to do so by virtue of the patent laws of Canada; I affirm, however, that it is true of many. It seems to me that it is a proper matter to be considered and carefully weighed in approving this proposed trade agreement. *If we are to enter into an agreement with Canada under which certain concessions are granted, it is our duty to see that the contract will be effective.* What avail the agreement even as to the slight reductions given, when Canada, under her patent laws, can render the concessions absolutely ineffective and can require our manufacturers holding Canadian patents either to sell them or to send their money to Canada for the purpose of manufacturing there?

There is another interesting law in Canada, known as the "dumping clause" of their tariff law, which is as follows:

CUSTOMS TARIFF, 1907.

6. In the case of articles exported to Canada of a class or kind made or produced in Canada, if the export or actual selling price to an importer in Canada be less than the fair market value of the same article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to Canada at the time of its exportation to Canada there shall, in addition to the duties otherwise established, be levied, collected, and paid on such article, on its importation into Canada, a special duty (or dumping duty) equal to the difference between the said selling price of the article for export and the said fair market value thereof for home consumption; and such special duty (or dumping duty) shall be levied, collected, and paid on such article, although it is not otherwise dutiable.

While I do not have time to discuss it, it will be seen that it provides another method by which Canada can protect her industries, and it is susceptible of such administration.

I have called attention to these matters for the reason that they seem to me to be materially related to the question of the consideration the United States is receiving from Canada. Even though the consideration be slight, it should be made effective. How can we justify approving a contract without doing so?

RELATIVE TRADE CONDITIONS.

There is still another phase of the subject to which I desire to allude if this agreement is to be considered from the standpoint of reciprocity. Attached to the special message of the President to Congress on January 26, 1911, and on page 70 thereof, is a table containing an analysis of the import, export, and total trade of Canada by countries, showing that the entire trade of Canada was $655,800,567 for the fiscal year 1910, of which the United States furnished $327,701,484; that the import trade of Canada was, in round numbers, $375,833,016, of which the importations from the United States were $223,501,809; that the export trade of Canada was $279,247,551, of which $104,199,675 was to the United States. These figures of course include the entire trade of Canada without respect to the articles included within the proposed agreement.

For the proper consideration of this agreement, however, the figures pertaining solely to the articles included within the agreement should have been furnished. Fortunately the bulletin to which I have heretofore referred, entitled "Trade relations of Canada," covers this subject. It appears that of the articles included in the agreement more than 80 per cent of the entire Canadian imports come from the United States. The total imports of the articles included in the agreement for the year ending March 31, 1910, were $41,072,185, of which the imports from the United States were $32,913,823, or, as I have stated, 80 per cent, so that of the articles included within this agreement there remains only $8,158,362 as a possible market in Canada for the United States, *and of this there is only the small amount of $683,225 that is not included in the importations from Great Britain and her colonies which have a preferential and the countries with which Canada has a favored-nation-clause treaty.*

The Canadian commissioners were shrewd enough in drafting the agreement to include the articles which would not affect her own markets or her own interests. I have here a British document, with tabulations on the subject, which also gives the importation of articles included in the agreement into the United States. The figures are in thousand pounds, and for the purpose of reducing the figures I have used $5 for the pound. The table shows that of articles included in the agreement the total imports into the United States were $101,415,000, of which the imports from Canada were $34,280,000, leaving a possible increase for Canada of $67,135,000, as against a possible increased trade of the United States with Canada, as above stated, of $8,158,362. Canada, however, will have favored treatment as to these articles in our country, while the United States will not have favored treatment in the markets of Canada.

I will insert in the RECORD tables showing the foregoing facts. The table showing the imports into Canada of articles included in the agreement I take from the bulletin issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor, and the table showing the imports into the United States of the articles covered by the agreement I take from the British tabulation, reduced from pounds to dollars on the basis of $5 per pound:

Table showing imports into Canada of articles covered by the agreement and also total imports for the year ending March 31, 1910.

Imports into Canada from—	Total imports covered by agreement.	Total of all imports.
United States	$32,913,823	$223,501,809
Great Britain	6,394,638	95,350,200
British colonies	290,510	16,448,117
Most-favored nations	789,989	10,275,506
Other countries	683,225	30,257,284
	41,072,185	375,833,016

Table showing imports into the United States of articles covered by the proposed reciprocity agreement both from Canada and from all countries.

	From Canada.	From all countries including Canada.
Articles already free to all countries	$2,535,000	$3,945,000
Dutiable articles on which the rate of duty is unchanged	35,000	45,000
Dutiable articles now made free to Canada	25,915,000	60,565,000
Dutiable articles now dutiable at lower rates to Canada	5,795,000	36,860,000
Total United States imports included under the agreement	34,280,000	101,415,000

The more you examine the agreement the more apparent it becomes that Mr. Fielding was right when he stated to the House of Commons of Canada that they had gained everything they desired, free access to our markets, "without doing any injustice to our manufacturers." I am unable after a careful examination to find wherein the agreement can by any fair construction be termed a reciprocity agreement. It can not be sustained on that theory. No one has attempted to point out what Canada grants the United States, and I challenge anyone to show where our people are given any favorable concession in Canadian markets. The agreement inures wholly to the benefit of Canada. It is unilateral. It should be entitled, as Senator Chandler observed of the treaty of 1854, an act "to encourage emigration from the United States to Canada and to encourage production in Canada instead of the United States."

It is not reciprocal. You do violence to the term to call it so. It is in direct contravention of the express declaration of our last Republican national platform, that we are in favor of a protection that will measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. It is a repudiation of the principle and purpose of the Tariff Board, whose findings are ignored. It is repugnant to the spirit of our institutions which demands that legislation should be applicable and equitable to all classes alike.

Mr. Chairman, mindful of the interests of the people whom I have the honor to represent, and as well the interests of all the people of our country, I can not give my sanction to this measure. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, the attacks of the Republican dissidents, upon the reciprocity pact, recoil upon their own heads. This is neither a Democratic concept, nor the outcome of a Democratic conference, but is the favorite child of a Republican Executive, who has assembled the Congress in an extraordinary session, in order that a Republican Senate may have another opportunity to put itself in line with the action of the last Republican House. If this agreement is an attack upon the citadel of protection, it is an attack conceived and delivered by the leader of the Republican Party, the man who was elected amid the hurrahs of the standpatters, and the enthusiastic acclaim of the tariff barons.

This measure is not a measure of free trade, unless our Republican friends are willing to admit that their President has become a free trader. The frenzied standpatters assert that reciprocity is a spear thrust into the vitals of protection. If so, go further, and charge that the titular head of your organization is a traitor to the chief tenet of your party faith. This measure is not a cunningly contrived attack upon prosperity, unless such a criticism can be justly directed against the recommendation of a Republican President, who was elected for the alleged purpose of conserving prosperity against the machinations of Democratic conspirators, fatally bent on mischief. So at least, we were informed by various Republican spellbinders, patriotically engaged in saving the country, in the Bryan-Taft campaign of 1908.

If this is free trade, it is Republican free trade, for the President approves it, and insists that his party followers shall indorse his attitude.

If this pact imperils the interests of the farmers, as asserted by its stand-pat opponents, ascribe the responsibility to a Republican administration, and to the Republican Executive who negotiated the agreement with Canada.

Truly Canadian reciprocity is a pent-up Utica, which confines the vituperative powers of our Republican friends within the narrow limits of a temperate, and chastened criticism. It is well that it is a product of Republican statesmanship, and is stamped with the stamp of Executive approbation. Otherwise a copious flow of barbed invective, and bitter vituperation, would be directed against its authors. I sympathize with my Republican friends. They have long misrepresented the Democratic attitude on the tariff, and in terms of general denunciation, assailed every suggestion of tariff reduction, or reciprocal trade, as a menace to prosperity, thus avoiding any discussion of policies on their merits, and befogging the public mind to such an extent, that many sincere and serious Americans have earnestly believed, that in some mysterious and inexplicable, but sufficient fashion, the Republican Party, through its attitude on the tariff, was the country's rock of defense against the economic heresies of the Democrats. But at last, the party of protection, as it is fond of acclaiming itself, is confronted with a dread and awful dilemma. Reciprocity is a measure of tariff reduction. If they approve this pact, and accept this reduction, and the change works well, then they will be plagued by schemes of further reduction. But if they reject the reciprocity pact, or amend it so as to compass its defeat, then they reject and flout their President, who was elected to afford a safe and sane administration, and to furnish policies that would be enthusiastically approved, and blindly followed. Unhappy followers! Unhappy leader! Approve his policies, and you discredit yourselves. Discredit his policies, and you discredit your leader.

If this bill is treason to your party, your President is the traitor. He has inaugurated this movement, nay, pressed it upon the country with superlative vigor, and incredible pertinacity. Your plight is pitiable, your predicament distressing. At last the mills of retribution are grinding you, and the grinding is exceeding fine. But sharper than a serpent's tooth, is the reflection that the author of this measure which you so bitterly assail, is not some wild-eyed Democrat, but one of your household and party faith, your own familiar friend, whom you profess to admire as a man, but reject as a leader. Others before you have been the authors of their own misfortunes, and in the bitterness of your present reflections, prostrate under the stroke directed by the President whom you aided to elevate to his high position, perchance you may recall the lines:

> So the struck eagle, stretched upon the plain,
> No more through rolling clouds, to soar again,
> Viewed his own feather on the fatal dart,
> And winged the shaft, that quivered in his heart:
> Keen were his pangs, but keener far to feel,
> He nursed the pinion, that impelled the steel:
> While the same plumage that had warmed his nest,
> Drank the last life-drop, from his bleeding breast.

I have said that this is a Republican, not a Democratic proposition. The statement is correct. From the first to the last word, it was conceived in secret conference between President Taft, and his party advisers, on the one hand, and the representatives of Canada on the other. In its final form, the President sent it to Congress with his emphatic imprimatur. He has never disowned his child. On the contrary he is proud of its paternity. Some of the Republican standpatters, the Old Guard, which is now engaged in dying, as a preferable alternative to surrender, are seeking to repudiate reciprocity. Vain task! The Republican Party is a house divided against itself. It must fall. On the one hand, ex-Speaker CANNON, Mr. DALZELL, Mr. FORDNEY and their following, representative, as they claim, of Republicanism pure and undefiled, are vociferating against the bill as un-Republican, and un-American. But in its defense is found the President, the balance wheel of the Republican organization, the man to whom the trusts turned in their extremity two years ago, as a sane and safe leader, the antithesis, in all respects, of his predecessor. Standing with him, are our friends, HILL of Connecticut, MCCALL of Massachusetts, and many others, all sturdy Republicans, who unite in saying that if the terms of this agreement are enacted into law—

It will be in full accord with the practices of the Republican Party in the past, and with the provisions of the national Republican platform at the present time.

So that whatever this reciprocity pact may be, we must view it as a proposition of purely Republican antecedents, which challenges attention, and invokes consideration on its merits. If on the whole, it is mischievous and dangerous, it should be rejected.

But it should be given a respectful hearing, and President Taft and his followers should be afforded the opportunity to make good, in the forum of free discussion. The parentage of the measure compels the standpatters to exercise a repression of utterance which must be most painful to them. To that extent it is a restraint upon free speech. Criticism of its alleged demerits, have come, and will continue to come, from standpat speakers, but they have been, and will be, remarkable for their moderation. A reproduction of what these gentlemen would like to say, if unrestrained by the exigencies of the situation, would be interesting, if lurid reading.

But the embarrassment of our friends, is the opportunity of the Democrats. Tariff reduction, in concrete form, when urged by Democrats, is one thing. Tariff reduction in the guise of reciprocity, urged by the President, is quite another and different thing, in respect of the treatment that it will receive from the standpatters and the country. The one may be whistled down the winds by interested partisans, or dismissed with contemptuous comment, as merely another illustration of Democratic vagaries, but the other compels the whole tribe to sit up, and take notice. The cry of wolf will no longer serve. They must produce the wolf. In this time of popular discontent with the present conditions, the President has been quick to perceive that the old-fashioned shibboleths of the Republican Party, will no longer suffice to carry his party to victory. If it is vain to say peace, when there is no peace, and war is flagrant, it is equally vain for the standpatters to seek to stay the growing movement for cheaper living, within the Republican Party, by vociferous claims that all is well in the land. For years the standpatters have pursued the attitude of misrepresenting their political adversaries, and terrifying a timid public, by clamorously asserting that the policies of our party threatened disaster. But it is not so easy to apply this rough and ready method to the recommendations of the President. If his suggested policies spell danger to the national welfare, his opponents must point out that danger by sufficient, and dispassionate analysis of his recommendations. As against attacks from the members of his own household, the President is in a position to enter a general denial, and call for proofs. In this attitude he will be supported by the country.

Now for the evidence of record, to determine who is responsible for the reciprocity pact. In his annual message of December 6, 1910, and in his special message of later date, President Taft writes as follows:

By my direction the Secretary of State, dispatched two representatives of the Department of State to Ottawa, to confer with representatives of the Dominion Government. These commissioners were authorized to take steps to formulate a reciprocal trade agreement, and the Ottawa conferences thus begun, were adjourned, and resumed later in Washington. In the month of January two cabinet ministers came to Washington, as representatives of the Dominion Government, and the conferences were continued between them, and the Secretary of State. The result of the negotiations was, that on January 21, a reciprocal trade agreement was reached, the text of which is herewith transmitted, with accompanying correspondence, and other data.

So much for the genesis and responsibility for this famous agreement. Many reckless statements, and much misleading matter have been made, and circulated by interested parties as

to the effect of this agreement. Hence the confusion in a portion of the public mind, which does not discriminate between trade with the people of Canada, a like people, living in a like climate to ours, under substantially similar conditions, and free trade with the world. What does the President say in this connection:

It is known of all men that the general conditions that prevail in Canada, are the same as those which obtain in the United States in the matter of agricultural products. It is said that reciprocity will injure the farmers. I deny it.

A man who has anything to sell, is on the lookout for a good customer. The United States has many things to sell. She is seeking markets, and customers the world over. Our neighbor of the snows is a prosperous, progressive, wide-awake, Anglo-Saxon country. She has many things to sell that we need. This country has many things that we desire Canada to buy. Under these conditions a rapprochement between the two countries was inevitable, looking to the establishment of mutually profitable commercial arrangements. In this connection, the President says:

A reciprocal trade agreement is a logical sequence of all that has been accomplished in disposing of matters of a diplomatic, and controversial character. The identity of interests of two peoples, linked together by race, language, political institutions, and geographical proximity, offers the foundation. The guiding motive in seeking adjustment of trade relations between two countries so situated geographically, should be to give play to productive forces as far as practicable, regardless of political boundaries. No yardstick can measure the benefits to the two peoples, of this commercial intercourse. We have reached a stage in our development, that calls for a broad and statesmanlike view of our future economic status, and its requirements. Excluding cotton, which is exceptional, a radical change is already shown in our exports, in the falling off of the amount of our agricultural products sold abroad. A far-sighted policy, requires that if we can enlarge the supply of our natural resources, and especially of food products, and necessities of life, without substantial injury to any of our producing, and manufacturing classes, we should take steps to do so now. We have on the north of us a country contiguous to ours for 3,000 miles, with natural resources of the same character as ours, and in the development of which, the conditions as to wages, and the character of the wage earner, and transportation to market, differ but little from those prevailing with us.

This is a calm and dispassionate statement of essential facts, and it is difficult for the alarmist to find a just occasion of terror in these recitals.

Another citation from the message will be of interest, in view of the fact, that the Republicans who are fighting the policy of their own President, are seeking to place the reciprocity pact before the country in a false light, boldly asserting that it commits this country to universal free trade. Nothing of the sort. It is that form of reciprocal trade, limited to the contracting countries, which both the Democratic and Republican Parties have favored. This pact is not a world-wide policy, but a limited arrangement with a neighbor. If it proves to be mutually profitable, it will be continued, as it ought to be, but if, on the contrary, it proves hurtful to any form of American industry, or destructive to our prosperity, the remedy is in our own hands. We can withdraw from the arrangement at any time, without even consulting the other party to the agreement. The contract is not effectual until it receives the assent of both parties, but either party can compel a new adjustment at any time, by rescinding its approving action.

The plight of the standpatters is both ludicrous, and pitiable. Every argument which they direct against the agreement, is a covert attack on the President. If it is supposed to menace our prosperity, the President is convicted of leading the attack. If it is free trade, then the President is a free trader. If it is an attack upon the principle of protection, then the President is the man behind the gun. If the people are being misled, then the Republican President is misleading them. If the people are following a false light, it is a light in the hand of the Republican leader. If the Republican Party is being wrecked, as the standpatters allege, the President is on the job, as the wrecker. So much for the predicament of the standpatters, who, like the demoniacs of the Scriptures, are ready to rend themselves with rage, at the plight in which they find themselves. But listen to the President, in defense of his recommendation.

This is not a violation of the protective principle, as that has been authoritatively announced by those who uphold it, because that principle does not call for a tariff between this country, and one whose conditions as to production, population and wages are so like ours, and when our common boundary line of 3,000 miles in itself, must make a radical distinction between our commercial treatment of Canada, and of any other country. The Dominion has greatly prospered. It has an active, aggressive and intelligent people. They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must decide soon, whether they are to regard themselves as permanently isolated from our markets, by a perpetual wall, or whether we are to be commercial friends. Both countries in their industrial development, have to meet the competition of lower-priced labor in other parts of the world. Both follow the policy of encouraging the development of home industries, by protective duties within reasonable limits.

But the President is not content to point out the advantages in general, of the agreement which he negotiated. He proceeds to point out the advantage to the farmers:—

The benefit to our widespread agricultural implement industry, from the reduction of Canadian duties in the agreement, is clear. My purpose in making a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada, has been, not only to obtain one, which would be mutually advantageous to both countries, but one which also would be truly national in its scope, as applied to our own country, and of benefit to all sections. The imports of Canada in 1910, were $376,000,000, of which amount the United States contributed more than $223,000,000. The reduction in the duties imposed by Canada, will largely increase this amount, and give us an even larger share of her market than we now enjoy. We have secured free entry into Canada for the cottonseed oil of the South, a most important product, with a rapidly expanding consumption in the Dominion. This agreement with Canada, will extend the market for numerous products of the United States, among the inhabitants of a prosperous neighboring country, with an increasing population, and an increasing purchasing power. I therefore, earnestly hope that this measure will be promptly enacted into law.

So much for the message of the President, which is proper to be reproduced in part in this connection. As the man on trial, at the hands of his one-time party friends, he ought to be heard in his own defense. But a Democrat can defend his own attitude toward this measure, without regard to the merry war between the President, and his party. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who stoutly opposes reciprocity, avers that he would like to see the President demonstrate his case. Well, in the opinion of some at least, the reasoning of the President, as contained in his message, may be fairly set against all the railing accusations that have been brought against his favorite measure, by his quondam followers.

What is reciprocity? Merely an agreement between two countries, to modify their imposts, so as to enlarge a mutually profitable trade. The Canadian duties operate against our products, when sold in Canada. Our tariff operates against Canadian products, when sold on this side of the line. We sell much more largely to Canada, than Canada sells to us. The balance is altogether in our favor. Hence, an enlargement of our trade will increase our balance. Does that spell danger to the United States? Our profit is in that balance. Increase that balance, and you increase our profit.

In the last five years we have bought from Canada goods to the extent of $393,913,673, while we have sold her goods amounting to $886,417,376. Difference in our favor is $492,503,703. Canada is a good customer. It is to our interest to make her a better one. In a nutshell, that is the purpose of this reciprocal agreement. The most frenzied opponent of reciprocity, is the Paper Trust. Most of the misleading statements and specious objections to the measure, can be traced to this source.

Reciprocity would give this country cheaper paper, a matter in which we are intensely interested, for there is hardly a family which does not take a newspaper. Owing to the great advance in the price of the paper on which their issues are printed, the newspapers found themselves in a dilemma from which there were only two exits, one was to secure cheaper paper over the head of the Paper Trust, the other was to submit to its exactions, and raise their subscription rates. It is not difficult to see that the interests of the great newspaper-reading public are on the side of cheaper paper. Not daring to come into the open, and confess the selfish reason for its opposition to reciprocity, the Paper Trust, which controls the prices for plain paper, writing paper, news paper, school books, et cetera, puts its opposition to the measure, on the pretended ground of its interest in the farmers. Let the farmers be of good cheer. They are not interested in preserving the monopoly of this great corporation. On the contrary, the real leaders of the Republican Party have been forced to recognize that the combinations and trusts have exacted unreasonable profits from the consumers. In the latter class, all farmers of every character, large and small, are included. To illustrate:

As far back as August 20, 1910, President Taft saw the handwriting on the wall, indicating the public dissatisfaction with the stand-pat attitude of his party. In his famous Beverly letter he admitted that this dissatisfaction was well founded, and that the interests had oppressed the consumers. He wrote as follows:

The excess of tariff was not regarded as objectionable, because it was supposed that competition between those who enjoyed the high protection would keep the price to the consumer down to what was reasonable, for the manufacturer. The evil of excessive tariff rates, however, showed itself, in the temptation to manufacturers to combine, and suppress competition, and then to maintain prices, so as to take advantage of the excess tariff rate.

Speaking to the farmers, at the National Corn Exposition, at Columbus, Ohio, on February 10, 1911, the President said:

I am a Republican, and the Republican Party has always advocated, and pursued the policy of protection to American products, and manufactures. For a long time that policy had little, or no limitation. It was thought that tariffs on protected products could not be too high,

and that if all foreign products were excluded, competition would stimulate production, and reduce its cost, and its price. The temptation to destroy competition by combinations became so great, however, that the party in its platform modified its policy.

Again on February 11, 1911, speaking at Springfield before the General Assembly of Illinois, the President repeated his statement to the effect that an excessive tariff had bred monopolies and trusts, to the prejudice of the general public. The main thought of the Columbus speech is presented in slightly different phraseology as follows:

There was a time when leading Republicans thought there was no danger in having a tariff higher than necessary to protect an industry.

The Democrats have never entertained this economic heresy, so, having nothing to recant, they welcome the President as a convert to the truth which, in time, will make him free. Proceeding, the President declared that—

it was thought—

By the Republicans only, I may say—

that if the country was made dependent on manufactures, behind the tariff wall, the competition between the manufacturers would stimulate the reduction in the cost of production, and thus reduce the cost of the product.

Not at all. The Democrats have always insisted, that once given control of the situation, the trusts would not put their prices at the lowest figures consistent with a reasonable profit, but on the contrary would fix those prices at the very highest level that the trade would carry. This has been the result in the case of every product controlled by a trust. In buying, they fix the price without competition, at the lowest figure that will keep the producer going, for they are careful not to put him out of business, though in the case of the burley tobacco raisers, they almost accomplished this result. In selling, they are equally the masters of the situation, for there is no one to say them nay. At last the abuses which others have long since perceived, have opened the eyes of the President, for at Springfield, as at Columbus, he concluded by saying:

The temptation to combine, by which the prices could be controlled, and thus the excessive tariff taken advantage of, has led to a modification of the protection theory.

I have been careful to reproduce these statements of the President, for they indicate an interesting evolution of attitude, in the case of one Republican, at least. As a Democrat, I am tempted to say to him and to all like him, who at last have seen the light: "I told you so." In the theory of the standpatter, the rule of the trusts is a benevolent despotism. The fundamental theory of Democracy is opposed to despotisms, benevolent or otherwise. No combination of capital, large enough to control the market, may be trusted to handle such a situation with an eye single to the public interests.

Such an anticipation is inconsistent with our knowledge of, and experience with, the selfishness of human nature. Hence the Democrats have always insisted, that the interests of the consumer must be secured, either through the control of the trusts by the Government, or by the application of domestic, or foreign competition to the situation. No Democrat, no matter what his political adversaries may say, would knowingly support any policy that would bank the fires of a single furnace, or interrupt the musical whir of the spindles, in a single factory. If a great trust, like the Paper Trust, insists that it is entitled to control the market, and fix the prices of its product to secure a reasonable profit, the consumers who pay those prices, are entitled to a look in upon its books, in order that it may ascertain what the trust calls a reasonable profit. Failing to secure this inspection, it may well conclude that the profit is unreasonable, and go elsewhere for a cheaper product. This is what reciprocity proposes to do, to give us cheaper paper, and cheaper agricultural implements, and cheaper many other things, at the same time increasing the profits of our commerce with Canada, by enlarging the markets for our products in that country. The suggestion that Canadian wheat, or hay, or sheep, or horses, will flood this country, and depress the home market is absurd. We sell Canada more cattle than she sells us. We sell Canada six times as many horses, as she sells us. We sell her 17 times as much meat, and dairy products, as she sells us. We sell her almost five times as much breadstuffs, as she sells us. The danger from Canadian sheep is even more remote. Canada specializes on them, and raises only a comparatively small quantity of high-grade stock. The price of sheep in the United States runs from $2.90 a head, to $5.30, while in Canada the price runs from $4 to $7. We need the sheep of that country to cross with our sheep, and produce a better grade of domestic animals. The Government statistics to support the assertions which I have made, are as follows, for the last five years:

Horses:	
Sold to Canada	$14,172,075
Bought from Canada	2,549,201
Cattle:	
Sold to Canada	1,578,179
Bought from Canada	1,193,796
Meat and dairy:	
Sold to Canada	17,011,017
Bought from Canada	904,191
Breadstuffs:	
Sold to Canada	31,596,556
Bought from Canada	6,678,884

Now if these are the figures of our trade with the present restrictions on our intercourse, it is perfectly plain that with the impediments removed, this trade will be enormously increased in the existing ratio, which is altogether in our favor. This trade is either desirable, or undesirable, either to our advantage, or to our disadvantage. If it is the latter, then shut it out by erecting the tariff wall favored by the gentleman from Michigan, which has no top, save the blue vault of heaven. But if it is the former, should a Democrat be criticized for favoring a policy which will enlarge our commercial intercourse with a friendly country, a policy which has received the distinct approbation of both the Democratic, and Republican Parties. In the Democratic platform of 1892, it is declared that:

Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantage to the countries participating, is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith.

In the Republican platform of 1892, we find our friends pointing with pride to—

the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has increased, and new and enlarged markets opened for the products of our farmers, and workshops.

We are not without the lamp of experience in this matter. Reciprocity has been tried out, under a former treaty with Canada, under conditions that in all respects parallel those of the present time. In addition the treaty of 1854 was, if anything, more far-reaching in its provisions, than the agreement negotiated by the President. Under the beneficial operation of that treaty there was an enormous increase of profitable traffic between this country and Canada. But for the intervention of the Civil War, and the temporary friction which it caused between this country and Great Britain, the treaty of 1854 would not have been repealed. As it was, its repeal was justly regarded as a public calamity. The continuous pressure of public opinion favorable to its restoration, is the impelling cause of the present agreement. After the fashion of the cuttle fish, the standpatters have ejected so much obscuring matter into the waters of this controversy, that at times we lose sight of the main proposition, which is to build up, not destroy, our prosperity by the simple and familiar process, of expanding our commerce, and enlarging our markets, through a reciprocal commercial agreement. Commerce and prosperity have gone hand in hand from the time of King Solomon, who sent his fleets and caravans to the uttermost parts of the known world, and by this wise policy raised his country to an unexampled pitch of glory, and riches.

But we should not limit our contemplation to the consideration of the pending measure, though technically it is the only one before us. The companion bill to this measure, admits free of duty, agricultural implements, sewing machines, fence wire, and many other products of daily consumption on the farm. This bill will afford the standpatters an opportunity to illustrate the sincerity of their attitude, in seeking to amend the present bill. If they favor the principle of their amendments, they will soon be afforded an opportunity to square their professions, by their acts. On many articles of essential interest to the farmers, the present tariff is prohibitive, or so nearly so, that the revenue raised is negligible. This situation has resulted in the formation of those rapacious trusts, whose sinister operations finally opened the eyes of President Taft to the mischief of their existence in the body politic. Prominent among these combinations is the trust in agricultural implements, which dominates the whole domestic market. For a number of years this combination has sold many of its products in foreign countries, at a lower price than at home, and impudently justified this practice, to the agricultural associations that protested against its obvious unfairness. Agricultural implements of every kind are placed on the free list in the companion bill—

in order to remove, or prevent, any possible discrimination against our farmers in the prices of these necessary articles, and to place them on an equal footing with their competitors elsewhere in the world. Our domestic manufactures of agricultural implements, tools, and vehicles, have grown to great proportions, and are largely organized into great trusts, and combinations. These organizations are selling their products all over the world, meeting and overcoming all opposition. They need no protection. Our imports of agricultural implements are insignificant. The value of all such imports, free and dutiable, amounted to $122,302

in 1910. The export of these implements has become a matter of more importance, than the domestic trade, the figures indicating an increase from $3,859,184, in 1890, to $28,124,033, in 1910.

Another item of great value to the cotton farmers of the South, is bagging, and bailing materials controlled by the "Bagging Trust." These materials are placed on the free list. The Payne-Aldrich bill, put hides on the free list, for the benefit of the leather industries, particularly the tanners. Leather boots, shoes, harness and saddlery are put on the free list in the companion bill, for the benefit of the farmers, and the consumers generally. The sewing machine is a machine of universal necessity. The American consumer is entitled to a price on these machines, as favorable as that given to foreigners. Sewing machines can be made here as cheaply, as in any quarter of the globe, but for years it has been a notorious fact, that the concerns making these machines in the United States, have sold them at lower prices to foreigners, than to the domestic consumer. These machines have been properly placed on the free list. The passage of this bill, as a companion measure to the reciprocity pact, will mark a long step forward in the battle of the people, with the special interests. The long lane of Republican triumphs, had a sudden turn in the election of last fall. That election was an upheaval, a cataclysm, that shook from place and power many men who constituted a reactionary element in public life, men who had heard, but had not heeded, the voice of the people during the sessions of the Sixty-first Congress. It has brought into this Chamber many new faces, and much young and aggressive blood, consecrated to the uplift of the men and women who by the way of bitter travail, produce the wealth of this country. The Democratic Party in the present House, has already made good, and by its initial acts, justified the hopes of its supporters, and brought confusion to its adversaries. The time is at hand when the obscuring mists will roll away from the political skies, and the party of Jefferson, and of Jackson will come into its own again, as a controlling force in national affairs. That time will be the dawning of the morning, of a more glorious day of greater opportunity, and more abounding prosperity.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask now that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] will consume some of his time.

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND]. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this subject may have the right to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that that is a motion that can not be put in committee. The House only can give such leave. In committee leave to extend may be given only to separate gentlemen.

Mr. DALZELL. The Chair is right, and I was in error about that.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that right be granted for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. But, Mr. Chairman, wherein is that competent in Committee of the Whole, and not competent to apply to more than one?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there are a number of precedents, running over a series of years, that a Committee of the Whole can grant leave only upon the individual request of Members, whereas the House can grant general leave.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed the privilege of revising my remarks and extending them in spots where necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWLAND. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this time will not be taken out of my allotment. It is suggested to me that it is now an opportune time to ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWLAND. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request—that I may be allowed to extend the remarks I have made in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the fervid rhetoric to which we have listened to-day, I propose to give my cordial support to the pending bill. [Applause.]

I do not know whether my action in this respect will meet with the approval of my constituents or not, but I am absolutely satisfied that that action is eternally and everlastingly right, and on that ground I take my stand. [Applause.]

Every discussion that has come up which touches on the question of reciprocal agreements has always aroused on this floor the bitterest antagonism. This antagonism was encountered at the time of the adoption of the Hawaiian treaty. The same fight was had over the Cuban differential. Members became hysterical, and charged that ruin stared our industries in the face. But those storms came and passed away, and we proceeded serenely on our career of prosperity.

Every piece of progressive legislation, every departure from the beaten path always meets with bitter opposition.

It is indeed interesting, when these questions arise, to note the alignment and the position taken by Members upon the floor and their attitude upon these questions.

I was indeed interested yesterday as I listened to the labored and strained effort of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in the long apology which he presented to the House and to the country for his position on this bill. No measure presented to the Congress by the Administration has ever received anything at his hands but carping criticism. The reason is perfectly patent to those who are familiar with political conditions. No man inveighed more severely against the Payne-Aldrich bill and its iniquities than the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin. He pleaded for the common people—oh, how he loved the dear common people!—and told about the iniquitous prohibitive tariffs in the Payne-Aldrich bill. He told what he would do for the common people if he got a chance to vote for lower duties on the necessities of life. Now that chance is presented to him to do the very thing he was talking about then, and he takes an hour to tell the country why he does not propose to do it. No one has advocated more earnestly the conservation of our natural resources, yet when in the pending bill the natural resources of all Canada are offered us and we are to be permitted access to the mineral and forest wealth of half a continent, the gentleman from Wisconsin proposes to vote against it.

It is easy to stand up on the floor and name yourself a progressive Republican. I claim that privilege, reserving the right of writing my own definition; but when the Payne-Aldrich bill was before the House, with its maximum and minimum provisions, with its enlarged free list, with many lowered duties, with its corporation tax, and improved administrative features, he voted against that bill, and thereby voted to continue the higher duties of the Dingley bill in force; and now, when the opportunity is presented to the gentleman to vote for free food products and lower duties on many manufactured articles, he proposes to vote in favor of continuing those duties on foodstuffs in force as they are in the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. Oh, progress! The gentleman from Wisconsin stands with his face toward the rising sun and marches steadily backward toward the camp of the reactionaries and standpatters; and as I listened to the sinuous, devious argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin I was reminded—I say it all in good nature—of that old couplet, which runs something like this:

> It wiggled in, it wiggled out,
> And left the people all in doubt,
> Whether the bird that made the track
> Was going north or coming back.

[Laughter.]

I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], and I give my most cordial indorsement to the brilliant tribute which he paid to the yeomanry of our country. Yes, the home on the farm is an institution and not a factory; but, Mr. Chairman, there are millions of homes of wage earners and salaried men in this country that are just as much institutions as the home on the farm. And it makes no difference, sir, whether that home is included within the four narrow, bare walls of a tenement house in the great city, it incloses all that is dear to the hopes and aspirations of the human soul; and while I speak for the yeomanry of my country, in my legislative action I shall not limit it to the consideration of any particular class. If I believed that this legislation would sacrifice or damage the farmers of my country I would not give it my support. Neither would I give it my support if I believed it would injure any class of citizens in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is very true that the home on the farm is an institution, and when hard times come the farmer can not sell his produce; but the gaunt wolf of hunger never looks in at his window. But when dividends stop and the factory shuts down and the pay envelope does not come around, the wage earner must starve or steal.

Oh, some gentlemen are unduly exercised upon this subject of the agricultural interests. Why, from Nova Scotia, from New Brunswick to British Columbia, there is one long wail going up from the Canadian agriculturists, protesting against the enactment of this law by the Canadian Parliament, on the ground that it will destroy the agricultural interests of Canada. The distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] called attention to the fact that the legislative assembly of New Brunswick had passed a resolution against the adoption by the Canadian Parliament of this reciprocity agreement. And a peculiar manifestation developed here yesterday. A long telegraphic communication was received here on the floor and put in the RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. It was a copy of a statute that had just been passed by the legislative assembly of New Brunswick. It strikes me we are in pretty close connection with the provincial legislative assembly of New Brunswick to get telegraphic communications here immediately of adverse legislation of foreign Governments.

Is the parliament of the Canadian Province of New Brunswick, which is bitterly opposed to the ratification of the pending bill in the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa, attempting to play big politics with the Congress of the United States by passing a law the effect of which would be to irritate the American people and have a tendency to defeat this legislation? I ask the question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWLAND. I have declined to yield, but under the circumstances I think I ought to.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I want to assure the gentleman from Ohio that I am not a secret agent of New Brunswick.

Mr. HOWLAND. I will relieve the gentleman from the necessity of defending himself against that imputation. I did not intend to cast any imputation upon anyone. The gentleman was merely the agency through which the telegram was put in the RECORD. The fact that the parliament of New Brunswick is adverse to this legislation suggested the thought that they might think it would help to defeat the reciprocity bill in the Congress of the United States if they passed a law to which we would naturally take exception.

Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting, after all the eulogies which have been paid and all the tears that have been shed in behalf of the agricultural interests in this country by gentlemen representing agricultural constituencies—and I represent one myself—to take up just briefly and read a few extracts from the debate in the House of Commons at Ottawa on this subject:

DEBATES IN HOUSE OF COMMONS.

[Mr. W. W. German (Welland), March 2, 1911, column 4582.]

It is said that the farmers will be benefited. So far as the county of Welland is concerned, there are two townships in the county which grow quantities of fruit, but they also grow large quantities of ordinary farm products, and it may be said that the people of the county are almost exclusively a farming community. In 1891 the farmers of that county were anxious to get into the Buffalo market, but in view of the home market we have established since then, they are not now so anxious. I doubt very much, sir, if the farmers of my county or any other county in Canada will be very considerably benefited, if benefited at all, by this agreement. Why, sir, the whole argument of the statesmen of the United States in favor of this proposition is that it will decrease the cost of living in the United States; and how, in the name of all that is sensible, is it going to decrease the cost of living in the United States and at the same time give a higher price to our farmers for their farm products? I certainly can not reconcile these two things. But I do not think it will give any considerable benefit to the farmers of this country, and even if it did give them some small benefit, I think that benefit may be obtained at a cost too high for the general welfare of this country. Now, sir, let me say that in my own county there is at least one-third of it (comprising the townships bordering on the Niagara River) contiguous to the Buffalo market. The Buffalo market would be a natural market for the agriculturists there, and they might in some instances get a higher price for their commodities on the Buffalo market, and it might be more convenient for them than to go to the town of Welland, where they would get nearly the same price.

But, sir, what would happen—the same vehicles that carry the Canadian farm products to the Buffalo market for sale will bring back from Buffalo the merchandise required by the farmers to carry on their farming operations, and which will be purchased from the United States merchants. It has already been said what the effect will be, and I believe it, that British Columbia will trade with the Pacific Coast States, that the western Provinces will trade with the States to the south of them, and so on from the Pacific to the Atlantic, our people will be trading with the American people north and south, instead of trading east and west, among themselves.

[Mr. Broder, Apr. 5, 1911. Column 6877.]

What effect is this treaty to have on the interests of the farmer? After all, it is the cold question of business. There are localities in the country which it will no doubt help. It will help the country in spots. How is the farmer in Ontario to be affected? It will affect four large industries adversely—the hog market, the horse market, the egg market, and the apple market. These are four principal products of Ontario and Quebec. There are others, but these I will deal with. Why do I say that it will affect the hog market? There are in the United States 49,000,000 hogs, and there are something less than 3,000,000 in Canada. That is 16 to 1, and it is worse than Bryan's. I intend to make a comparison of the average price for five years in Montreal and Chicago. Some people take Buffalo, but it is not a center, compared with Chicago, which is the principal center for hogs. Here are the yearly average prices of the hogs for five years in Montreal and Chicago:

Years.	Chicago.	Montreal.
1906	$6.20	$7.77
1907	6.10	7.43
1908	5.70	7.10
1909	7.35	8.64
1910	8.90	9.60
Average for the five years	6.85	8.10

What about horses? There are 21,000,000 horses in the United States. There are 12 States lying along either side of the Mississippi River which are adjacent to our western country, and in those 12 States, one-quarter of the whole United States in number, you find 11,600,000 horses. Does any one pretend to say that our western market, which is our best market for heavy horses, will not be supplied from those States? In the first place their horses are more easily got into the market, and with less risk to the buyer. What is the average price given to the American farmer—$108.19 on the farm, old and young and all. Again, the American authority gives the average of the Canadian horses on the farm at $133, almost $25 difference in favor of the Canadian.

I will now quote from the remarks of the Hon. George E. Foster in the Canadian House of Commons on February 9, 1911, and I commend the attention of the House to this line of argument:

In the United States what was the condition of things? A high tariff from time immemorial, growing higher through the Dingley bill and the McKinley bill and at last coming to a height of 45 per cent on an average on dutiable goods; against that a revolt broke out, a campaign was waged, and the slogan of the campaign in the Republican Party was a downward revision of the tariff in the United States. The Republican Party promised it; they were elected; they brought down their measure and the Payne-Aldrich bill ended not in any downward revision that was worth mentioning. What happened? They were defeated in the country. The insurgent force that swept the Republican Party out of power was pledged to downward revision. It was known by all men that the coming Congress would deal with that matter and it was known that they would deal with it in the line of taking off and diminishing duties especially on foodstuffs and natural resources. Canada would have secured these markets anyway, without reciprocity and without giving up her own.

It sounds to me, in view of the well-known attitude of the Democratic majority here, as though there might be some force in an argument of that kind addressed to the Canadian Parliament. I quote now from the remarks of Hon. Mr. Borden, of Halifax, leader of the opposition, on February 9, 1911, where he presents an argument about the money expended by Canada in building her railway transportation system from East to West, running into something like $700,000,000, and he continues:

We know how immensely important forests are to this country. Important not only in respect to their values as timber, but in their relation to the great waterway systems of this country. Important to the people of this country in every sense, and when we observe that the President of the United States over and over again directs the attention of Congress to the importance of giving to the people of the United States access to the forests of Canada, in order that their own may be preserved, surely that suggestion in that argument affords ample room for thought to the people of this country as to whether or not they should accept these proposals.

Hon E. D. Monk, on February 9, 1911, said in opposing ratification of treaty because "it tends to invade our forest wealth and other natural resources:

"We have constituted a commission of conservation. We have spent a great amount of time in the study of those resources and the means of conserving them, and we have just had a meeting at which it has been made apparent that we must change our course and in the future bring to the conservation of those great natural resources all that care which has been found wanting in other countries and which is necessary to prevent the waste of what constitutes the real strength of a nation."

Second argument—

"The tendency of the reciprocal agreement is admittedly to make our trade north and south, after they have been working 20 years to get lines of transportation east and west."

Mr. Foster, on February 14, 1911, further said:

What else have you done? You have reduced the meat duties. You have reduced the preserved and cured meat duties. In the northwest Provinces millions of dollars worth of these cured products have been going and a large trade has been carried on during the last seven years. Under this arrangement, if it comes into force, the northwest Provinces will be supplied absolutely from the packing establishments of Chicago, Milwaukee, and the near-by places in the United States. You take

away from the packing industry of this country a part, and a valuable part, of its local market, the domestic market in the northwest, and you transfer it to the United States market.

Mr. Martin Burrell, on February 14, 1911, 3656 et seq., protests bitterly against the agreement as ruinous to fruit growers and market gardeners.

Mr. J. E. Armstrong, on February 16, 1911, said:

My good friend from Prince Edward Island spoke of the wonderful advantages the people of Canada would have in farm and dairy products by this arrangement. Does he know that we imported into Canada from the United States last year $52,597 worth of poultry and exported only $3,526 to the United States; imports of potatoes $213,554, exports to United States $36,770; imported $177,577 worth of eggs and exported to the United States $12,596; that 6,604 horses came in from the United States and we sent them 2,615?

He continues the argument and takes a strong stand against the treaty as injurious to farming interests on the ground that the United States is a great exporter to Canada.

Mr. Lemieux, on February 21, 1911, said:

We are told by my honorable friend (Mr. Sproul) that it is a one-sided agreement, but we also have one of the highest protectionists on this continent, Mr. JOE CANNON—Uncle Joe—prominent in American public life, who objects to this agreement because it is one-sided. It is, indeed, strange to find protectionists on both sides of the line agreeing that it is a one-sided agreement to the prejudice of each.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, judging from the anxiety of our Canadian friends, I think our friends, the agricultural interests on this side of the line, as I said before, are unduly alarmed. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] referred at some length to the old treaty which was in force, and I have been surprised in the course of this discussion, when it is claimed that this legislation will ruin the prosperity of our farmers, that we have not been referred to the ruin and privation that fell upon them during the 11 or 12 years that the treaty was in force. But no; no such figures have been presented, and no such figures can be presented, for everyone who has investigated that situation knows that during the time that that treaty was in force agriculture flourished as it never had flourished before in this country, and I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that if it had not been for the sympathy which the Canadian people manifested for the Southern Confederacy during the Civil War that treaty never would have been abrogated. No one would ever have conceived the idea of abrogating that treaty.

Oh, you can cite extracts in the discussion by partisan men in the Congress, made up entirely of Republicans just returned from the bitter conflicts, ready to take action in any direction where some hostile influence existed; but I want to cite as authority for the position which I have taken Mr. Stanwood, in his Tariff Controversies of a Hundred Years (vol. 2, p. 138). Mr. Stanwood is an impartial witness, though biased strongly in the interest of a protective tariff, and this is the language he uses in speaking of this very subject:

All through the North a feeling of resentment had been growing steadily on account of the apparently strong sympathy of the Canadians for the Confederate cause, and in the end it seemed to become the chief reason for abrogating the treaty.

It seems to be fashionable, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to the names of distinguished men and the positions which they have occupied upon this question. There has been a studied effort during this discussion to try to carry the impression that those of us who are favoring this legislation are departing from the time-honored principles of our party. There has been a studied effort to make it appear that the President of the United States in negotiating this treaty and recommending is passage by the Congress has violated the principles of his party.

At the time this old treaty was abrogated James A. Garfield was a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, and, as a Representative from the old nineteenth district of that State, a district loyal to the core, where secession sentiment was barely tolerated and where the agricultural interest at that time was by far the most important, was big enough and broad enough to vote against the abrogation of that treaty. He did not think that its operation for 12 years had been adverse to the interests of his agricultural constituents, and it was not. They cordially returned him to Congress term after term, then sent him to the Senate, and finally he was elected President of the United States.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make this suggestion to the gentleman, and that is that President Grant in his administration negotiated a treaty, or his Secretary of State negotiated a treaty, on the general lines of the Elgin treaty and on the lines of this treaty negotiated by President Taft.

Mr. HOWLAND. I am glad to have that; I did not have it in my list, and I am very glad to have the information.

Mr. DALZELL. It did not go very far.

Mr. HOWLAND. No; it was stopped just the same as all legislation that affects or seems to affect any protected interest is stopped. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCALL. The Senate stopped it.

Mr. HOWLAND. Yes; the Senate stopped it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa a short time ago attempted to appeal to the loyalty which every Republican has for the name of James G. Blaine. It is true that Mr. Blaine voted in favor of the abrogation of the treaty in 1865, but I propose to call the attention of this House to Mr. Blaine's attitude in 1890 on the question of reciprocity. Did anybody ever hear that reciprocity was good Republican doctrine? You would think, to hear the discussions in this Chamber, that reciprocity was heresy. Why, we used to hear gentlemen talk glibly about reciprocity as the handmaiden of protection; but what has happened to that handmaiden of protection at the hands of the standpatters in this debate is simply awful.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. This is another girl; this is a different girl.

Mr. HOWLAND. It seems to be difficult for the standpatters to locate any girl by the name of Reciprocity. At the time the McKinley bill was under consideration in the Senate James G. Blaine was Secretary of State. He sent to Senator Hale an amendment which he had drafted. Before I take up that amendment I want to make this preliminary statement. I am aware of the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] on this question. He claims that the Republican doctrine of reciprocity is a mutual trade convention or agreement between this country and a foreign country in noncompeting products only.

Where does the distinguished gentleman get his authority for such a definition? I propose to show that it is not a correct statement of the Republican doctrine of reciprocity as understood and advocated by the most illustrious of our leaders and about which we have harangued and argued and talked so glibly. This amendment which Mr. Blaine sent to Senator Hale in 1890, when the McKinley bill was in the Senate, is as follows:

And the President of the United States is hereby authorized, without further legislation, to declare the ports of the United States free and open to all products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports, free of all national, provincial (State), municipal, and other taxes, flour, corn meal, and other breadstuffs; preserved meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits; cottonseed oil, rice, and other provisions, including all articles of food; lumber, furniture, and all other articles of wood; agricultural implements and machinery, mining and mechanical machinery; and structural iron, steel rails, locomotives, railway cars and supplies, street cars, refined petroleum, or such other products of the United States as may be agreed upon.

There is the amendment offered by Mr. Blaine. Is there any distinction in that amendment between competitive and noncompetitive articles? [Applause.] None whatever. The Republican doctrine of reciprocity that has been advocated by our leaders is that we will concede limited access to our markets on more favorable terms to a given nation provided that nation gives us a substantial equivalent in her markets.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will my colleague yield for a brief suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND] has expired.

Mr. McCALL. I will yield 5 or 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] yield further time?

Mr. McCALL. I yield 10 minutes further.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND] yield to his colleague [Mr. LONGWORTH]?

Mr. HOWLAND. I do.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I simply want to ask my colleague if, in his judgment, it would be possible to have any reciprocity whatever with Canada except in competing articles?

Mr. HOWLAND. In reply to that I would say that even the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] admits that on the doctrine of noncompeting products reciprocity with Canada is impossible. The doctrine of reciprocity in noncompeting articles is simply a weapon used to kill off commercial trade agreements when they are brought forward and contain substantial mutual concessions. [Applause.] Why, what is a noncompeting product? Every pound of foodstuff that is imported into the United States, whether it can be produced here or not, competes with every domestic foodstuff that we have.

Would anybody say that tropical fruits imported into this country do not compete with domestic fruits? Take the manufacturing proposition. We can manufacture everything under the sun that we want that has a dollar in it to pay us a profit on the investment. And you can go down the line, and when you go down the line where are you? We are down to tea and coffee. Tea and coffee are necessities of life, and it was proposed in the Payne bill—but it did not get very far when the

country found out what the proposition was—to put a tariff on tea and coffee, so that we could have a club with which to knock coffee and tea exporting countries in the head if they discriminated against us in their customs duties. That is to say, tea and coffee being noncompetitive, the tariff would, of course, under all constructions, be added to the retail price, and the consumer would pay it. In other words, it was proposed to tax our own people for the sake of punishing a foreign commercial nation. To punish ourselves in order to make a commercial rival be good. What would Brazil care how much of an import tax we put on coffee? She did not have to pay it; we paid it. Why, that reminds me of the man who committed suicide in order to make his enemy regret it.

I was diverted just a moment from a consideration of the position of ex-Secretary Blaine upon this question. In his letter to Senator FRYE, referring to his amendment to the McKinley bill—I know everyone is familiar with this celebrated letter, and I want to have it in the RECORD, at least a few sentences from it—he said:

> It furnishes an opportunity where the farmer may be benefited primarily, undeniably richly benefited. Here is an opportunity for a Republican Congress to open the markets of 40,000,000 people to the products of the American farm.

And in discussing the McKinley bill, then under consideration in the Senate, he said, in the same letter:

> There is not a section or line in the entire bill that will open a market for another bushel of wheat or another barrel of pork.

This amendment which Secretary Blaine advocated was the method by which he proposed to benefit the farmer and enlarge his market for agricultural products. Oh, but you say, this was not adopted. Before I pass to the consideration of that question I want to say to the House that Secretary Blaine was so anxious to have this amendment adopted that he sent Mr. William E. Curtis, who was secretary, I believe, of the Pan American Congress in session here at that time, to Maj. McKinley and asked him if he would not introduce the amendment and try to get it adopted in the House. Mr. Curtis, in the National Reciprocity Magazine of August 15, 1902, says that the amendment met the approval of Maj. McKinley, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; that he submitted it to the consideration of that committee and advocated and voted for it in the committee. [Applause.] Maj. McKinley's vote was the only vote in favor of it in the committee. After it had been defeated in the committee, Mr. Curtis says "That Maj. McKinley, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Windom, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, and other members of the administration worked hard to bring the committee to their senses. There was a meeting one night at the Ebbitt House, at which Mr. Blaine spoke with greater force and earnestness than he had ever heard him before or since. He finally got an amendment attached to the bill. It was not what he wanted. His negotiations were very much restricted. He had asked for bread, and they gave him a stone."

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which was finally adopted in the Senate was offered by Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island, and authorized the President to place a duty on sugar and molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, when any nation discriminated against us, these articles being placed on the free list in the bill.

But even in the Aldrich amendment, which is called a reciprocal amendment, the distinction between competitive and noncompetitive products is entirely lost sight of, for no one would contend for a moment that sugar and molasses and hides, raw and uncured, were not competitive products.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on down and take up the Dingley bill, sections 3 and 4, even down to the Payne tariff bill, if you please, which contains some reciprocal provisions; but nowhere in these laws do you find the distinction between competitive and noncompetitive products. The nearest intimation that you have of it is in section 4 of the Dingley bill, where it is provided that certain items may be transferred to the free list for a limited time by the President, provided "the products are the natural products of the foreign country and not of the United States." But even there the distinction is not drawn between competitive and noncompetitive products.

And so I take it that you will look long and far before you will find anything that will authorize you to lay down the distinction as accepted political Republican doctrine that reciprocal trade agreements must be in noncompeting products only. [Applause.]

Mr. McKinley was elected President in 1896, and immediately proceeded to carry out his campaign promises to the American people, and insisted upon legislation which would open up the mills of the country rather than the mints.

The Dingley bill was passed, and an era of prosperity came upon the country unparalleled in its history; and we soon came to the question of whether or not our agricultural interests, which were prospering, and our manufacturing interests, which were prospering, would not produce a surplus and a glut in the market, with its consequent business depression and hard times. President McKinley, to whom it was given to look further into the future than falls to the lot of most men, grasped that proposition thoroughly, and immediately commenced to cast about for ways and means to obtain larger foreign markets, in order that our industries might continue prosperous and the surplus of our agriculturists and manufacturers might find a profitable market.

Under the authority contained in section 4 of the Dingley bill he authorized and instructed Mr. Kasson to negotiate certain commercial trade agreements with foreign countries. You can examine those treaties—the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] can examine those treaties—as carefully as he likes, and if he can find the distinction there between competitive and noncompetitive products as the line of discrimination along which President McKinley negotiated those treaties, I would be obliged to him if he would point it out, because I have not been able to find it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more, if possible.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I will yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HOWLAND. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, as I am very anxious to call specific attention to a few of the provisions of the Kasson treaties. In consideration of substantial equivalents in her markets the convention for Barbados admitted into the United States cane sugar and molasses, fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, and asphalt at a reduction of 12½ per cent. In consideration for substantial equivalents in her markets the convention for Turks and Caicos Islands gave salt the benefit of a 12½ per cent reduction on the Dingley rates. For Jamacia cane sugar and molasses were given a reduction of 12½ per cent from the Dingley rates. Citrus fruits, pineapples, fresh vegetables, including potatoes and onions, and rum were given a reduction of 20 per cent of the Dingley rates. The convention for Bermuda gave potatoes, onions, tomatoes, and other fresh vegetables, bulbs, and natural flowers a reduction of 20 per cent of the Dingley rates. The convention with the Argentine Republic gave a reduction of 20 per cent on hides, wool, and sugar for substantial equivalents in our markets. Many other instances might be cited, but I have called attention to a sufficient number to demonstrate conclusively the correctness of my position.

The Kasson treaties were not ratified by the Senate, and the only reason why I call attention to them is to establish the fact that they did not discriminate between competitive and noncompetitive products. President McKinley indorsed and approved those treaties, and we thus see clearly that he did not recognize the doctrine of noncompeting products as the correct basis on which to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. Chairman, President McKinley was not discouraged by the failure of the Senate to ratify the Kasson treaties. In his second inaugural he called attention to the necessity for larger markets in the following language:

> Our diversified productions, however, are increasing in such unprecedented volume as to admonish us of the necessity of still further enlarging our foreign markets by broader commercial relations. For this purpose reciprocal trade arrangements should in liberal spirit be carefully cultivated and promoted.

In the tragic speech at Buffalo, which I will once more call to the attention of the House—"lest we forget"—he said that reciprocal trade agreements must be enacted; that we must yield something to our competitors, something of our markets, of our tariff rates, in order to get concessions from them, agreements founded upon a valid consideration. And so I say here this afternoon that when the name of McKinley is used as opposing treaties of this character it is erroneously used, and the language at Buffalo, prophetic as it would seem to me, carries an absolute refutation of such statements. In speaking on this subject at Buffalo on the day of his assassination President McKinley said:

> We have a vast and intricate business, built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or of undue selfishness. NO NARROW, SORDID POLICY WILL SUBSERVE IT. The greatest skill and wisdom on the part of the manufacturers and producers will be required to hold and increase it. Our industrial enterprises, which have grown to such great proportions, affect the homes and occupations of the people and the welfare of the country. Our capacity to produce has de-

veloped so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention.

Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. In these times of marvelous business energy and gain we ought to be looking to the future, strengthening the weak places in our industrial and commercial systems, so that we may be ready for any storm or strain.

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible it would not be best for us or those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet and we should sell everything we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

THE PERIOD OF EXCLUSIVENESS IS PAST. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. IF PERCHANCE SOME OF OUR TARIFFS ARE NO LONGER NEEDED FOR REVENUE OR TO ENCOURAGE AND PROTECT OUR INDUSTRIES AT HOME, WHY SHOULD THEY NOT BE EMPLOYED TO EXTEND AND PROMOTE OUR MARKETS ABROAD?

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would call attention to the message to Congress, December 3, 1901, of President Roosevelt upon this subject squarely in line with McKinley, but my time is almost exhausted; therefore in conclusion I say to this committee that President Taft, in negotiating and sending to the Congress the pending treaty, is acting in accordance with the best Republican doctrine [applause]; he is acting in accordance with the doctrines of Grant, of Garfield, of Blaine, of William McKinley, and of Theodore Roosevelt; and if anybody can question the Republicanism of those men, I should like to hear him do it. Certainly it can not be done in this presence. [Applause.]

I give my support to the pending measure, in the full faith that it makes for national progress, and will promote the common welfare of our people. "No narrow, sordid policy will subserve it. The period of exclusiveness is past." [Applause.]

Mr. MCCALL. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe thoroughly in the principle and practice of protection, and I have been asked how I can consistently with that belief support this bill. My answer is that against the people of Canada we need no protection. The principle does not apply. They are a people composite like us, of many different races, but with the resultant dominant type very much like ours. They have similar ideals of public and private life and much the same standards of living. They have the same environment, are planted in a land with the same resources and products, where nature has spread for them the same obstacles, and by conquering them they have developed the same self-reliance and enterprise. [Applause.]

They have the same diversities of religion and blood and traditions which complex and perplex us. For thousands of miles there is no natural or artificial boundary between the two countries, and a wanderer without inquiring would never know with which nation he was sojourning. Their people have overrun the invisible boundary line in swarms and made their homes with us, and our people have returned the flattering compliment and in great multitudes taken up homes with them. No cannon frowns from either side against the other, and by reason of a most auspicious convention the inland seas between us are unvexed by any of the ships of war which nowadays are claimed as the necessary instruments of peace.

It would be difficult to imagine two countries more alike. To be sure, they preserve a monarchy and aristocracy while we maintain "a church without a bishop and a State without a king," but this superficial difference only illustrates the truth of Pope's hackneyed couplet:

> For forms of government let fools contest;
> Whate'er is best administered is best,

for in aspiration and enjoyment of personal and political liberty, in deep-rooted hostility to tyranny and persecution, and in legal guaranties against them, it would be hard to detect any difference in the two nations. And it is the spirit of the people and not administration or laws that keeps alive freedom. The laws may be of ideal excellence for preserving true democracy, but a reckless or torpid population will nullify them.

Their industries are stimulated by the same protective policy we have found so successful. Both nations are developing along exactly the same lines, and if there are differences in standards and modes of life, they indicate only different stages of development. Equal differences exist between different parts of our own country.

Against such a country with such a population I see no reason to invoke the principle of protection.

I think it would be to the advantage of both countries that mutual trade and intercourse should be unfettered, that business and personal relations should be intimate, and that together we should spread over the continent a uniform and identical civilization. Certainly as the larger, richer, more highly developed neighbor, we ought not to find it to our disadvantage. The difference in the cost of production on the two sides of the line is too wavering and inconsiderable to be calculated, and under full reciprocity would quickly disappear. And so I think it is desirable that all tariff walls should be broken down between two countries so akin in everything which goes to make up their industrial life, and then production and trade may develop along whatever lines the unerring laws of mutual advantage shall determine. [Applause.]

Neither nature nor laws nor habits of life have given them any permanent advantage over us in the contest. We start on fair terms, and we ought not to shrink from the test. I should like to see unrestricted reciprocal trade in everything, and I welcome this pact not so much for itself as for the promise it gives of closer union and broader pacts. The important argument to my mind is not so much whether by fine calculations of probable imports or exports you can figure out a profit to us as it is that this is an initial step toward a greater trade movement and intimacy between these two related neighbors which will stimulate and modulate and steady their mutual development. Momentary local losses, which are likely to accompany any change of policy, will soon be swallowed up and forgotten in the general gain. Like the quality of mercy, it will be "twice blessed—it blesseth him that gives and him that takes."

Dr. Johnson said at the sale of Thrale's brewery:

> We are not here to sell a parcel of boilers and vats, but the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice.

And so the value of this pact is not the mere exchange of a few specified articles, but it is the opening of a new era in the relationship of two kindred and sympathetic nations.

The question of annexation has occasionally been brought up for the purpose of embarrassing this bill. Doubtless many persons on both sides of the line regret that when the original United States was formed Canada, whose destiny nature had apparently joined with ours, was not included in the Union. But no sane man believes that there is any purpose here, direct or indirect, ever to annex Canada against her will. It may happen generations from now that the countries will have so grown together that our descendants will mutually agree peacefully to unite their fortunes in one government. But that at present is only the vision of the dreamer and not the plan of any statesman.

And it is safe to say that there will never be any hostile action by this people to annex our friendly neighbors. Any such demonstration is meant as a bugaboo or a sensation, not as a serious purpose.

The far-seeing President who had the courage to negotiate the pact against the remonstrance of many of his own party and against the advice of astute calculators of political results has won for himself lasting fame. Whether it now becomes a law or not, whatever the immediate result on his fortunes, he has linked his name with a great step forward in our international relations. His policy may not win approval now, but it will never be retraced. If he can not complete it he can not be robbed of the honor of beginning. I am reminded of one of the finest passages in one of Schillers best tragedies, Don Carlos, where the Marquis of Posa says to the Queen:

> Er lege
> Die erste hand an diesen rohen stein.
> Ob er vollende oder unterliege
> Ihm einerlei. Er lege hand an. Wenn
> Jahr-hunderte dahin geflohen, wird
> Die vorsicht einen fuerstensohn wie er
> Auf einem thron wie seiner wiederholen,
> Und ihren neuen liebling mit derselben
> Begeisterung entzuenden.

The translation of it into prose takes away all of its beauty and much of its force.

> Let him begin the work on this unshapen stone. Whether he succeed or fail all alike to him—let him begin the work. And when centuries have rolled away Providence shall again raise a prince like him upon a throne like his and inspire her new favorite with the same noble purpose.

And I believe the President when he made this pact acted in that spirit and did not stop to weigh on pigmy scales the immediate party or local or personal advantage. His horizon

was broader. He was but beginning a great work. He acted for what he thought was the ultimate permanent gain of both party and country. He offered to Canada that full reciprocity which between such kindred, intelligent, similar neighbors is bound to come. And whether it succeed or fail now, I believe this policy is certain of ultimate triumph and certain to bring honor to the courageous President by whom it was inaugurated. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this bill may have leave to print for five legislative days on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this bill may have leave to print in the RECORD for five legislative days on the subject of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent reference of the bill (H. R. 4704) making appropriations and providing for continuing contracts for the construction, repair, and preservation of public works on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth be changed from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 19, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Waupaca River, Wis. (H. Doc. No. 20); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Stilaguamish River, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 19); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Great Kills Harbor, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 18); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4704) making appropriations and providing for a continuing contract for the construction, repair, and preservation of public works on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth, and the same was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 5948) to prohibit in the District of Columbia the intermarriage of whites with Negroes or Mongolians; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 5949) to fix the term of enlistment in the Army and to reduce the expense of the military establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5950) to repeal all laws and parts of laws authorizing increase of the pay of commissioned officers and enlisted men of the Army serving beyond the limits of the States comprising the Union and the Territories of the United States contiguous thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 5951) for the erection of a public building at Batavia, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 5952) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned bronze or brass cannon or field pieces and cannon balls to the George W. Spencer Post, No. 489, Grand Army of the Republic, city of Dolton, State of Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 5953) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 5954) to amend section 3716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 5955) providing for the regulation, identification, and registration of automobiles engaged in interstate commerce, and the licensing of the operators thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5956) to fix the sizes of baskets or other open containers for small fruits or berries; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 5957) making drunkenness in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor, and to provide a hospital for inebriates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 5958) authorizing all tribes or bands of Indians of Oklahoma to submit claims to the Court of Claims which have not heretofore been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5959) dividing the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma into three divisions, fixing the time and place for holding court therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 5960) for the erection of a public building at Fairmont, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5961) authorizing national banking associations to make loans upon improved agricultural land; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5962) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Tullahoma, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5963) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lewisburg, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5964) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Lincoln, in the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5965) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Stones River; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 5966) authorizing the President to appoint a commissioner to supervise the erection of monuments and markers and locate the general route of the Oregon trail; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 5967) authorizing an investigation with a view to securing allotments for the Choctaws of Mississippi; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5968) to authorize a survey of Tchula Lake, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 5969) renewing a franchise, as originally granted, to the South Mobile Terminal Co. to construct wharves, docks, and piers at or near Alabama Port; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 5970) relating to the removal of employees of the Government in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 5971) to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in any ship, naval station, or building used, controlled, or owned by the United States Government; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 5972) to establish at Atlanta, Ga., a subtreasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSE: Resolution (H. Res. 104) requesting the Postmaster General to furnish certain information; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 105) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish certain information; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GARRETT: Resolution (H. Res. 106) authorizing and directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make inquiry into the condition of turbulence alleged to prevail in the Republic of Mexico and to report thereon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Resolution (H. Res. 107) directing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to make inquiry into the condition of turbulence prevailing in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5973) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Ackerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5974) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bilsing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5975) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon C. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5976) granting an increase of pension to John Cotner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5977) granting an increase of pension to John Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5978) granting an increase of pension to John Fralick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5979) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Jump; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5980) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Kanzleiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5981) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Kieffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5982) granting an increase of pension to Harry W. Leitz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5983) granting an increase of pension to Adam Lichty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5984) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Mesnard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5985) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5986) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Mount; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5987) granting a pension to Barbara Pifher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5988) granting an increase of pension to George W. Shreckengaust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5989) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5990) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Utz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5991) granting an increase of pension to John Whittaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5992) granting an increase of pension to Rowland J. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5993) granting an increase of pension to David W. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5994) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Zink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 5995) granting a pension to Francisquita Chaves de Peña; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 5996) granting an increase of pension to John Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5997) granting an increase of pension to William M. Deaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 5998) granting a pension to Mary Jane Tillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5999) for the relief of Charles A. Davidson and Charles M. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6000) granting an increase of pension to William O. Sutherland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6001) granting an increase of pension to John Compton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6002) granting an increase of pension to James F. Buckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6003) granting an increase of pension to James M. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6004) granting a pension to Susan Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6005) granting a pension to Marion Southern; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 6006) for the relief of John C. Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6007) for the relief of the Turner Hardware Co.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6008) granting an increase of pension to Christian Koppelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6009) granting an increase of pension to Sanford Glass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6010) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6011) granting an increase of pension to Robert Sutor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 6012) for the relief of Addison Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6013) for the relief of Adolph Hartiens and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6014) for the relief of the heirs of Sarah West, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6015) for the relief of the legal representatives of Wilson Parker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6016) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Zimmermann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6017) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6018) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6019) granting a pension to Joseph W. Wightman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6020) for the relief of Charles Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6021) for the relief of James Wiley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6022) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Thomas G. Warner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6023) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jesse W. Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 6024) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Blanchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6025) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Dunnaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Dewees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) granting an increase of pension to Nixon B. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) granting an increase of pension to Joseph V. Gillespie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6029) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Haverfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6030) granting an increase of pension to John J. Burtsfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6031) granting an increase of pension to James Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6032) granting an increase of pension to George L. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6033) granting an increase of pension to William H. Vasbinder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6034) granting an increase of pension to Ludwell Tinsman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6035) granting an increase of pension to John D. Tidrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6036) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pitner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6037) granting an increase of pension to James Creighton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6038) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Mushrush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6039) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Seals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6040) granting an increase of pension to Frank Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6041) granting a pension to Mary I. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6042) granting a pension to James McNulty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6043) granting a pension to Thomas C. Acton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6044) granting a pension to William McGrew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6045) granting a pension to John M. Poplin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6046) granting a pension to Benjamin Gallaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6047) granting a pension to Annie M. Gladfelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6048) granting a pension to Serena Fink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6049) granting a pension to Anna C. Foulke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6050) granting a pension to Francis W. Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 6051) granting a pension to Mary A. Malosh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6052) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6053) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Varner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6054) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Kreiser and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 6055) granting an increase of pension to Paul G. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6056) for the relief of former occupants of the present military reservation at Point San Jose, in the city of San Francisco, and to repeal an act entitled "An act to refer the claim of Jessie Benton Fremont to certain lands and improvements thereon in San Francisco, Cal., to the Court of Claims," approved February 10, 1893; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 6057) granting an increase of pension to Randall Kinnie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6058) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 6059) granting an increase of pension to John F. Sias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6060) granting an increase of pension to George W. Keighler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6061) granting an increase of pension to William P. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6062) granting an increase of pension to John Langan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 6063) granting an increase of pension to William Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6064) granting a pension to William F. Douds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 6065) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Claypool; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 6066) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon C. Foy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 6067) for the relief of Edward Byrne; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6068) granting a pension to Thomas Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6069) granting an increase of pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6070) granting an increase of pension to William A. Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6071) granting a pension to Nannie Eckert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 6072) granting an increase of pension to Jacob S. Plunk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 6073) granting a pension to Cecil R. Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6074) granting a pension to Chappel Q. Fossett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6075) for the relief of Alfred J. Drake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6076) for the relief of Samuel E. Howell and James H. Howell in their own right and as sole heirs of Mary Ann Thomas, deceased, and William T. Howell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6077) granting an increase of pension to Catherine T. M. Bachman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 6078) granting a pension to Mary B. Oder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) granting an increase of pension to George F. Wonder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, against tariff on all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of T. R. Morris and 91 other citizens of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, favoring establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of Congress Grange, No. 1726, Wayne County, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. S. Creamer, treasurer of the State of Ohio, recommending the passage of an act making it compulsory for the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit the surplus Government funds in national banks that offer the highest rate of interest; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. AYRES: Papers of Walter H. Storm, of New York, and H. U. Singhi, favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petitions of Brandywine Grange, No. 60, West Chester; East Lynn Grange, No. 1263, Unionville; and Goshen Grange, No. 121, West Chester, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Local No. 320, International Association of Machinists, New York City, favoring the enactment of the reading or illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Paper Makers' Local No. 57, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against the Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, indorsed by their divisions in Kansas City, Mo., against new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of citizens of Buffalo, favoring the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Papermakers, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULLOP: Resolution to investigate the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, indorsed by same societies of Kansas City, Mo., opposing the establishment of any closer relations with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of Honeoye Falls Grange, Honeoye Falls, Monroe County; Webster Grange, Monroe County; Brockport Grange, Brockport; Riga Grange, Churchville, Monroe County; Mendon Grange, Mendon, Monroe County; Penfield Grange, Penfield, Monroe County; and Gates Grange, Gates, Monroe County, all in the State of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of Paper Makers Local No. 51, Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petitions of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and Paper Mill Workers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Petition of citizens of State of Virginia, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of business men, State of Idaho, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions from Gorham Mercantile Co. and others, Payette; Lincoln Hardware & Implement Co. (Ltd.), and others, Kendrick; Jones & Dillingham Co. and others, Lewiston; Nuineman Hardware Co. and others, Lewiston; O. E. Bell and others, Moscow; Empire Hardware Co. and others, Moscow; Olson Johnson & Co. and others, Troy; J. C. Hamil and others, Juliaetta; F. M. Remington and others, Culdesac; F. H. Bowen and others, Caldwell; W. C. Dyer, manager, Jones Furniture Co. and others, Caldwell; W. A. Fulkerson Lumber Co. and others, Weiser; Taylor Hardware Co. and others, Weiser; Russell Department Store and others, Payette; and H. P. Kizer and others, Weiser, all in the State of Idaho, bearing upon the question of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of International Paper Co., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, against arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring placing on the free list bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of citizens in the city of South Haven, county of Van Buren and State of Michigan, requesting appropriation by Congress for the purchase of a site for a post office and the erection thereon of a proper building; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of State of North Dakota, favoring passage of H. R. 26791, known as the Hanna bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of farmers of the State of North Dakota, protesting against Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John J. Keen, Wahpeton, N. Dak., protesting against the parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARTMAN: Resolution of citizens of New York, protesting against any alliance with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Bedford, State of Pennsylvania, against parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Resolutions of Wethersfield Business Men's and Civic Association, of Wethersfield, Conn., opposing the passage of the reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULD: Resolution of Chelsea (Me.) Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, in relation to a measure pertaining to reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Resolution of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Seward Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers of Albany, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Cordage Co., favoring the placing on the free list of jute cotton bagging and russia rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Anson F. Love and 14 other residents of Hubbard Lake, Mich., favoring parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of New York Cordage Co., favoring the placing on the free list of jute cotton bagging and russia rope, tarred and untarred, for marine use, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Niagara Falls Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Albany, N. Y., against reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Local No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., against reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Douds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: Telegraphic petitions by J. A. Delfelder, president Wyoming Wool Growers; Sweetwater County Wool Growers' Association; Eastern Wyoming Wool Growers' Association; Lewis Barker, commissioner central district; J. J. Bentley, commissioner northern district; J. S. Atherly, secretary board of sheep commissioners, State of Wyoming; and F. S. King, commissioner southern district, protesting against a reduction of the wool schedule or any action relative thereto until after the Tariff Board shall make their report; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of employees of Keystone Paper Mill & Paper Manufacturing Co., Upper Darby, Pa., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Charles E. Vrooman & Co., of Carthage, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Oswego, N. Y., in favor of Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Resolution of Lime Rock Grange, No. 22, Patrons of Husbandry, of Rhode Island, against Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Central Labor Union, of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring the construction of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petitions of farmers of Clarkfield; voters of the county of Yellow Medicine; citizens of Balaton; Tracy Farmers' Elevator Co.; legal voters of Lone Tree, county of Chippewa; and residents of Yellow Medicine County, all of the State of Minnesota, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition against removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring placing cotton ties and bagging on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Edward Olmsted, captain, in favor of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Niagara Falls Local, No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *April 19, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Our Father in heaven, help us to appreciate Thy goodness and Thy wonderful works unto the children of men, that we may think nobly, feel deeply, and act worthily in the vocation whereunto Thou has called us, and thus hallow Thy name. In the spirit of the Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTING ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT OF APPROPRIATION ACTS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported House joint resolution 1, to correct errors of certain appropriation acts, approved March 4, 1911, which was read a first and second time and, together with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 5), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not make the point of order, but I desire to say that this is not in order as a privileged matter on this holy day—Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of the matters I wish to report are not privileged, but I desire to call them to the attention of the House.

Mr. MANN. I understood that the gentleman from Alabama would like to make a motion to suspend with proceeding under that calendar.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order, the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. There is no business for what is called Calendar Wednesday, anyway.

EXPENSES OF FIRST SESSION SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by the direction of the Committee on Appropriations, also reported House joint resolution 2, making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, which

was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 6), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

MILEAGE.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, also reported House joint resolution 3, making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 7), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

AMERICAN RED CROSS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, also reported House joint resolution 38, to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C., which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 8), referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that as the opportunity presents I shall endeavor to call these measures up for consideration.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to-day is Calendar Wednesday, but I understand that there is no business on the calendar. Calendar Wednesday can be dispensed with under the rules by a two-thirds vote of the House. I therefore move to dispense for to-day with the business that comes under the rule providing for Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. It has been decided by my predecessor that under the conditions as they prevail here to-day there is no necessity for the motion where there is no business on the calendar.

Mr. MANN. Of course it would require the calling of the calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would necessitate the calling of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, to dispense with proceedings under the rule for Calendar Wednesday.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the motion was agreed to.

PLACING CERTAIN ARTICLES ON THE FREE LIST.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meat, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. 4), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I offer the following resolution, to fill a minority place on a committee.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 111.

Resolved, That JAMES WICKERSHAM be, and he is hereby, elected as a Delegate member of the Committee on the Public Lands.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING VIEWS OF MINORITY.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the report just made from the Committee on Ways and Means I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have leave to file their views.

The SPEAKER. Within how long a time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. DALZELL. Say, until the disposition of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We granted the gentleman the other day that time in reference to the bill then pending before the House because we immediately reported it. It has been almost a week since the Committee on Ways and Means agreed to this bill, and I would ask the gentleman whether, if he should have permission to make a report by Monday, would that not be time enough?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; Monday will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] have until Monday to file the views of the minority in reference to the bill H. R. 4413, which has been reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have until Monday to file the views of the minority (H. Rept. 4, pt. 2) on the bill H. R. 4413. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. GUDGER].

[Mr. GUDGER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire what the balance of time is; how much has been consumed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], and myself?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used, including the time yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts, 8 hours and 40 minutes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has used 6 hours and 56 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to consume enough time to equalize it.

The CHAIRMAN. The genleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield so much time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, not, in my judgment, since the War with Spain and all that followed it, of benefit and of burden, has there been considered by the House of Representatives so important a bill as the one now pending. Therefore, it is entitled, without passion and without prejudice, to the careful, candid consideration of this great body, 391 in number, representing 92,000,000 of people, for on its consideration and enactment or defeat, in my judgment, rests the well-being and the prosperity of all of the people of the United States.

I represent a district agricultural in part—I think perhaps one of the best in the United States—and in part a manufacturing district. When I state that in my district there are many thousands of men in organized union labor, in mine and in factory, you will at once understand that I represent people who produce not only in the factory, but in the mine and on the farm. The output of coal from two townships in my own county is over 3,000,000 tons annually, and the output and development are rapidly increasing.

But, aside from the interests of my own district, I want to stand here and say that I am equally anxious to promote the welfare of every American citizen, whether in Greater New York, the mightiest of all our cities, in Chicago, the second city in the United States, or in Philadelphia, the third. I want to do what is best for all the people, North and South, East and West, as we stretch from 49° on the north down to the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. When I vote on this bill I vote for legislation that goes to every fireside, and I would not receive my own approval or retain my own self-respect if I stood attempting to array section against section, industry against industry, farmer against factory man, capitalist, or railroad man.

So I approach the discussion of this important bill from the standpoint of the best interests of all. That much by way of introduction.

It is proposed, on slight consideration, to vitalize into law an agreement that will throw, without let or hindrance, into the United States the market furnished by 92,000,000 of people the agricultural products of 8,000,000 people in Canada. Now, if this is to our advantage, in Heaven's name let us do it. If it be to our disadvantage, as we shall answer to our own self-respect and judgment, and later on to our constituents, let us not do it. And in cold blood I am going to inquire, as briefly as possible, whether it ought to be done or not.

REVENUE BILLS SHOULD NOT ORIGINATE WITH THE EXECUTIVE.

Mind you, so far as the country is concerned, so far as the Senate is concerned, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, this bill, except by virtue of two amendments added to it, was not prepared in accordance with the Constitution. Our fathers wisely provided that revenue measures should have their origin in the House and that the Senate might amend.

They wisely provided that while the President may recommend legislation he only becomes a coordinate branch of the legislative body when the House and Senate have agreed on bills, which, if they are revenue bills, must originate in the House. Then he only has power to approve on the one hand or disapprove on the other, which disapproval is efficient, unless two-thirds of the House and Senate pass the bill notwithstanding that disapproval.

Here is a measure that was made in secret. Is there anybody within the sound of my voice on either side of this House, whether he is for or against this bill, far-reaching as it is, affecting every hearthstone, if vitalized, who will say that he knew anything about this agreement until we received the President's message, with the accompanying bill, which was formally introduced in the House at the last session by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL]? I pause for an answer. No man arises in his place in this great body and says he was consulted.

When we come to deal with foreign countries, the Constitution provides that a treaty made by the Executive, and vitalized by the approval of the Senate by a two-thirds majority, shall be the supreme law. What did our fathers mean when they provided in this manner for the making of treaties which should be the supreme law of the land? They knew that the world was large, with conflicting interests, diverse civilizations, governments differing in their organization. So the great power of negotiating treaties was placed in the hands of the President, but to become effective they must be vitalized by the concurrence of the Senate, not by a majority, not in a minute, not under the previous question, but after serious consideration in executive session and by a two-thirds vote. Looking in your eyes, Mr. Chairman, I say there have been treaties made even under the safeguards of the Constitution, after full consideration, that have not been wise.

Take the War with Spain. Ex-Speaker Reed once said, "When you go to war no man knows the end thereof." We went into that war because gentlemen on the other side, being in the minority, moved by a spirit of altruism, crossed on a little bit of politics, grew very patriotic, and we on this side also grew very patriotic. War was declared. The end thereof was the Philippines, responsibility for Cuba and for Porto Rico. To indicate that mistakes perchance may sometimes be made in the making of treaties, even with the two-thirds majority required in the Senate for ratification, we have the Philippines, in my judgment, for all time. We say on the stump, "Oh, we are going to civilize them and make them competent for self-government, and then we are going to tell them, 'Go forth and govern yourselves.'"

The treaty was concluded. Now, I am not speaking of the peerless leader, Mr. Bryan, to criticize; but it was necessary for him with his great personality to come to Washington and exercise his great influence to bring about the ratification of that treaty. He has been down here again performing the same function. [Applause on the Republican side.]

He put his strong hand and eloquent tongue upon his party friends in the Senate and the necessary majority was furnished to ratify that treaty. When a thing is accomplished I never grumble. I would not refer to it now did I not aim merely to illustrate how important it is in a government by the people under the Constitution to observe the law not only in the letter but in the spirit.

You may say that a government of the people is so wise and good and patriotic that no advantage can be taken of it. Nevertheless, when you deal with the nations of the world, when you deal, through the mother country, with our friends across the Canadian border, you want to be mindful of a favorite expression of an old constituent of mine who dropped now and then into a little bit of poetry. He was my client. He said: "This is an exceedingly important matter." I replied, "The plaintiff is not a bad man." "Oh," said he, "Mr. CANNON, you don't know him; he may not be bad, but when it comes to material matters he steeps his tongue in honey and clothes his feet in the cunning of a fox." [Laughter.] That is true not only of individuals and parties, but it is especially true of great countries.

NO AUTHORITY TO MAKE TRADE AGREEMENTS.

This bill is to carry out what is called a reciprocal trade agreement. Has the President any authority in law by which he can make such agreements? I will let Mr. PAYNE, former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, answer that question. When Mr. PAYNE presented to the House the bill which bears his name and made his speech explaining and defending it, he was asked by Mr. Cox of Indiana:

Is there anything in this bill which would enable the President of the United States to negotiate any trade agreement with Germany?

Mr. PAYNE. There is not.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is there any other law in effect that would still authorize him to do that?

Mr. PAYNE. No law, except the general provisions of the Constitution allowing him to negotiate treaties and submit them to the Senate.

Now, what are the objections to this bill; first, from the standpoint of the farmer, who comprises one-third of our population; and, second, from the standpoint of the other two-thirds? What is for the best interest of all the people? In considering this matter I crave the attention of the House, and I will try not to be tedious.

Our 92,000,000 people have just scratched the resources of the United States. The countries of Europe, including Great Britain, have a population of from 300,000,000 to 350,000,000 people. With a country far better than Europe in quality of soil, in mineral wealth, and in resources of every kind, we can, when fully developed, easily support with bread and meat and clothing and everything, save the products of the Tropics, 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 people.

How rapidly we have grown and developed. I am not an old man, but I recollect very well when there were but 17,000,000 people in the United States. I have observed a great many things since that time. I recollect very well when there were not 100 miles of railway in all the country west of the Allegheny Mountains. I recollect very well when the only market was found in New Orleans for all the great Mississippi Valley, and I might say almost for the whole Middle West was found in New Orleans. The flatboats floated down the Mississippi carrying our products, and the little steamer came back laden with the products received in exchange.

I know what it is to have seen Ohio, Indiana, Missouri to a great extent, and Michigan and Iowa and all that country of the great West brought partially under subjection. On the Wabash, where you could cut the malaria with a knife [laughter], where the timber was thick and heavy, there was no place to plant corn or sow wheat. They did not believe that men could live on the rich prairies of the West. It was supposed that they never would be settled. It was worth a man's life to cut down the forest and bring 80 acres under subjection in that timbered section, and then when he built a new house, costing from $700 to $800 in labor, he died. Of course he did, he was worn out.

There was the same struggle in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, and in New York; and let me say to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] that it was a long time after the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers before they extended settlement and development very greatly in New England. I am old enough to recollect the time when those splendid lands in Illinois and Iowa, which could be obtained on military land warrants at 70 cents an acre, were supposed to be good for nothing except grazing. No one ever dreamed that the time would come when the lands in the Genesee Valley in New York would depreciate in value by one-half or more. At that time the tide of immigration from the East to the West had not set in to any great extent. The railroads came, and when I speak of the railroads—and I do it with pride—I think of that great Democratic statesman, Stephen A. Douglas. The quickening hand of development never struck the State of Illinois until 1850, when, under the leadership of Mr. Douglas, then a Senator of national reputation, there was enacted a law granting land to the State of Illinois, the alternate sections being reserved. Under and by virtue of that act the Illinois Central Railroad was constructed from Chicago to Cairo and from Centralia to Dunleith. The alternate sections were snapped up in the twinkling of an eye at $2.50 an acre. Immigration set in. There was a chance to get to market. You all know the history of development since that time.

The war came—that great struggle that we all thank God resulted as it did. Then, from political and military necessity during the war it became necessary to begin the construction of a railroad to the Pacific coast. Deserts and mountains and Indians had to be overcome. The line ran through an uninhabited country, but that railroad was built in the fullness of time. Then came the Northern Pacific, and then the Southern Pacific, the Santa Fe, and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul. Then came James J. Hill, that wizard among business men, a great man who leads in doing great things, and with him came the building of the Great Northern from Duluth, reaching across the continent to Seattle and the Pacific. As a result the western country was settled pretty rapidly.

CAUSE OF ABANDONED FARMS IN THE EAST.

But what was happening in the meantime down in New York and New England? While the rich prairie lands in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois were being developed—virgin soil, such as it seems to me God never made anywhere else on earth—what was happening in the East?

Many of the bright, enterprising boys took Horace Greeley's advice and went west. They went in great droves and helped to develop that country. Railroads were built and transportation charges were brought down until you could place a barrel of flour made from wheat grown in Minnesota or Illinois or Missouri, manufactured in Minneapolis or St. Louis, into the market of a little hamlet anywhere in New England for less money than you could haul it in a wagon 3 miles. [Applause.] The result was that the lands in the Genesee Valley in northern New York and in New England could not compete with the production of those lands in the West, where you had only to tickle the earth to have it fructify and bring forth in marvelous abundance fruits and cereals.

The farmers in many sections of the East were placed at such disadvantage that many farms were abandoned in Connecticut, in Massachusetts, in all New England, in New York, and, to some extent, in Pennsylvania. There were more than 7,000,000 acres in abandoned farms in New England and New York. There was also a reduction of $200,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same States in those 20 years. In the period from 1880 to the year 1900, even in magnificent Ohio, which has not yet lost the capacity to breed and produce Presidents, the farmers suffered a decrease of $100,000,000 in the value of their farm lands in the presence of this competition from the West.

In developing the West we have sometimes suffered even from the excess of rich soil. I recall that upon the prairie in Illinois, within 50 miles of where I now live, with good railroad connections, with coal without limit deposited by the Almighty in the immediate neighborhood, I have seen corn, as good and sound as was ever grown, burned for fuel to keep the frost out. I merely speak of that to illustrate that our production was so great that the East, notwithstanding her decadence in agriculture, could not take our surplus. We had a long, weary road to travel, but men with brave hearts said "We want better markets; we will build more railroads"; and they got the railroads built.

It is needless to recount the growth and development of the middle and western sections of the country since 1860, when Abraham Lincoln was nominated as a candidate for the Presidency. Nor is it necessary to refer to the splendid cities that have sprung up—Chicago, the great market place for all the Middle West, which has grown from less than 100,000 people in 1860 to two and one-half millions of people, and countless other prosperous communities. It is, however, significant to note in connection with the consideration of this bill the remarkable, if not ominous, trend from the farm to the city, a movement which, in my opinion, will be stimulated by the enactment of this bill. To-day there is a far less percentage of people engaged in agriculture in the United States than there was in 1860. At that time more than one-half of our people were engaged in agricultural pursuits, while to-day the percentage is not over one-third. It is true that, aided by invention, with improved farm machinery, with the steam plow, the reaper, and the binder, one man on the farm now can do more than two or three men on the farm in the old days. But let us be honest; the same is true in all the walks of life. One man in a machine shop now can accomplish more than four men could have accomplished in 1860, until to-day the 92,000,000 people in the United States are producing more agricultural and more manufactured products—I measure my words in making the statement—than all Europe. That is a pretty strong statement, but it is true.

FREE LABOR V. SLAVE LABOR.

We fought out the economic question from 1861 to 1865. The Government's need for money, the necessity in the Northland to produce munitions of war, gave birth to the protective policy, and under it we prospered; while down South, with as good brain and brawn and as splendid manhood and womanhood as was to be found in the North they found difficulty in procuring proper arms and munitions and sufficient subsistence.

In that contest the great question touching labor was settled, and settled forever, in our country. The result was good for the North; it was good for the South; but it never would have been settled had it not been that roaming around in the body and brain of the average man, the mechanic and farmer, was a feeling that when a slave was doing in the South the work that elsewhere in the country was being done by an American sovereign, responsible for the control of the country, the dignity of labor was degraded.

With the close of that great struggle came an increased necessity for revenues to pay the Nation's debts, to pay pensions, to assist in the building of railways, to improve the great rivers and harbors, and the revenues were derived principally under the policy of protection. We said that the foreigner paid most of the tax; you said it was paid by the individual who consumed. Well, I can not stop your saying that, and you can not stop my saying the other; but, lo and behold, what have we achieved? Under this policy of protection we have prospered, until we now have over one-fourth of all the wealth of all the world, and it is better distributed amongst our 92,000,000 of people than is the wealth of any other nation in the world. Now, it may be that you Democrats could have done a great deal better, and if I were to make that charge you would confess it [laughter]; but there is no way of turning the hands back on the dial, and I suppose you will just have to accept the results, because if you had continued that policy of servile labor for which you fought, the South, instead of having a renaissance, instead of having improvement of land and all values, instead of having increased production by three, would now, in my judgment, be practically deserted.

But what has that got to do with Canada? I will ask to have the map brought in. I always believe in kindergarten instruction. [Laughter and applause.] I learned more readily in that way than in any other.

The time came when we found it was necessary to improve our agriculture; and I thank God for the instruction that is being given in our colleges, in our agricultural papers, and by our experts. I thank God that all over the country we are not wasting the natural resources of the soil as we did when corn was burned for fuel. We are improving all along the line now, and in no section is the improvement more noticeable than in the South.

I was born in North Carolina, and when 4 years old, in the arms of my mother, was moved over the mountains. The family went to the Wabash, and my good old mother never ceased mourning for the magnificent climate of North Carolina. My father, when a young man, helped to found a college down near Greensboro, N. C. A few years ago I accepted an invitation to attend its commencement. I arrived the day before the commencement, and I went around with Prof. Hobbs through the section of country in the vicinity of Greensboro.

PROSPERITY RETURNS TO THE SOUTH.

I visited the old farm where I was born, and found there every evidence of prosperity and thrift. As I remembered the place, it was crossed by deep gullies and was not good for very much. I asked the farmer how he got the land into such a prosperous state. He replied that he began by throwing a dam across each gully, so that the dirt washed in and leveled up the land. Then he had found the use of clover and cowpeas and improved the land, and that while he had paid only $10 an acre for it a few years before, he had within a few days refused $25 per acre. I asked if any other agency were at work in bringing about this increase than his own labor and intelligence. "Oh, yes," said he, "we have railroads and factories now. Over here at Greensboro they have large factories, and I find there a market for my chickens and eggs and all the small fruit I have to sell."

I was amazed at the evidences of progress on every side, and if I had been taken into Greensboro blindfolded I would have remarked, "How marvelously has the city of Peoria, or the city of Quincy, improved."

So that renaissance in agriculture is not only going on in New York and in New England, but is going on in the South. The quickening life of other industries furnishes a market.

I went out to the old Quaker graveyard and even there I could trace the progress of that country. The first little monuments were 2 or 3 feet high, but gradually higher ones were added, until the monuments of the last 8 or 10 years compare favorably with those erected in any prosperous community. The graveyard told the story.

I am interested in seeing North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, all the Southern States, diversify their industries and restore their lands.

With our enterprising people, the most enterprising in the history of the human race, the Mississippi Valley bottom lands will discount a dozen Niles in Egypt in production. I am anxious to see them reclaimed, and by the aid and cooperation of our 92,000,000 of people, as the Federal Government performs its function, the rivers tributary to the Mississippi will be made good outlets for the tile, and when that land is drained it is the best land on earth.

I want to ask—and I would like to have an answer from any gentleman on the other side from the Southland—Is it not true that in the last 10 years, certainly in the last 20 years, the value of your lands, improved and unimproved, has doubled and been multiplied by three? "Oh, well," you say, "we raise cotton down there, and we have a monopoly of that production."

But do you know that last year, with a bumper crop of corn, aggregating three thousand million bushels in the United States, you raised in the Southland, in addition to your valuable cotton crop, one-third of that great corn crop—a thousand millions of bushels?

You may say, "The wheat farmers over in Canada with their cheap lands do not bother us." I will show you in a moment. Counting Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, the Southland produced almost one-third of the magnificent wheat crop of 1910. I will insert the actual figures later. If you did not raise a bushel of corn or a bushel of wheat or a bushel of oats or a bushel of barley or a bushel of potatoes, Irish or sweet, you would be interested. If you did not raise anything but cotton you would be interested, just as much as we of the Northland who do not raise cotton and who are liberal customers of yours, as you would be liberal customers of ours under the same circumstances. The South is growing more and more able to live within itself, and as she grows more and more able to do that her income will be greater and greater, and your fellow citizens all over the country will get their share as you get yours of the general prosperity.

Just here I want to call the attention of the honorable Speaker of the House to the interest the farmers of Missouri have in this bill. Missouri is a banner agricultural State. Her production of hay, oats, corn, barley, and fruits is enormous. In 10 years the value of Missouri farm lands has been more than doubled, and in 1910 that State produced more than 25,000,000 bushels of wheat.

I desire to inquire of my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], who made a speech yesterday, what he will say to the people of Oklahoma, in whose growth and progress we all take pride, and which also produced in 1910 more than 25,000,000 bushels of wheat, when they complain that you have brought in competition with their products the almost illimitable production of Canada?

OUR OWN CITIZENS MUST DEFEND THE FLAG.

Recollect, if there is war, every citizen of the United States is called upon to defend the Republic. If there are school houses to build, if there are colleges to found, if there are railroads to maintain, if there are factories to construct, if labor is to be furnished, we can rely only on our own people. In the event of trouble, how much in taxes would Canada contribute for the preservation of the Republic? In the event of war, how many soldiers from Canada would fight the battles of the great Republic? How many of Canada's people would contribute to education in the United States? The college professors flourish and expound their delightful theories: "All mankind are brothers; all men are equal." Very good generalities, but all men are not equal from the intellectual standpoint. Some men are born simple-minded, some go to the insane asylum, some are weak, some are strong, some are wise, and some are wiser.

Mr. MURDOCK. And otherwise. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and otherwise. I am reminded that I have spoken an hour. I must hurry along, because there are several other matters I want to talk about.

Gentlemen, there come times in the history of a generation when those who have had the kindergarten instruction are in the minority. To the young who come in you may theorize and preach, but they know better, and 5 per cent of them—a percentage that holding the balance of power work a political revolution, five off one side and five on the other—have to learn through their stomachs what they do not learn through their heads. [Laughter.] This is true sometimes, not only of men in the shops, on the farm, and on the railways, but of men in office, and I have known it to be true of Members of Congress. [Laughter.] It is not a theory, whether it is your doxy or my doxy, that I care about, but facts. What will this bill do to us or for us?

It is 3,700 miles across Canada from ocean to ocean. Eight millions of people occupy that land, while we have 92,000,000. The countries were settled about the same time. The people of Canada are good people. We have had lots of them come to this country, and they have made good citizens. They came because it was for their interest to come. Now they have waked up. Great Britain is a wise country, a far-reaching country. The sun never sets on her possessions. Far away India, the Straits Settlements, Africa, Asia, Europe, North America—all in greater or less degree are under the magic wand of that great people. They are our brothers, our uncles, our fathers, and grandfathers, and if anybody thinks the people of Canada are fools they are mistaken. What have they in railway development?

Here (indicating on a map) is the Hudson Bay; here is the 49th parallel of latitude, the boundary between Canada and the United States. Canada has to-day, with 8,000,000 people, 24,000 miles of railway. We have 92,000,000 people, with a territory comparatively well settled, and we have 240,000 miles of railway. It is said our lands have been taken up, but there are large areas of public land in western Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, Washington, and all over that great western country which, with improved agriculture and with better farming, all things considered, would make the best lands in the world.

It is said there is no danger from a free market with Canada so far as our wheat is concerned. Let us see about that. The President in his message says practically that this bill will eventually reduce the cost of living and will not reduce the price of the farmer's products in the United States. Our President is a great man and I have great respect for him. I voted for him, and I apprehend that I will vote for him again. I am not here to abuse him, but I would like to see him demonstrate the proposition that it will not impair the farmer's prices and yet will still reduce the cost of living. [Laughter and applause.]

CANADIAN RAILWAY DEVELOPMENT BY SUBSIDIES.

The Canadian Pacific Railroad stretches across the country to Vancouver, with substantially 10,000 miles in Canada and 4,000 miles in the United States. The 24,000 miles of railway built in Canada have received over $300,000,000 in aid from that Government and 55,000,000 acres of the best cereal producing land, excluding corn, on earth. The stock of the Canadian Pacific, as I recall, amounts to $1,300,000,000. My friend from New York says that is too high, that that is the amount of the stock of all the Canadian railroads. However, its stock yesterday, I believe—a 10 per cent stock, was quoted at 224 or 225. The stock of the Union Pacific Railroad, one of the best equipped railroads on earth, is a 10 per cent stock and has never defaulted, but it is quoted at about 170.

The Canadian Pacific has also great steamship lines aided by the Canadian Government to the extent of a million and a half dollars bounty annually, and those steamship lines reach Japan, Hongkong, Australia, and San Francisco, and run down the South American coast and across the ocean to Liverpool.

Then comes the Grand Trunk, running from Quebec and Montreal to Winnipeg, branching out with three or four lines and running up here [indicating on map] from Manitoba, through the two great Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I understand it is also extending its line by Government aid to the Pacific coast, and that the extensions are soon to be completed. Already there is another great transcontinental system, the Canada Northern, being constructed by Government aid. It is connecting up the smaller roads that have been constructed, touches Winnipeg, and will have a terminus on the Pacific coast at a point not yet determined upon, but in the vicinity of Prince Rupert. Already it has, if I remember aright, over 2,500 miles constructed, and I read in the New York Sun that it has contracted for the construction, I believe, of four or five hundred miles this year. So that all things considered, the railroad development in Canada is simply wonderful. What good are the railroads going to do? Why do they build them? To aid in the settlement and development of a vast territory capable of producing vast quantities of grain.

I speak of the President respectfully, because I entertain the highest respect for him, but if he makes a mistake touching a policy or recommendation it does not absolve me. I have a warrant from the people—not as many as he has a warrant from, but from the people that I represent in my vote here, and when I vote my vote affects also the people of New Jersey and Florida and all the country, and I must follow my own judgment. I have done so in the past, and, God helping me, I will in the future after investigation follow my judgment, whatever Presidents may recommend. [Applause.] His duty is to veto or approve my action when it reaches him, not to dictate it. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am a Member of this body, and proud of it. I believe in it. It has its duty under the Constitution, and God helping me, whoever is President, and however the Senate is composed, while I hold official position I will walk in the shadow of my own judgment as God gives me to see the light, although I tread the path alone. [Applause.]

The President in his message congratulates the country on the making of the so-called reciprocity agreement, and says in effect that we have been aided greatly in developing the United States by immigration from Canada. He says further—I do not quote him literally—that it is well for our patriotic, wise, and experienced farmers to go over into the promised land and help in the development of Canada. Now, let us see about that. In the last two years, if I recollect right, about 300,000 American farmers went over into Canada. But it is said, "That is a new country; don't you know, Mr. CANNON, that

the people in the United States are to be greatly benefited by getting free wheat from that country," and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] says that the improved farms in Canada are worth as much as they are in New York, if I remember correctly.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman did not understand.

Mr. CANNON. Then, I will stand corrected.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman misunderstands a great many things.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, one thing at a time. I am not clothed with all wisdom; I do not have all kinds of statistical knowledge crowded into my head at all kinds of angles, and the power to defend the industries of Connecticut at one session of Congress and attack the industries of the balance of the country at another. [Cheers and applause.]

WHEAT LANDS IN CANADIAN NORTHWEST.

Now, how much wheat did Canada produce in the year 1909? In round numbers, if I recollect right, 166,000,000 bushels. Where was it grown? All except about 19,000,000 bushels grown in eastern Canada was produced in Manitoba, in far-away Saskatchewan, in far-away Alberta, with a very little bit in British Columbia. That shows what that new country can do. How much of the land there is under cultivation? Under cultivation in these three Provinces last year there were less than 12,000,000 acres. What says the deputy minister of agriculture of the Province of Alberta? George Harcourt, deputy minister of agriculture for the Province of Alberta, in 1909, made this report:

Of the country which is known the area capable of producing grain is 220,000,000 acres. The total area in crops last year was 11,257,879 acres, producing a total crop of 240,000,000 bushels. The unoccupied land in the future will produce at least 5,000,000,000 bushels. This is not the end. There is a great northern country, the McKenzie Basin, which is capable of producing grain. (Canadian Yearbook.)

I cite the following as to wheat production in the United States and Canada, and the figures are taken from official Government reports:

Wheat statistics.

		Bushels.
Wheat produced in United States, 1910		691, 767, 000
Wheat exported ——bushels	24, 257, 392	
Flour exported 8,370,251 barrels=bushels	35, 666, 129	59, 923, 521
Wheat consumed in United States		631, 843, 479
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909		166, 744, 000
Wheat exported ——bushels	49, 000, 000	
Flour exported 1,000,000 barrels=bushels	4, 500, 000	53, 500, 000
Wheat consumed in Canada		113, 244, 000
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909		166, 744, 000
Wheat produced in Manitoba ——bushels	52, 706, 000	
Wheat produced in Saskatchewan ——do	85, 197, 000	
Wheat produced in Alberta ——do	9, 579, 000	
		147, 482, 000
Wheat produced in remainder of Canada		19, 262, 000

The three Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced this yield of wheat with less than 12,000,000 acres under cultivation. They have an available area suited to the cultivation of wheat of 220,000,000 acres.

	Bushels.
Average yield of wheat per acre, Canada, 1909	21½
Average yield of wheat per acre, United States, 1909	15½

Wheat statistics, 1910.

[Crop Reporter, Department of Agriculture, 1910.]

	Bushels.
Minnesota	94, 080, 000
North Dakota	36, 105, 000
South Dakota	46, 720, 000
Washington	25, 603, 000
Oregon	16, 413, 000
Idaho	12, 603, 000
Montana	10, 470, 000
Total	241, 994, 000

Wheat produced in Southern States (including Kansas and Oklahoma).

	Bushels.
Maryland	13, 816, 000
Virginia	10, 176, 000
West Virginia	5, 125, 000
North Carolina	7, 433, 000
South Carolina	4, 983, 000
Georgia	2, 730, 000
Missouri	25, 130, 000
Kentucky	9, 600, 000
Kansas	62, 068, 000
Tennessee	10, 647, 000
Alabama	1, 560, 000
Mississippi	78, 000
Texas	18, 780, 000
Oklahoma	25, 363, 000
Arkansas	2, 710, 000
New Mexico	860, 000
Arizona	379, 000
Total	201, 438, 000

AMERICAN FARMERS GO TO CANADA.

But some one says, "Mr. CANNON, our improved lands are substantially the same price as Canadian improved land." Granted. The price of improved lands in the farming districts of New York is substantially the same, as I understand, as those in Ontario, and perhaps the price of land in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire is substantially the same as the price of land in Quebec and perhaps in Nova Scotia. I am only approximating; but let us see. When you lose an industrious farmer who understands the science of farming, with his wife and his children, you lose more than money. [Applause on the Republican side.] A few days ago Mr. Earling, manager of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad and brother of its president, did me the honor to call on me to pay his respects. I was glad to see him. I asked, "Are you carrying lots of home seekers on that great road of yours?" He replied, "A good many." I inquired, "Where are they going—to the Dakotas and on to Montana and Washington?" "No," he replied, "we are carrying more than we ever carried, but we are only carrying them as far as Minneapolis." I asked him why they stopped at Minneapolis, and he answered, "They transship for Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta." One-half, two-thirds—yes; more than that—of the 200,000,000 acres of land in the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta—and a great portion of them are as good as the sun ever shone upon—may be homesteaded, and if a man lives on the homestead for a year and turns over the sod on 30 acres, he takes title in fee. Then he can buy an adjacent quarter section, if it has not yet been taken up, at the Government price. In addition, there is much of the 55,000,000 acres of land granted by the Government to the railways which is subject to settlement on favorable terms. And yet Liverpool fixes the price of our grain say my friends who agree with the President, and all this will not make any difference in the price!

Now let us inquire about that. The freight rate on wheat from Winnipeg to Liverpool is less than it is from Minneapolis to Liverpool. I have made inquiry about this, and I speak by the book. Will some gentleman be kind enough to explain to me in his own time why it is, under such circumstances, that the price of wheat, equal in quality, as shown by the report of the Tariff Board called for by a resolution of the Senate, averages from 10 to 12 cents more per bushel the year round in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg? Last year the magnificent crop of wheat in the United States, amounting to nearly 700,000,000 bushels, was all consumed in the United States except about 60,000,000 bushels.

What was the per capita consumption of wheat in the United States last year? Nearly 7 bushels. What a contrast that is to the condition in 1894. In that year, in spite of a good crop of wheat in the United States, conditions were bad. I am not stating why they were bad; I am not seeking to play politics by referring to what happened while the Democratic Party had full possession of the Government; but I call attention to it in order to illustrate the point. In the four years from 1893 to 1897 there was a minimum of consumption of wheat—not more than about 4 bushels to each inhabitant. If I recollect aright, for one year, 1894, it was less than 3½ bushels. In that year of lowest per capita consumption the price of wheat was the lowest we have had in 50 years—less than 50 cents a bushel to the farmer. What was the reason? Who buys the wheat after the farmer consumes his share? The other two-thirds of the people in the United States. A falling off in the consumption of wheat at the rate of 1 bushel to each inhabitant in the United States represents a loss of 92,000,000 bushels. Last year we had a great crop, and more than six-sevenths of it was consumed here. Less than 70,000,000 bushels of it went abroad.

Between 6 and 7 bushels per capita was retained in this country for consumption. Why? Because our people—the men on the railroads, the men in the factories, and in other branches—were fairly well employed. They received increased wages. There was a great cry raised by politicians, by the college professors, and others as to the high cost of living; and yet two-thirds of the people, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, earned sufficient wages to consume 6½ bushels of wheat to each man, woman, and child, and they had the wherewith to pay for it. In the four years from 1893 to 1897 the average consumption was a little less than 4 bushels per capita. Why? Hundreds of thousands of men were tramping; three or four millions of men were out of employment, or on short employment.

FARM PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS DECLINE.

Let us pursue that policy whereby we adjust our production so that it is consumed substantially in the United States. Let us do as other nations do, and pursue that policy which is for our best interest. When a man says to me that Liverpool fixes

the price of grain for this crop of over 600,000,000 bushels of wheat, five-sixths of which is consumed in the United States, I say to him that I will believe him when he shows me that the tail wags the dog. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Since the election on the 8th day of November last, when our Democratic friends succeeded in carrying the House of Representatives by a majority of over 60, the farm price of agricultural products in the United States has decreased more than 25 per cent. The value of the product of labor and effort in other lines of industry, however, has not depreciated since that event. The wages of the employee in the factory, on the railroad, and in the mine have not been reduced, and I hope they will not be, although I could wish that there were a surer foundation for the hope than at present exists.

The cost of food products to the ultimate consumer, after they have passed through the hands of those who distribute, has not decreased in any commensurate proportion to the decrease in the farm price of agricultural products; in fact, prices at retail are almost as high, considering the season, as they were last November.

The farmer is not to blame for this condition. Although the farm value of his products has decreased over one-fourth, there have been no strikes on the part of the farmer. He is patient, patriotic, loyal, and is willing to bear his share of losses which come under the natural laws of trade. He is willing to submit to that law which should regulate all commerce in the United States, namely, the regulation of price by the supply and the demand.

I ask the question, What would have happened in the United States if the compensation of those who employ labor had been reduced one-fourth and if the wages of labor on railway, in factory, and in other industries had been cut in proportion? All over the country men now employed would be idle. There would be strikes, disorder, and panic, involving bankers, merchants, and the whole body politic.

Notwithstanding all this, the Democratic Party, with their enormous majority in the House, will pass this miscalled reciprocity bill, which will result in prosperity for our Canadian neighbors and bankruptcy for those engaged in agriculture in the United States.

This result may not come in a day, a week, or a month, but if this bill is enacted into law so long as it remains upon the statute book the situation will grow more and more acute, and while the burden will rest primarily upon those engaged in agriculture, no man lives to himself alone. Whatever injuriously affects the one-third of our population engaged in agriculture must inevitably react on and injure the other two-thirds. When the ability of the one-third to purchase the products of the other two-thirds is impaired, there must necessarily be a halting and slackening of production in all lines of industry, and we will have widespread panic and bankruptcy.

Some one says the northern railroads want this bill. Yes; some of them do; in fact, many of them do. One of the greatest men, in my judgment, in the United States, Mr. James J. Hill, a great railroad and empire builder, for whom I have the highest respect, heartily advocates this bill. He has builded a great railroad system from the Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, running near our northern boundary. I would rather agree with James J. Hill, Democrat as he is, than to disagree with him; but in my opinion the man is worse than an infidel who cares not for his own household. [Applause on the Republican side.] Here [indicating] is his railroad running up near the Canadian line, and you can count, as I have counted—and I think I have counted correctly—20 branch lines or spurs reaching over into this "poor" country of Manitoba, of Saskatchewan, and of Alberta. How poor that country is! Why, the eloquent gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], for whom I have great respect, in his speech made me wonder why there was so much fuss made about this proposed reciprocity agreement, for he seemed to prove, satisfactorily to himself at any rate, that this land would wear out in his lifetime or mine. Well, we have the reports in regard to it, and they show that it has a magnificent subsoil.

CLIMATIC CONDITIONS FAVORABLE TO WHEAT.

I went to the Weather Bureau to ascertain about the climate in these Provinces. I told them that I had read about the Japan current, that I had read about the long hours of sunshine during the crop season in northern Canada, and that I wanted to know about it. I asked them to make me a map, and after a week they sent me this one [indicating]. These red lines [indicating] are the heat lines. This one [indicating] starts away down here, not a great way from the central part of northern New York, and runs away up almost to 54° 40′. These lines indicate that they have as much heat in Canada during the crop season, and more, than in North Dakota. These other lines indicate precipitation. I think I have asked the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA] more questions, perhaps, than anybody else in regard to this matter in my effort to learn about the section of the country in which he lives.

As I have said, the crop season is from April to August. I asked him, "How about the wheat lands up there?" "Why," said he, "they are all right." "Well," said I, "don't you get nipped with the frost?" He said, "Florida had her orange groves frozen a few years ago; you lost a wheat crop within your own recollection in Illinois and Iowa; you had the great corn crop in 1863 or 1864 absolutely killed before the middle of August. You have got to run those risks everywhere in the Temperate Zone, north or south."

Now, last year there was not enough moisture in North Dakota, and the crop was short about 5 bushels to the acre—the gentleman from North Dakota will correct me if my statement is inaccurate—but in Alberta, here, and in Saskatchewan, a little to the north, I think they raised in the neighborhood of 20 bushels to the acre. They had a little more moisture there. The dews were heavier. Farther north they had a little more sunshine. After the closest study I have been able to give the matter I have no hesitation in saying that in these three Provinces, without going into the McKenzie Basin, here [indicating], which reaches away up to the sixtieth degree of latitude and above, tempered by the current that comes from the Pacific Ocean and by the winds that down in the State of Washington are called the chinook winds, with the Rocky Mountains lower, with the Coast Range almost obliterated—I say to you there is as much moisture during the crop season throughout all this country here, up to Prince Rupert, including British Columbia, as there is in North Dakota; as much as there is in South Dakota and northern Michigan; and as much as at Port Arthur, in the magnificent Province of Ontario, which reaches down like a wedge between New York on one side and Michigan on the other.

The average temperature at Edmonton, 325 miles north of the border line between Canada and the United States, is the same as at Kalispel, Mont., and Port Arthur on Lake Superior.

Calgary, 150 miles north of the border line, has the same average mean temperature as Duluth, Minn., Alpena, Mich., Devils Lake, N. Dak., Cheyenne, Wyo., and Denver, Colo.

There is more rainfall in the crop season 100 miles north of Edmonton than in any part of the States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, or northern North Dakota, and Minnesota, and the same rainfall as in North and South Dakota.

Calgary has the same precipitation as the northwestern part of the United States.

WE SHOULD CARE FOR OUR OWN.

Now, it is up to us to say whether we will care for our own. Will we continue to develop our own country from east to west and from north to south, or will we, without one iota of compensation, throw open our markets to all the agricultural products of the rapidly developing country in Canada?

Nations care for their own. These 92,000,000 of people of ours not only have to be strong enough, but wise enough, to face the world and pursue that policy that is the best for them.

Now, I want to say to the gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts and New England that in the last 10 years hundreds of millions of dollars have been added to the value of your farm lands—enough to make up for the loss sustained prior to 1900, while we were developing the great West.

New York and New England had 7,200,000 acres of agricultural lands abandoned between 1880 and 1900. There was a reduction of $260,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same States in the same period.

Ohio also lost $91,000,000 in the value of farm lands and buildings in the same time.

Illinois increased the value of farm lands and buildings in the same time $756,000,000.

The losses in the East have been recovered in the last 10 years.

New England increased the value of farm lands and buildings $183,000,000 since 1900.

Connecticut had a loss of $24,000,000 in such values from 1880 to 1900 and a gain of $39,000,000 from 1900 to 1910.

Maine had a loss of $6,500,000 in such values from 1880 to 1900 and a gain of $61,000,000 in the last 10 years.

Vermont's loss for the 20 years prior to 1900 was $26,000,000, and her gain since that year $29,000,000.

New Hampshire lost $5,500,000 from 1880 to 1900 and gained $15,500,000 in the last 10 years.

Massachusetts lost $19,000,000 in the value of farm lands and farm buildings between 1880 and 1890 and gained $54,000,000 in the same values in the last 20 years, $33,000,000 of that increase being credited to the last 10 years.

Rhode Island lost $2,000,000 in similar values from 1880 to 1900, and gained $4,000,000 from 1900 to 1910.

The losses in value on farm lands and farm buildings from 1880 to 1900 in New England alone amounted to $83,000,000, and the gains in the same section in the last 10 years amounted to $183,000,000.

New York's farm lands and farm buildings were worth $168,000,000 less in 1900 than in 1880 and $288,000,000 more in 1910 than in 1900.

The Empire State in the last 10 years recovered her losses of the preceding 20 years and added $120,000,000 as a net gain over the values she had in 1880, when her farms began to decline.

The average value of farm lands per acre increased in the last 10 years as follows:

	Per cent.
Maine	75
Massachusetts	32
Vermont	30
Connecticut	43
Rhode Island	17
New Hampshire	40
New York	31
Pennsylvania	14
Illinois	106
Indiana	94
Iowa	120
Michigan	33
Minnesota	76
Missouri	104

So I say that the renaissance in agriculture has come to the East as well as the West, and by this legislation you propose to check that return of the American farmer to his old-time prosperity.

HARRISON AND BLAINE ON RECIPROCITY.

There has never been a time when Canada was not earnestly knocking at the doors of the United States for the admission, without tax or tariff, of her agricultural products. I do not care whether you call it reciprocity or free gift. Gentlemen will recall the treaty of 1854 and its subsequent repeal. I will not go back to that; that is behind us. In 1892 Canada, through the British minister, asked the administration of Benjamin Harrison, Blaine being Secretary of State, to receive delegates from Canada to cooperate with the British minister in making a reciprocity agreement. They came. Harrison tells it in a few words:

Here is what President Harrison said in his last message, December 6, 1892:

> During the past year a suggestion was received through the British minister that the Canadian Government would like to confer as to the possibility of enlarging upon terms of mutual advantage the commercial exchanges of Canada and the United States, and a conference was held at Washington, with Mr. Blaine acting for this Government and the British minister at this capital and three members of the Dominion cabinet acting as commissioners on the part of Great Britain.
>
> The conference developed the fact that the Canadian Government was only prepared to offer to the United States in exchange for the concessions asked the admission of natural products. The statement was frankly made that favored rates could not be given to the United States as against the mother country. This admission, which was foreseen, necessarily terminated the conference upon this question. The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

Now, what is a natural product? Oh, the air, the ocean, the mountains, the coal in the ground, the forest, the soil, the iron ore in the ground, the limestone for the flux, the clay for the brick. But when the coal becomes coke, when the clay becomes fire brick, are these products natural products? No; because the mining of the coal requires labor; the coking of the coal requires labor. The man who digs the fire clay puts into it his labor; the man who mines the iron ore contributes his labor. Wherever the hand of man makes matter assume a shape that is useful to the human family, when it leaves his hand it has ceased to be a natural product and has become a finished product. [Applause on the Republican side.] What temerity to call a product a natural product after it has been touched by the hand of labor! I believe this bill is greatly in the interest of Canada, without compensating benefit to the United States. In support of that view I want to quote from the report of the proceedings in the Canadian House of Commons. They have the English system in Canada, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been, I believe, prime minister for 16 years. He is a man of great ability and a candid man.

PREMIER LAURIER SAYS IT BENEFITS CANADA.

In addressing the Canadian House of Commons on March 7 on this proposed, miscalled reciprocity agreement, amongst other things Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

We—

Referring to Canada—

> are, above all, an agricultural people. Our chief wealth is the growth of these products of the Temperate Zone. What are they? Fruits, cereals, and vegetables; and it is our boast—not an idle boast, but a boast founded on actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables, and fruit we can, without exaggeration, beat the world.

Will you accept Mr. Laurier as a proper witness? Again, he says:

> All that we ask under these resolutions is to obtain for the man who works in the field the best possible remuneration for his labor.

And then he compliments the minister of finance, Mr. Fielding, and the minister of customs, Mr. Patterson, who negotiated in secret this agreement with our Secretary of State. If the people of the United States had been informed what they were up to, in my judgment, their indignation would have thundered throughout the country until no Secretary of State would have dared make the agreement. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Sir Wilfrid Laurier thanks these two men for having obtained from the United States such an advantageous arrangement, and having obtained it without the sacrifice of any Canadian interest. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Again, Sir Wilfrid Laurier says:

> I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made is simply to get better prices for the products of the Canadian farmer.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, that is the statement of the man who is responsible for the Canadian Government. The man responsible in an executive capacity for our Government says: "No; Sir Wilfrid, you are wrong."

Again Mr. Laurier says, and I want your attention to this:

> Then there is the cattle trade. Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the exchange embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and therefore if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise in Great Britain, there is a ready market in the United States.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Again, the Canadian premier says:

> We are exporters not of manufactured products, but of natural products, and we are large importers of manufactured products; and we have given to the Americans a free entrance to our markets only for their natural products, as they have given us a free entrance to their market for our natural products.

Again, he says:

> It is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products; but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

Mr. Laurier is a remarkably candid and square man. He wants this legislation for the protection and benefit of the agriculturists in Canada. I am against it, because I believe it will work grave injury to the one-third of our people engaged in agriculture and inevitably to all our people, because if the agriculturist does not prosper, if his lands are sold for taxes, if his numbers decrease, if his production falls off, if he becomes a starvation consumer for the factories in Connecticut and in Massachusetts that weave the clothing, the whole people are bound to suffer.

STEEL TRUST FAVORS THE AGREEMENT.

Now I want to refer to one or two other matters. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] represents that great district in which Birmingham is situated, where God Almighty, when he threw matter into space, placed side by side the iron ore and the limestone and the coal. It is said that the great United States Steel Corporation—and I have no abuse for it as long as it performs its functions for the benefit of all the people—has so large an interest in the district which my friend represents that it is very desirous that this bill should pass. My information is accurate, for I have it in black and white from a man who ought to know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not in the confidence of the United States Steel Corporation. They do own about one-third of the iron ore in my district, a very valuable property. I am satisfied the gentleman from Illinois can inform the House as to its plan of procedure better than I can. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. After all, that is gratuitous. I did not speak of the gentleman personally in connection with this matter. I spoke of the factors in his district, which is being so magnificently developed. I want to say that if he could construe what I said into a reflection on him personally, it seems to me he would have to strain the construction.

Now, I will look my friend in the eye and say that I never, directly or indirectly, had any interest in the United States Steel Corporation, nor did any relative of mine. That great corporation may or may not be violating the law. If it is, let it be prosecuted. But, as it is a great corporation, and as I have, as I think, been reliably informed that it believes this agreement ought to be ratified, I made that statement.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In what I said I intended to make no reflection on the gentleman's personality, but merely meant to imply that the gentleman, speaking from the standpoint of the Republican Party, must of necessity be very much closer to the Steel Corporation than I was, speaking from the standpoint of the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. That is the case with all industries.

Mr. CANNON. I am proud of all the industries in this great Republic—the railroads, the factories, and the furnaces. I am proud, also, of the great development brought about by that great organization the Standard Oil Co., no member of which I have any personal knowledge of directly or indirectly. Its fleets are upon every ocean. Its production is magnificent. It reaches with its pipe lines into the districts represented by my colleague, Dr. FOSTER, and myself. Our constituents, Doctor, were exceedingly anxious to get them to construct their pipe lines, and now that they have got them, I fancy that, while some of our constituents are very anxious to damn them, they would not have them turned out. [Laughter.] The American people have worked and are working out their own salvation.

THE FREE-LIST BILLS OF 1894.

Now, then, one word more. I hold in my hand the bill reported, as I understand, this morning by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], placing on the free list agricultural implements and various other articles. Already in the Payne law, which has been so cursed and damned, any country can have free trade with us in agricultural implements provided it grants a like concession to us. You now propose to go further. You say to Great Britain, and you say to every foreign manufacturer of agricultural implements, come in without price and enjoy the markets of 90,000,000 of people without yielding anything in return. Canada levies, I believe, a tariff of from 12½ per cent to 20 per cent on agricultural implements.

This is not the first time the Democrats have passed popgun tariff bills through the House. I was here when the Wilson law was passed. I saw the virile Democratic majority run the steam roller over the minority, and agree en bloc to 600 Senate amendments without dotting an i or crossing a t. That was pretty bad. Cleveland said the bill was a measure of perfidy and dishonor, and he let the bill become a law without signing it. But it became a law all the same, and the present honored Speaker of the House [Mr. CLARK] spoke and voted for it. Then what happened? The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Springer, a Democratic Member, rose in his place and offered a popgun bill, putting iron ore on the free list. They just rushed it through by the aid of the steam roller. Then, I think, bills placing coal and several other articles on the free list were passed in the same way. The Democrats in the House said, "We will show the people that we are willing to make a free list." They thought that was fine politics. We were just entering upon the campaign in the fall of 1894, and after that election the Republican Party came back into the House with a majority of something like 120. Oh, yes; you passed the Wilson bill as you propose to pass the reciprocity bill—without amendment—and you passed popgun bills putting numerous articles on the free list, just as you propose to do now. When I was a boy I read about that wonderful bird, the ostrich, with its small head and great body, and when it wanted to hide it stuck its head in the sand. I used to wonder how that ostrich looked. I saw how it looked when you passed those bills. [Laughter.] History repeats itself.

Pass your popgun bills through, but they will not, in my judgment, serve you any better than similar bills served your ostrich brethren in 1894.

"Oh," it is said, "we must pass this bill as it is, because if it is amended Canada won't have it." Who is legislating for the United States—we or Canada? [Applause on the Republican side.] A treaty made under the auspices of Great Britain, between Canada and France, was hung up in the French Senate for months. It was said that it must not be amended or Canada would not have it; but the French amended it, and provided that fattened cattle coming into France on the hoof should not come in under the minimum tariff, but should pay the maximum tax. They amended it from the standpoint of the interest of the people of France.

The treaty went back to Canada. The negotiations were ended if Canada did not accept the amendment. Canada did accept the amendment. Canada has not yet acted upon this measure. Would it not be well enough to let Canada speak for herself? Gentlemen, you may pass this bill, and if it is enacted into law and disaster comes on account of it, the American sovereign, as you will find out, has a keen eye and a long recollection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It has been stated that the adoption of the reciprocity agreement will increase our trade with Canada. On evidence that would be strong enough to impel me to act upon matters of great importance to myself or my country, I say that is not its object at all. Have you noticed the figures of our imports into Canada?

CAN WE IMPROVE OUR TRADE WITH CANADA?

To those who urge that the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement will expand our trade with Canada and widen the market in that country for American production, let me quote from the Canada Yearbook for 1909 the figures of imports.

In 1909 the total imports into Canada were $309,756,608. Of this amount, $192,661,360 came from the United States; $86,257,557 from the British Empire, including Newfoundland; and $30,837,691 from all other foreign countries. In other words, the United States sent into Canada in the year 1909 $75,566,112 more in products than all the rest of the world, including Great Britain and the British possessions.

As showing the growth of the trade of the United States with Canada, the percentages furnished by the Canada Yearbook are even more illuminating, showing, as they do, that the United States has gradually, year by year, increased its trade with Canada until in the year 1909 59 per cent of the total imports into Canada came from the United States.

In 1868, when the Dominion Government was organized, the percentage of imports from Great Britain into Canada subject to duty was 64.78 of the total imports subject to duty; and the percentage of imports which came in free was 39.82 of the total imports which came in free. In the same year the percentage of imports from Great Britain and the British possessions dutiable and free to the total imports dutiable and free was 56.06.

The percentage of imports from the United States to Canada for the same year subject to duty was 22.93 of the total imports subject to duty, and the percentage of imports from the United States which came in free was 53.96 of the total imports which were admitted into Canada without payment of duty. The percentage of all imports from the United States dutiable and free to the total imports dutiable and free was 33.77.

Since the year 1868 the proportion of imports from Great Britain to Canada to imports from the United States has steadily decreased until in 1909 Great Britain sent to Canada only 29.84 per cent of the total dutiable imports admitted to Canada, 16.31 per cent of the total imports admitted into Canada free of duty, and 24.52 per cent of the total imports of Canada.

The percentages of the United States, on the other hand, had increased, until in 1909 we sent to Canada 51.76 per cent of her total dutiable imports, 70.20 per cent of her total free imports, and 59 per cent of her total importation, dutiable and free.

The average for the 42-year period from 1868 to 1909 for the respective countries of Great Britain and the United States is as follows:

Imported from Great Britain.

	Per cent.
Dutiable to total dutiable	41.24
Free to total free	22.59
Dutiable and free to all imports	34.49

Imported from the United States.

	Per cent.
Dutiable to total dutiable	43.15
Free to total free	65.75
Dutiable and free to all imports	51.24

It is interesting and instructive to note the average ad valorem rate of duty paid by American imports into Canada in comparison with the average on imports into Canada from Great Britain and other countries. In spite of the Canadian preferential tariff in favor of Great Britain, the figures show that the lowest average ad valorem rate is paid by imports from the United States. I quote the following figures taken from the Canada Yearbook, 1909 (p. 225):

	Per cent.
Average ad valorem rate on dutiable imports into Canada from Great Britain, 1909	25.755
Average ad valorem rate on dutiable imports into Canada from the United States, 1909	24.868
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from Great Britain, 1909	19.028
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from the United States, 1909	13.247
Average ad valorem on dutiable imports into Canada from all countries, 1909	27.315
Average ad valorem on all imports into Canada from all countries, 1909	16.586

When Canada wanted to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States in Harrison's administration they asked permis-

sion that they might come to Washington and treat. The pending agreement was initiated upon our invitation, not upon theirs, and it is the first instance of the kind in the history of the country.

FREE PRINT PAPER THE ISSUE.

What are we to gain by such an agreement? We have the lion's share of trade with Canada, and at a less ad valorem than any other country on earth. Why did this invitation go? What was there that caused this agreement to be initiated without the Secretary of State taking the American people into his confidence? Now, I am going to present the evidence to you, you being the jury. There has been a good deal of talk, running over several years, about the price of print paper. I have not been under the tongue of good report with the publishers of our metropolitan newspapers and magazines. I only refer to it to illustrate the situation. I have no feeling about the matter. It is behind us. The publishers can not now change it, nor can I.

The Committee on Ways and Means in the Sixtieth Congress was headed by Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCCALL, Mr. DALZELL, and others being members. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS introduced his free print-paper bill, and it went to that committee. As I am informed, the committee by a unanimous vote, including the honorable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], then and now a member of that committee, postponed the bill for that session of Congress, and did not even hold hearings on it. I was Speaker. They unloaded on me. [Laughter and applause.] The minority in the House had inaugurated a filibuster that lasted to the end of the session. It was ably lead by Mr. WILLIAMS, now a Senator from Mississippi. We had a stormy time. Newspaper publishers, through their representatives, one of whom I will name, Mr. Herman Ridder, came to me, demanding that I should do something which had never been done, so far as I know, in the history of the Republic—that I should recognize some Member, JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS or some one else, on a Monday—suspension day—and move to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of that bill and pass it.

I said that I could not do that; that it would not be just to my party. I said, "This is no time, on the eve of a presidential election, to take such action, and by doing so, if I had any regard for my personal welfare, I would subject myself to legitimate criticism, lose the respect of the minority, receive the condemnation of the majority, and the disapproval of the country." [Applause.]

There was some nasty talk, to which I will not refer, and it is not necessary to do so; but I have been hammered from that time to this, though I believe they have let up on me now, inasmuch as I am no longer the Speaker, and I am enjoying a little season of rest. It is all right. I am 75 years old, and, whatever they do, when I appear at the gate of either of the places where men go hereafter [laughter], whether I go where they wear asbestos halos or those of muslin, I will walk with my head erect and say, "I retain my own self-respect." [Loud applause.]

I am not going far into the matter here. I am going to run over the personal part of it as rapidly as possible. Many things happened about that time, and threats were made that if the Republican Party did not promptly put print paper upon the free list that great and good man who headed the Publishers' Association, Mr. Herman Ridder, would support Mr. Bryan for the Presidency and contribute $100,000 to his election.

We did not pass that bill, and when the time came Mr. Ridder was made treasurer of the Democratic national committee, and I guess he gave you boys on the Democratic side $50,000, did he not? [Laughter.] The newspapers say so, and I have never seen it denied. So much for that.

COST OF PRODUCTION HERE AND IN CANADA.

I recollect very well that under the hot attack upon myself personally, and upon the party of which I was a member, I looked about for some means of defense, and I introduced a resolution creating a special committee to investigate the condition as to print paper. When the resolution was agreed to, I appointed that committee, and my honorable colleague [Mr. MANN] was made chairman. The House will recall the high personnel of that committee, and will agree that it worked industriously. But from one end of the country to the other I was criticized for that action by resolutions passed by the Publishers' Association and by denunciations in the newspapers. The committee made an honest investigation, and in the fullness of time they submitted a report. They found that there was a difference of $2 a ton between the cost of production in Canada and the cost of production in the United States. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I recall, stated, if not in the report, on the floor of the House, that that was as near as they could get it to the actual difference. It was a unanimous report, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] and the other Democrat on the committee concurring.

This House in the consideration of the Payne tariff bill accepted the recommendation of the Mann special committee and fixed the duty on print paper at $2. The bill went to the Senate, where there is no previous question. The Mann report was not accepted by that body, and they fixed the duty at $4 a ton. In the compromise effected between the Senate and the House—and all legislation is a compromise—the rate was made $3.75 a ton, a reduction from $6, the rate under the Dingley law.

In this connection, allow me to call the attention of the House to the difference between the Tariff Board and the Mann special committee on this matter. The Mann committee reported that $2 would represent the difference, whereas the Tariff Board said that $4.14 represented the difference. (S. Doc. 849, 61st Cong., 3d sess.) In this bill you reject both reports and propose to let it in free.

I hold no power of attorney to defend the paper industry. I have not a constituent, so far as I know, who has an interest in it. If it be true that the difference in the cost of production of this material in Canada, or anywhere else on earth, and the United States is $2 a ton or $4 a ton, then that difference ought to measure the tariff rate. I say that because I am a protectionist. Beyond that I have no interest.

The New York World claims that there is $798,000,000 capital invested in the printing trades, and admits that the product last year was valued at $857,000,000. Is there any other industry in this country whose annual product is valued at more than its entire capital?

By the industrial census of 1905 there were $385,000,000 capital invested in these trades, including books, newspapers, periodicals, etc., and the annual product was $496,000,000. Three-fifths of the capital and product was credited to the newspapers and periodicals, as follows:

Capital	$239,518,524
Salaries	47,128,711
Wages	59,830,768
Incidental expenses	67,638,099
Materials	70,358,000
Product	309,327,606

The combined cost of production, including salaries, wages, materials, incidental expenses, amounted to $244,955,578. Subtracting this from the value of the product, $309,327,606, leaves $64,372,028, which is a trifle less than 27 per cent of the capital.

Patent medicines and women's clothing were the only other industries that equaled this percentage of profit on investment in that census.

By the census of 1905 it was also shown that nearly 60 per cent of the income of newspapers and periodicals, including country weeklies, came from advertising and little more than 40 per cent from subscriptions and sales.

It is claimed by the New York World that the product of the printing trade is now valued at $857,000,000, or nearly double what it was five years ago, and it is admitted that the income from advertising yields a greater ratio of the whole income than it did it 1905.

ADVERTISING AND THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The advertising bill of this country is placed at more than $500,000,000 a year. This is from the printing trade alone. Add to this the cost of electric and mechanical advertising, and it is estimated that we are spending between $700,000,000 and $800,000,000 a year for advertising—to induce the people to purchase.

So, my Democratic friends, advertising is one of the items in the high cost of living.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. And it is on the free list. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; absolutely on the free list.

The total value of all farm property in 1900 was given at a little more than $20,000,000,000, and it is now estimated at more than $30,000,000,000, while the total value of all produce from the farms of the United States last year is given by the Secretary of Agriculture at a little less than $9,000,000,000.

According to the figures given in the President's message, there was less than $6,000,000 worth of wood pulp and print paper imported from Canada last year, and we are asked to open the doors and jeopardize the farmers' market for nearly $9,000,000,000 worth of produce to enable the publishers to get less than $6,000,000 worth of paper and pulp at a less cost than they have had to pay, when they are making 27 per cent on their invested capital.

This wood pulp and print paper is the one item in the agreement on which there is no reciprocity. Mr. Fielding, in his letter to Secretary Knox, made this perfectly clear. He said:

In the meantime the present duties on pulp and paper imported from the United States into Canada will remain.

The Canadian duty on print paper is 15 per cent.

The six cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Boston, and Baltimore have one-half of the whole publishing business of the United States, and it is easy to account for the enthusiastic demands for the ratification of this agreement by the publishers of those great centers of population whether the dwellers in those cities are equally clamorous or not.

The proposed reciprocity agreement should be labeled "the publishers' pact," whereby agricultural products are traded off for the publishers' profits.

I have inquired to some extent as to the capital and profits of some of the great newspapers and magazines. I recollect I made inquiry about one—the only one, perhaps, that ever perpetrated a criminal libel upon me in all my public or private life. The one to which I refer was committed by a man named Higgins, who published Success. I had a lawyer friend who agonized with me to bring a criminal action and civil action against him for libel. So I caused an inquiry to be made, and the information came back that the concern and some of its stockholders were so insolvent that nothing would be found on execution to satisfy a judgment against them. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not hate the newspapers. I know many of their publishers, editors, and correspondents. I have the highest respect for them. The metropolitan newspapers and magazines have access to the people. In my last campaign I covered my district by automobile, taking my constituency into my confidence. They knew, after the years I had represented them and lived with them, that I would tell the truth. When I could not get the truth into the metropolitan newspapers, the country newspapers came to my rescue. God bless the country newspapers. [Applause.] They are a part of us. When we are married and given in marriage they tell the good news. They go to our weddings and our funerals. They rejoice with us when we rejoice and mourn with us when we mourn. [Applause.] One reason why I am against the parcels post is because it is in the interest of strangers. We know the local merchant and the commercial traveler. They belong to our churches and to our clubs. They help make our civilization; they are acquainted with our farmers and our farmers are acquainted with them; but we do not know the mail-order houses.

I do not know the men who own the enormous metropolitan papers. They have heard of me, but they do not seem to care much about me. [Laughter.] I am not complaining. I am not seeking justification. If they do not let me alone, I will not quit public life, if I get my way about it, until my constituency asks me to retire. [Applause on the Republican side.]

WHY THE PUBLISHERS WANT RECIPROCITY.

I have referred to Herman Ridder. A friend of mine who publishes a country newspaper sent me this:

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS' ASSOCIATION,
WORLD BUILDING,
New York, March 15, 1911.

DEAR SIR: May I invite your attention to the point that promptness in ratifying the reciprocity agreement of the United States with Canada is of the utmost importance to newspapers?

There is danger in amendments, or changes, or delay.

[Laughter.]

The two Governments had a tacit understanding that the arrangement would go through as framed. The difficulties attending ratification on the Canadian side may be increased greatly if there is hesitation or an attempt on our part to make a new trade.

Will you kindly urge, through your publication and by letters to your Representative and Senators, that the agreement as made by the State Department be passed speedily by Congress and without amendment?

Yours, faithfully,

HERMAN RIDDER,
President American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, I have another:

[Established 1844.]

CHICAGO DAILY JOURNAL,
Chicago, Ill., November 18, 1910.

This is dated before the making of the reciprocity agreement—

MY DEAR SIR:—

I want the Democratic Members to listen to this and see if they will not recognize this delightful letter. Stand up now and bear testimony—

I want you all to get up and sing "Renew my courage, Lord," and say whether you got this letter. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

MY DEAR SIR: The independent press—

This is one of the independent fellows. [Laughter.]—

The independent press of the country, and a large part of the Republican press, supported Democratic candidates this year because Republican Senators and Representatives did not keep their word in regard to removing the tariff on paper.

In my opinion the way to insure the continued support of these publishers through the campaign of 1912 is to put all print paper, pulp, and all material entering into the manufacture of paper on the free list at the earliest possible moment, and to announce now that that will be the policy of Democrats in Congress.

Yours, truly,

JOHN C. EASTMAN.

Is there anybody on the other side of the House who did not get one of these letters? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] If so, let him arise and say so. No one arises.

It does not make much difference to me what somebody said in the past or what somebody did in the past so long as they do not violate the law. What they said and did may sometimes be useful as an example and admonition, but it does not shed much light on the present or on the future. Yet there have been so many efforts to drag in the name of William McKinley, by whose side I sat for 16 years when he was an honored Member of this House, that I want to clear the matter up a little bit. Somebody has got to defend the dead.

M'KINLEY'S RECIPROCITY POLICY.

McKinley held to the Republican theory of reciprocity in noncompeting products. In his opening speech on the McKinley bill in the House of Representatives, May 7, 1890, speaking of reciprocity, he said:

We have been beaten in every instance. From 1854 to 1866—12 years of reciprocity with Canada—we bought of them twice as much as they bought of us. Ninety-five per cent of their products came into the United States free of duty, while only 42 per cent of ours went into Canada free of duty. Mr. Chairman, what these other countries want is a free and open market with the United States. What we want, if we ever have reciprocity, must be reciprocity with equality, reciprocity that shall be fair, reciprocity that shall be just, reciprocity that shall give us our share in the trade or arrangement that we make with the other nations of the world.

It will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that wherever we have tried reciprocity or low duties we have always been the loser.

President McKinley did not advance upon any new ground in 1901. He said at Buffalo substantially what he had said in his first inaugural address March 4, 1897. Here is the reciprocity paragraph from his inaugural address, and I challenge anyone to find any other or different policy set forth in his Buffalo speech:

In the revision of the tariff especial attention should be given to the reenactment and extension of the reciprocity principle of the law of 1890, under which so great a stimulus was given to our foreign trade in new and advantageous markets for our surplus agricultural and manufactured products. The brief trial given this legislation amply justifies a further experiment and additional discretionary power in the making of commercial treaties, the end in view always to be the opening of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

That is just what President McKinley said in the beginning of his administration when he gave notice that he would call the Congress to meet in extraordinary session on March 15, 1897, to revise the tariff on protection lines, and it is substantially what he said in his last public utterance at Buffalo in September, 1901.

What did McKinley say at Buffalo? Here it is:

By sensible trade arrangements, which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. * * * We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industry and labor. * * * What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and production, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

McKinley's idea of reciprocity was to provide an outlet for our surplus production; the pending reciprocity measure is an attempt to cheapen our consumption.

McKinley sought to increase our exports; this proposes to increase our imports. The two schemes are radically different.

Oftentimes when McKinley's Buffalo speech is quoted the words "without harm to our industry and labor" are omitted. I indorse every word of that speech. It is in harmony with his official life and his action as a legislator. I have always been for that policy announced by McKinley and always expect to be for it.

I recollect that a great candidate for office in 1904 read that extract; but he left out the words "without harm to our industry and labor," so that it would read, "We should take from our customers such of our products as we could use." I had to meet that quotation frequently, and I could always meet it in a sentence. Gentlemen will recall the old story about the infidel and the preacher. The infidel said that he could prove by the preacher's own Bible that there was no God. "Show me," said the preacher. The infidel turned over and found one of the chapters which David is supposed to have written, and he said, "There it is." It read, "There is no God." But the parson

had read his Bible. He said, "You scoundrel, take your thumb off and read it all." And when he did so, it read, "The fool saith in his heart there is no God." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I had no idea I should talk so long. I am a Republican and a protectionist. I indorse the Republican policy announced in the Republican platform of 1908. I believe in it, and I will support it; but I beg gentlemen to recollect that there is nothing perfect that comes from the hand of man, and there never will be enacted a tariff bill satisfactory in every particular to any man. Perfection comes from God alone, who has all wisdom and all power.

I voted for the Payne-Aldrich bill. I agree with the President in what he said at Winona, that it is the best protective-tariff bill ever passed. I still believe that. If I had supreme power, I would wipe out some things in it. I could find duties here and there which might be lowered, and I want to tell the truth and say that I could find here and there an article on the dutiable list with a duty that is not protective, or an article on the free list which, if placed on the protective list, would have founded great industries.

HYSTERIA HALTS PRODUCTION.

Hysteria has been promoted by the great publishers. They can do a great deal in destroying parties and wiping out individuals, but they can not do as much as they could have done two years or four years ago. [Applause.] When this proposed agreement is vitalized by legislation, when you hold the country up with the threat of tariff revision, to get rid of the Payne law, which the President said—and I think, substantially, all on this side agree with him—was the best protective tariff bill ever passed, though not perfect, you make men fearful. The farmer buys 5 per cent or 10 per cent less; the man with a fixed income buys a little less; and the laborer on the railway or elsewhere buys a little less; and when you reduce by 5 per cent the capacity of our 92,000,000 people to consume, you close factories, you cut down wages, you beget strikes. You ought to recollect that, my Democratic friends. Some of you were living in 1894, and some of you were here; but there are many of you who have come in since who will have to learn by kindergarten instruction.

Now, I want to say to men on this side of the House that I am somewhat full of cumbativeness. Sometimes I seem to have temper when I have none, and sometimes I have temper when I think I am under unjust charge; but when matters are behind me, I say again, as I have said on a former occasion, there is nothing in animate nature that I would harm or punish. I never expect to agree with all of you, and most of you, perhaps, will not agree with opinions I may hold; but we must cooperate; we must stand together or hang separately. [Laughter.] We are in the minority. We are not responsible for legislation. The Democrats are responsible. Our office is criticism, and I think we are perfectly able to perform the duties of that office. [Laughter.]

I want to say to my New England friends, to my Missouri friends, to my Illinois friends, and to all men who share the Republican faith, that if the Republican Party is to live, it can live only by being true to and supporting the policy of protection, under which the men who live in the sweat of their faces, bearing the burdens of the most expensive civilization on earth, receive $2, as compared with $1 received by labor in other countries of the world; by equalizing production in our own country and keeping our own markets.

Gentlemen from Massachusetts, gentlemen from the Keystone State, the citadel of protection, the great State that through evil and good report has always kept the Republican faith, may hug to their breasts the delusion, on account of all that has been said as to the high cost of living, that they want you to vote for this measure; but, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, without regard to what others may think, God helping me, I will keep the Republican faith; and after the majority, substantially in solid phalanx, vitalizes this outrageous legislation, I would sooner take my chances in 1912 as an adherent of Republican doctrine.

To you gentlemen from Massachusetts I will say that I love Massachusetts. She has done more, perhaps, than any Commonwealth in the Union in shaping the sentiment and promoting the civilization of the people of the great Republic. Did you vote for Foss in the last election? Is he to represent the permanent public sentiment in Massachusetts? When the penalty is paid, as it will be paid between this and the year 1912, and consumption and production are restricted and decrease, are you still going to support him? Is he your leader? This bill might well be labeled, "A bill by the grace—or punishment—of God, the aid of the Secretary of State, and Foss, of Massachusetts, and the almost solid vote of Democratic Members." Choose ye! [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat I will ask him if he will permit a question?

LIVERPOOL DOES NOT FIX THE PRICE.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; if it is apt.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I have been very greatly interested and entertained by the remarkably able speech of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. Toward the close of it he said he was a protectionist and a Republican. I, too, am a protectionist and a Republican, and I wish to ask him this question, and to say before asking the question this, that I never as a Republican claimed that the price of wheat in the United States was not fixed in Liverpool. The gentleman entered into a very astute and very earnest argument to show that the price of wheat in the United States was not fixed in Liverpool. Does the gentleman entertain that view as a Republican?

Mr. CANNON. The price of wheat, I am satisfied, is fixed where the major part of the product is sold. [Applause.] Five-sixths of the wheat produced in the United States is sold to our own people in the United States. I will further answer the gentleman's question by asking another: Will the gentleman have the kindness to make things as plain by explaining why wheat of the same quality averages from 12 to 15 cents more in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg?

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him one other question? I recalled, while the gentleman was speaking, that I heard the gentleman from Illinois say that the price of American wheat was fixed in Liverpool. I remembered that because it was my first term in Congress, and I found the RECORD——

Mr. CANNON. On what occasion? What was the bill?

Mr. COOPER. It is page 994 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-third Congress, second session.

Mr. CANNON. Read.

Mr. COOPER (reading)—

Mr. SIMPSON——

Speaking to Mr. CANNON.

Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman not admit that we are now competing in Europe with the different countries of the Old World for the sale of our wheat?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; with Roumania, Russia, and India.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the gentleman will admit that the price we receive there fixes the price of our article not only in the United States but in the foreign markets?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; all prices are regulated by the prevailing market, wherever it is.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman then went on to say—I will be candid with the gentleman—that he thought we should protect by a tariff our market here so that we could develop a market and consume all we produce and not have any surplus, but he unequivocally stated, and I have always carried the impression and never heard it doubted, that the surplus in competition with the world fixed the price. If we could get more at home we would not sell the surplus over there.

Mr. CANNON. I fancy that I might, on reading all that was said, possibly have nothing to apologize for in a speech made, I take it, in running debate in 1894. I have no pride in what I have said in former years. Let me say to the gentleman, I can turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the first Congress in which I served, the Forty-third Congress, and I can show him where I, too, believed that commerce knew no boundaries, and that there should be universal free trade. I had not the benefit of a college education. I had practiced law for a living until I came down here at the age of 36. It did not take me long by study and observation to become a Republican in fact as well as in name, and, being converted to the true faith, I suppose I will die in it. I have no pride in what I have said heretofore touching the matter. The gentleman can find in an examination of——

Mr. DALZELL. There is no contradiction.

Mr. CANNON. I do not care to discuss what I said although it seems to me what I said in 1894 does not conflict with what I have said to-day. The gentleman can go back, if he desires and has the interest, and hunt up my record, and he will find that in 1876, in Illinois, we made a contest for the free coinage of silver. There were only two points of difference in value between 16 of silver to 1 of gold, silver then being worth 98 cents an ounce. The issue was not metallic money, but fiat money—"be thou a dollar." I voted to put out great quantities of "sound money." It was not as sound, as subsequently developed, but it had real value, and I recollect putting my contestant out of business when I said to him, "If a fiat of the law can make a dollar, he is an infernally mean man who will

not let the Government issue millions of dollars and make us rich, inasmuch as it costs nothing."

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] yield to his colleague [Mr. MADDEN]?

Mr. CANNON. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. Just one word.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, what my colleague said in his speech concerning 1894 corroborates exactly what he said to-day, namely, that the price was fixed in the market where the bulk of the product was sold. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. I care little about what I said then; I am standing by my vote on this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, on the 26th day of January last the President of the United States sent a special message to Congress embodying such legislation as would ratify and approve of what is known as the Canadian reciprocity measure. That message, Mr. Chairman, fell upon the ears of the Republican standpatters like the alarm of a fire bell at midnight. By their action and by their speeches they have constantly, on all occasions since that, demonstrated that fact. Since that message was sent to Congress it has been very generally discussed in the newspapers and the magazines and by the people throughout the country, and I verily believe that now it is more generally indorsed by the masses of the people than it was when Mr. Taft sent it to the Congress.

It is a question that, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, far exceeds the personal or the political record of any public man—a wrangle about which we have just heard on the floor of the House. In that I agree with the distinguished ex-Speaker, who has just taken his seat after a long and elaborate argument, the solution and analysis of which is simply an argument that has been made for years past in favor of protection for protection's sake, that this reciprocity measure is of great importance. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that it is a difficult matter for me to believe that any man, whether he opposes or favors this measure, can misrepresent or exaggerate its importance. It is far-reaching in its effects, and the more we study it the more we think about it, the broader and more comprehensive it becomes as to its future beneficial effect, and for that reason, as an earnest Democrat, and believing in the realization in the early future of its mutual benefits to the Governments involved, as well as the present good effect of this reciprocity, I am now and have been a cordial advocate of the measure.

But the question comes now, after this long discussion in the public press and in the magazines, as to what this message means. It plainly draws the lines between the two great political parties of our country. It is a parting of the ways. Republican protection, which means a tariff that prohibits competition on the one hand, and a tariff for revenue, which stands for a reasonable, fair competition, on the other hand. That is really and truly what this reciprocity bill means. All the voluminous talk can not disguise the real issue. I contend without any hesitancy that the standpat Republicans on the other side of this House are right when they assert that it is a menace against the doctrine of protection for protection's sake, the foundation rock on which rests the creed of the Republican Party. I say that not only is it a menace to the doctrine of protection after the manner in which the Republican Party has upheld it, but it imperils the very existence of that party. [Applause.] By no means does this reciprocity measure contain on its face all that will be wrought by it in the future.

What is the proposition? Here we have lying on the north of us Canada with a boundary line of 3,700 miles and more, with not a popgun for defense or aggression to disturb our peace. This is no Mexican boundary to guard or to protect. There it is with more than 72,000 square miles larger than the United States. There it is with 180,000,000 acres of wheat land, 6,000,000 acres of which are now in cultivation, with a people speaking our language, with our habits and customs, living under the same labor conditions that we are, with wages about equal to ours, and who has suffered for years by a tariff wall that this country has constructed and vigilantly guarded along that peaceful boundary line for years past.

That measure which the President has sent in here, Republican President as he is, the Democrats in the last Congress sustained almost unanimously, and a majority of the Republicans voted against it. What else do we find that encourages us to believe that it is right as patriots, from an economic standpoint if nothing else, that we should support this measure?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has just taken his seat, said that we have a population of 92,000,000, and that Canada, the one section he did not favor trading with, had about 9,000,000 of people. What is the record of that Caucasian people? Fifty years ago they had a population scarcely exceeding 3,000,000 people. Within the 50 years, while this country has reached a growth of population of 30,000,000 to 35,000,000, Canada increased to only about 9,000,000 of people. What did it? It was because the natural lines of trade and of commerce which gave the least resistance led to the United States, and the tariff wall we constructed was the barricade. [Applause.]

And let us look at it, Mr. Chairman, for a few moments. We can only judge of what this measure means by surrounding circumstances, conditions, and environment. The President in his special message enunciated a far-sighted policy when he called the attention of the Congress to our rapidly increasing population and our decreasing productivity, and especially in food products. Bread is just as necessary to the people as air and water, and the man, or men, who connives at its scarcity and speculates for the sake of money and deprives those who have to have bread commits a dastardly crime. [Applause.] The President in his reciprocity measure with Canada put wheat on the free list. What motive induced him to do that? Our country produces or did produce for many years over 500,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. After using at home all we could consume the remainder was exported. It was evident by the gradual decrease of productivity and export that a change was taking place in our economic position.

In 1909 we exported 114,268,468 bushels of wheat, and in the same year we imported 48,082 bushels, and in 1910 we imported 164,201 bushels, nearly four times as much wheat as we did the year before. Why should we not take steps to meet the inevitable congestion that will overtake us soon if some great change does not take place, by encouraging the development of the fertile wheat lands of Canada and let our people have it free of tariff. Another concurring circumstance that tends to give light as to what this reciprocity measure means and why so many Republicans are against it—a great demand came up from the people in 1906–7 that the tariff duties must be reduced. Many, many were the excuses made by the Republicans why revision should not take place. Becoming alarmed, they at last reluctantly consented to put a paragraph in their platform of 1908 to that effect and went to the country. A special session of the Sixty-first Congress was called to redeem that pledge, and when they went back to the country, on the 8th of November, 1910, the voters told them in plain words how utterly faithless and untrustworthy the Republican Party and its leaders had been in redeeming their tariff pledges by electing an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, and that is why we are here now, battling for reciprocity. [Applause.]

They undertook to convince the country, by tariff-board propositions and various other political devices, that if they got back into power once more they would certainly correct the mistakes they had made. What was the answer of the people to their suggestion, on the 8th day of November last? It was that they could not be trusted. That was it.

And now let us see. When the worthy and honorable gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] made his most learned and elaborate speech on last Saturday on this floor the result was simply to uphold the doctrine of "protection for protection's sake." The speech of the gentleman from Maine showed labor and profound study. It was a carefully prepared dissertation. He told us that whenever you open up new areas of land that we must resort to the doctrine of protection to save the lands we have been cultivating. If we follow that up to its legitimate result, but few new countries would be opened up. His speech was a mournful echo of the past. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that whenever you separate, as this reciprocity bill proposes to do, protection for protection's sake from the Republican Party it will languish and die. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is the doctrine that the Republican Party stands for in every essential respect. But, Mr. Chairman, this very doctrine of protection for protection's sake was, by a confession made by the President of the United States, admitted to be wrong, and it ought to be changed. Every standpat speaker has forgotten that. I refer to his celebrated Beverly letter, written at the request of the national congressional Republican committee of August 20, 1910. What was it? I want you to listen to me while I read it. The President was making a promise, hoping to get his party back into line and power. He hoped that the people would listen to him, and he hoped in that way to reform and restore the broken and shattered ranks of his party. Parenthetically, I will say that it seems to me as a political proposi-

tion his reciprocity measure has done as much as anything could possibly do to break down the old stand-pat Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has. What did he say in that Beverly letter? He said:

The truth is—

And emphasis is laid on that expression, "The truth is"—this is President Taft who is talking, talking to get his party restored to confidence, but he did not succeed—

The truth is that under the old protective idea the only purpose was to make the tariff high enough to protect home industry. The excess of tariff over the difference in the cost of production here and abroad was not regarded as objectionable, because it was supposed that competition between those who enjoyed the high protection would keep the price to the consumer down to what was reasonable for the manufacturer. The evil—

Of what?

of excessive tariff—

That his party had been following since it originated—

the evil of excessive tariff rates, however, showed itself in the temptation to manufacturers to combine and suppress competition, and then to maintain the prices so as to take advantage of the excess tariff rate over the difference in the cost of production abroad and here.

That is a clear-cut, plain admission by the leader of the Republican Party, the President of the United States, that the very tariff rates that we are complaining of to-day were "excessive"—an "evil"—that all the great trusts had combined and had squelched out the small industries of the same character and then enjoyed the liberty and the privilege and the power to charge just what they pleased; and they did it with the full knowledge and connivance of the Republican Party, and they oppose this reciprocity because it stops this.

And, Mr. Chairman, the wonderful accumulation of wealth and the wonderful growth of corporations in the last 15 years have come from that excessive tariff and under Republican administration. Do you suppose that honest people, people who have tried them heretofore, are going to trust the Republicans again? Why, no. They are not going to trust them, and the response of the people last November put the responsibility upon the Democratic Party. There are the words of the President himself that the manufacturers took advantage of the consumer; that they combined, and that they abused the excessive tariff by combinations; and that they put up the tariff rates so that no foreign goods could come over here, and thereby built up these colossal fortunes that we are fighting. And yet the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] in his elaborate speech of several hours says that the great object in successful government is to maintain the "equilibrium" between the factory—a dividend-bearing affair—and the farm, which is a home of areas. That is his doctrine, to maintain the "equilibrium"; to keep up and enrich the manufacturer and impoverish the farmer and make the life of the ultimate consumer one of labor and toil.

Gentlemen, that is the true doctrine of the standpatter. That is what he means, and there has not been a speech made on either side against this measure that has not been in defense of the doctrine of protection for protection's sake. A Republican who faithfully affiliates with his party can not consistently stand for anything but protection. All on a sudden Republicans have become very considerate about the interests of farmers. I am not one of those who so largely believe that this reciprocity measure will at all militate against the interests of the farmers of this country. I remember the great words of Patrick Henry, "By the light of the lamp of experience shall my feet be guided."

If that be true, as uttered by that wonderful Virginian in the early days of the American Revolution, then what have we to go by to lead us to believe that this bill is not unfriendly to farmers? Don't you know that the reciprocal treaty made in 1854 beween this Government and Canada was made by a Democratic Congress? The South at that time, it is true, was quite influential in the conduct of affairs of the Republic. Who repealed that treaty? It was the Republican Party that repealed it. Yet they come here now and complain about the things that Mr Taft includes in his reciprocal pact. What was in that treaty of 1854? Let us look and see. Who repealed it? Undoubtedly history shows, as far as concurrent history can demonstrate anything, that it was the gathering of combined influence of money that got together and repealed that treaty of 1854, the repeal taking place in 1865.

What did Mr. Taft put in the treaty that we are now supporting? It includes cattle, fish, wheat, other grains, fresh vegetables, fruits, and dairy products, and also rough lumber and raw materials useful to our industries. And for the benefit of some of our friends on the other side of the Hall I call attention to the fact that the President, in his reciprocity message of January 26 last, said: "We ought to have free lumber."

What was in the treaty of 1854? It placed upon the free list those articles I have mentioned as being included in Mr. Taft's message, with a good many others. The treaty of 1854 put the following articles and products on the free list:

Grain, flour and breadstuffs, animals of all kinds, meats (fresh and otherwise), cotton, wool, seeds, vegetables, fruits (dried and undried), fish of all kinds, poultry, eggs, hides, furs, crude stone or marble, slate, butter, cheese, tallow, lard, horns, manures, ores of all kinds, coal, pitch, tar, turpentine, ashes, timber and lumber of all kinds, firewood, plants, shrubs, trees, pelts, wool, fish oil, rice, broom corn, bark, gypsum, grindstones, dyestuffs, flax, hemp, tow, unmanufactured tobacco, and rags.

The repeal of this treaty was then considered a public calamity. The repeal of that treaty was most harmful to the rights of American citizens relative to Canadian canals. It broke up the rights of American fishermen, granted under the treaty, to fish in the Atlantic where they pleased, without any regard to limit as to distance. All these and other troublesome and long-pending questions were reopened by the repeal of the treaty and finally settled at The Hague.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with these lights before me can anyone dare say that the treaty of 1854 and the Canadian reciprocity bill now being considered are materially different? It was the protection theory of the Republican Party that repealed the treaty of 1854 and they are struggling now to prevent its revival. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have not the time to discuss this treaty from a political standpoint. I agree with the stand-pat Republicans that, so far as the political standpoint is concerned, if the President was playing only politics and seeking to advance the political welfare of his party, it was a great blunder that he made to send in this reciprocity matter; but he was broader than that. He looked to the welfare of his home country, the economic blessings to us all, to the betterment of Canada. Mr. Chairman, we are in an extra session of Congress and should some one ask me if I thought it a wise political move for a Republican President to call into existence a hostile Congress eight months before due, I would say "No." I was one of those Members who did not want any extra session, and I believe that if we had left it to the Democrats and the Republicans of the House to vote on the question there would have been hardly a baker's dozen in favor of an extra session. But we are here, and the Democratic Members are ready to stay here until we run into the regular December term of Congress if necessary to perform and carry out our program to relieve the people. [Applause.] What have we done? I am more than gratified as a Democrat at the conduct of our leaders and our party here.

In a few days we have passed the bill for the election of United States Senators by the people; we have taken up the campaign publicity bill and put in a provision requiring report of campaign contributions before election as well as after. We have taken up, now, this reciprocity measure, and we will soon have up the "farmers' free list." All of these bills died in the Senate last session. More will be done by a Democratic Congress in this session than has been done in the last 40 years in this House in the same length of time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are following the wise policy of "one schedule at a time." We are going to keep up the good work. We were not sent here to act like a "bull in a china shop," to tear everything to pieces. We are exercising and we will continue to exercise conservatism, prudence, and care. Mr. Taft, in his Beverly letter—written, as I said before, at the request of the Republican National Committee—strongly commended acting on one schedule at a time. He certainly can not complain at the course we are pursuing. In due time our people will put up to the President a reasonable, fair reduction on the wool schedule. The country knows that the President said publicly that the woolen schedule was indefensible. I say all we have to do is to keep to the course that we have started, permit no outside influences to guide us, keep up the care, prudence, and freedom from the extreme which has so far characterized our action and has won the commendation of the country and given trouble to political opponents, and just as sure as the election takes place, as it will next year, we will nominate either Harmon, Marshall, CLARK, Wilson, Dix, or some other good Democrat and elect him President of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And you will never hear any more complaint about putting these articles on the free list. The people will welcome our conduct. We have suffered long, long years from the onerous imposition of Republican protection for protection's sake. They talk about prosperity. Is it possible that a man can believe that prosperity would come to this country alone through protection? I will tell you what I stand for, and I believe that we should avail ourselves of it, that when we work it out to the

full extent we will establish in Canada with this country of ours the same free commercial relations that exist between our States. I believe this country will welcome that hour when it comes. Let them have the same untrammeled free commercial relations that exist between the States, and I believe that this bill leads in that direction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If Canada can receive the blessings of this reciprocal agreement with a population of not an average of two citizens to the square mile, why can not our country barter and trade in the same way, when it is to our mutual benefit, with France, a country that has 200 people to the square mile, or with Germany, that has 300 people to the square mile? This is not impracticable. That is why in the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I said I look upon and welcome this reciprocity measure as a wise menace to protection for protection's sake. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the latest declaration of the Texas Democracy upon the question of free raw material is contained in the State platform of August 10, 1910, and is in these words:

> We reaffirm the tariff declarations of the Democratic State and national platforms of 1896, and we expressly condemn the proposition to remove all duties from the manufacturers' raw material so long as such duties remain on the manufacturers' finished product.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the position of the Texas Democracy upon the question of free raw material, and it is this position upon that question which has called down upon the Democracy of our State severe criticism in certain quarters. In my opinion the Democracy of Texas is eminently correct in its position, and I shall briefly address myself to an examination of the criticisms which have been directed against that position.

One of the ablest and most recent assaults upon the position of the Texas Democracy upon the tariff question was set forth in a speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas], and because his speech upon the doctrine of free raw material is the fairest and most logical that has attracted my notice, I shall use that speech as the basis of my remarks.

The tariff is a tax. Whatever men may have thought and said about it in the past, we of this day, both Democrat and Republican, concede that it is a tax. All taxes are burdens, and particularly so is a tariff tax, because it is incapable of just and equal distribution. All enlightened men concede that organized government can not exist without imposing the burden of taxation, and all good men are willing to submit to this burden so long as the tax is laid in accordance with the principle of equality. Favoritism and discrimination in tariff taxation as administered by the Republican Party is alone responsible for the disfavor into which the system has fallen in this country, and therein lies the vice of the proposition to exempt the manufacturer from the payment of his taxes when he buys his materials, and which at the same time continues the tax against the people who buy the manufacturer's finished products.

As a means of protecting, fostering, and encouraging the manufacturing industries of this country, I shall concede that free raw material is an effective weapon. Indeed, there is no business in this country, whether it be farming, cattle raising, mining, or manufacturing, which would not be protected, fostered, and encouraged by being exempted from taxation. But the doctrine of Democracy has always been that it was an unjust and oppressive abuse of the taxing power of the Government to tax one man or one avocation in order to protect, foster, or encourage another man or avocation. For almost a hundred years the Democratic Party has warred upon Whig and Republican injustice in administering discriminatory and inequal laws of tariff taxation, so framed as to stimulate a certain class of industry at the expense of the general taxpayers of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The fear of injuring the manufacturing industries of this country has always been the excuse of the Republican Party for the imposition of burdensome and excessive import taxes, but it is indeed a strange doctrine to proceed from Democrats who profess to adhere to the Democratic principle of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

Those Democrats who propose exempting domestic manufacturing industries from taxation by means of free raw material rest their case upon the following grounds. They say:

First, it is necessary to give the manufacturer free raw material in order to prevent injury, disaster, and handicap to his business. Second, they say, it is necessary to give the manufacturer free raw material to enable him to build up an export trade and to successfully compete in foreign markets with foreign manufacturers. Third, because, they say, it is futile to tax the manufacturer, inasmuch as he adds such tax into the cost of his finished product and it is paid by the consumer.

My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas] very ably presents the position of those Democrats who adhere to these views. He assigns the following reason for the first contention:

> My remarks now shall be directed especially to the question as to how the duties must be laid under a revenue-tariff system so as not to handicap or injure any of the industries of the country. I shall undertake to show that this can be done only by placing the raw materials of manufacture on the free list. I shall undertake to show that without the importation of such raw materials free of duty a tariff only for revenue, as contradistinguished from a tariff for protection, is impossible without disaster to many of our industries, from which it will follow that the free raw material is the true Democratic doctrine.

Mr. Chairman, the proposition to exempt the manufacturer from the payment of his taxes by means of free raw material for the purpose of saving his business from handicap, injury, and disaster, is, to my mind, but stating the Republican position negatively. To save from injury is but another name for encouragement; to hold harmless against disaster is but protection negatively announced, and to insure against handicap is at least equivalent to fostering. Neither the Republican doctrine of protection nor this pseudo-Democratic doctrine of saving from injury, is the true principle upon which our tariff laws should be based. The use of the taxing power of the Government for the avowed purpose of protecting, fostering, and encouraging one man's business at the general expense is an iniquitous abuse of power; and it is equally unjust to exempt one man's business from the payment of its just proportion of taxes as a means of saving that business from injury, handicap, and disaster. It is an abuse of power to tax or untax any class of persons or enterprises for the purpose of affirmatively aiding or of negatively preventing injury, where such assistance is given by special privilege at the expense of all other classes of persons and enterprises. The Republican doctrine of taxing all the people for the purpose of encouraging a few, is not improved upon by the proposition to give the manufacturer exemption from taxation by increasing the taxes of everyone else.

The second reason assigned in support of free raw material is that it will enable the manufacturer to build up an export trade. Quoting again from the speech of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas], he says:

> If our manufacturers were not burdened by a tax upon their raw material, they would need no protection, and the duty upon their products could be reduced to a revenue basis. They could go into foreign markets and meet the competition of the world.

The solicitude for the manufacturing industries entertained by those who desire to give them free raw material has already been anticipated by the Republican Party in the drawback provision, so far as articles manufactured for export is concerned. The present tariff law, written by the Republican Party, contains the provision—

> That where imported materials on which duties have been paid are used in the manufacture of articles manufactured or produced in the United States there shall be allowed on the exportation of such articles a drawback equal in amount to the duties paid on the material used, less 1 per cent of such duties.

The effect of this provision is to relieve the domestic manufacturer from the payment of his raw-material tax upon all articles manufactured for the export trade. In the light of the drawback provision above quoted from it is evident that those who now advocate free raw material for domestic manufacturers do so as a means of giving the manufacturers a bounty not enjoyed by other people, and not for the purpose of increasing our exports.

It is very evident to my mind, Mr. Chairman, that when the time arrives that our domestic manufacturers can pay freight and insurance and successfully compete in foreign markets, there will no longer be occasion for the anxiety manifested by protection Republicans or the solicitude exhibited by free-raw-material Democrats for the safety of our manufacturers in our home markets as against the competition of foreign manufacturers with freight charges and insurance against them. I shall not contend, Mr. Chairman, that it would not benefit the manufacturer to exempt him from the payment of his taxes. On the contrary, I know it would aid him greatly. There is no man or business that would not likewise be aided by exemption from taxation. I doubt not that if you exempt the manufacturer from the payment of his taxes it would enable him to wage a more effective war with his competitors abroad in the markets of the world. It would also encourage the farmer, the stockman, and, indeed, all men, to free them from the burden of paying taxes. The farmer, for instance, if relieved of the handicap of taxes, could more successfully invade the foreign markets with the products of the farm.

But the point I wish to emphasize is that it is an abuse of the taxing power of the Government to exempt one class of men or

enterprises from those necessary burdens of organized society at the inevitable expense of the balance of the community, even though such favoritism does operate affirmatively to protect, foster, and encourage or negatively to save from injury, handicap, and disaster. Equal and uniform taxation is, and will ever remain, the watchword of true Democracy, and special privilege under this doctrine is equally hateful whether bestowed affirmatively by taxing all men for the benefit of a few or negatively by exempting a few men from taxation at the expense of the many. If the manufacturer demands a free market in which to make his purchases, he ought to be willing to give the people a free market in which to make their purchases. If the exigencies of government are such that both must contribute by tariff taxation to its maintenance, then let us divide and lighten the burden by imposing a part of it upon each. To take all the tax from the backs of the consumer and place it upon the backs of the manufacturer would be no more unfair than the reverse of that proposition, which would result from free raw material. If it is just and wise to relieve the manufacturer from the payment of his indirect taxes, why should not State, county, and municipal governments avail themselves of the wisdom of this theory and exempt manufacturers from all taxes? If exemption from taxation in the one case would afford some degree of insurance against injury, disaster, and handicap, then exemption in all cases would vouchsafe greater assurance against those misfortunes which are likely to overtake any business.

The statement that untaxed raw material would enable our manufacturers to successfully compete with foreign manufacturers in the foreign markets proves entirely too much. It is not so much competition across the ocean that the American people demand as competition at home, in the very markets where they are compelled to buy and sell. But let us suppose that our manufacturers, if given exemption from taxation in the purchase of their materials, would be enabled to carry their goods across the ocean, pay freight charges and insurance, and still sell in the foreign markets cheaper than the foreign manufacturer. What prospect would we then have of obtaining foreign competition? For surely if the foreign manufacturer, with freight charges and insurance in his favor, was undersold in his own market by our manufacturers, he could not pay freight, insurance, and even a moderate revenue duty and bring his goods from the abandoned market at home and hope to compete in this market with the rival who had undersold him at home. So, if this contention were true the effect would be to destroy rather than to encourage a healthy foreign competition.

The third reason assigned by those who would remit the taxes of the manufacturer is that it is futile to collect taxes from the manufacturer, because, they say, he will but add the tax thus paid into the cost of his finished product, and it must be paid by the consumer at last. Quoting from my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas] upon this phase of the discussion, he says:

> If a manufacturer should import raw material for his own use, or if he purchases raw material imported by some one else upon which a duty is paid, he adds such duty into the cost of his finished product, and it is paid by the consumer.

If this proves anything, Mr. Chairman, it proves that it is futile to tax any man or business that has the power to add the tax to the cost of the thing sold. Under such a system of emancipation the first great enterprises which would come in for freedom from taxation would be the great railroads and other public-service corporations, in whose behalf the Supreme Court of the United States has already announced the proposition that they can justly and legally add not only taxes, but all other operating expenses, and a reasonable profit as well, to the service sold the public. Under such a monstrous principle of taxation all persons and all property would be exempt from the burdens of supporting the Government save and except the utterly defenseless. The Steel Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Tobacco Trust, the Oil Trust, and, in fact, all trusts would cease to pay taxes, because their ability to add the tax into the prices of the thing they sell is as great, if not greater, than the ordinary domestic manufacturer. Under this specious doctrine of special privilege it would be a waste of time to tax the merchant, because he would add the tax to his selling price. Nor would it avail to tax the professional man, because he would but add the tax to the charge for his services. Through the meshes of this net of favoritism all men would escape except the defenseless multitude who have not the power to pass their burdens along to the shoulders of others. But these defenseless victims of every scheme of privilege and inequality are not always able to pay taxes, and it is doubtful if any scheme of taxation could be devised which would afford sufficient revenue to maintain the Government based upon the principle of taxing only those who were too weak and helpless to pass any part of the burden to the shoulders of others.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the manufacturer proposes to recoup himself for import taxes paid when he sells the finished product. He also purposes to add to the price of the finished product all the other elements of cost, such as freight, interest, insurance, and State, county, and municipal taxes. After adding all the elements of cost to the price of his finished product, he then adds, in addition, as much profit as the laws of competition will allow. If a manufacturer suddenly found all his taxes, direct and indirect, and other fixed charges as well, remitted by governments and individuals, he would still exact for the finished product as great a price as his customers would endure. It is true of all men under all circumstances that they seek to obtain the highest possible price for what they sell and to pay the lowest possible price for what they buy. In this regard the manufacturer is not unlike the farmer. If you were to free the farmer from the payment of his taxes, he would still demand the highest possible price for his produce. To expect a different course from merchant, manufacturer, or farmer would be to expect in vain a reversal of the laws of nature and the laws of trade. If an example of this apparent truth were needed, we have a very recent one fresh in the memory of this body. Until the enactment of the Payne tariff bill the manufacturers of boots, shoes, harness, and other leather goods were paying in import taxes to the Federal Government on imported hides about $2,000,000 a year. By the terms of the Payne bill this $2,000,000 was remitted to the manufacturers by placing their raw material on the free list. It is undoubtedly true that the remission of their taxes reduced the cost of production of these manufacturers the $2,000,000 which they had formerly paid to the Government. But it is equally true that their selling price has not been reduced, but, on the contrary, has actually been increased. A tax was retained on the finished product sufficient to keep out the foreign manufacturer, and as a result the purchasers of leather goods not only did not receive any benefit from the remission of the manufacturer's tax on his raw material, but was affirmatively injured, because the resulting loss of revenues to the Government were necessarily made up by increasing his taxes upon other articles. Free raw material means the exemption from taxation of the things the manufacturer buys and an inevitable increase of the taxes paid by the people upon what they buy. If the emancipation of one man from the burdens of taxation could be effected without increasing the burdens of all other men, the operation would still be open to the charge of favoritism and inequality. But what must be said of a proposition to relieve one class of persons of their tax burdens by increasing the burdens of all other men?

If the contenders for free raw material are correct in their position that it is futile to tax the manufacturer because he will in turn demand a return of the tax from his customers, then indeed must our system of taxation be reversed and remodeled. The manufacturer will always purpose to collect the tax he pays from the jobber to whom he sells. The jobber in turn will purpose to collect the tax from the wholesale merchant, and he in turn from the retail merchant and this last from his customers, the ultimate consumer. In this line of dealers, each of whom purposes to add the tax to his selling price, it is as futile to tax the one as the other, for they are each actuated by the common purpose to visit the burden upon the purchaser. The railroad company purposes to add its taxes to freight and passenger tolls, and the telegraph, telephone, and express companies operate upon the same principle. The farmer himself is equally solicitous to add his taxes to the price of the things he sells, and if he fails to do so it is not because he is deterred by altruistic considerations. But the ability of the farmer, merchant, manufacturer, or public-service corporation to add taxes paid to the selling price of his or its goods or services depends upon a variety of circumstances to be considered in any proposition to remit taxes. If the farmer manages well and wisely and is not visited with disaster in the seedtime and harvest he is usually enabled to add his taxes into the selling price of his produce. But his ability to do so not only depends upon his skill and industry, but upon the condition of the markets and the elements of nature as well. The burden is upon him to do all in his power to keep down the cost of production to a point where he can meet competition, and even then he must take his chances with the weather and market conditions. If the farmer neglects to till his fields or is overtaken by storm or drouth he will not be able to add his taxes into the selling price of his produce. And the manufacturer should be willing to meet the same requirements and take his chances upon the same conditions. If the manufacturer wisely and economically conducts his business and is fortunate enough

to escape those disasters which so often befall all lines of human endeavor, he will be enabled to secure a return of his taxes in the thing he sells. But he has no assurance of the return. He must keep the cost of production down to a point that will enable him to meet competition if the taxes he paid to the Government is to be returned to him in the price of his finished product. No man purposes to sell without making a profit. Profit must include taxes as well as the other elements of the cost of production, and the ability of the seller to recoup himself should depend in all cases upon his ability to meet competition. Every tax paid by those whose business it is to acquire, produce, or manufacture for sale is treated as an advance and added into the cost of production with the purpose of securing a return from the buyer and a profit as well. The Government is under neither a legal or moral obligation to insure any class of persons or enterprises that taxes paid will be returned to them in the final sale of their goods. That is a risk which all men are justly obligated to assume, and the issue is one of business management and not of governmental favoritism.

POPULATION IS DRIFTING TO THE CITIES.

Mr. Chairman, the whole tendency of our tariff system has been to safeguard and encourage the manufacturing interests at the expense and to the discouragement of agricultural and pastoral pursuits. The result has manifested itself in a hundred harmful ways, but in none more striking than that exhibited by the census returns. Under this system of favoritism to the manufacturing industries and discrimination against the rural population, our cities have become overgrown and congested, while everywhere in the country is presented the spectacle of abandoned farms. Who can blame the farmer or the farmer's son for leaving the farm for the city when he beholds his own avocation discriminated against and neglected by a Government bent upon bestowing all its favors on manufacturing enterprises of the cities. If the farmer is compelled to pay his own tax and that of the manufacturer as well, the tendency naturally will be for him to abandon his own avocation and engage in some other business less burdened. It is unfortunate for the well-being of this Republic that our population is drifting to the cities and manufacturing centers. The agricultural population is by far the safest and most stable constituents of free government. Mr. Chairman, I am utterly opposed to favoritism in government. A just government will confer equal rights upon all and exact equal burdens from all the people. But if this Government is committed to the doctrine of favoritism and can not be dissuaded from that unjust course, then it is high time we select the agricultural class as the objects of our especial care. For a hundred years they have been compelled to bear a double burden under the pretext that it was necessary in order to foster and protect the manufacturing industries. The worst evils to flow from the pernicious doctrine of free raw material would be a further discouragement of pastoral and agricultural pursuits. If the manufacturer is to be relieved of his taxes by this free raw-material device, thus inevitably laying added burdens upon all other classes of taxpayers, the farmers will continue to send their sons to the cities and manufacturing centers. When gentleman talk of imposing taxes for the purpose of encouraging, or remitting taxes for the purpose of saving from handicap the manufacturing industries, they should remember that these artificial helps and aids to one class of people is at the inevitable expense of all the balance of the people. And for every encouragement they afford one man by exempting him from taxation, they do to that extent discourage some other man, whose burdens are increased in the operation.

Mr. Chairman, I have no sort of prejudice against the struggling millions who flock to the cities in an effort to avail themselves of the special privileges bestowed by this Government upon those engaged in manufacturing. I have no criticism to make against country people who flee from the farm to the city. So long as the Government pursues the policy of discouraging the pursuits of the country and encouraging the pursuits of the city we may expect this condition to prevail. What, sir, is the doctrine of free raw material but a command to the farmer and stock raiser to abandon his calling and move to the centers of population? You say by this doctrine that farming and stock raising do not rise to the dignity of domestic industries. If the manufacturer wants to purchase materials for his business you remit his taxes as an encouragement to his industry. But when the farmer wants to purchase materials for his business you demand that he pay a double tax in the purchase. By this selfish contortion of the tariff laws you declare that farming and stock raising are not such industries as are worthy to be encouraged. You go even further in your discrimination, for you demand that the producers of raw material shall pay the manufacturer's tax as well as their own. What has been the fruits of this favoritism to those engaged in manufacturing? The fruits, sir, are the untilled fields and abandoned homes of the country and the congested slums and teeming millions of the city.

Not only is our swelling tide of foreign immigration flocking to the cities as soon as they set foot upon our shores, but the native population are no longer content to remain in the country. The recent report of the Immigration Commission reveals a startling state of affairs in this regard. A census of the pupils in the schools of 37 of our largest cities shows that 58.5 per cent of the total are the children of foreign-born fathers. In the great city of New York 71.4 per cent of the pupils were the children of foreign-born fathers, and in the cities of Chelsea, Mass., and Duluth, Minn., the percentage was 74.1 in each city.

The Secretary of Agriculture in his 1909 report strongly emphasizes the depopulation of the farming districts in the following summary:

With the rapid extension, also, of our industrial life and the opportunities offered in the past in business and in the professions the cities have called upon the country for clear brains and vigorous bodies to such an extent that large areas have become so depopulated of active and vigorous minds and bodies that the stock is insufficient to repeople the country districts. The result has been that some of the most fertile lands in our Eastern States, some of the most fertile lands of the world, have been left in a condition of practical if not actual abandonment, and the price of provisions has increased for the simple reason that there are not enough people to actually work the soils and to raise the crops necessary to feed the nonproducing population of the cities.

In the face of these conditions gentlemen propose a further discouragement of the pursuits of the country by discriminating against the farmer's produce, which they are pleased to arbitrarily classify as raw material.

I do not find fault with those who want to give legitimate encouragement to domestic industries, but I do most seriously object to a classification which excludes the farmer, the stock raiser, the mechanic, and all others except those who give the finishing touches to articles of commerce. The farmer whose products feed the world is as much engaged in domestic industry as the manufacturer who converts the products of the farm into a more refined state. Stock raising is a domestic industry as important as the manufacture of leather. The great trouble with those who demand free raw material for the manufacturer upon the plea that it is necessary in order to save domestic industries from harm is that they omit all agricultural and pastoral pursuits from the list of domestic industries.

THE OLD DEMOCRACY.

Prior to the Civil War the Democratic Party very largely controlled the tariff legislation of this country. Under the administration of a long line of able Democratic Presidents the agricultural and pastoral pursuits were recognized as important avocations. Prior to the Civil War no man ever heard of a Democrat who advocated free raw material for the manufacturer. Of all the ante bellum Presidents James K. Polk was by all odds the best equipped upon this question. He was for many years a Member of the House of Representatives, was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and Speaker of the House. Polk was the best informed man of his time upon the tariff question. In a work entitled "The Messages and Papers of the Presidents," compiled under the direction of Congress by Hon. James D. Richardson, I find these statements as to President Polk's position in the councils of the Democratic Party:

He was prominently connected with every leading question, and upon all he struck what proved to be the keynote for the action of his party. During the whole period of President Jackson's administration he was one of its leading supporters and at times its chief reliance.

It is a coincidence worthy to be set down that President Polk brought Texas into the Union, and that Texas has furnished to the Union the ablest defender of Polk's views and the views of Democracy upon the tariff question.

In his first annual message to Congress President Polk defined with great care the position of the Democratic Party upon the tariff question. I quote from that message:

In levying a tariff of duties Congress exercises the taxing power, and for purposes of revenue may select the objects of taxation. They may exempt certain articles altogether and permit their importation free of duty. On others they may impose low duties. In these classes should be embraced such articles of necessity as are in general use, and especially such as are consumed by the laborer and the poor as well as by the wealthy citizen. Care should be taken that all the great interests of the country, including manufactures, agriculture, commerce, navigation, and the mechanic arts, should, as far as may be practicable, derive equal advantages from the incidental protection which a just system of revenue duties may afford. Taxation, direct or indirect, is a burden, and it should be so imposed as to operate as equally as may be on all classes in proportion to their ability to bear it. To make the taxing power an actual benefit to one class necessarily increases the burdens of the others beyond their proportion, and would

be manifestly unjust. The terms "protection to American industry" are of popular import, but they should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer or planter who toils yearly in his fields is engaged in "domestic industry," and is as much entitled to have his labor protected as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator, or the mechanic, who are engaged also in "domestic industry" in their different pursuits. The joint labors of all these classes constitute the aggregate of the "domestic industry" of the Nation, and they are equally entitled to the Nation's protection. No one of them can justly claim to be the exclusive recipient of protection, which can only be afforded by increasing burdens on the "domestic industry" of the others.

My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas], in his speech above quoted from, employs this language:

So it is always safe to bet that the man who advocates a tax on raw material is in his sympathies at heart a protectionist, and whenever protectionists need his help they usually get it.

By the side of that indictment against those of us who denounce the doctrine of free raw material I place the latest declaration of the Democracy of Texas, in which it is declared that—

We expressly condemn the proposition to remove all duties from the manufacturer's raw material so long as such duties remain on the manufacturer's finished product.

As a further indictment against the Democracy of Texas my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Texas] says:

Mr. Chairman, a tax upon raw material is distinctly and emphatically a Republican doctrine.

If that statement is true, then Texas, the banner Democratic State of this Union, is intensely Republican. If that pronouncement is to be accepted, then this Democratic House finds itself under the leadership of a Republican. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and floor leader of the Democrats in this body [Mr. UNDERWOOD] distinctly condemned the doctrine of free raw material so recently as March 25, 1909, when the Payne tariff bill was under discussion. Upon that occasion Mr. UNDERWOOD said:

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider the bill before the House. I want to call the attention of the committee to these paragraphs that provide for free raw material. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PAYNE] announced in his opening statement that he was a believer in the doctrine of free raw material. Being a protectionist, I believe he can justify his position in favor of free raw material. As far back as three-quarters of a century ago Henry Clay announced that one of the ways in which you could protect the industries of the country was to give them free raw materials. Manifestly so. Protection looks to giving some one something, and it is of no importance to the manufacturer at which end of the line you give him the protection, whether you raise the tariff taxes so high as to prevent competition from abroad and enable him to control the entire market at his own prices or whether, on the other hand, you exempt him from the taxation that is being paid by other people and give into the coffers of his treasury a free gift that other people are required to pay for. But I do say that if the theory of the Democratic Party is a correct one, that we are only entitled to levy taxes for the purposes of raising revenue, then we should distribute taxation as broadly as possible, so that its burdens may be borne equitably and evenly by all. That being the case, I do not see how a Democrat can justify himself in the position that what the manufacturer buys should be free and what the people use should be taxed. When he comes to that proposition he admits that he is giving the manufacturer an exemption from taxation for the purpose of making his business prosperous and refuses to levy tariff taxes for the same purpose. Is not the doctrine of free raw material exactly the same position the Republican protectionist takes when he proposes a high protective tariff to make business prosperous? But although the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] may be consistent in his theory in believing in free raw material as a Republican doctrine, I do not believe he has been consistent in his theory in applying his principles to the bill that is presented to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel to make with such of my Democratic associates as believe in free raw material. If they can reconcile their consciences and constituents in the espousal of this device of protection, I shall patiently abide the day of their enlightenment and regeneration. But I do quarrel with such of them as seek to dress this old Republican fraud up in Democratic garments and parade it before the country as the first-born of Democracy. The doctrine of free raw material is either the legitimate progeny of the Whig-Republican Party or it is a political bastard. It was never conceived in Democratic brains or warmed at Democratic breasts.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK, always safe and true as a leader of the hosts of Democracy, is one of the innumerable and unquestionable authorities for the statement that free raw material is not of Democratic origin. So recently as March 24, 1909, Speaker CLARK delivered a speech upon the floor of this House in which he made that matter clear in these words:

A political remark about free raw material may be apropos. There has been a great hullabaloo in later days about free raw material being the Democratic doctrine. It is not true at all. I will tell you what it was. Henry Clay said, in the greatest speech ever made in America in favor of a high protective-tariff system—and, by the way, if he and Alexander Hamilton could get hold of these schedules of woolen manufactures, or hear of them, they would turn over in their graves and curse the day on which they ever advocated the system. But in the greatest speech ever made in America in favor of a high protective-tariff system Henry Clay put down free raw material as one of the four means of working protection. That statement can not be denied. There is no sort of objection to any man's advocating free raw material if he desires, but he ought to give the correct reason for so doing.

Mr. Chairman, the sooner Democrats cease to talk about free lists and begin a systematic and scientific adjustment of our tariff laws the better it will be for the Democratic Party and the country. Let us equalize the burdens of the tariff and the benefits will equalize themselves. If an equal and uniform tax is impossible, that affords no good reason for abandoning the principle of equality and uniformity in adjusting the tax. We should so levy the tax that it will be as nearly equal and uniform as possible. A light tax upon a large number of articles is less burdensome than a heavy tax upon a few articles. If we will make the entire list of imports tax bearing, a light tax upon each article will suffice for the needs of the Government, but if a portion of the articles imported are given free-list immunity from taxation the tax upon the remaining articles must inevitably be made to yield greater revenue. I would scatter the burdens of the tariff tax over a wide range of articles, and if incidental benefits to any class of persons or avocations result from the imposition of the tax, these benefits would likewise be widely distributed. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I leave my own seat because from that place it is impossible to be heard. Listening to the arguments that have been made against this reciprocity treaty I have been struck with one fact, and that is the fact that this great and glorious country of ours is the poorest country on earth in the sense that we are absolutely unable to compete on our own ground with the inhabitants of any other quarter of the globe. We can not compete in cattle or sheep with the warm regions of South America; we can not compete in farm products with the colder regions of Canada; we can not compete with the bleak plains of Siberia; we can not compete with the peon labor of Mexico; we can not compete with the pauper labor of Europe, nor can we compete with the high-priced labor of the New World. We can not compete with any people in any country in any product under the sun, and Heaven itself is so cruel that the very minerals in the bowels of the earth and the trees in our forests can not compete in richness or growth with any other land. Under the same reasoning, the same class of gentlemen, if the Constitution in the beginning had not forbidden the levying of any duty between the States, would in each and all of our States have erected tariff walls against each other. In Texas they would contend that Texas could not compete with Kansas in corn and they would contend that Kansas could not compete with Minnesota in wheat. They would contend that Minnesota could not compete with California in lumber or fruit; that Georgia could not compete with Florida in oranges, and so on through the long list. They would have had 46 different systems of protective tariff, erecting a wall around each and every one of our States. They would have had a system of petty, picayune protection that would have enabled the few in each State to be enriched at the expense of the many. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And perhaps in the magnitude of the splendid resources in such a State as Texas the protectionists there would have been pointing to the wonderful progress of Texas and saying that protection for Texas had built up its industries and made for its prosperity.

The truth is that this country is so largely prosperous as it is to-day because it embraces the largest multitude of free-born, industrious citizens, among whom there is absolute free trade that was ever in the history of the world given free commercial intercourse. Our country has greater natural resources and a greater enlightened population than was ever gathered under the folds of any government of the earth before, and it is the free trade between these magnificent peoples that enables them to prosper, as they have prospered in spite of the hampering of your protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those gentlemen who sing the praises of protection do not compare Germany and France with England, where the natural conditions are similar, though one of these countries is under free trade, comparatively, and the others under protection; but they always compare this country, the richest on the earth, inhabited by the most ingenious, industrious, and productive people in the world, with the peoples of the Old World, crowded down by the oppression of the classes for the centuries which have gone by, and tell us that our better condition here is due to protection. They never tell us that Germany is ruled by high protection, and that they term her labor pauper labor. They never tell us that England is almost free trade, and has prospered more than any nation in Europe since she adopted her free-trade policy.

This discussion gives opportunity to measure this Congress, not only as to its grasp and conception of the questions of tariff and protection, but also as to how far it understands, how fully or how slightly it realizes the dawn of the new era in

politics and the awakening of the heretofore indifferent masses under which the people are more and more determined to tear down privileges, prevent wrong and oppression, and establish justice. Do Members realize what is in the air? What does this talk about insurgents mean? What does the talk about progressives mean—progressive Republicans, progressive Democrats, set over as a force against standpat or reactionary Republicans and reactionary or standpat Democrats? What does all this volume of protest mean? What mean these sharp-tipped arrows of criticism and revolution flying through the air in every direction, arrows tipped with truth, winged with strength, and sure aimed against the high and mighty? What mean the speeches of statesmen who love their country and humanity more than they do party sign and symbol, or the lure of office? We hear the watchmen with vision and voice to see and tell of the night; we read the newspapers every day, those argus-eyed creatures of modern civilization, who pierce every nook and cranny of hidden things; we scan the pamphlets of the so-called muckraker and the magazine writer, the textbook of the political economist, the stories of the novelist, the sermons of the pulpit, and the essays of the humanitarian; the air is charged. What does it mean? It means that the people are in revolt against privilege, oppression, greed, and corruption. Populism and socialism in this country in the nineties was in great measure a protest against the treason of the great popular leaders, who served their masters, not the people, too well.

A wilder storm than Populism may sweep this land if we of this day do not put a curb on unholy greed and make sure that public servants shall indeed serve the people and not other masters.

But, Mr. Chairman, I diverge too far. A local paper on April 16 had this editorial:

SENATE TO ADOPT OMNIBUS BILL PLAN—FINANCE COMMITTEE WILL CAST ASIDE TARIFF PROGRAM PREPARED BY DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY IN HOUSE AND SO MAKE REVISION IMPROBABLE.

When the House of Representatives has finished its tariff program—has passed Canadian reciprocity, its free-list bill, and several schedule revision bills—the Senate Committee on Finance will throw the whole product to the winds and proceed on entirely new lines.

The Senate program will be based on the omnibus bill plan. That is, instead of bringing out the different House bills as separate measures, the Finance Committee will take up the entire series of them, re-form them into a single general tariff-revision bill, and bring this before the Senate.

In doing this the Finance Committee will produce a situation calculated greatly to weaken the chance for any tariff legislation at all to pass.

STRANGE MIXTURE OF MOTIVES.

A strange mixture of motives will account for the Senate's adoption of this program. The regular Republican Senators, of course, favor the omnibus plan because it gives opportunity for that logrolling which has always been the determining influence in making tariffs. They will be able to trade among different interests and groups and industries; to hold one group in line for high duties which it does not want with the threat that if reduction is made at one point it will have to be carried throughout the list.

* * * * * * *

DEMOCRATIC DIVERGENCE.

Then there are two elements of Democrats—progressive and conservatives—on tariff. Among these the division and the divergence of motives is no less acute than among the different stripes of Republicans. Some of them represent States in which protection sentiment has become a factor too important to be entirely ignored. It is crystallized about particular interests, industries, and localities. It is responsible for the bitter antagonism of powerful lumber interests in Arkansas to removal of the lumber duties. It accounts for the fact that Senator CLARKE of that State has lately been accounted a protection Democrat.

This same influence has long made the Louisiana Senators frank protectionists because of sugar. It is making itself felt powerfully in expressions that come from the live-stock and rice industries of Texas. It has made Florida only second to Louisiana among Southern States as a protectionist Democracy because of the Florida fruit interests. It writes the story of Senator SIMMONS's vote for the lumber duties.

The article goes on—I will not read it further now, but I will simply say that it recalls to my mind the suggestion made by the gentleman from Minnesota the other day, who wanted to inject into this bill an amendment adding our free-list bill to this, saying that if we were sincere we would accept the amendment. Ah, in doing that he is charging insincerity on the part of his President, it seems to me. But I say to him that if the Republican Senate should tack the free-list bill to this measure I would vote, when it came back to the House, to accept it, for it can not affect the treaty. I would trust that the President would not, in the face of public sentiment and of the vote of both the House and the Senate, veto that bill, but to put that measure on this bill in the House means to invite its defeat in the Senate, where surely that would then be its fate. I do not propose for this bill to be logrolled to its death. Put this bill and our free-list bill together and we almost guarantee the defeat of both. Separately, this bill will pass this House, and with the President earnestly urging it, it will surely pass the Senate; and then, if those Republicans who now profess to want our free-list bill and want to tack it to this are honest, we will pass that, too, both here and in the Senate, and if we do, I for one believe the President will sign it. In fact, when this bill has become a law I believe our agricultural Republicans will be forced to vote for our free-list bill.

LOGROLLING HAS BEEN THE POWER BEHIND PROTECTION.

The history of tariff legislation shows, indeed, that it has been a long, fearful game in which every man has played for himself. Those whose interests were best organized always have and always will win in such a game. If no man could win an advantage under it, if every man was equally benefited and equally burdened under it, no man would want it. If one man received a benefit of $10 from it only that he might bear the burden of paying $10 benefit to some other man, neither of them would ask for the law. But equal benefits and equal burdens are not a part of protection.

Perhaps 10 per cent of all our people actually receive a benefit from the tariff. Perhaps 40 per cent of them think they receive such a benefit. Ninety per cent of them in fact bear the burden of the tribute that goes to the favored few. That is why those favored few move heaven and earth, spend money, bribe, and lie in order to retain a protective tariff. I represent that vast 90 per cent that bear all the burden; they are the blacksmith, the carpenter, the doctor, the lawyer, the shopgirl and the house girl, the clerk, the farmer who does not raise sheep or cattle or a special kind of wheat, and the workingman—those who toil with their hands by the day or by the month or by the year. I do not represent the capitalist whose personal and family consumption is but a fraction of his individual income. His interest is on the other side or is so comparatively small that it does not affect him. It may seem useless here to try to make plain what this tariff is—how it works and why it is so ardently defended. It is a tax; but if that were all no fight would be on in Congress over it now, nobody would urge it to be made higher, nobody could resist its reduction. Let me illustrate the tariff: If Washington were a walled town such as existed in ancient days, including within its walls all classes of citizens, say to the number of 50,000, she might include 100 families who were gardeners. Now, these 100 families could not raise on their ground all the potatoes consumed by the 50,000 people, and many bushels would be brought in through the gates of the city and sold at the general market price fixed by the law of supply and demand for the whole country round about. Just at this point there comes on the scene a gardener of great shrewdness and he says to the city council, "Our taxes to support this city government are grievous. We could make these people outside our gates pay these expenses by charging them 25 cents per bushel for every bushel they bring in." And the council, with glad acclaim, hail this proposed arrangement and put it into operation. What is the result? The outsider begins to take his potatoes elsewhere, to Baltimore or to Philadelphia, so the people begin to be short and the grocer here is compelled to go outside the gate and pay the same price for his potatoes that Baltimore does and pay that tax or charge of 25 cents himself in order to bring them in. Then if he pays the outsider 50 cents for them and the gatekeeper 25 cents entrance charge, they have cost him 75 cents per bushel, and he must have a profit when he sells them to all the people of the city who eat them, so the people at last pay that tax. But, we have forgotten that wise, shrewd gardener who is raising potatoes inside. He gets a new idea, and taking counsel with himself, says: "If the people who eat pay 75 cents for the potatoes shipped here they must pay 75 cents for my potatoes, therefore, I will raise my price," and he does that very thing. Still finding that they can not raise enough potatoes to supply the city and that potatoes are still coming through the gates and paying this tax and the people seem to know nothing about it, and, finding further, that the city government are lavish spenders and want more money, and that some of them raise potatoes themselves, he comes before the council again, and tells them the land is much richer outside the city and potatoes grow much better outside, and a thousand other things, wherefore he asks that the tax for entrance be raised to 50 cents per bushel and it is done. Now, the people in the city will pay, not 50 cents, not 75 cents, but $1 per bushel for all the potatoes brought in and for all the potatoes the gardener raises, and, therefore, Mr. Gardener defends and demands that this law be decreed sacred and that nobody touch it, unless it be to amend it by revision upward. This, Mr. Chairman, is "the tariff."

Of course it is readily seen that if there were so many gardeners that they raised more potatoes than could be eaten inside the city and they had to go outside the gates themselves to sell their surplus, they could not have had their prices raised by this charge at the gate unless, knowing about the gate tax,

all the gardeners inside the city combined together; and having tried the outside market and found the price there to be 50 cents, they might come back into the city, put all their potatoes together, and make the people pay 50 cents plus the gate tax per bushel for all they consume inside and send all their surplus out and sell that at 50 cents. That, also, is not so bad, and that is what our Steel Trust has done. That is the trust stage of protection, which is growing every year a heavier burden and curse on our people. We growers of wheat, corn, and cotton are very much out in the cold. We never have been and never will be able to form such a trust. I very much fear that if we were situated so we could ride on the backs of our fellow citizens we would be inclined to do just as I have supposed the potato grower to have done in the walled city. On this point the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is illuminating. He says that when his mills have cut all the lumber they can sell to home consumers at the price they are able or willing to sell them at, being protected against any outside competition by the tariff wall, then it is right that they begin to sell their surplus at lower prices, not to home people, but to foreign markets, without profit or even at a loss, and keep their home price high enough to make a good profit on their entire output in that way, giving to the outsider the benefit of the great supply and cheap product and making the home consumer bear the double burden. Under this kind of protection the donkey is a fitting party symbol of Democracy, because the mass of the people bear the burden of it. We not only bear the burden of higher prices to us, but the burden of enough higher prices to enable the protected interests to go out into the outside market and by adding to the supply there still further lower the prices to the outsider. Our higher prices here help decrease home consumption and help to make a surplus in the home market, and that surplus is used to help supply the foreign demand and lower the foreign price. What does the lumber-mill man care who pays him the money, so he can cut all his lumber and make the average price a very profitable one? That is what the gentleman from Michigan said the Lumber Trust did; in effect he said they made the home people pay the profit on all the lumber they sold both at home and abroad.

Suppose, Mr. Chairman, it were proposed to make a similar distinction and discrimination as between different classes of our home people. Suppose we should say that when dull times come and a surplus of lumber is on hand the mill man might still keep his prices up as to the countryman, the farmer, but lower it to the city home builder. Would we deem it just? Yet, is it any less just and right to favor some of our home people at the expense of others of our home people than it is to favor foreigners at the expense of all our home people? No, sir; and I tell you we will never get relief from organized greed until we compel the great industries in this country to sell always, whether they are running long or short, at the same price to all buyers, whether for home or foreign trade. Then if Mr. FORDNEY's supply shall be greater than the demand at high prices, let him lower his prices; and if his supply at the lowest price at which he can profitably cut lumber becomes greater than the demand, let him stop cutting. What right, Mr. Chairman, has the lumber king to demand of you and me that we pay him more than we could buy his own lumber for anywhere else than in our own country?

I want to tell you, however, what the largest cattle grower in my county said to me. My county has a little more than 50,000 inhabitants. This gentleman, discussing with me the duty on hides, said that he rendered 600 head of cattle for taxes. He said that if the tax remained on hides and the cattlemen got all the benefit of it, it would probably amount to 50 cents per head, or $300, to him. He also stated there were not over 300 men in the county whose cattle possession would average 20 head. This would make 6,000 cattle belonging to 300 men, and the raised price for their benefit would amount to $3,000. "Now," he said, "if they got the money, who had to pay it?" He thought the tanner could not lose it, so when he bought the hide he would charge it up when he sold the leather to the shoemaker and harness maker, and he would also have to have some profit or go broke—that the harness man and shoe man could not lose it; that they would have to charge it up when they sold it to the man, woman, or boy who wore the shoes or used the harness—and so he said he thought the people who would ultimately pay him the $300 and the 300 small cattlemen their $10 each would be those 50,000 people of my county; and he finished by saying that he had no right to take this money from his people or make them give it to him and that he was not a beggar or object of charity. Mr. Chairman, this plain statement that the ultimate consumer paid the tax, or the increased price by reason of the tax, was the teaching of every Democrat or professed Democrat until two years ago. The Republicans used to claim that the foreigner paid the tax on all imported goods, but even he never claimed that anybody but the ultimate consumer ever paid the increased price paid the home producer by reason of the tax. Even the high-tariff Republican has too much sense and conscience to deny that the original cost of any article must be carried on through its few or many stages of manufacture or transfer and finally unloaded on the ultimate consumer. This has been Democratic teaching for over 40 years, but two years ago a leader of a certain following among Democrats announced a new doctrine, to wit, that somewhere between the producer and the consumer this increase of price to the producer was absorbed and did not affect the price paid by the consumer. This new doctrine is neither Democratic nor true, but it is professed by every so-called Democrat who has some special interest or industry that he wishes to favor or help rob the people.

I want to be perfectly fair, however, to this school of Democracy, and I grant that where the tariff on any finished product is left so high as to exclude all importation, and that product is made and its price fixed by a trust, then placing on the free list the material out of which the finished product is made will not affect the price of the finished product to the consumer, and will add to the profit of the manufacturer, but in that case putting back the tariff on the raw material would increase the profits of the producer of the raw material, but neither hurt nor help the ultimate consumer. The way to benefit the consumer, the ultimate consumer, is not by putting back the tariff on raw material, but by taking the tariff entirely off of the finished product, and let me warn hopeful friends of the ultimate consumer that until we find some efficient means of destroying monopolies and combinations all tariff reduction will largely fail to give the relief we look for, and the greater the number of the people and classes that become interested in profits derived from a tariff on what they produce the harder it will be to prevent these monopolies and combinations and to break the strangle hold of the special interests on the ultimate consumer. I make this statement partly to apply to the colloquy between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. I am not sure that the price of some special grade of wheat may not be raised by a tariff.

It may be that there is grown in Minnesota a peculiar grade of wheat, all of which is consumed in this country, and for which the demand in this country is even greater than the supply. In my opinion, sir, a tariff tax on the importation of such wheat does have a tendency to raise its price, especially if there is a greater supply than there is demand for the same kind of wheat in Canada, our next-door neighbor, but in my opinion the effect would not be great. As its price increases the people, especially the poorer people, will use less and less of this superior grade and more and more of substitutes for it in poorer grades of flour and corn meal and other substances, while if the supply of this fine wheat increases and the price of it tends to fall, the people will use more and more of this and less and less of substitutes. Whether there be much or little of this superior wheat, it would always be higher than inferior grades of wheat, but not very much higher, because the masses will use common flour or corn meal rather than submit to too great extortion, and we all know that the price of this common wheat both in Canada and America is fixed in Liverpool and must be substantially the same and can not be affected by this treaty agreement, so that the whole effect of this law or agreement, after it has passed and conditions have become settled, its operation become normal and natural, will be so slight as to make the narrowest protectionist wheat grower wonder and ask how it has hurt him or whether it has hurt him at all; but, Mr. Chairman, if it be admitted—and from all the evidence adduced and arguments made here on this floor it is substantially true—that the same class of labor receiving substantially the same wages produce this wheat in Canada that produce it in Minnesota, and I can not see how the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] can contend that the President is wrong when he says that free trade with Canada in wheat does not violate the Republican doctrine of protection, because the Republican doctrine has been proclaimed to be that the tariff should only be high enough to equalize the cost of production in this country and abroad.

I know it is argued that the price should be made higher here than in Canada, because the market price of land in Minnesota is higher than the market price of land in Canada; but it has never been announced, Mr. Chairman, even by the Republicans, that protection ought to be made the means of equalizing the price of land or giving the landowner an equal income on the value of his land, unless the last paragraph of the last

Republican platform, which demands that a reasonable income on investments to be insured by the tariff be so construed, and that part of the platform I understand Mr. LENROOT to repudiate. Besides all this, sir, there is just as much difference in the value of lands in the different States of the Union as there is in the value of land between Minnesota and Canada.

The difference between the Canadian yield and the Minnesota yield is not near so great as the difference between the Minnesota yield and the yield in Texas. The difference in the quality of the wheat in Minnesota and Canada is not near so great as the difference in wheat in quality in favor of the Minnesota wheat over the Texas wheat. Greater yields of wheat per acre generally may be made perhaps in the North than in the South, and by the logic of the gentleman from Minnesota, if there is to be any justice in tariff, then we ought to have a tariff between the States, so as to equalize the cost of production and equalize the value of land and the yield per acre in the different States. Again, Mr. Chairman, if those who oppose this treaty on the ground that it may enable somebody to compete with their wheat products and possibly lower their price by adding to the supply of this fine wheat, if they are right, I say, they ought to oppose everything else that would have the same tendency. They ought to oppose every project for irrigating vast arid regions or for draining great swamp regions and thereby adding hundreds of millions of acres to our agricultural lands, because by these means we would increase, and vastly increase, the crops of corn, wheat, and other foodstuffs which help to feed the American people, and by this increase you will help to lessen the demand and price for the gentleman's fine wheat. We have spent millions and are spending millions more to redeem great areas of this arid and swamp land, and yet when a proposition arises under which without the expenditure of a single dollar we may have access for the purpose of raising wheat to millions of acres of land of good quality which has heretofore been cut off from us, the gentleman from Minnesota objects. There is no consistency in spending millions by the Government to irrigate a million acres of land to make it produce wheat for our people's consumption and refusing to accept a million acres of land already fitted for growing wheat when it is offered to us without money and without price.

In the same way there is no excuse for spending millions to reforest land denuded of its trees and refusing to accept all the timber and lumber free of tax that might be shipped into our borders. I want to be fair with these gentlemen. There is no question of any necessity of a tariff on wheat to equalize the labor cost of production; but there is a reason that may become powerful if our city population continues to grow and our rural population ceases to grow, under which the farmer, especially the producer of foodstuffs, may ask for a so-called protective tariff to greatly enhance the price of his products.

If this country ever ceases to produce breadstuffs or foodstuffs of all kinds sufficient for its home consumption and becomes an importer rather than an exporter of foodstuffs, then the farming interests of the United States, without any tariff, will get better prices than they ever have gotten for their products, but if they do like the manufacturing interests have done heretofore, they will combine and demand that a tariff wall be erected and a great tariff tax be imposed for their benefit, and this, even though they may be able to produce at a smaller labor cost than the countries against which they ask protection. They will see an opportunity to levy a tribute for bread upon every man, woman, and child in the United States, and they will find a reason to justify it, unless, before that day comes, we shall have been able to make right and justice and principle stronger than greed in the human heart or, unless before that day comes, we shall have abolished the system of collecting taxes by import duties and cease to hold before all our people a system under which part of the people are interested in making taxes higher and higher, because the higher the tax the greater the tribute collected by them, a system that must have been born in hell, because it tempts all men to gain the whole world at the loss of their souls.

Beyond question, if we did not raise enough wheat of all kinds to supply our people's demand for flour, corn would be resorted to as a substitute, and if we did not raise enough corn and wheat together to supply all our bread, then assuredly a tariff on corn and wheat would greatly raise the price of both—both to the grower and to the consumer. That leads me, Mr. Chairman, to the speech of the gentleman from Maine. He urged us to be guided by Germany and France, which both imposed high duties on farm products, so as to give home producers better prices. It is true that both of these countries do impose a high duty on wheat. Under what pretext I do not know, but surely not on the ground that their poorly-paid labor must be protected against the high-priced labor of America. Doubtless the high protectionist there makes the same patriotic professions he does here, but let us see how it works out. I speak from memory and not precisely. Germany raises only about half the wheat her people consume. Her yield per acre is far greater than our own. Her landowners belong to the higher classes and embrace the lords, who are a great compact political body, well organized, and long trained to uphold their own interests. These landlords combine with the mill owners and other manufacturers to help each other to levy a tribute upon the great masses, and together these German lords, landowners, mill owners, and manufacturers have fixed upon Germany the most iniquitous tariff burdens to be found outside of the United States, and as a result of her system of laws under which the few are favored and the many are burdened, as we were told by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], her working people in the great cities scarcely know the taste of meat. He told us that in the city of Berlin an intelligent foreman of a great factory, talking of the price of living for the employees in that factory, told him that they ate no meat, but lived on potatoes, rice, and the like.

But back to German wheat. Germany has imposed a tariff of 60 cents per hundred on all imported wheat. To do this the landlord helped put on a duty for the benefit of the miller of $1.20 per hundred on flour, to say nothing of the duty he joins in imposing on other manufactures. Then, for the further help of the miller, in order that he might have a monopoly of the grinding for German consumption, and of grinding Germans as well as German flour, they give to the miller a drawback of all the tax he pays on wheat and, I think, even a little more than that on all the flour he makes and exports from imported wheat. This is done, they say, to encourage her mill industry. Under this German law the German miller, like our manufacturer, sells high at home and low abroad. In London German milled flour sells as cheap or cheaper than American flour, but not so in Berlin; that is, the German flour does not sell as cheap in Berlin as the American or German flour sells in London. But this lure of 60 cents duty on wheat has made the German farmer for protection. The miller is for protection because of the $1.20 per hundred duty upon his flour. All the strong organized manufacturing interests are for protection for similar reasons, and none are left to fight for simple equality but the unorganized, the weak, the defenseless. The artisan, the day laborer, the employee, the hireling, the great multitude of the poor, these may sweat and toil and receive the drippings of protection as it trickles down to them through the tight-gripping but overfull hands of the favored classes. These may pick up the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table, but some day their wrongs will cry and cry aloud till Heaven hears them. One thought more. Germany raises half her wheat and imports the other. For her home wheat the price is raised by just about the amount of the tax on wheat imported, and the price of all the flour her people consume is raised by the amount of the tax on flour, or $1.20 per hundred. Therefore, wheat, but not flour, is imported into Germany. Now, if they consume 2,000,000,000 pounds of flour, they pay $24,000,000 more for it than they would without the tax; but Germany only imports one-half her consumption, or, say, 1,000,000,000 pounds of wheat, on which the Government collects six millions of revenue, so by this wheat and flour duty the Government collects six millions of revenue and the people pay just four times that much, or $24,000,000, one-fourth of which goes to the Government, one-fourth to the wheat producer, and two-fourths to the mill owner. This is a fair sample of the workings of protection; but if it shall work in this country till strong men, though laboring hard, may eat no meat and but little bread, a day of reckoning will come when just indignation and hunger will tear down the palaces of greed and oppression. Instead, sir, of insisting on their high privilege of levying tribute on all the people, ought not the gentleman from Minnesota to join us in adopting this bill, which has so many reductions of duties, and then help us to further tear down the throne of this modern Moloch of special privilege? I might be tempted, Mr. Chairman, in some instances to agree with the gentleman that we might favor a protective tariff law whose duties were based on the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad if I did not know that, under the assertion of that principle, under the profession of that faith by the Republican Party for the last 50 years, we have been led first to the Dingley bill and then to the Payne-Aldrich bill. I know, and he knows, that no such protection as he proposes is possible. I know, and he knows, that lemon growers in Florida and California, sugar growers in Louisiana and in the West, woolgrowers in Texas and Ohio will unite with the timber kings on the Pacific and in the South, and the Steel Trust in Pittsburg, and the cattle barons of the West, and the manufacturers of the East, and alto-

gether they will work for and with each other and wring every possible dollar of tribute from the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, the subject I want most of all to discuss in connection with this Canadian reciprocity bill is lumber. I believe that before long every legislator not blinded to the welfare of the people or wedded to the interests will realize that all natural resources which may be exhausted in time, or of which our supply is limited or less than our need, ought to be imported free from any country. They are not the product of man's labor. He can not make them. Nature has planted and matured them—some of them, like the forests, in the passing centuries; others, like iron, coal, crude oil, copper, in the passing of untold ages. If we, as a Nation, might be selfish—not selfish for the few, but selfish for all our people—we might have deemed it wise to impose an export duty on all these and thereby try to reserve them or make them cheaper for our people alone, but we have not done that. By our Constitution we have forbidden that and declared there shall be no export duty—that our riches may go out free into all the world. Nevertheless, the whole country is stirred with the talk of preserving these resources from untoward destruction, and conservation of our natural resources has become a national watchword. If I could to-day double the number of standing trees on every acre of our forest; if I could double the thickness and richness of every vein of coal, copper, and iron; if I could double the output of crude oil, and place all this increase in the ownership of the Government for the benefit of all the people, would I do it? Yes; a thousand times yes; and then I would place a guard with flaming sword over these riches, to see that the Carnegies, the Guggenheims, and the Rockefellers, and the Weyerhaeusers never come near them. If we would preserve all our natural resources—if we would spend, as we do, millions to increase them—why, then, do we put up a barrier to keep out these same riches when from the abundance of other lands they seek our shores? Why, indeed, except to serve the greed of the present holders of these great riches? The lumber story, which is only one of the stories to be told, shall tell you why.

Mr. Chairman, the summary of the report of the Commissioner of Corporations, Herbert Knox Smith, on the lumber industry, part 1, gives a world of information. The author of that report, Mr. Smith, says that his investigations show—

(1) The concentration of a dominating control of our standing timber in a comparatively few enormous holdings, steadily tending toward a central control of the lumber industry.

(2) Vast speculative purchase and holding of timber land far in advance of any use thereof.

(3) An enormous increase in the value of this diminishing natural resource, with great profits to its owners. This value, by the very nature of standing timber, the holder neither created nor substantially enhances.

Another paragraph of his report reads:

From Government to private ownership: Only 40 years ago at least three-fourths of the timber now standing was (it is estimated) publicly owned. Now about four-fifths of it is privately owned. The great bulk of it passed from Government to private hands through (*a*) enormous railroad, canal, and wagon-road grants by the Federal Government; (*b*) direct Government sales in unlimited quantities at $1.25 an acre.

Further on I read:

During this interval, and chiefly in the latter half thereof, the value of standing timber has increased tenfold, twentyfold, and even fiftyfold, according to local conditions. The present annual growth is only about one-third of the present annual cut. Replacement by new growth is very slow.

And this further:

Control of the timber controls the whole industry: Whatever power over prices may arise from combinations in manufacture and distribution (as distinguished from timber owning), such power is insignificant and transitory compared to the control of the standing timber itself or a dominating part thereof.

Amount of standing timber: There is now left in continental United States about 2,200,000,000,000 board feet of privately owned standing timber, of which 1,747,000,000,000 is in the "investigation area."

By "investigation area" he explains that he means the area fully covered by his investigation. I read further:

The present commercial value of the privately owned standing timber in the country, not including the value of the land, is estimated (though such an estimate must be very rough) as at least $6,000,000,000. Ultimately the consuming public will have to pay such prices for lumber as will give this timber a far greater value.

Concentration of timber ownership: Three vast holdings alone, the greatest in the country, those of the Southern Pacific Co., the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railway Co. (including their subsidiary companies), together have 238,000,000,000 feet, or nearly 11 per cent of all our privately owned timber. With the five next largest they have over 15 per cent of the total privately owned timber and over 19 per cent of that within the investigation area. Finally, nearly one-half (48 per cent) of the private timber in that area is held by only 195 great holders. The term "holder" covers any single interest—individual, corporate, or group—which is so united as to be under one control.

The Pacific Northwest: Five-elevenths of the country's privately owned standing timber is in the Pacific Northwest (California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana), 1,013,000,000,000 feet. One-half of this is now owned by 37 holders; many of these are closely connected. The three largest holders (named above) alone have nearly one-quarter. This section now furnishes only one-sixth of the annual cut. Thus its timber is being largely held for the future, and the large owners there will then be the dominating influence in the industry.

The Southern Pacific Co. holding is the greatest in the United States—106,000,000,000 feet. It is difficult to give an adequate idea of its immensity. It stretches practically 680 miles along that railroad between Portland and Sacramento. The fastest train over this distance takes 31 hours. During all that time the traveler thereon is passing through lands a large proportion of which for 30 miles on each side belongs to the railroad, and in almost the entire strip this corporation is the dominating owner of both timber and land.

The second largest holder is the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. (including its subsidiary companies), with 96,000,000,000 feet. This does not include further very extensive timber interests of the Weyerhaeuser family and close associates.

These two holdings would supply the 46,584 sawmills in the country for four and two-thirds years. They have one-eleventh of our total private timber.

The third largest, the Northern Pacific Railway Co., has 36,000,000,000 feet.

These three holdings have enough standing timber to build an ordinary five or six room frame house for each of the 16,000,000 families in the United States in 1900. If sawed into lumber and placed in cars, their timber would load a train about 100,000 miles long.

The holdings of the two railroad companies are Government grants, and 80 per cent of the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. holdings was bought from the Northern Pacific grant.

Southern pine region: In the southern pine region there are 634,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber. Concentration in total timber is much less than in the Pacific Northwest. There is, however, a high concentration in the more valuable species, longleaf yellow pine and cypress. Sixty-seven holders own 39 per cent of the longleaf yellow pine, 29 per cent of the cypress, 19 per cent of the shortleaf and loblolly pine, and 11 per cent of the hardwoods.

The Lake States: In Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan there are 100,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber. In Wisconsin 96 holders have three-fourths of all the timber. In Michigan 113 holders have 66 per cent. In Minnesota 6 holders have 54 per cent of the very valuable white and Norway pine, 16 per cent of the other conifers, and 2 per cent of the hard woods. Taking all three States, 215 holders have 65 per cent of all the timber.

Is it any wonder that, influenced as we all are by our environments, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] should be so intensely bitter against this reciprocity treaty, when the fact is that lumber alone is the great item that may be affected by this reciprocity? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, let me go on further with this lumber business. Mr. Smith says:

Effect of concentration: Such concentration in standing timber, if permitted to continue and increase, makes probable a final central control of the whole lumber industry. A few strong interests, ultimately holding the bulk of the timber, can set the price of timber and its products. The manager of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association recently said to lumbermen on the Pacific coast:

"The day of cheap lumber is passing and soon will be gone, but the men who make the money will be those who own timber and can hold it until the supply in other parts of the country is gone. Then they can ask and get their own price."

And I want to say, in connection with that, that in my State the thin remnant of standing timber is fast being cut down and sawed into lumber, and, not content to supply our own State from this fading supply of our timber, they seek for distant markets, and they object to any increase of our supply; and by imposing a tariff attempt to prevent us from obtaining lumber from foreign lands, whereby our present prices of lumber would be cheapened and the timber we have would be further from exhaustion. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I read further:

Certain further factors, not exactly measurable, increase still more the real concentration. First, a further interweaving of interests, corporate and personal, connects a great many holdings which the bureau has treated as separate; second, there are very large totals of timber so scattered in small tracts through larger holdings that they are substantially "blocked in" or "controlled" by the larger holders; third, the concentration is much higher in the more valuable species.

General information obtained indicates a very high concentration in timber ownership outside the investigation area.

Policy of great holders: The largest holders are cutting little of their timber. They thus reserve to themselves those incalculable profits which are still to accrue with the growth of the country, the diminishing of timber supply, and the further concentration and control thereof.

The concentration already existing is sufficiently impressive. Still more impressive are the possibilities for the future. In the last 40 years concentration has so proceeded that 195 holders, many interrelated, now have practically one-half of the privately owned timber in the investigation area (which contains 80 per cent of the whole). This formidable process of concentration in timber and in land certainly involves grave future possibilities of impregnable monopolistic conditions, whose far-reaching consequences to society it is now difficult to anticipate fully or to overestimate.

Mr. Chairman, these statements I have been reading are not wild flights of fancy or the frothings of political oratory. They are sober findings of fact by a painstaking Government official acting under resolutions adopted by Congress asking for investigation into the causes of the high prices of lumber. Now, how any man claiming to represent the people can vote to favor these lumber interests, to deny free admission to lumber, as these lumber kings demand, passes my comprehension. And

If any man should profess to believe that these lumber and timber men are not fighting free lumber by every means in their power, we must either wonder at his stupidity and credulity or at the brazen effrontery of his profession.

I want to read just a little more, and I want now to say that I shall not include in my reading some tables which I will insert with my remarks. I want to refer now to the amount of timber in the different regions.

Total standing timber in the Pacific Northwest.

[In billions of board feet. Thus, 1,512.9=1,512,900,000,000 board feet.]

States.	Total.	Privately owned.	Not privately owned.	
			National forests.	All other.[1]
Pacific Northwest	1,512.9	1,013.0	440.8	59.1
California	381.4	248.1	114.4	18.9
Oregon	545.8	398.1	135.8	11.9
Washington	391.0	294.6	81.6	14.8
Idaho	129.1	50.4	71.0	7.7
Montana	65.6	21.8	38.0	5.8

[1] Includes national parks, military reservations, unreserved public lands, Indian reservations, and timber land owned by the States.

In the southern pine region the total of 634,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber is distributed as follows:

	Billion feet.
Louisiana	119.8
Mississippi	95.3
Arkansas	78.7
Florida	73.9
Texas	66.0
Alabama	56.3
Georgia (part)	46.0
North Carolina (part)	42.9
South Carolina (part)	30.7
Virginia (part)	14.5
Missouri (part)	9.9

In the Lake States the total of 100,000,000,000 feet of privately owned timber is distributed as follows:

	Billion feet.
Michigan	47.6
Wisconsin	29.2
Minnesota	23.2

The lake region is the least important of the three in quantity of timber, but much of its timber is exceedingly valuable.

Concentration in the ownership of standing timber.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL HOLDINGS.

The bureau's investigation has disclosed a remarkable concentration in the ownership of the country's standing timber. A general indication of this great concentration is afforded by the following tables, in which the private timber holdings of the country are arranged by groups of holders according to size of holding in the investigation area.

Group 1 contains the timber holdings of the Southern Pacific Co., the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railway Co. The other groups contain the holdings ranging between the limits shown below:

Group 2: From 13,000,000,000 feet to 25,000,000,000 feet.
Group 3: From 5,000,000,000 feet to 13,000,000,000 feet.
Group 4: From 3,500,000,000 feet to 5,000,000,000 feet.
Group 5: From 2,000,000,000 feet to 3,500,000,000 feet.
Group 6: From 1,000,000,000 feet to 2,000,000,000 feet.
Group 7: From 500,000,000 feet to 1,000,000,000 feet.
Group 8: From 250,000,000 feet to 500,000,000 feet.
Group 9: From 125,000,000 feet to 250,000,000 feet.
Group 10: From 60,000,000 feet to 125,000,000 feet.
Group 11: Less than 60,000,000 feet.

For the entire investigation area the extent of concentration, by these groups, is as follows:

Concentration of timber ownership by groups in entire investigation area.

Group.	Number of holders.	Amount of timber owned, in billions of feet.	Per cent of total.
Total		1,747.0	100.0
Groups 1 to 10	1,802	1,208.8	69.2
Group 1	3	237.5	13.6
Group 2	5	102.0	5.8
Group 3	14	119.5	6.8
Group 4	26	115.3	6.6
Group 5	42	116.2	6.7
Group 6	105	149.2	8.5
Group 7	190	132.4	7.6
Group 8	273	96.4	5.5
Group 9	489	84.8	4.9
Group 10	655	55.5	3.2
Group 11		538.2	30.8

From these tables it will be seen that 3 holdings include no less than 237.5 billion feet, or nearly 11 per cent of the privately owned timber in the entire country, and over 13.5 per cent of the privately owned timber in the investigation area. These 3 holders are the Southern Pacific Co., the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., and the Northern Pacific Railway Co. Five other holders ranking next in importance own in the investigation area an aggregate of 102 billion feet, or 4.6 per cent of the total privately owned timber of the country and 5.8 per cent of that in the investigation area. Thus the 8 largest holders together own approximately 340 billion feet of timber, or 15.4 per cent of the total privately owned timber of the country and 19.4 per cent of that in the investigation area.

Twenty-two holders own 26.2 per cent of all the timber in the investigation area; 195 holders own 48 per cent. Stated in another way, more than one-eighth of the total timber in the investigation area (this representing 80 per cent of the total privately owned timber of the United States) is owned by only 3 holders; more than one-fourth is owned by only 22 holders. Almost one-half is owned by 195 holders.

The most marked concentration is in the hands of the comparatively few large holders of the upper groups; the lower groups control a much less important percentage. Thus, while the 385 holders in groups 1 to 7, inclusive, control 55.6 per cent of the timber in the investigation area, the 273 holders in group 8 control only 5.5 per cent, the 489 holders in group 9 only 4.9 per cent, and the 655 holders in group 10 only 3.2 per cent.

Furthermore, these 10 groups, 1,802 holdings, embrace nearly 70 per cent of the total timber in the investigation area, while group 11, the remaining holdings, aggregating unnumbered thousands, have in all only 538.2 billion feet, or 30.8 per cent of the total.

This pronounced concentration is discussed in detail later. At the moment it is essential to point out a few general considerations as to the significance of these figures.

There are other matters in this report showing how these large holders have locked in and hold at their mercy smaller holdings, and how at various times under various laws they have been able to exchange their poorly timbered for the choicest timbered lands, how they never sleep, and so forth, but I must desist. I think I have shown enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY. May I have just a little more time, say, just 10 minutes? How much did I have?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had one hour. I promised to let the gentleman from Massachusetts in.

Mr. HARDY. I can conclude in five minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, then I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that the great thing involved in this reciprocity treaty is the opportunity to be given to our people to get the benefit of cheaper lumber, one of the common necessities. I may say that there may be differences of opinion as to whether there will be a slight fall or rise in the price of wheat. It may be that if the tariff wall between us and Canada is down, when Canada's crop fails our wheat growers may be benefited, and when our wheat crop fails that our consumers may be benefited by it; but shall we always be held between the upper and the nether millstones of extortionate prices on everything because some one interest may sometime in some slight degree be affected? If we can not start by giving our people free bread, when surely the great bulk of our wheat is priced by our surplus which goes abroad, where can we ever begin to stand for the forgotten man—the man who has nothing but his labor to sell, the man who needs protection? Who among our fathers who framed the Constitution forbidding export duties, willing that our riches might flow into all climes, and trusting that the natural riches of other lands might find welcome here, could have dreamed, when he walked through the primeval forests of oak and pine in this country, as I have done in my boyhood days, gazing under the sheltering boughs of those vast giants with eyes searching the distant gloom through vistas resembling somewhat the pillared aisles of some ancient cathedral—who could have dreamed 30 years ago that the day would ever come when some vast monopolistic aggregation would gather into its control all the wealth and power of these great resources and would say to the people: "We will fix the price of the shelter over your head"? [Applause on the Democratic side.] God planted the trees, and sent the rain and the sunshine that made them grow. The Government gave away vast areas of land covered by the forests in bounties to railroads, and some—a lesser part—it sold at $1.25 per acre, and these sold lands have been taken over, in the main, by the same stupendous combinations. And now these corporations, these magnates, these potentates, whose wealth puts to shame the heritage of emperors and kings, come to us and say: "It is true these lands, this timber, cost us little or nothing, but we ask that the Government put its arms around us and shield us and protect us, and, by a tax upon importation of lumber, make our timberlands worth, not $10, or $25, but $50, $100, or $200 an acre." And all this we are asked in order that we might pour into the laps of those already overwealthy individuals, from the toil and bounty of the poor, untold, unnumbered, and immeasurable millions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCALL. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HUBBARD].

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Chairman, I find myself standing very much alone. I am the twelfth juryman against the eleven obstinate fellows. I believe in this reciprocal agreement. I look for it to add to, not to detract from, the well-being of the United States. I come from a farming community. Our interests are agricultural. During the years that have immediately passed we have felt, in that country, that the tariff tax, as levied, has subserved the interests of a selfish few; that it meant nothing to us, but meant all to those from whom we had to buy.

I came here pledged and bound to a revision of the tariff downward. My party promised a revision of the tariff downward. Our people demanded it. They had no doubt and no question as to the direction in which their demand lay, as to whether it called for a revision upward or a revision downward. We acted upon the tariff. The Payne bill was the result. My people felt that such a result was a mockery and a failure.

We are called here by a Republican President for the purpose of redeeming, so far as we may, something of that failure.

For these many, many years the farmer has been the drawer of the chestnuts. We have been assured of protection to us when protection to us was, in the very nature of things, an impossibility, and in return we were expected to gather in the ring which disposed of the question of tariff duties, take our share of the loot, and keep our mouths shut. There is an open door offering that which we have sought, an effective revision of the tariff. I shall not hesitate to enter upon the path and follow it to the accomplishment of our purpose.

I do not care particularly to discuss the question whether the tariff on Canadian wheat or Canadian barley increases or leaves untouched the price of wheat and barley in the United States. It seems to me that when the surplus of Canada reaches the free paths of the ocean, and when the surplus of America reaches the free paths of the ocean, they stand there upon a level as to price. They pass to a common market and necessarily to a common price.

And as long as a surplus lasts so long of necessity, with exceptions here and there, must that market price be prevailing and controlling in this market as well as the other markets of the world. But what of it? But what if the price is raised here, what if the duty is added to bread? Can any man contend that the farmer is so poor and so hard pressed that this burden must be added to that of poverty? Are we, in the agricultural regions of these United States, in such miserable condition, as to our land and our labor, that we must, like a sick Caesar, cry to the protected interests: "Give me some drink, Titinnius! Give me some drink."

If scarcity oppresses the land, is it to be thought of that we shall drive bread from our doors that some may profit while others starve? [Applause and laughter.]

Why, sir, what is the wonderful history of my country, of my State, if you please, almost the entire development of which I have seen within my brief lifetime? I drove over wild prairie into Iowa. The prairie fires had been raging. The country was a waste of blackness beneath, and as the night came on and the rain fell, looking upon it from the stagecoach, it was the "seat of desolation, void of light." The land was worth from $1.25 to $3 an acre, and $10 was high. But immigration poured in from all the quarters of the world. Scandinavia sent her thousands and tens of thousands to us, and today it is a fenced-in land. There is no wilderness left in it. The land is worth from $100 to $200 an acre, and earns profit upon that price. And beyond us during all this time, the time of our great development, have lain the Dakotas.

I have seen the time when on one side of the Sioux River land would sell for $40 an acre and $50 an acre, while immediately across, in South Dakota, just as excellent land, bearing just as much, would not sell for to exceed $12 to $15 an acre. Dakota was there. Her lands rose in value as our lands filled. Her prices went up. Her lands became peopled. She is becoming a fenced-in land. To our detriment? No; to our blessing and to our benefit. We exchange one with the other, to and fro, across those State boundaries; her prosperity is our prosperity. The value of our lands has advanced in equal step with the development of Dakota.

So with Nebraska lying next to us. Did we lose anything by the prosperity of Nebraska? Where are conditions of farming most profitable, most sure? Where and when have they been best with us? In the pioneer days, on the edge of things, with wilderness beyond, or among peopled and developed States, cities, towns, market places? Why, my friends who have argued this question seem to think that because across the border from North Dakota, for instance, Canada is selling wheat for possibly 10 cents less than on our side of the line that somehow we are prospering, that somehow our wheat is made dearer because Canada's wheat is made cheaper. As if somewhere, somehow, it must not meet our grain in competition. The influence that to-day, more than all others, is contributing to the splendid growth and well-being of Montana, the Dakotas, Minnesota, is the rapid development of the great Northland. There they are no longer confronting an inhospitable waste, but a growing land filling with a friendly and kindred people. It is as sure as the course of nature that prosperity can not advance on one side of the line and not advance on the other, so long as wind blows and water runs.

We have gone through one experience in the restriction of commerce between these kindred lands. We had a heritage of forest sufficient for all time. I shall not rehearse the miserable story of blind destruction. Our supplies are approaching the end. On the Canada side are now almost immeasurable forests We have forbidden our people to get their lumber from across the line. We have concentrated lumbering upon this side, and the result of the concentration is that it has gathered itself into a few powerful hands that hold the price in the market for lumber in their grasp and fix it at their pleasure. Our posterity for many generations will foot the bill for our folly. Do we wish to repeat the same process with food? We have been the most wasteful people that the world has known. Step by step in our 200 years or a little more of history we have moved across the land leaving it a waste behind us.

Here is Washington situated in the midst of a wilderness. The land once covered by fertile plantations is now grown to woods. All New England has been swept over, the fertility of her soil taken from her and carried away. In Illinois and Iowa we no longer hear of the great returns per acre in wheat which once were common. When you sell a bushel of wheat, of necessity you sell some of the soil with it, unlike the cultivation of corn, clover, alfalfa, and the feeding of stock, leaving each acre the richer for use. Taking the United States as a whole, leaving out these momentary and local interests that may be affected for the instant by Canadian competition, can there be question as to the advantage of these United States in having this great body of wheat-bearing lands lying right along our northern border?

Why, they say the Canada lands are cheap. Not for long; not for long. History will rapidly repeat itself. The human tide has flowed irresistibly from shore to shore. It is but a few years when even the waste lands among us will be peopled and cultivated. They must be. Suppose some great convulsion of nature were to happen to-morrow and the fields of Canada should be severed from us, covered and destroyed as to all possibilities of cultivation. According to these people who are pleading against this treaty such a calamity would be the greatest good fortune that could come upon our country and to our people. This would make us prosperous, add millions to our wealth, because Canada could not then sell wheat in competition with us, either at home or abroad. [Applause.]

Our people are pouring into Canada. We could not keep our land-hungry folks out of such lands, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has described, with guns. We can not prevent this movement if we would. And why should we regret or resist? It is but a repetition of the historic flow of population that has developed the continent. Is it not an excellent and desirable thing that we should have friends and kinsfolk dwelling over the border and influencing the policy and commerce of our northern neighbor?

Who deems it a misfortune that Canada is there? Who would replace her fertile fields and busy millions with waste and solitude?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts wish to yield to anyone else?

Mr. McCALL. Not at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how the division of time stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used 10 hours and 45 minutes, including the time allowed to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has used 10 hours and 3 minutes.

Mr. MANN. In reference to the time charged to the gentleman from Alabama, does that include all of the 5 hours allotted to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has used 3 hours and 10 minutes, and the total time, including that, is 10 hours and 45 minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. So there is 42 minutes difference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to have the time evened up on the two sides to-night before we adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. There is 43 minutes difference in favor of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration a proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada, the same proposition that was up for consideration by this House in February last, during the third session of the Sixty-first Congress. At that time I submitted some remarks against the proposed treaty, and I wish to-day to briefly make some additions thereto.

The speeches that I have so far heard upon the subject here in the Houe have been largely along the lines as to the effect the proposed treaty will have upon the consumers of the country and upon the manufacturing interests. I wish to speak more directly as to the effect I believe it will have upon the farmers, especially the farmers of the Northern States from Maine to Washington.

The State of North Dakota, which I have the honor of representing in part here in Congress, is purely an agricultural State. The 350 miles of its northern boundary is bounded by the southern boundaries of the great Canadian Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

Within the last three months I have received from farmers and business men of my State signed protests exceeding thirty-five hundred in number, protesting against the ratification of this proposed treaty. The great majority of these protests have been signed by farmers themselves, and I have only had five communications from my State asking or suggesting that I should support this proposed treaty. The farmers in North Dakota know from actual personal knowledge the difference between the prices which they receive for their grain upon the American side and the prices which the Canadian farmers receive upon the Canadian side of the line. I stated last February that at the town of Portal, on December 31, 1910—and that was before there was any talk of Canadian reciprocity—wheat was worth there that day 86 cents a bushel; across the street in North Portal, which is in Canada, wheat that same day was worth 75 cents a bushel. Barley that day at Portal was worth 63 cents, and at North Portal, across the street, it was worth 35 cents. Flax that day was worth in Portal $2.33, and at North Portal, across the street, it was worth $1.89. (These figures were furnished by the American customhouse officer.) The wheat that is raised upon both the Canadian and American sides of the line is exactly the same kind of wheat.

The grades run the same and the freight rates to Minneapolis, Duluth, Fort William, and Winnepeg are the same. The tariff and the tariff alone gives the American farmer the larger price. There is no argument that can be advanced by any man upon the floor of this House that will convince the farmer living in the border States and who knows the difference in the prices of his products upon this side of the line and the prices for products upon the Canadian side of the line that this Canadian reciprocity agreement is a good thing for him.

There has been much said as to the price of wheat in Chicago, Minneapolis, and Winnipeg. The wheat that is marketed in Chicago is not the kind of wheat that is raised in the Canadian Provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba and the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota. The quotations on Chicago wheat are entirely for what is known as soft winter wheat. No. 2 red is, I believe, the contract grade. The only States that produce spring wheat, from which the patent flour is made in any quantity, are the spring-wheat States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, and the wheat that is produced in the Canadian Provinces of Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan is the identical same kind of wheat. This spring wheat is a very hard, flinty wheat and makes the very best of flour, and naturally brings a somewhat higher price than the soft winter wheat; and, in fact, quite a large quantity of this spring wheat is used for the purpose of mixing with the winter wheat and thereby raising the quality of the flour made from winter wheat. There is practically no spring wheat exported from this country, but it is almost all used here in the United States. Six years ago the Province of Saskatchewan produced about 5,000,000 bushels of wheat, now they produce over 90,000,000 bushels; the production of oats has increased from 1,500,000 bushels to over 60,000,000 bushels; barley increased from less than 200,000 bushels to nearly 8,000,000 bushels; flax increased from nothing to over 4,000,000 bushels; and the production of wheat, oats, barley, and flax in Manitoba and Alberta is going up by lesps and bounds.

In the summers in the Canadian northwest the days are extremely long, and the same is true to a somewhat less extent in Minnesota and the Dakotas. In the city of Fargo, in which I live, in the summertime a person can see to read out of doors at 9 o'clock in the evening. The daylight and twilight continues even longer as we go farther north. The consequence is that the isothermal line extends a long way to the north and it is possible to mature grain in this northern country in a very short time. Wheat sown in April is harvested early in August; oats sown in May are harvested at the same time; barley sown in May is harvested the last of July; flax sown the 1st of June is harvested the 1st of September. I have traveled extensively over the Canadian northwest and have seen its millions of acres of virgin soil, much of it as yet untouched by the plow of the farmer, and I realize its possibilities. It is capable of producing wheat, oats, flax, and barley in great abundance, and this vast country, as yet in its infancy in the production of grain, will, with the admission of Canadian grains into the United States free of duty, have the effect of lowering the prices that are now received by the American farmer for grain of a similar character all over this country.

The early part of this month there was a State convention held in the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the purpose of protesting against this Canadian reciprocity agreement. Every county throughout the State, some 50 of them, held county conventions and regularly elected delegates to attend this State convention. It was attended by some 1,200 to 1,500 delegates from all parts of the State, men who were representative farmers and business men, to enter their protest against this proposed treaty. They passed the following set of resolutions by a unanimous vote:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.

We, the farmers and business men of North Dakota in convention assembled, protest against the ratification by the Congress of the United States of the pending trade agreement with Canada. In view of this attitude the following declarations were unanimously adopted:

1. That it is unfair and unjust to the agricultural interests, offering to them no semblance of reciprocal equivalent in return for what it purposes to give.

2. That it will bring suffering and disaster to a very large number of our producers, with no hope that the price of bread will be lowered to the consumer.

3. That the duty on barley will accrue in benefit solely to the brewer, incurring great loss to the producer.

4. That it places our farmers in the position of competing in our own home markets with an alien people, upon conditions most advantageous to our competitors.

5. That the Canadian producer, with his cheaper land, requires smaller investment, making the per bushel cost of his product much less than ours.

6. That it "blazes the way" for the emigration of thousands of our people and millions of our wealth to a foreign field.

7. That it will reduce farm values, increasing the burden of the debtor, destroy incentive for the greater development of farm production, and lure to alien benefit untold millions of our wealth that should and would accrue to this and future generations if employed in the development of those vast untilled acres that lie between the Mississippi River and the Pacific within our own borders.

8. That it will lower the standard of farm life, reducing it to one of drudgery, lessen the opportunities for the better education of farm children, and drive from instead of encouraging them to remain on the farm.

9. That it will lessen the purchasing power of our own producers, and by so doing the commercial interests will suffer a greater loss than can possibly be overcome by any gain in trade with Canada.

10. That in trading our home markets of over 90,000,000 people (markets that are abundantly supplied by our own producers, markets that have been largely made and earned, and which, by right and heritage, belong to our own producers) for that of 8,000,000 Canadians, with its doubtful increased advantage to the commercial and manufacturing interests, is not only unfair and unjust, but reprehensible.

These resolutions express the sentiments of over 100,000 American farmers living in the State of North Dakota.

Recently I had a letter from Mr. C. B. McMillan, of my State, who lives within 5 miles of the Canadian boundary line. He writes me "that every farmer and every business man on the American side is against the proposed treaty." He states that "every farmer and every business man across the line on the Canadian side are for it." Let me ask, Are we, the Members of Congress of the United States, legislating to help our own people or the people of Canada?

I also have a letter from Mr. Frank H. Dickinson, of Ayr, N. Dak., a man who has lived in my State for 30 years, and who is one of its most prosperous farmers. He has written me within the week that he intends to sell every acre of his North Dakota land. He says that he believes that this treaty will go through; that it will have the effect of lowering the prices of land, and that he had better get out now while he can get out at a fair price; and then he adds further on in his letter, "land is cheap in Canada; I will go up there and invest." Another farmer writes me, and his letter was received yesterday, and says:

The proposed reciprocity treaty is the burning question in North Dakota. I congratulate you and the delegation in Congress from North

Dakota for the position you have taken against it. Everyone in the State, Republicans and Democrats, farmers and business men alike, are bitterly opposed to the ratification of the treaty.

I have had hundreds of letters on this subject, and the ones quoted are fair samples of them all. I do not believe that if we go from Maine to California, throughout any of our northern States, we will find one farmer out of a hundred who is in favor of this reciprocity treaty. For 350 miles North Dakota borders upon Canada. Through the northern half of the State the Great Northern Railroad from St. Paul to Seattle crosses the State. Running north in North Dakota from the main line of the railroad to the Canadian line are 12 branch lines of the Great Northern Railroad, and only three of them cross over into Canada at the present time.

The rest of them run up to within a mile, or 4 or 5 miles, of the boundary line and stop. The reason they stop there is because of the tariff wall that now exists between the United States and Canada. Remove that tariff wall and this railroad will immediately push its branches across into Canada and bring down the Canadian wheat, oats, flax, barley, cattle, and everything else in competition with the farmers of this country.

I see many of the Manitoba and some of the Saskatchewan Canadian papers, and they are without exception heartily in favor of this proposed treaty, believing that it will raise the price of their lands by the influx of Americans into their country and by opening up to them the great markets of the United States. My understanding as to the right way to increase the trade of a country by reciprocity is to trade something we have and which the other country does not have for something they have and which we do not have, and I believe that is true reciprocity. For instance: The United States uses a very large amount of coffee. We buy it largely from Brazil, and it is imported to this country entirely free of duty. We could enter into a trade agreement with Brazil, with the understanding that we would continue to allow their coffee to come in free of duty, and they to make concessions to us for things we produce or manufacture and which they do not produce or manufacture. This would be true reciprocity. But, under this proposed treaty, we are entering into an agreement with an agricultural people—for Canada manufactures but little—and we intend to bring the 8,000,000 Canadian people, who are largely interested in agriculture, into direct conflict and competition with our own agricultural people and in the very same line of products.

In the speech which was made last Saturday by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] he stated the facts clearly and plainly; showed that while the United States at the present time, at least, was importing but little butter from Canada, yet at the same time Canada was exporting millions of pounds of butter to England. Naturally, if the tariff between the United States and Canada is removed, the distance being so much less and the freight rates so much lower, instead of shipping her butter to England she would ship to the United States, and the same analysis would apply to every other agricultural product.

I wish to quote the price of wheat on Thursday, April 13, 1911. No. 1 northern at Winnipeg was 89½ cents; No. 1 northern at Minneapolis was 98⅝ cents. This is exactly the same kind of wheat—hard spring wheat in both cases. Flax at Winnipeg was worth $2.30 and flax in Minneapolis was worth $2.54. Would these figures indicate that the tariff was of no benefit to the farmers of the United States?

Mr. Chairman, I am bitterly opposed to this proposed treaty. I consider it a one-sided treaty, and that Canada has a long way the best of the bargain. If it is ratified, it strikes the farmers of this country a deadly blow. It means that everything the farmer produces is placed on the free list, except wool—and that, I understand, is to go next. Free raw material seems to be the cry, and the farmer, producing nothing, it is said, but raw material, although to him, at least, that which he produces is the finished product, must suffer. For years the American farmer has been led to believe that a protective tariff was best for the development and building up of this country, and I have so believed and have so maintained, and I believe so now, where all interests and all classes are treated alike. The American farmer has been told that when the time came that the American people consumed the products of the farms that then the tariff would be of real and direct help to him. That time has now arrived. At the present time we are not producing any more barley than we consume; we are not raising as much flax as we consume; our wheat exports are dwindling down, and within the next four or five years we will no longer be an exporter of wheat; we are practically using all of the cattle we produce in this country, and the same is true as to butter, eggs, potatoes, and all farm produce; and the day has arrived when the tariff upon farm products is a real benefit to the farmer. But now, when this time has arrived and when the opportunity has come for the farmer to get a fair price for the products and the things he produces, then the tariff, which is to help him, is to be wiped out entirely.

Under this proposed treaty wheat is placed on the free list, but a duty is left on flour; barley is placed on the free list, but a duty is left on barley malt; flax is placed on the free list, but a duty is left on linseed oil; cattle are placed on the free list, but a duty is left on beef. Where is the justice or the equity in a proposition of this kind? Who has put the larger amount of time and labor into any one of these articles—the farmer, who produces the wheat, barley, flax, and cattle, or the miller, the maltster, the crusher of flaxseed, and the packer? And who is most fairly entitled to a reasonable amount of protection? There is but one answer, and that is that right and justice are upon the side of the farmer, and as far as lies within my power I shall do my best to see that he gets a square deal.

The farmer will not stand to have his products placed on the free list and be content that the manufacturer alone shall have protection. The people have complained as to the high cost of living, but the high cost of living has not been caused by reason of the price that the farmers have been receiving for their products. The trouble has been, and is, that the high cost of living has been caused by combinations and monopolies, high freight rates and express rates, which have been and are between the producer and the consumer. This proposed bill will not in anywise affect any trust or combination which exists for the purpose of raising prices, but will really help them by giving them all farm products free of duty. Farmers' organizations have been started. We have the Grange, the Farmers' Alliance, the American Society of Equity, and others, and the time is not distant when the farmers will rise up in their might and will form an organization that will sweep over this country, and they will demand and will get their just rights.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in a fair protective policy—protection that shall apply equally to all sections of the country, to all classes, and to all people. This proposed treaty strikes at the very foundation of the great principle of protection, which has been the solid rock upon which the Republican Party has stood for half a century and upon which it has had the confidence of the American people. Let us stand together now as Republicans, true to our time-honored principles, and vote against this bill; and if it must go through this House, let it go through by Democratic votes and as a Democratic measure, for that is what I believe it to be. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt in the minds of those of us who have read the statements made by representatives of farm organizations before the committees, or who have read the editorials of farm journals, or who have heard the speeches of Members representing agricultural States, as to what the American farmer thinks of this proposed pact with Canada. He is against it, so far and as fast as he is informed of its real provisions, of its total disregard of sound economic principle, of its total disregard of moral standards, and of its utter lack of the spirit of the square deal.

NO BENEFITS FOR THE FARMER.

The representatives of the American farmer have made it clear that so far as benefits to him are concerned in this tariff measure they are Utopian, imaginary, fantastical. They do not exist. But, so far as burdens are concerned, they are only too real and threaten to become heavy and grievous to bear.

THE BARB-WIRE BUBBLE.

When the masters of the National Grange of many Eastern States first sounded a note of warning to the farmers of this country Secretary Wilson was sent East to make a speech so as to allay the farmer's fears. The great benefit to the American farmer that he found in this treaty was free barb wire. The American farmer may be naturally slow, possibly credulous, and yet he is no man's dupe. He proceeds to look into this alleged benefit. What does he find? He finds it ridiculous to suggest that a saving in the small amount of barb wire used to fence a field or two for cattle would be any offset to his losses. Moreover, he finds that Canada does not produce barb wire, and certainly not in such quantities as to affect the American price of barb wire the least fraction of a cent. He finds that Canada has barb wire on the free list and imported last year over 96,000,000 pounds of wire from the United States. This importation has reached as high as 114,000,000 pounds of wire a year. So this benefit of free barb wire turns out to be a bubble that upon examination bursts and vanishes into thin air. But in the mind of the American farmer Secretary Wilson suffered on this same barb wire a severe rent in the trousers of his reputation which it will take him some time to mend.

FREE LUMBER A GOLD BRICK.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. My time is limited, but I will answer a question.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether in his investigations the farmer made any discoveries with reference to lumber.

Mr. NELSON. He did. The next alleged benefit that was claimed for the farmer was free lumber. So the farmer set to work to find out what benefit there is in that item. Being somewhat suspicious on account of barbed wire, he expected to find in it knots and slivers for him. And so he did. The lumber he does not use in any quantity—the rough lumber—is on the free list, but the lumber he does use—shingles, boards tongued and grooved—are taxed in this treaty. But suppose that the benefit of the average reduction made in the tariff on lumber that he does use gets by Jim Hill's railway freight charges, through the benevolent associations of retail lumbermen, and reaches his pocketbook in safety, what would be the amount of saving when he comes to build a new house once in 40 or 50 years? Any old farmer can figure out in his head that this saving, if it got to him, would not exceed $10 or $15. So that this benefit from free lumber turns out to amount to 10, 15, or possibly 20 cents a year as an offset to his losses. Now, the farmer may be slow, credulous, and wear long whiskers, but he is no man's fool. He knows when some one is attempting to work off on him gold bricks.

MOONSHINE MARKETS.

Thereupon the farmers were told of the free markets of Canada for small fruits and vegetables. The farmer takes down his geography to look for these markets of Canada to which he may send his small fruits and vegetables and expect a reasonable profit after he has paid the freight. But he does not find them. They are Utopian. They do not exist. As well might these gentlemen go to the icemen of America and point out the profitable markets of Iceland for ice, or go to the coal men and suggest to them the markets of hades for coal. The farmer knows as well as anybody that his home markets are far to be preferred. He can not be fooled into the belief that he can profit by carrying coal to Newcastle. The farmer may be slow and credulous, but he knows as well as anyone else when some one is attempting to hand him a lemon.

FARM LOSSES REAL.

But while his benefits in this pact are imaginary, his losses are real. The representatives of the American farmer made it clear before committees that now when consumption had overtaken production and he stood to gain from the tariff his relief from Canadian competition is to be taken away from him. They also made it clear that his losses would come to him in three forms.

FALLING PRICES.

These representatives called attention to the falling prices in the crops now on hand. Gentlemen for the treaty may shut their eyes and their ears to the abundance of evidence that exists of its probable effect upon prices, but the farmer knows what is taking place to-day. At the very suggestion of the passage of this pact he suffers a severe loss in present prices. He knows what has happened to the wheat, barley, oats, hay, and dairy products. He asks himself, If this is the effect before its passage, what will be the result when this pact shall have become a certainty? Who can estimate the loss in dollars and cents to the American farmer that comes to him in the falling prices of crops now on hand?

DECREASED CROP VALUES.

But a more serious loss will come to him in the decrease of the average value of his crops per acre annually. The representatives of farm organizations, who know farm statistics, who know the cost of production of every crop, who know from bitter experience the effect of an oversupply in the markets, assert with intense conviction that when this Canadian competition shall be a fact, when the Canadian farmer with his special benefits, which, in general terms, they point out as consisting of greater farm areas, cheaper lands, fertile virgin soil, lower taxes, lower-priced farm labor, cheaper manufactured articles plus farm implements, plus the necessities and comforts of life under the favorable trade relations between Canada and England, and generally a much lower standard of living; when the Canadian farmer shall have free access upon equal tariff terms to American markets in competition with the American farmer, who would suffer under these special disadvantages; smaller farms requiring intensified farming, higher priced lands, the investment required having doubled the last 10 years, worn-out soils, either producing smaller yields per acre or requiring more labor and fertilization, and rotation of crops and years of fallowness, higher and growing taxes, higher wages of farm hands that have increased 60 per cent in 10 years, 45 to 60 per cent tax on manufactured articles plus farm implements now protected by high tariff walls, the necessities and comforts of life, here controlled by monopolies which levy tribute at will, and, finally, the cost of production 50 to 100 per cent above 10 years ago and a much higher prevailing standard of living; when this Canadian farmer, numbering millions, shall flood American markets with his products, the effect must be inevitably a decrease in the average value of American farm crops of at least $1.50, probably $2, and possibly $3 per acre annually. Who can estimate in dollars and cents this annual loss in the lessening values of his crops per acre that may come to the American farmer as a result of this Canadian pact?

WISCONSIN HIT HARD.

Such States as Wisconsin, it is asserted, will be hit hard by this treaty. Farmers fear that it will probably ruin the barley market and at times greatly affect prices on potatoes, oats, cattle, sheep, hogs, cheese, and dairy products.

TUMBLING VALUES OF FARM LANDS.

But the most serious loss, they fear, is tumbling values of farm lands. As a basis upon which to ground this point, I will read a few lines of testimony by Prof. Atkeson, of West Virginia, before the Senate Committee on Finance. Prof. Atkeson testified, in part, as follows:

I am a practical farmer and a teacher of agriculture in our agricultural college. I have been dean of the agricultural college for a good many years. A good many years ago, when I was younger than I am now, I was a laborer on a Kanawha Valley farm that I still own and operate. That land was selling in the fifties, when I was a boy, at $100 an acre. Soon after the construction of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, which reached Charleston from the farms of the West, that land could not be sold for $35 an acre. Lands that had sold 20 or 30 years previously, before the Civil War, at $100 an acre suddenly dropped to about $35 an acre, because all the lands of the West were brought into competition with this Kanawha Valley land in West Virginia.

What I saw as a boy in the Kanawha Valley, in bringing into competition with that fertile valley the fertile fields of the West, this country will see and feel to a greater extent when we open the fertile, cheap lands of Canada to competition with these higher-priced lands of America. That is as certain as that twice 2 make 4. I do not know to what extent, I do not know how much, it will affect the price of wheat, but I feel absolutely certain that the opening of those cheaper lands to competition with ours must affect seriously the agricultural interests of the country.

Now, this dean of the college of agriculture was stating, from an abundance of experience and knowledge, what every man knows who is at all familiar with the history of agriculture in this country.

A WARNING FROM EXPERIENCE.

What he says of West Virginia was equally true of all North Atlantic States. With the development of the West, where lands were cheap and wild and homesteads free, with the building of the transcontinental railroads, which put the products of these western farms into eastern markets in competition with the products of the high-priced lands of the East, what were the consequences? The eastern farmer took the life out of his farm. He wore the soil to the bone, so to speak, in striving to meet that competition. But it would not avail him. The prices of farm values in the East fell, fell, and fell, until they reached the bottom, where they remained stagnant for about 30 years. There they remained until the West had settled up, until the farms of the West were taken up even in the arid and semiarid regions, until the prices of farm lands became so high that population commenced to drift back East and South, buying up these abandoned farms. Of recent years farming in New York, in New England, and in the Virginias has been picking up. There is now a fair living to be made out of these old farms, and with proper fertilization some profit. The equilibrium between East and West has nearly been restored. But when you now tear down, as you propose to do, the tariff wall between the American farmer and the Canadian farmer, what will be the effect? The dean of the agricultural college, out of his experience and knowledge, has stated the farmers' view. The effect of Canadian competition, he asserts, must be that the farm lands East and West will fall in value precisely as formerly the East fell in competition with the West.

A LONG PERIOD OF STAGNATION.

To what extent they will fall no one can foresee. How long this condition will exist no one can know. It is probable that stagnation will exist until Canada, like the West, shall be populated, all agricultural lands developed, the prices of farm lands in Canada equal prices in America, and general conditions in both countries assume a standard of equality. But in the meantime, basing our experience on what happened in this country and what has happened under like conditions in every country in the world, who can estimate the loss in dollars and cents that may come to the American farmers through this unspeakable folly?

FARMERS' SENSE OF RIGHT AND WRONG OUTRAGED.

But the farmer is not opposed to this pact from material motives merely. It is not with him wholly a question of money. His sense of right and wrong has been outraged.

REAL RECIPROCITY HELPFUL.

At first these words, Canadian reciprocity, fell upon his ears with a pleasant sound. Reciprocity was suggestive to him of the golden rule. It was symbolic of all that is fair, equitable, and just in the dealings of the people of one country with the people of another country. He had not forgotten past Republican platforms. He remembers more or less distinctly the speeches of American statesmen, notably McKinley and Blaine, on reciprocity. He had no fear of any harm, for it meant merely reciprocal arrangements between these two countries in tariffs on noncompeting products. He thought of it something like this: Canada will send over to us some things that we need but do not produce, or do not produce in sufficient quantities, and we will send to Canada that which Canadians need and do not produce in sufficient quantities. Thus no industry will be injured in either country and no class discriminated against, but there will be mutual benefit and service to the people of both countries. He never dreamed of a treaty going beyond noncompeting products, because the moment it does so he can see, as anybody can see, that of necessity favoritism comes into play. Some industry and class will be selected for losses, other industries and classes will be selected for increased profits. Thus the very spirit of reciprocity is destroyed. The farmer's dream was over when he found what this pact really contained. He found in it discrimination against him of the rankest sort.

NOT RIGHT BUT MIGHT.

"By what moral or ethical rule of right have they measured out to me my portion of probable losses?" he asks. "By what ethical standard of right have they selected my products for free trade? What right had they to cheapen the labor of my arm and my brain so as to give raw material to the manufacturer, to relieve him of the payment of tariff revenues to Canada, and to help him to enlarge Canadian markets at my expense? By what standard of ethics was the right or wrong in any of these 250 items determined? By what standard of right and wrong were any of these decreases or increases of tariff rates established?"

To these questions there has been given, there can be given, but one reply—the framers of this pact were evidently not at all disturbed over questions of right and wrong. They had the arbitrary power to make what selections they pleased. Nothing in this pact is clearer than that there was no consideration had of questions of right; it was wholly a matter of might.

TRUTH NOT WANTED.

Moral standards of right having been disregarded, what effort was made to avoid error and to ascertain the truth? The farmer is entitled to know the facts.

"What light was had upon the items of this treaty?" he asks his Representative in Congress.

We answer, "None whatever."

"But did you not have a Tariff Board, to which a quarter of a million dollars of appropriations had been made, whose duty it was to supply you with these facts?"

"We had, but the Tariff Board was not consulted in the preparation of this pact. After the treaty had passed the House a Senate resolution by Senator CUMMINS called upon the Tariff Board for facts. Thereupon the board reported, but the facts furnished in no way sustained the President's argument for the treaty. Instead, it strikingly proves the injustice done by it to the farmers of the country."

"Did not some committee investigate the facts with reference to these items?"

"No," we reply. "Members of the Ways and Means Committee repeatedly stated upon the floor of the House that this treaty was prepared by some person in the diplomatic service, no investigation was had by the committee, and no detailed statement of facts furnished as to any item in the treaty. All testimony taken before the committee was given against it, with the single exception of the newspaper representative, who frankly stated that the newspapers wanted this pact, because it would give them free wood pulp and print paper. The newspaper association represented by him, he argued, would thus save $6,000,000 a year in the cost of print paper."

THE INTERESTS FAVORED BY THE PACT.

"What are the favored interests in this treaty?" the farmer wishes to know.

We reply: "The Beef Trust seems a great favorite. Cattle on the hoof are put on the free list, but meats are taxed 1½ cents per pound. The flour combine is another favorite. It gets free wheat, but secures a tax of 50 cents a barrel on flour. Automobiles are given reduced rates into Canada. This looks like a gift to the General Motors Co., the automobile combine. Automobile manufacturers, at any rate, will save about $80,000 a year in Canadian customs duties. Printers' supplies are in the treaty for reduced rates. This seems to be in the interest of the American Type Foundry Co., which is the so-called Printers' Trust. Aluminum is in the treaty for reduced rates. The American Aluminum Co. is a perfect trust. It has a plant in Canada, but has no rival either there or in the United States. Biscuits are in the treaty. This seems for the benefit of the Biscuit Trust. Fruit products are in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. This may be for the benefit of the Canned Fruit Trust. Bituminous coal is in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. There can hardly be any doubt as to this being in the interest of the Coal Trust. It will save at least $450,246 a year in customs duties to Canada that will hereafter be remitted. Condensed milk is in the treaty. This seems to be in the interest of the Condensed Milk Trust. Cottonseed oil is in the treaty. Clearly this is for the benefit of the Cottonseed Oil Trust, which is given free Canadian markets. This trust will thus save annually the sum of $179,138 that it paid Canada last year in customs duties. Articles of glass, of leather, and of brass are in the pact for reduced rates into Canada. This is probably in the interest of the Glass Trust, the Smelter Trust, and the Leather Trust. Iron ore is in the treaty for reduced rates. This may be for the benefit of independent steel companies, but more likely it is in the interest of the Steel Trust. Cement is in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. This is likely to be in the interest of the cement combine. Farm implements are in the treaty for reduced rates into Canada. This seems clearly in the interest of Morgan's International Harvester Co., which gets reduced rates into Canada for farm machinery of all kinds, and saves at least $100,000 a year in Canadian customs duties—thanks to this proposed pact."

FAVORITISM AND POWER.

"But how in the name of common sense," asks the now indignant farmer, "were these items selected anyway?"

We do not know, but we can form an opinion from the facts that have come to our attention. We find, for example, that cream separators are singled out from all the machinery used in butter making and placed upon the free list. The creamery separator companies directly charge in their circular literature that this industry was discriminated against through the influence of a prominent Canadian senator. A member of the Ways and Means Committee stated that he had requested that grindstones be included in the treaty. From such facts it is easy to infer that when these diplomats representing the United States met with the diplomats representing Canada they favored their friends, their home interests, and political ends; they bargained with each other behind closed doors; and after the exercise of diplomatic ingenuity, skill, and political wire-pulling the items, industries, and classes in this treaty were finally agreed upon, some for probable losses and some for probable gains. Certainly the whole transaction smacks of rank favoritism.

THE GENERAL WELFARE DISREGARDED.

"But was there no consideration had," the farmer asks again, "as to the probable effect of this pact upon the well-being of the American people?"

NOT THE WELL-BEING OF THE FARMER.

The reply must be that a study of the pact reveals clearly that no thought was taken whatever of the well-being, the prosperity, and the good will of the American farmer. He gets no benefit out of it whatever, but stands to lose in every possible way.

NOT THE WELL-BEING OF THE CONSUMER.

Nor will the consumer profit by it. Common sense and a careful study of the treaty will convince anyone of the fact, admitted on both sides of this Chamber, that the reduction made in tariff rates on the farmers' food products will not affect the cost of living to the consumer. He will be the most disappointed of mankind, if he expects to buy his bread, milk, meats, and beer any cheaper than he does now.

The 10 or 15 cents lost by the farmer on a bushel of wheat is not likely to get by the railroad companies, but if it should it will be less likely to get by the Flour Combine, but if it should it will not get by the baker. A loaf of bread will not be changed either in price or size. The loss the farmer suffers on his cattle is not like to get by the transportation companies, but if it should it will hardly get by the Beef Trust, but if it does it will not get by the butcher. The price and size of the pound of meat will not be changed a particle for the consumer. The loss to the farmer in the price of barley will not get by the

railroad companies, but if it does it will not get by the brewer, and certainly it will not escape the saloon keeper. The price of a glass of beer will not be less for thirsty throats.

That the consumer will gain nothing by the passage of this pact is so certain that no Member of this House has dared to assert that it would cheapen the cost of living. The farmers' losses will be absorbed by the middlemen, who now get 65 cents to his 35 cents out of every dollar the consumer pays for food. The consumer expects bread, but he will get a bone.

THE MANUFACTURING INTERESTS WILL GAIN.

The manufacturing and monopoly interests will gain in three ways: The Beef Trust, the Flour Combine, the Steel Trust, and other interests will get raw material free, or at reduced rates from Canada. These interests are relieved entirely of payment of customs duties to Canada or given greatly reduced rates. In the case of the Coal Trust, this amounts to nearly $500,000 a year, and, moreover, these privileged interests secure Canadian markets for themselves in return for American markets to Canadian farmers.

NOT PRINCIPLE BUT FORCE.

This treaty, therefore, is not based upon any economic principle, nor is it in accord with any ethical rule of right, and is wholly lacking in the spirit of the square deal. It is what law always comes to be when enacted by a combination of special interests—the expression of brute force and of arbitrary power. That and nothing more.

POWER BACK OF PACT.

Will the House pass this pact? Undoubtedly. There is back of it a combination of irresistible power. The President is back of it with all the power of his great office. The Democratic Party, except 12 Representatives from farm districts, is back of this bill solidly, especially from the South, and party leaders frankly and consistently state that they are for it for two purposes: They desire the overthrow of the entire protective system and the defeat of the Republican Party at the polls in the coming Presidential election. The big daily newspapers are back of this treaty, because this pact gives them free wood pulp and print paper. And, finally, there is back of this treaty most of the Representatives in Congress from New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, and all the large cities, whose constituents mistakingly hold the farmers responsible for the high cost of living. Such is the combination of power that is about to run the steam roller over the American farmer.

FARMER RESENTS UNFAIR TREATMENT.

Now, the farmer resents this treatment of him as a class. He has the self-respect of a just and honorable man, and this discrimination touches his pride keenly. His hands may be callous, but his heart is not, nor his head. The American farmer asks only for a square deal. Why should he suffer such unfair discrimination? How has he deserved it? Certainly not from his own political party.

BACKBONE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The American farmer has been the backbone of the Republican Party all these years. Cities might go Democratic, but when the votes were counted in the rural districts it was found that the farmer had saved the day. He has been the patient pack horse of protection, because he believed what the campaign orators told him repeatedly upon the stump, that he was getting relief from Canadian competition in American markets.

GRUMBLED AT THE ALDRICH BILL.

It is true that he grumbled when the overloaded Aldrich bill was placed upon his broad back, but even then he did not kick over the traces entirely on the protective principle. He still believed that he had his portion of relief from competition with the only country on earth that he had any cause to fear. His surprise may therefore be readily imagined when President Taft, contrary to his pledge in the Republican platform, proposed a pact that removes entirely the farmer's protection from competition with Canada. In his message the President, in effect, asserts that the American farmer has been the pack horse of protection all these years for nothing.

Unfortunately this announcement comes to the American farmer when relief from Canadian competition would be of real benefit to him, because now consumption has overtaken production East and West; it comes to him at a time when the farmer's vote is no longer dominant at the polls, because 55 per cent of the population of this country now live in the large cities of the land; it comes at a time when the abuse, the perversion, the misapplication of a great economic principle has so outraged public sentiment that it calls for a scapegoat. So the farmer is selected as the sacrificial victim to suffer for the wrongs done by those privileged interests, who even in this pact profit by his misfortunes.

THE FARMER WILL DEFEND HIMSELF.

These privileged interests may well beware lest they plague him beyond all patience. Shorn of his once kingly strength, there is yet remaining to the American farmer the strength of Samson, and Samsonlike he may some day pull down the whole tariff temple over the heads of privileged interests. Surely the Republican Party can not support free trade for the farm and protection for the factory. "A house divided against itself can not stand." Hereafter the farmer will demand protection for every industry alike or free trade for all.

LOYAL TO HIS COUNTRY.

The farmer is loyal to his country. He has faith in Government. He believes that law must represent justice to all classes alike. He is therefore keenly hurt at the thought that the farmer class should thus be discriminated against. What justification is there? The farmer is in no trust. His industry is the one in which there is still full and free competition. He does not declare dividends quarterly. His margin of profit is at most 2½ to 3 per cent on his investment. As a rule he gets little more out of his year's labor and the labor of his wife and children than a fair living for himself and family. There has been no rush from the cities to the farms. The farmer can not strike for an eight-hour day. He works eight hours—but, as has been said, eight hours before noon and eight hours after noon. He risks his year's toil on wind and weather, heat and cold, bugs, worms, pestilence, and politics. As he sees it, this pact will but increase the per cent of mortgaged lands and of farm tenants.

THE REAL PRODUCER.

The farmer feels hurt at this proposed injustice, because he knows he is the real producer of wealth in this country. Farm investments represent twice the value of the investment of manufactures. The farmer has produced 75 per cent of the Nation's wealth. He is the producer of necessities of life, and to discourage him is to reduce the purchasing power of 45 per cent of the population. Is not this a government for the greatest good of the greatest number?

ROOSEVELT REVERSED.

The farmer feels hurt at this injustice, because he knows that he is the salt of the land. Upon the farms must be reared the strong men and women, physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually, that shall be the salvation of this Nation in the future. He knows the danger of centralized population in the great cities. He is familiar with the story of ancient Rome. He knows the history of the decay of nations. Why this sudden reversal of a great national policy? What of the Roosevelt Farm Commission and its purpose of making a happy, contented, and prosperous people upon the farms of this country? What of the appropriations of millions yearly to encourage agriculture? Why, now, strike this body blow at the American farmer?

CONCLUSION.

Gentlemen advocating this treaty profess to believe that these fears and forebodings of the representatives of the American farmer will prove unfounded. Fervently we hope and pray that this may be true. But whatever the future may have in store it is certain that the farmer has nothing to gain by this pact and everything to lose. As a trade this treaty is a farce. Canada gives up revenues amounting to $2,500,000; America gives up revenues amounting to $5,000,000. The American farmers are given Canadian markets of only 8,000,000 people, but the Canadian farmers are given the American markets of 92,000,000 of people.

In short, Mr. Chairman, from the farmers' point of view, this pact is not only a bad bargain, but most unfair when tested by every moral standard and utterly lacking in the spirit of the square deal.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, have I 15 or 17 minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, being a new Member, I sat in my place during all the sessions of this term and listened closely to the several debates. Due modesty, as expected from a first termer, would probably require me to sit in eloquent silence throughout this discussion, but I represent a district essentially agricultural, in which all the sources of my people's thrift are to be affected by the final disposition of this bill.

I heard the delightful three hours' entertainment furnished by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and I wish that my constituents could have seen and heard it. Then came the Member from Maine, worthy successor of Thomas B. Reed, the greatest Speaker of the nineteenth century, and James G. Blaine, that unsurpassed statesman of any age. Blaine gave

us the name of the proposition here this day discussed, and I believe that if living they would indorse the doctrine so well voiced by Maine's eloquent son. I do not think either would indorse the substance of the proposition before us to-day. As I was taught reciprocity it was to be the sword of commerce, companion to protection, the shield. And while it might be used as a weapon of offense and even conquest, it should never be perverted into the suicidal blade.

That speech of the new Member from Maine and the several other Members leave anything more than a fragmentary discussion unnecessary. The first days' proceedings of this bill will leave little question in the minds of the country why Maine, smaller in size, less fertile in soil, and younger in history, has and does still exert a more powerful influence upon the times, the Nation, and the world than North Carolina.

The proposition before this House is one vouched for by the President of the United States. That is the best thing that can be said of it. That is also, to my mind, the worst thing that can be said of the President. That my attitude may be thoroughly understood, let me say, I regard our President as the best equipped chief magistrate who ever graced the presidential chair. To his great heart, big brain, ripened judgment, and thorough experience as a jurist, diplomat, and executive, my admiration as a man, my allegiance as a citizen, and my zealous support as a partisan have been faithfully accorded. Something more than two years ago we elected him as President, and when we compare him with those who have announced themselves as candidates against him for the election they all suffer by comparison. But this does not carry, express or implied, any right to control in the processes of legislation. In this matter his work was done when this treaty was negotiated, and I assume his interest now to be similar to that of any other public man in the country outside of the Senate and the House. The Members of this House and Senate should determine this legislation and thus exercise our constitutional prerogatives, "wearing our rights as royal robes, our manhood as a crown."

And to those of the majority let me say that if we are independent under the circumstances, it should be easy for you; if we can meet the front of a presidential Cabinet, you ought to be able to brave the wrathful threat of a Kitchin cabinet.

I am willing to bear my full share of public burdens. My people cheerfully bear theirs; but I dislike unwarranted discrimination. Last Friday this House passed a publicity bill. Publicity is all right, but it should apply to all. That bill should be called "An act to subject Republicans to publicity and exempt Democrats." Well, maybe we could bear publicity better than they, but I did not like the discrimination.

Another discrimination. I do not recall the action of any Republican national convention calling for free trade in our real competitive products and retaining a duty on those practically noncompetitive. I know of no caucus of our party, House or Senate, that has said that all the protection the farmers have enjoyed shall be removed, without removing or paving the way for the removal of all other protective duties. This at a time, as was stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS], when consumption is forging fast upon the heels of production; just when the protective tariff, insuring us control of the home market, would make farm life profitable and homes desirable. Now to lose it after the American farmer for a hundred years, the best buyer in the world, has been forced to buy from protected American factories and mines. Again, the gentleman from Massachusetts suggests that we will soon be able, through the adoption of a constitutional amendment, to have an income tax; just when the farmers are becoming able to have reasonable incomes they will tax them. I am in favor of a reasonable income tax, but its coming at this time, when foreign competing articles are not even taxed up to a revenue basis, seems like "crowding the mourners." And recollect that the farmer's wealth is open to the view of his neighbors, the assessor, and the world; and he can not conceal his thrift as can others.

To our Republican friends who favor this proposition and still desire protection on articles in which they are interested, I recall the chivalrous offer of Artemus Ward, who was ready to sacrifice all his wife's relatives to put down the rebellion. History does not recall what the relatives said when the proposition was put to them, and history is yet to be written what the great Northwest, where Republican congressional votes, as the results of last fall's election, are thickest, will do after the final passage of this act, should it receive material Republican assistance. Unfair discrimination may be endured from the majority during the brief biennium of their incumbency, but such a discrimination by Republicans should never be tolerated.

No farmers' organization seems to have been consulted prior to the enactment of this treaty. Its immediate effect is against the farmers. They were entitled to a hearing. Altruistic and neighborly reasons have been suggested for our ratification of this measure, but to the 6,000,000 farmers this is an economic question and not one of altruism or philanthropy. It is suggested that we should give Canada better terms than we would any other Nation. If we desire to protect our own people and do so effectively, we must be more solicitous of our protection against our more immediate industrial and commercial competitor than those at a greater distance, because in the latter case the additional freight charges amount to a degree of protection.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] said that it was unfortunate that some must live close to the Canadian border. That is true, and we can not widen that line in terms of miles, but we can widen it in terms of money. If we can not say that it shall be 500 miles wide, we can say that it shall be 10 to 25 cents per bushel wide.

I desire to consider the leading reason assigned by the friends of the measure. To be perfectly frank with the country, the President, the majority, and this minority should state that the large purpose, both in negotiating the treaty and its passage through the Congress, is to reduce the cost of living; and to be equally frank in adding that the same shall be done at the sole expense of the American farmer. The majority say it will reduce the cost of living. I agree, although others opposing this bill do not do so. The only important question for debate then is, At whose expense? The products of whose toil, foresight, and prudence are affected? The various grains, forage, and meat and dairy products, all of which are produced by the American farmer, and which are practically all of the products of the American farm, are placed on the free list. If they were not to be reduced in price, then the negotiation of the treaty, the action of the last Congress, and the expense of the present extraordinary session would be all in vain, and if they are reduced in price to the purchasers, they must of necessity be reduced in price to the sellers. I know of no power in such a connection that will make the prices paid smaller and the prices received larger. That is a Herculean task fit only for the majority caucus of this House to attempt. This reduction is considerable; it should not be hastily imposed upon the farmers. If the reduction would be inconsiderable, this whole procedure would amount to "much ado about nothing."

The eloquent gentleman from North Carolina insisted that the price of wheat was the same in Canada as in the United States and therefore there would be no change, but the men who know how prices have run along the southern Canadian border and the northern American border and the testimony they give overwhelmingly establish the incorrectness of the general proposition. There is not an owner of a thousand bushels of wheat who would risk its marketing on the proposition of the gentleman from North Carolina, but millions will be marketed upon the basis of the proposition of the gentleman from Minnesota. I marketed my wheat last fall right from the machine, and advised my neighbors to do the same. We heard from Vermont a short time after that, and wheat has been coming down ever since, and what has occurred in wheat has been true in other foodstuffs and meats and dairy products. The supreme confidence of the American people in the ability of the present majority to reduce prices seems firmly fixed. The first reduction came with Vermont's defection. This was emphasized when Maine slumped. It was intensified with the landslide of the general election, and when reciprocity was announced the toboggan seems to have been hit so that the prices now, compared with what they were, represent already countless millions of dollars to the farmers of the land. These market movements and political results may or may not be closely related as to cause and effect, but they usually go together. Some of them feel like an eminent financier in 1904, when there was a sharp slump on the stock exchange of a great national system of railroads. He is reported as saying to his son, "Well, Jay, $5,000,000 went to hell in the Wabash and Missouri Pacific to-day." The comforting boy said, "Never mind, father, grandpa will get it." The farmers can not take such a philosophic view of their losses, because they refuse to admit that they have grandfathers occupying coigns of vantage to catch the loss.

No, my Democratic chanticleer, this is not your sunrise. The king of your brief day was up and beaming in your waking eyes before you, golden-throated herald of the morn, even thought to crow. And he will set regardless of your protest. The more or less warranted resentment of the people was against the Republican Party. It was not in your favor except as an incident. The old remember how prices were smashed in the late fifties under the Elgin treaty and a Democratic administration.

The young remember the cheap man's paradise under your last administration. Do you think, for a moment had the majority last fall declared for this you now indorse—that is, throw down our bars to Canada—that you would be in a majority to-day? No. Tammany and Dixie would not have been given an opportunity to combine against the country.

I listened to the admonition of the gentleman from North Carolina not to fool our farmer constituents upon wheat prices. I will not. I could not. I did not. They told me and are telling me now in a storm of protest by letter, card, and petition, demanding that I vote and speak against this bill, and from the farmers of my district I have not heard one favoring note on this proposition, and these people are from a State with the lowest per cent of illiteracy in the Union. My recollection is that it is a little less than 3 per cent, while that of North Carolina is 28.7 per cent, so that they probably do not need his solicitous aid.

I asked one of my Democratic farmer friends if he thought I should, in the interest of my neighbor farmers, vote for the treaty. He said, "Should the chicken vote for the ax?"

Our market for wheat is to a large extent Minneapolis and St. Paul, where our winter wheat, which does not make the whitest of flour, is mingled at a lesser price with the high-priced northern wheat and commands uniformly a larger price in Nebraska than the high-priced wheat does in Canada, equidistant from Minneapolis. Turn in competition the vast amount of Canadian product and it will drive our wheat from the Minneapolis market. We are not permitted under the pure-food law to bleach our wheat, and we must then depend on the local and southern markets or export. Our friends from the South may be getting cheaper food, and we will be selling cheaper wheat. The millers of my district agree that it will very largely reduce the price of our wheat, and the amount of this reduction will not be measured by the recent production of Canada.

One gentleman discussed the advantage to the beef producer on the farm. A few hundred head of cattle which I annually feed, a few more hogs, the few hundred tons of hay I ship, and what wheat I have produced makes this question to me a practical and familiar one. Especially as to beef. Canada can fatten her cattle on grass and hay and prepare them for slaughter just as well as can and do the cattle raisers of Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana, which cattle, well prepared, furnish a strong competition for our corn and alfalfa fed beeves. I am careful not to send to the markets my corn-fed cattle when there are big runs of cattle from the Northwest fed on cheaper land, cheaper grain, and cheaper hay.

And while we speak of cattle, I recall that under the Payne bill they got our hides—now they want to get our carcasses. I hear the threat of free raw wool. Mr. Farmer, prepare for your income tax. I wonder if there is any new hammer-lock, half-Nelson, strangle-hold, or any other political grip held in readiness for the man whose children have left his home and become a majority in the cities. It is the potential production of Canada, to be stimulated into activity by this agreement, that in the years to come will be the serious, grinding competition, lessening the prices of our products, decreasing the values of our land, draining our banks, destroying the thrift of our communities, and inviting the means, enterprises, and the youth of best promise into a country, an empire in extent, which is to be developed by the drainage of American wealth and energy.

This leads me to what I regard the most important objection to this bill; that is, in this day of progress, it is distinctly a step backward. This Government and its people have lived, grown, and prospered because they have always had the courage to say that our home interests shall be protected and exalted, and upon that theory have our business and industries been upbuilt.

The farmers believed that their protection was safe until at least some great political party declared against it. So, last November they slumbered and slept. The Democratic platform of 1908 furnishes no basis for this act. The following is the Democratic declaration made at Denver. This, if you will recall, was the third epistle of William to the faithful. It was not to the Ephesians, as might be inferred from the Scripture lesson of the gentleman from Connecticut. Both the majority party and the Ephesians have gone out of the silver business. The first epistle of the same eminent author said the gold standard had slain ten thousands while the tariff had slain but a thousand. They are getting down to the small bunches now.

First it says: "We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties." How? First, "articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list." Now, that is as far as the free list goes. Do our Democratic friends say that farm products are controlled by trusts? Are the farmers in the trust? And if they are not, will you punish them because they are not and somebody else is?

Second. "Material reduction should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home." This measure is not under this clause, because it is a removal of the tariff and not a reduction.

Third. "Gradual reduction should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis." It can not be under that clause, because having taken off all the duty, you could scarcely tell how many more gradual reductions you should make before you restore it to a revenue basis. Do you not think you should have warned the farmers before you took this oppressive step against them? You will not be heard to say that a Republican President vouched for it. The Constitution fixes the responsibility upon a majority of this House for revenue legislation.

A large portion of this country was and appeared to be rich and fertile. These parts of the United States have been taken up and settled either through purchase or by the bestowal of the Government. As the American people looked for newer lands, the question seemed to present itself to the Government as to whether the enterprising young people should be allowed or encouraged to change their homes to the new lands of Canada, Australia, or elsewhere. It was concluded by the American people without partisan division, but by common consent, that between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans plains that seemed to be arid, mountain slopes that appeared to be rocky, swamps that were rich but undrained, presented an opportunity which by reasonable amount of governmental assistance would add many millions to the arable lands of the United States without either conquest or purchase on the part of the Government. Under the advice of wise administrations and the assistance of generous Congresses, large projects for drainage, irrigation, conservation, and reclamation have been inaugurated and made effective in various parts of this country, and over $60,000,000 have been so spent. Large projects for drainage in the South and for irrigation in the West are under construction now. The great mountain snows that have heretofore melted in the spring and tumbled down the slope, becoming great engines of waste by erosion and otherwise, and then running purposeless to the sea, are now being captured and held in vast reservoirs to furnish water power at proper intervals and in the dry summer seasons to bathe the soil. The result of all these has been that throughout the West and South lands unproductive either through too much water or too little have been made productive. The deserts of the West have become in large sections as fertile as the Valley of the Nile, and the swamps of the South are being made as arable and productive as the rich prairies of the Middle West. Out of these projects more wheat has been raised per acre than anywhere or at any time in the history of this world. Greater fruit crops have been yielded than were yielded in the Promised Land, the final tempting fact which induced the Israelites to enter. Greater forage yield has come. Greater yield has come from these projects than was ever produced anywhere. There arose among the people of the United States, financial, philanthropic, industrial, and educational, a strong cry and a mighty movement, "Back to the soil." Men, considering carefully the social and industrial problems, welcomed this new movement. It also took on the form of redeeming and reclaiming the impoverished farms of the East and the saving and replenishing of the forestry throughout the United States. In fact, it seemed that so far as agriculture was concerned, the exploiting in a speculative way all new land and impoverishing the old had come to an end.

Perhaps the greatest shock to those interested came with the announcement of this treaty, which, by its terms, prejudiced the farming interests in the United States. It invites men of wealth to make their agricultural investment in Canada instead of in America; the young men and women to seek Canadian farm homes rather than western farm homes; to draw the money from the banks in agricultural communities to invest it in Canadian properties, bringing the level of farm prices and farm products down to the Canadian level; and to divert attention and interest from intensive conserving methods of farming and reestablishing the extensive speculative methods of farming in Canada that were in vogue 25 and 30 years ago throughout the West.

The purpose of all these projects was not speculative, but was to disperse the American people throughout its borders, where homes would be built and maintained and the drift from the farm lands of the eastern half of the United States to the

cities might be checked. Wise men, looking ahead, saw the ill results of gathering people into the great cities, every one of which has been well said to be a "great evil."

The United States has within its borders 3 cities containing collectively eight and a half million people. It has 8 cities each containing more than a half million. It has 19 cities containing more than a quarter of a million each. It has 50 cities containing more than 100,000 each. It has 108 containing each more than 50,000; totalling nearly 25,000,000. Broad and inviting as are the valleys, fields, prairies, and forests, the current of human life in America is drifting toward the cities. When this country took its first census, only 34 out of every 1,000 people lived in cities or towns. Thirty years later that number increased to 49 out of every thousand; 60 years later it had increased to 125. In 1900 it reach 311, nearly 10 times what it was at the time of the establishment of our Government. Our urban population now is about 500 out of every thousand, or 50 per cent. And this despite the fact that creative genius made the country, clothed it with beauty, and filled it with fatness; while the city was man made to pollute the air, befoul the crystal rivers, deforest the hills, rob and impoverish the soil. Yet paths to the city from every compass point are worn deep by the feet of farmers' boys and girls, leaving staid and comfortable farm life for the doubtful lure of the city's uncertainties. Were this drift new and without historical precedent, no great concern might be excited, but the tidal drift of humanity into the cities from the beginning of recorded history has led to anything but desirable national results.

Carlyle said, "A great city is a great evil," and few will question that statement. True, there is wealth gathered, culture abounds, religion rears her greatest temples, and beauty basks in the light of loveliness. Yet there is more than a counterbalance of shadow. While Dives feasts, Lazarus, surnamed Legion, fasts and starves. While purity exists, vice is nurtured, debauchery stalks, and crime multiplies. There is the air putrid, the pathway foul, heat oppresses in summer, cold pinches in winter, while manhood and womanhood, weakened and emasculated, become ready victims to sinful and insanitary surroundings. The white plague finds in congested tenements its multiplied victims. Many thousands so afflicted children are in New York and other great cities, while ten times as many daily risk infection in their disease-breeding dwellings, named more politely apartment houses. There, too, the white slave dons her garb of degradation in an atmosphere and environment which forge, fit, and fasten the chains of her shortened life and render swift and sudden the loss of her soul. The metropolitan glare lures fatally the rural moths. They see the apparent warmth and splendor of mansion and saloon. They hear the clink of gold and are thrilled with the throb of the multitude. And these young men and women, like the ant and the swallow, gregarious in their instincts, leave the ozone of mountain, the pure air of the fields, and the beauties of the valley to herd with the multitude at a risk incalculable and a price often unspeakable. The American people were just making a good beginning to turn the tide back to the pure air, rich fields, and happy farm homes, and it seemed to have the support of the great thinkers and those in authority.

Theodore Roosevelt has said:

> I warn my country that the great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization, for our civilization rests at the bottom on the wholesomeness, attractiveness, and completeness, as well as prosperity, of life in the country. The men and women on the farms stand for what is fundamentally best and most needed in our American life. Upon the development of country life rests ultimately our ability, by methods of farming requiring the highest intelligence, to continue to feed and clothe the hungry nations, to supply the city with fresh blood, clean bodies, and clear brains, that can endure the terrific strain of modern life. We need the development of men in the open country, who will be in future, as in the past, the stay and strength of the Nation in time of war and its building and controlling spirit in time of peace.

President Taft has said:

> If I were advising young men as to their future profession, I would say that there are greater opportunities in agriculture than in any other profession in our country. The farmer's life takes him away from that nervous exhaustion, that gambling propensity, and that bustle and rapidity that hurry men to their graves.

It seems to me a pertinent inquiry under this consideration, Where are these greater opportunities in agriculture? Are they not the lands rapidly being reenriched and reclaimed in our East, rich still and productive in the Middle West, or that part being rendered especially desirable, profitable, and productive in the great West and South in the United States? Or are they on the boundless plains of Canada? Are they among our home people, or are they among strangers? Are they under the American flag or under an alien flag? It seems to me that the choice is easy and nothing should be done to thwart it. We have lands fertile now and which can be made productive to accommodate and provide for the people of a mighty race for a thousand years to come. If American capital, American brains, American industry, and American youth and blood are to develop any lands, it should be our own. We own the pole at the north; we own the canal at the south. We own all that we want between, where there is ample opportunity for American industry and thrift, and ample room for free, healthful, patriotic homes under the American flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire for the fullest and fairest trade relations between the United States and Canada.

I honestly differ with anyone who is of the opinion that this agreement in its present form is fair, just, and equitable.

In clear and unmistakable terms it discriminates against the farmer and for which I feel there is no just cause.

I am unable to understand why in the making of a treaty of this nature it was necessary to place alone the products of the farm on the free list, while at the same time practically everything the farmer purchases remains upon the protected list, ranging from 45 to 60 per cent.

It would be interesting to know—

First. Who it was, acting for the United States, made this treaty with Canada; how much time was spent in the preparation of the same; and what information was furnished, and if this is available. And I hope during this debate some one will discuss the legal features of the same. As I understand it, all revenue legislation is supposed to originate in the House of Representatives.

Second. What data, if any, has the Tariff Board given the Committee on Ways and Means concerning this agreement, and where can the same be procured?

We are paying each of five members of a Tariff Board $7,500 a year, whose business it is, among other things, to secure the best available information upon matters like the pending treaty and give the same to the President and Congress, and recently $250,000 was appropriated that the Tariff Board might have the fullest opportunity to make investigations and report. It does seem to me that if the Tariff Board has not been consulted, or has not had time to consider this measure, undue haste has been exercised.

If the Tariff Board is to be ignored in this, then it will afford an excuse for so doing in all future tariff legislation, and we might as well abolish the board and save the expense.

It is true that the Tariff Board has made a report (see S. Doc. No. 849, 61st Cong., 3d sess.), but in their letter of February 28, this year, addressed to the President, it seems to me that they have made it clear that they have not had sufficient time to properly investigate the matter set forth in the report; and, as much as I admire the President, I am sorry he has called Congress in extra session at this time, for it does seem to me that neither the Tariff Board, Members of Congress, nor our constituents have had sufficient time and opportunity to investigate so important a matter as this treaty; and, for one, I would have been very glad to have had an opportunity between the adjournment of the last Congress and the next regular session of this Congress to have mingled with my constituents, believing that frequent conferences and discussion respecting this treaty would have been of mutual advantage and perhaps would have avoided a good deal of unpleasant feeling that exists in the country to-day, growing out, in part, of the feeling that too much haste has been exercised in forcing this treaty upon the people of this country.

I have the honor of representing a district stretching from the Detroit River (just across from Windsor, in Canada) beyond the State capital and more than 40 miles wide.

Four wards in the city of Detroit—the twelfth, fourteenth, sixteenth, and eighteenth; six townships, bordering in part upon these wards; my home city—Pontiac—of 15,000 people; the cities of Flint and Lansing, with populations in round numbers of 40,000 each—all three splendid manufacturing cities; 75 villages, ranging in population from 50 to 3,000 or more; and the four fine agricultural counties of Oakland, Genesee, Ingham, and Livingston constitute the sixth congressional district of Michigan.

Located as these wards are, just across the river from Canada, composed of thousands of laboring men, manufacturers, merchants, doctors, lawyers, and ministers, I have not received a dozen letters from the people residing in these four wards asking me to support this treaty, and from the 75 villages and

three cities mentioned I have not had 50 letters asking me to vote for it, but from the farmers and laboring men on the farm, receiving such splendid wages as they do and who seem to appreciate the same, I have received hundreds of letters and petitions from thousands, not simply asking but pleading that I work and vote against this measure.

Now, why have I not had more requests from the wards to vote and work for this bill? Because many of their citizens lived during the last Democratic administration and have heard it said many times that the last Cleveland administration was more costly than the Civil War, and they contributed their share. Many men and women living in those wards came from the adjoining country districts and they know from bitter experience how, under the last Cleveland administration the farmer was deprived of his Detroit market, the nearest and best one which he had—deprived of it because, under the Wilson-Gorman bill, go as early as he might in the morning with the products of the farm, he would invariably find the Canadian farmer there, ready and willing to part with his products at a cheaper price.

I have, however, received possibly 30 letters from citizens and friends whose opinions I respect, in the other wards of Detroit, urging me to support the treaty, and in each and every case I replied frankly, stating my position, that I did not regard the agreement as fair, and in nearly every case where I received replies they were equally as frank in admitting my contention, but urging that we must be broad, generous, and magnanimous; others that it was only an entering wedge; and from others that it was but the beginning. I am unable to understand why we should begin by taking the whole pound of flesh from the farmer.

The farmers residing in my district are greatly dissatisfied with the terms of this treaty, and have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms. To give you an idea of the sentiment among the farmers, I will say that it has been no uncommon thing for a canvass to be made of a rural route, and some of the results are as follows: One for the treaty; 32 against; 5 for the treaty; 49 against; 3 for the treaty; 62 against.

At the recent spring election, April 3, in the township of Novi, Oakland County, 250 votes, in round numbers, were polled, as I am informed, and I have received a petition from more than 200 of that number who are opposed to the treaty.

T. J. Davis says:

I have canvassed the townships of Farmington, Novi, and Highland, with the following results: For reciprocity, 1; against reciprocity, 516.

I want to add in this connection that the feeling among the farmers in my district is not confined to the border line, but appears to be practically the same all over the district.

Many merchants, laboring men, and others who help to make up the consumers in the cities and villages sympathize with the farmer and share with him in his opinion that the treaty is jug handled.

Let us at the outset not forget that our Nation's prosperity comes from the soil.

Do you think that by passing this treaty in its present form you are giving the farmer a square deal, when by its provisions everything the farmer produces is placed on the free list, while pork and other meat products and flour remain on the dutiable list? Why should barley be put on the free list and a tax retained on barley malt? Why is lumber in the rough placed on the free list, while manufactured lumber is retained on the dutiable list? Why are biscuits, costing over 15 cents a pound, taxed 32 per cent? Is this in keeping with your efforts to reduce the cost of living, and that while cattle, sheep, and hogs are free, meats, both fresh and cured, are taxed 1¼ cents per pound, and some say for the benefit of the Meat Trust, but I do not share in this opinion. Wheat is on the free list, but flour is taxed 50 cents per barrel. How much better it would be to defeat the treaty outright or to so amend it as to treat all fairly.

The farmers of the United States have enjoyed the benefits of a protective tariff for many years and been free from Canadian competition, and yet in the Middle West and in the East for many years were not prosperous, and farm values steadily decreased because of the competition of the thousands of acres of new and cheap lands beyond the Mississippi River. The fertile fields of the West offered such attractive inducements that it was quite natural that the farmers took the advice of Horace Greeley and "went West," and as a result it was impossible for the eastern farmer to compete and prosper, and so there were thousands of abandoned farms and discouraged farmers who left their farms and went into the city and villages seeking other employment.

This condition of affairs continued for 30 years or more; now that the western lands, in the main, have been taken up, farm values in the East have increased, while the increased demand for food products has so greatly improved the prices that farmers in the East have prospered as they never prospered before. Electric railways, the automobile, good roads, rural free delivery of mails, the bicycle, and the telephone have all aided in making farm life much more attractive, so that for several years past there has been a marked decrease in the number of abandoned farms and the tide of young men and young women who were bent on going to the cities has turned backward.

There is no denying the fact that for some years, possibly 10, farming has been regarded as a profitable business and farms were being sold and exchanged at remunerative prices. Now, what is going to happen? If this treaty is made effective, it will open up millions of acres of rich, fertile, and cheap lands in the Canadian Northwest, already proving very attractive, as is shown by the hundreds of thousands of people who have gone from the United States and settled on these lands, and to me it seems certain that we must pass through another period of depression like unto that which existed east of the Mississippi River while the farm lands of the West were being taken up; and, as a natural result, Canadian lands must be greatly increased in value at our expense.

What the farmer asks for is a square deal. During the past few years a half million emigrants from the United States have settled in Canada, and they have taken with them hundreds of millions of dollars. The Dominion of Canada has an area more than 700,000 square miles larger than the whole of the United States. The possible wheat belt of Canada is given at about 80,000,000 acres. Of this vast area 6,000,000 acres are now under cultivation.

The Canadian senate committee, after a scientific examination a short time ago, reported an area of 656,000 square miles suitable for growing potatoes, 407,000 square miles suitable for raising barley, and an area of 816,000 square miles suitable for raising wheat, and pasturage lands covering an area of 860,000 square miles.

The farmer in Alberta and Saskatchewan will be as near the American market as the farmers of the West. He can farm on an extensive scale upon land which cost from $10 to $20 per acre, where in the Middle West similar land would be valued at from $80 to $100 per acre.

And again, the Canadian farmer finds a Government which is willing to loan him money for drainage, or to build elevators and storehouses, which belong to the people.

Those who lived during 1893 and 1897 know full well about the dire disaster that came to the country under a Democratic administration and by reason of the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill, and I apprehend that there are none who witnessed those times who care for a repetition of the same. Who is there that does not remember also that after Mr. Cleveland was elected with a Congress Democratic in both branches, it was not necessary to wait for the enactment of the law that the people felt sure would come under a Democratic administration before business in all its branches began to languish, and there was no one business that suffered more than did the farmers of this country? Nature and nature's God were still good to them; better than the Democratic Party at that time, for they could raise horses, cattle, sheep, and abundant crops, but there was no market place where their products could be sold at a profit.

Have you observed how already, so far as the farmer is concerned, conditions are similar to what they were at the time referred to? In the language of one of my constituents, who is deeply concerned: "If the real thing is as much worse as the agitation, I pity the farmer. The bottom is about out on the prices of our farm stuff, and you can not help but realize that when the farmers are getting a good price for their products every other business is all right. Let me give you some figures: Last year lambs were selling from $8 to $9.25, this year for $5; hogs sold last year at from $9 to $10, at present $6.50; last year cattle were selling at $6, now for $4.50 to $5; last year wheat sold from $1.10 to $1.22, wheat is now selling at 78 cents; last year eggs sold at 20 cents, now 13 cents. Everything else in proportion. Everything we have to buy is going the other way."

In this connection I hope I may be pardoned for relating an incident that occurred during the last month of the last campaign. One morning I had occasion to leave my hotel at Flint at 5.30 a. m. to take a train. On the way to the train I was overtaken by a farmer who lived near Flushing, and who knew me. After the morning salutation, he said, "Mr. SMITH, do you think the next House will be Democratic?" I said, "Yes." His countenance at once changed, and he seemed worried. I said, "Why are you so much concerned?" After

a moment's hesitation, he said, "I will tell you; just before the last Democratic administration I bought a farm at a fair price, but had to run in debt for the same." Farm products were so low—and he named them one after another, wool at 8 cents, sheep at 50 cents—that he lost the farm, he said.

After McKinley was elected President, following the last Cleveland administration, he purchased another farm at a good price, and proceeded to relate what he had received for farm products since that time, and as a result of the good times under a Republican administration and a protective tariff he had been able to pay for his farm and was out of debt, and he seemed glad, in addition, to tell me that he had come from his home to Flint that morning, 14 miles away, with his automobile. I thought the statement of this well-known and reputable gentleman was worth repeating often, and I proceeded from that time on to tell my audiences what this farmer had told me, and his statement was received with telling effect, for there were so many farmers, as well as others engaged in business, who had had similar experiences during that same period.

I am wondering, if this agreement becomes effective, what proportion of the farmers will be riding in automobiles, and in this connection I can not refrain from saying that I can not understand why some manufacturers of automobiles and farm machinery do not take a different view of this proposition, for they are surely going to deprive themselves of one of the best markets when the American farmer is placed where he will be if this agreement becomes a law. I say this, representing, as I believe I do, the second, if not the first, largest automobile district in the Union. I have no hesitancy in saying that if the American farmer can be let alone millions of automobiles would be purchased by them in the next few years, and, better still, they would be able to pay for them; and I want to say further that by reason of their toil and labor I know of no class of people who are better entitled to the same than they, and I expect to see in the next few years many farmers having what I call a combination automobile, in the nature of the old "Democrat wagon," which can be used for carrying either the products of the farm to market or used for passenger purposes, or both, and I say hasten the day when this will come, for it will be only another pleasure and attraction along with electric railroads, rural service, telephones, and so forth, all of which have helped to make farm life much more attractive, inviting, and agreeable, and has been a source of great help in keeping the boys and girls upon the farm instead of their going into the cities.

And, by the way, what has become of all the efforts that have been made in recent years to encourage farming upon broad and scientific methods, and pleading with the young people to remain upon the farm? It is only a short time ago when the magazines and newspapers of the country bristled with articles of this nature, and the best talent was sought for to speak upon this subject; and I recall that during his last administration President Roosevelt went on a mission of this kind and spoke at the semicentennial celebration of the Michigan Agricultural College, located in the district which honors me with a place here. I was so impressed with that speech—and am now with the good that it has done and is continuing to do—that more than once, in public and private, I have said that I wish it might be read at least twice every year in every pulpit and school throughout the land.

I want to make an appeal that more attention be given to the various agencies of distribution in this country, and when this is accomplished, the problem respecting the high cost of living will be largely solved.

I want to make this prediction. If the proposed treaty goes through in its present form history will repeat itself in a measure. The farmer was just coming into his own, so to speak. He was improving his farm, notably his buildings and fences, and building up the soil by tile drainage and other ways. In order to keep pace with the Canadian farmer, he will have to return to a system of robbing the soil if he succeeds in profitably meeting this new competition.

CONSUMERS.

What is the necessity for this legislation that we are now considering? We are told that it is in the interests of the consumer, that they may have cheaper food products. The farmer is told that by removing the duties on farm products the price will not be decreased. And the consumer is also told that by reducing the duty on farm products the cost of living will be cheaper. Are both of these statements correct? It is evident to me that if the duty on farm products is removed the same will be decreased in price, but I am not sure, nor do I believe, that the consumer is to get relief because of the prices which the farmer may receive for his products, nor do I believe it was on account of the tariff. During the last campaign the Republicans and some Democrats frankly told their audiences that the high cost of living was world-wide and that it was not traceable to the tariff, for if it were, why were they suffering from the high cost of living in free-trade England? A careful examination of this matter will disclose that the consumer has been paying high prices traceable, notably in many cases, to freight rates, cold storage, and middlemen.

I want to quote from the report of Hon. James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, 1910, page 19:

"High prices was one of the subjects of my annual report for 1909. It was shown that for many years previous to about 1897, or a little later, the prices of farm products received by farmers were even less than the cost of production, and often little, if any, above that cost, so that during a long period of years the farmer was not thriving. It was shown also that in the upward price movement, which began about 1897, the prices received by the farmer have advanced in greater degree than those received by nearly all other classes of producers. That this should have been so was merely a matter of justice to the farmer to equalize the reward of his efforts with the rewards received in other lines of production."

On page 25 and following of the same report, he says:

"NO GROUND FOR COMPLAINT AGAINST THE FARMER.

"From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.

"PROBLEM FOR CONSUMERS, AND NOT FARMERS, TO REMEDY.

"After consideration of the elements of the matter it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroad to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment."

The high cost of living can not be traced to the farm, as statistics prove that the farmer receives less than 40 per cent of what the consumer pays for his product.

In this connection I want to say that the high cost of living is too often mistaken for the cost of high, and many times, extravagant living.

I want to give a recent experience of a farmer friend living in Ingham County, in my district, who, while visiting in Lansing, was asked to go to market and purchase a bushel of potatoes. At the market he witnessed the grocer purchase from a farmer a load of potatoes at 25 cents per bushel, and no sooner had they been unloaded from the wagon than the grocer charged the visitor 50 cents per bushel. I am not complaining at what the grocer received, but I do want to ask in all fairness, when you consider the time, trouble, and expense to which the farmer was put in raising and marketing those potatoes, at 25 cents per bushel—and I do not know how many miles he drew them to market—as compared with the labor and expense of the merchant, will it be claimed for a single moment that the farmer received an unfair price for his potatoes? Yet the consumer in this instance paid twice what the farmer received, and there were no freight rates and only one middle man.

Also from an honored constituent of mine whose letter was received some weeks ago, who says:

"I think the duty on potatoes is 25 cents per bushel. They are selling here at New Hudson for 30 cents per bushel. They are mostly put into sacks costing 7½ cents each, or 3 cents per bushel; the cost of sacking is 2 cents per bushel; commission for the dealer here is 5 cents per bushel; so you see, loaded on the car at New Hudson here the cost is 40 cents per bushel; now add the railroad freight, say to Detroit, about 4 cents per bushel; cartage and commission by commission merchant we will say is 6 cents more; this makes a total cost of 50 cents per bushel in the hands of the commission merchant in Detroit.

"The retailer buys of him at 50 cents per bushel, and we will say, to be conservative, he retails them at 15 cents per peck, or 60 cents per bushel, and many of them make 5 pecks out of a bushel, and that would mean 75 cents per bushel to the consumer. So you see the tariff on this one product at the present time does not cut much figure; but remove the duty, and if Canada has a large supply it would glut the market and they would be practically worth nothing. One of the great questions now is, How can we eliminate these middle men—potatoes selling for two and one-half times what the farmer receives?"

Without wearying you, I want to add the views of another constituent who has expressed himself in no uncertain terms:

"The boy who studies geography will tell you that the greatest populations exist in the Northern States, and there are above the Mason and Dixon line three-fourths of the population of the Union. Now, this market is to be open to the rich agri-

cultural lands of Canada; agricultural lands with $1-a-day labor against $2-a-day labor in the States, and more often, counting the board, $2.50 per day than $2. If the people wish to rob the Union of $2,000,000,000 yearly, they could have taken it from the Treasury, but the people in favor of this reciprocity treaty rob the people of the United States of this immense sum and more besides. As the agricultural lands of the Middle West and Eastern States were already on the decline and but lately on the advance, it means, with cheaper agricultural produce, these lands will not only go back in price but also in cultivation, and, in the end, subject to the better agricultural lands of Canada with its cheap labor. After this has been accomplished, it will take a quarter of a century to rebuild our lands, due to the beauty of the forensic popular orator.

"The present high prices of our produce are due to excessive freight rates. A car at New York market quotations to-day for No. 2 timothy hay at $18 per ton, taking out $5.50 freight, $1 commission, $1 for the local dealer profits, $1.25 for pressing, leaves the farmer $8.75; No. 1 timothy hay on to-day's market $15 would leave the farmer $9.25 after the farmer runs in debt for his farm, pays 6 per cent interest, pays his hired help, and taxes. Now, behold the beautiful angel of reciprocity. Canada comes in with an enormous crop and $4 a ton off, and the farmer has the munificent price, based on New York market to-day, of $4.75 for No. 2 timothy hay and $2.25 for No. 1 mixed, to pay interest, hired help, taxes, and live off of. It is a beautiful thing to enrich the farmer of Canada, open up the greatest market on earth, deplete our country of money, and reduce farm property one-third, if not more. This is all due to the great statesmanship of our leading politicians who, to favor a certain element, have advanced it. The laboring man repeats: 'Why, things will be cheaper.' But he wants to bear in mind that if the farmer makes no money, the market for the manufacturers is one-third to one-half gone. This means many a laboring man will be turned away, and even if eggs are 5 cents a dozen and butter 10 cents a pound, a soup with a lemon must do for him. The selfishness of people is apparent. The laboring man has been getting good wages, but he wants more. He wants the agricultural lands to deliver the produce he eats to his door free of cost. The advocates of reciprocity repeat that in years to come the matter will readjust itself.

"Why all this agitation for years; why a turmoil; why not leave well enough alone? The present good prices of farm products have done wonderful things. The people have gone back to the farms, finding a profit there where before there was none. The soil has become better, the latest and best implements of cultivation have been purchased, and the reliance on foreign lands to produce practically not needed. Twelve years ago, when hay was let in free, the farmer got $3 to $6 per ton for his hay (buyers lost money at that), 12 cents to 17 cents a pound for butter, and 10 cents a dozen for his eggs, and the result was—he left the farm.

"If you want free trade for agricultural products, then the farmer wants free trade for manufactured articles. The idea of shouldering on the farmer the weight of the opulent and trusts, the excessive freight rates, and let the merry manufacturing goat go free, as protected by a high tariff wall, is certainly the height of unfairness. If the price of farm produce was unnecessarily high and our lands could not produce the amount needed for the masses, then we had better have reciprocity. But at present—butter, 17 cents to 25 cents; eggs, 17 cents a dozen; flour becoming normal and meat on the decline; $9 to $10 a ton for No. 1 timothy hay; rye straw worth $10, delivered, New York City—how much cheaper do you want the farmer to go and live? Let us look at the other side of it. Farm implements higher; all manufactured goods higher, amounting from $2 to $4 a suit; linens and cotton goods out of sight; coal higher; freight rates higher; shoes higher; wages 10 years ago $1 per day, now $2 to $2.50 per day. Still the people high in office want to make a great swat at agriculture and prate great things, but they are not telling the people that their cost of living has been due more to excessive freight rates to pay dividends on watered stock, on manufactured goods and protection of trusts, who have raised the prices of every manufactured commodity. This would not do at all. The people who have the money blind the rest with their great ideas of benevolence at the expense of the agricultural community. There is not one single good idea in reciprocity at present, and certainly none in the future, unless a famine should strike the country."

I want to give you now a practical illustration of what has been occurring and is now occurring right here in Washington, and where five middlemen are employed before the consumer gets his products from the producer.

I am indebted to Mr. C. Louis Allen, president of the Cooperative Commercial Orchards of Virginia, for the same. Mr. Allen is known to some of the Members of this body, and especially to the Members from his own State, and he is a man of high character and standing. At the present time he is the owner of an apple orchard in Montana with 7,200 trees, and who, by reason of his experience, believes that the Shenandoah Valley in Virginia is one of the best fields in this country for apple orchards. I have said this much of him that you may know who he is, and that what he has to say in this connection ought to have weight, and I suppose his statement could be verified and duplicated over and over again, not only with reference to apples, but with practically everything else, that is the product of the farm, which clearly shows that the charge which is so often made that the farmer is receiving too much for his products is not true, when it can be shown that from two to five middlemen, with other causes, are the ones who have brought the high cost of living to the doorway of the consumer.

Mr. Allen says:

"A few figures which show how little of the apple consumer's dollar really goes to the producer. The original letters from the growers mentioned are on file in my office.

"F. S. Dunham, of Chelan, Wash., received 88½ cents a box for Jonathans, which were sold by the fruit dealer at the corner of Fourteenth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C., for $4 a box.

"G. B. Kinney, of Peshastian, Wash., received $1.52 a box for apples which were sold in this city for 75 cents a dozen.

"W. B. Wright, of Peshastian, Wash., received $1.52 a box for apples which cost the Washington City retailer $3.25 a box, and which he sold for $4.50 a box.

"S. M. Neher, of Wenatchee, Wash., was paid $1.41 a box for apples which were sold to Washington City consumers at 10 cents each, three for 25 cents.

"The first middle man in these transactions is the local fruit growers' association.

"The second, the commission merchant in New York City, such as Steinhart & Kelley and Rae & Hatfield.

"The third, a broker, such as Samuel Haynes, of New York.

"The fourth, the local wholesale dealer here in Washington City, like Mr. Engel; he gets his apples by local freight from New York.

"The fifth, the local Italian fruit dealer or groceryman is the fifth middle man to sell the apples to the consumer."

Secretary Wilson asks this pertinent question:

"Why do not consumers buy directly from the farmers? A distribution of farm products in this simple way has already begun in England, where cooperative organizations of farmers are selling by direct consignment to cooperative organizations of consumers in cities.

"Farmers cooperative selling associations are numerous in this country, but cooperative buying associations among the people of cities and towns are few. Aside from buying associations, maintained by farmers, hardly any exist in this country. It is apparent, therefore, that the consumer has much to do to work out his own salvation with regard to the prices that he pays. Potatoes were selling last spring, in some places where there has been overproduction, for 20 cents, and in some places for even 9 cents per bushel at the farm, while at the same time city consumers in the East were paying 50 cents to 75 cents per bushel, although there was nothing to prevent them from combining to buy a carload or more of potatoes directly from the grower and for delivery directly to themselves."

I am sure that further comment is unnecessary as to the prices which the farmer receives for his products.

An urgent appeal is being made to the toiling masses of the cities, and they are told that through the adoption of this treaty the cost of living will be greatly reduced. They are not told that the products from the farm required for the daily needs of the average family do not form the principal cost of living, and that for every dollar which the laboring man spends for products from the farm which come to his table, he spends five times that amount for the actual necessities of life.

I wish I could say to the great multitude of consumers in cities and villages that I believed that the enactment of the treaty into law would benefit them, but I do not. Grant that it will cheapen food prices for the sake of the argument, but you must not forget that it may bring about conditions like we had a few years ago, when it mattered not how cheap things were, you could not get them for yourself and family, for you could not sell your labor with which to buy the necessities of life.

I can not but regard this treaty as one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been presented to Congress for many years.

The people of the cities and villages in some localities seem to have an eye single only to their own selfish interests, losing sight of the fact that when the farmer prospers it is a pretty

sure index that everybody else is prospering. I regret to say some manufacturers, still protected by a tariff averaging about 40 per cent, are redoubling their efforts to have this treaty ratified.

I have been diligent in searching for the best definition for reciprocity, but I never knew before that reciprocity means giving something for nothing. You, upon the other side of the Chamber, claim that reciprocity is an original Democratic principle, and that the Republicans have taken it from you. If this is Democratic reciprocity, I hope you will take it and make the most of it; but I warn you, like the Wilson-Gorman bill, it will come back to plague you.

A word further to our friends upon the other side of the Chamber. The slogan of your party for years has been that you are a party for "tariff for revenue only"—a tariff that will not give special protection and advantages to special classes, and thus build up in this country great monopolies and unwarranted special interests.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. UNDERWOOD, has introduced H. R. 4413, commonly known as the farmers' free-list bill. You say you are going to pass it. This applies to the whole world, which means that, so far as Canada is concerned, at least, you are willing to abandon the principle of tariff for revenue only with reference to the articles mentioned in this free-list bill.

Now, I want to invite you, as an evidence of your sincerity and good faith, to offer an amendment to this bill, treaty, pact, agreement, or whatever you choose to call it, and pass it in that form. You can do it, for you have 63 majority, and you will get some votes from this side of the Chamber. Please do not make the excuse that this is not a bill, but a treaty, and that you can not do it, or that this treaty or agreement is so sacred that it can not be amended.

There are those of us who feel that before the proposed treaty is enacted into law it should be substantially amended, and it seems that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who, during the last session of Congress and for some years previous was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, entertained similar views and evidently felt the necessity, as well as the fairness, of having the agreement amended. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, this year, page 2520, I find the following:

"Mr. CLARK. I wish to suggest to my party fellows that if this bill is passed [and that is the bill which is now under consideration] it is not the end of the chapter or the end of the world. At high noon on the 4th of March we shall come into the possession of this House, and if this treaty does not go as far as we want it to go, we can then make it go still further. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

"Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman says his party will come into power after the 4th of March.

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the House.

"Mr. DALZELL. Suppose this treaty does not pass at this session of Congress. What will his party do with it if it is put up to them at the next session of Congress?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. 'Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.' [Laughter and applause.]

"Mr. DALZELL. Would you pass this bill?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think we would amend it and pass it."

So he did have in mind that it should be amended and many others are of the same opinion. But we are told when we make any suggestions of this nature that it would vitiate the agreement, and that to change it in any manner or form would prevent the acceptance of it by the Canadian Parliament. Well and good; let that be as it may. Are we more concerned in legislating for Canada, for whose people I entertain the greatest respect, who pay no taxes here and who are in no way interested in our Government, or are we legislating for our own people? But to show you that we are entirely warranted in making such amendments as we feel in right and justice ought to be made to the same, I want to quote from the same date and page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] had to say in this connection. The gentleman from Massachusetts was addressing a question to Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and said:

"Is the gentleman aware that when the reciprocity treaty was arranged between France and Canada in 1907 to 1909 that, as a matter of fact, the French Senate did amend the treaty in a very important respect and that Canada promptly came to terms?

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That might be. I do not say that Canada would not come to terms.

"Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Then it will not destroy the agreement.

"Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not say that Canada would not come to terms if we changed it and I do not say we would not come to terms if Canada changed it, but what I do say is that if either one of us changes it it must go back to the commissioners again, and that is an endless-chain performance that I have no use for."

In view of the manifest discrimination and unfairness of the treaty, it does seem to me that we are fully warranted in making at least one trial, as did the French, to amend this bill.

In the name of thousands of farmers in my district who, in the main, without regard to party, are strongly opposed to the passage of this treaty in its present form, and in behalf of the millions of farmers in this country, who are entitled to be accorded the same treatment as manufacturers and others, I protest against the adoption of this treaty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely fitting that the debate on this measure, which is likely to prove the beginning of a revolution to free the people from industrial bondage, should be in progress this day, April 19, the one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, that marked the beginning of the American Revolution and was the first fight for national freedom.

This is Patriot's Day, a legal holiday in Massachusetts, as it should be throughout the Union. This is also patriots' day in the House, and may the battle here result as gloriously as the memorable one in 1775.

Some of the new Members of the House who have spoken on this most important subject have felt obliged to apologize for doing so. It does not appear to me, as one of the new Members, necessary to do so, for it is my firm belief that it was the desire of the people of this country to see enacted just such legislation as this bill proposes that resulted in so many new Members being elected to this Congress. They sent us here to help by voice and vote make changes in legislation that will bring relief from the burden of trust rule that has enriched the few at the cost of the great mass of the people.

There is not time in the few minutes allowed me, nor desire after the able presentations of the general benefits of this reciprocity pact that have been made, to go into a lengthy discussion of this bill. I simply desire to show to those who appear to be so solicitous about the farmers; who believe, or, at least, say that farmers have not had opportunity to know what this agreement means; who state that the farmers are unorganized and helpless, how the farmers of Connecticut, a New England State, almost a border State, feel and act about it.

In the Connecticut Legislature, now in session, are 94 members who are farmers. They have there and have had for several sessions a farmers' club or association, to which only those making farming their business can belong. They hold stated meetings during the session, at which all matters affecting farmers, directly or indirectly, are considered carefully. They have faithful and competent officers and an executive committee who keep watch of all legislation of interest to them when introduced and during committee stages. They know their business and know it well.

A resolution was introduced in the present session of the Connecticut Legislature indorsing this reciprocity bill when it was before the last Congress, scarcely more than a month ago, and it passed the house, in which there are more than 90 farmer members, without a dissenting vote and passed the senate with only 6 votes in opposition. That is the record of the Republican Legislature of Connecticut and its farmers' association. [Applause.]

This is not a partisan question, in my opinion. I do not care if it is. I do not care whether you call it a Republican measure or a Democratic measure. The fact that it was arranged on the part of this country by a Republican President makes no difference to me. It is a measure along Democratic lines; is in accord with Democratic campaign promises that are being kept; is in accord with Republican campaign promises that were not kept.

It is a measure that the people of this country, irrespective of political belief, are demanding for their relief, and any party that may be responsible for its defeat will have to suffer the consequences.

Good Republicans, basing support on party lines, can vote for it because it has the Republican President for its sponsor.

Good Democrats can vote for it because it has the indorsement of two party caucuses and the record of years of advocacy. All can and should vote for it, because it is right and calculated to be of benefit to the country at large. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WHITE, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of B. F. Jackson, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, April 20, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 258) for the relief of Thomas W. Best; Committee on Agriculture discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 742) for the relief of the survivors of the shipwreck of the steamboat *Sultana;* Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6080) granting pensions to widows of soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6081) to amend the act approved March 23, 1906, entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute or necessitous circumstances"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 6082) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Bath, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6083) to amend an act entitled "An act for the widening of Benning Road, and for other purposes," approved May 16, 1908; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6084) amending section 1608 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend chapter 55 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,'" approved February 23, 1905; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6085) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6086) to provide for the erection of a public building at Middletown, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 6087) granting pensions to members of the military organization of 1862, known as "Squirrel Hunters"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6088) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 6089) to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 6090) to further amend an act to amend an act to amend section 4400, title 52, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the regulation of steam vessels, approved August 2, 1882, and also to amend section 4414, title 52, of the Revised Statutes, "Regulation of steam vessels," approved March 1, 1895; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6091) to extend the provisions of the existing bounty-land laws to the officers and enlisted men, and the officers and men of the boat companies, of the Florida Seminole Indian War; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6092) authorizing the Secretary of War to grade and fill certain ponds and lowlands on the military reservation at or near Fort Taylor, Key West, Fla., and to appropriate money therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6093) providing for the marking and protection of the battlefield known as "Dade's massacre," in Sumter County, Fla., and for the erection of a monument thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6094) increasing the pensions of those now receiving or entitled to pensions under the acts of Congress approved July 27, 1892, and June 27, 1902; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 6095) to amend section 1044 of the Revised Statutes relating to limitations in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 6096) in relation to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes, and to amend and revive the same; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6097) to amend an act to compel officers and employees traveling in the interest of the Government to file a verified itemized sworn statement of their travel allowance with heads of departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6098) to authorize the Campbell Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River from a point in Dunklin County, Mo., to a point in Clay County, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS: Resolution (H. Res. 108) for investigation of plans of organization and system of deliberative divisions in vogue in foreign parliaments, with a view to maintaining the deliberative functions of such bodies and the privilege of individual members to participate in legislation during its formative stages; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: Resolution (H. Res. 109) to investigate the Post Office Department and service; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution (H. Res. 110) authorizing Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to prepare certain index in relation to advances in rates by carriers; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6099) for the relief of Charles S. Kelley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6100) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Bloom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6101) granting an increase of pension to Adolph Billhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6102) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6103) granting an increase of pension to James Beistle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6104) granting an increase of pension to Michael G. Clapsaddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6105) granting an increase of pension to George D. Edgeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6106) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6107) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6108) granting an increase of pension to David Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6109) granting an increase of pension to John Herndon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6110) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Huber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6111) granting an increase of pension to James M. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6112) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Inman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6113) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Karr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6114) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Maskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6115) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6116) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mackey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6117) granting an increase of pension to Jasper D. Ooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6118) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6119) granting an increase of pension to Harvey B. Ragon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6120) granting an increase of pension to Joshua H. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6121) granting an increase of pension to Fred J. Reiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6122) granting an increase of pension to John G. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6123) granting an increase of pension to Michael Tuorrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6124) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Troup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6125) granting an increase of pension to Williamine M. Van Marter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6126) granting an increase of pension to John Zedeker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6127) granting a pension to Annie E. Farber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6128) for the relief of Hewson L. Peeke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6129) granting a pension to H. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6130) granting a pension to John Lilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6131) granting a pension to William C. Stanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6132) granting a pension to Peter Minor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6133) granting a pension to Clara W. Griego; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 6134) granting a pension to Antonio Salazar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6135) granting a pension to Leonisco Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6136) granting a pension to Nemecio Valencio; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6137) granting a pension to Juan Deciderio Valdez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6138) granting a pension to Theodor Reimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6139) for the relief of Alfred Miller; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6140) for the relief of Rayes Salas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6141) for the relief of Serapio Romero; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6142) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6143) granting an increase of pension to Frank O. Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6144) granting a pension to Amanda S. Teichman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 6145) correcting military record of Joseph R. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 6146) granting a pension to Peter Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6147) granting a pension to Otto Mehl; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) granting a pension to Charles F. Friedeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 6149) for the relief of Robert J. Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6150) granting an increase of pension to Willet Teller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6151) granting an increase of pension to William W. Baughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Zumer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6153) granting an increase of pension to Martin C. Rosencrantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6154) granting a pension to Alice Rothe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) granting a pension to George W. Erway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6156) granting an increase of pension to Math. L. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6157) granting an increase of pension to Duane R. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6158) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Older; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6159) granting an increase of pension to Frank Munn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6160) granting an increase of pension to William Bennet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 6161) granting a pension to Samuel W. Pescay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 6162) granting an increase of pension to James H. Waller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6163) granting a pension to Florence Chinn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 6164) granting an increase of pension to Roy E. Knight; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6165) granting an increase of pension to Dennis H. Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6166) granting an increase of pension to John Stephan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 6167) granting an increase of pension to Anna O. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6168) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Walburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6169) granting a pension to Martha Langeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6170) granting a pension to Jacob B. S. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6171) granting a pension to William P. O'Haver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6172) granting an increase of pension to Bernard F. Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6173) granting an increase of pension to Adeline Summerville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6174) for the relief of E. H. Hoult; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6175) for the relief of Charles L. Barnes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6176) granting an increase of pension to James C. Wildes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6177) for the relief of the estate of H. J. Royal, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6178) granting an increase of pension to James Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 6179) granting an increase of pension to James Earley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6180) granting an increase of pension to Ross M. Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) granting an increase of pension to James W. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6182) granting an increase of pension to William G. Mitzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6183) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Chisman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6184) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Jeffery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6185) granting an increase of pension to Alpha H. Shildtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6186) granting an increase of pension to Cicero Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6187) granting an increase of pension to E. B. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6188) granting an increase of pension to John C. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6189) granting an increase of pension to Edward Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6190) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6191) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel B. Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6192) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hoskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6193) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6194) granting an increase of pension to John Seals; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6195) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Swartwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6196) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Stid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6197) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6198) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hagerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6199) granting an increase of pension to George Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6200) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6201) granting an increase of pension to John L. Hefling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6202) granting an increase of pension to George W. Grissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6203) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6204) granting an increase of pension to Leander D. Bevan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6205) granting an increase of pension to Alex Rhodes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) granting an increase of pension to Moses W. Edgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6207) granting an increase of pension to Lindley Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6208) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Dock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) granting an increase of pension to C. L. Poorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6210) granting an increase of pension to William H. Host; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6211) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gooding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6212) granting an increase of pension to John Melville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6213) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Kinkade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6214) granting an increase of pension to Simeon J. Stone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6216) granting an increase of pension to John N. Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) granting an increase of pension to David Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Spriggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6219) granting an increase of pension to George H. Berstler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6220) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6221) granting an increase of pension to Perry P. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) granting an increase of pension to Leven B. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6223) granting a pension to Benjamin Penn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6224) granting a pension to Hannah J. Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) granting a pension to Caroline A. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6226) granting an increase of pension to James B. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6227) granting an increase of pension to Victor M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 6228) granting a pension to Lucy Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 6229) retiring Thomas Harrison, a clerk in the Naval Observatory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6230) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) granting an increase of pension to George W. Dalrymple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 6232) granting an increase of pension to W. C. May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) granting an increase of pension to Weston Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) granting an increase of pension to Edwin G. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6236) granting an increase of pension to William S. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 6237) for the relief of James Coey; to the Committee on War Claims.

My Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 6238) granting an increase of pension to James Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6239) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Branagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6240) granting an increase of pension to Albin F. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6241) granting a pension to Mrs. Forest Harmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6242) granting a pension to B. K. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) granting an increase of pension to David S. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6244) granting an increase of pension to William R. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6245) granting an increase of pension to David C. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6246) granting a pension to John H. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6247) granting a pension to James H. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6248) granting a pension to Lewis A. Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 6249) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Boynton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6250) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 6251) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Crowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6252) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ella Fales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6253) granting an increase of pension to Lucien E. Kent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6254) granting an increase of pension to Harriet B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 6255) for the relief of Charles C. Baumann; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6256) for the relief of George A. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6257) granting a pension to Paul Kempter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 6258) granting a pension to Adam Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to C. W. Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6260) granting a pension to Fannie F. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 6261) granting an increase of pension to David Curfman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6262) granting an increase of pension to Lyman H. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6263) granting a pension to Phillip D. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6264) granting a pension to John T. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6265) for the relief of George H. Smythe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 6266) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia A. Mobley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6267) granting an increase of pension to Lorin B. Ohlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6268) granting a pension to Joseph H. Waters; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6269) for the relief of James D. Butler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6270) for the relief of Samuel B. Ried; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6271) for the relief of the heirs of Adam L. Eichelberger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6272) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. Hill Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 6273) granting a pension to Robert D. McMillion; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6274) granting a pension to Mary E. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 6275) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Moffitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6276) granting an increase of pension to H. C. Kightlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6277) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6278) granting a pension to Theodore Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6279) granting a pension to Charles J. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6280) granting a pension to Lydia Erwin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6281) granting a pension to Mary Terry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 6282) granting an increase of pension to James M. Totten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6283) granting an increase of pension to Charles Rossiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) for the relief of Thomas B. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6286) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WICKLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 6287) for the relief of the estate of Vamalle Basile, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 6288) granting an increase of pension to Albert Morseman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6289) granting an increase of pension to Charlie C. Bane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6290) granting an increase of pension to Marvin A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6291) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6292) granting a pension to Amelia M. Lacy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Petition of citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, requesting the withdrawal of the troops from Mexico border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Cleveland Chamber of Commerce requesting tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Case Bros. and five other merchants of Shreve, Ohio, in opposition to the enactment of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany bills granting pensions to Duane R. Moore, Henry M. Older, and William Bennett, and increasing pension of Frank Munn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 3299; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 3296; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Women's Club of West Bend, Wis., for the passage of a law for the investigation of the communication of tuberculosis by dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Irish-American and German-American societies of Kansas City, Mo., against the enactment of a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Association of Army Nurses of the Civil War, requesting an increase in monthly allowance of pension to $30 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: Petition of citizens of the twelfth congressional district, State of Indiana, protesting against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harriet Walburn, for increase pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of Women's Club of Monroe, Wis., favoring the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Women's Club of Monroe, Wis., requesting legislation providing for the inspection of dairy and meat animals and their products, and of all food products known to harbor and spread germs of disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: Petitions of business men of Salem, Washington County; New Albany, Floyd County; Mitchell, Lawrence County; and Paoli, Orange County, all in the State of Indiana, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Berlin Grange, No. 966, against the reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of employees of the Eastern Talc Co. in the State of Vermont, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Petitions of J. M. McConnell and 11 others, of Cadiz, Harrison County; Frank Murphy and 15 others, of Steubenville; H. B. Robinson and 6 others, of Toronto, Jefferson County; and M. M. Webster and 5 others, of Scio, Harrison County, all in the State of Ohio, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Victor M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Henry T. Oxnard, New York; William M. Ward, Boston; and John H. Eastwood, of Belleville, N. J., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions of New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, opposing the proposed legislation to place boots, shoes, and leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Niagara Falls Council, No. 51, International Brotherhood of Papermakers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Fisher Grange, No. 790, of Harrisville, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. John R. Gregory and 62 other residents of Bay City, Mich., urging the passage of House bill 383, of the Sixty-first Congress; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Resolutions of Highland Grange, No. 364, Patrons of Husbandry, North Penobscot, Me., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of A. F. Bradley and others, of Carthage, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, requesting that bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolutions of the Senate of New Jersey and New Market Grange, No. 152, Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Savona (N. Y.) Grange, No. 302; Pomona Grange, Steuben County, N. Y.; and Prattsburg (N. Y.) Grange, No. 112, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: Petition of various citizens of the State of Michigan protesting against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Jackson, Manchester, and Northville, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against the rate imposed on the Women's National Weekly; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Albert Morseman, Tipton, Lenawee County, State of Michigan, for increase in pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *April 20, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the congregations of the Church of the Brethren, of Harrisonburg, Va.; the Church of the Brethren, of Stillwater, Okla.; of the Spring Branch Church, of Avery, Mo.; of the Arcadia Congregation of the Church of the Brethren, of the Church (Dunkard) of the Brethren, and of the National Christian Congress Association of America, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict the sale and traffic in opium, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of Local Union No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., and of sundry citizens of Ossipee, Swanzey, Franklin, and Berlin, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of South Kenilworth and Hampton Park, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the construction of a grade crossing at Mead Street NE., connecting Minnesota Avenue and Kenilworth Avenue, in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented memorials of Geneseo Grange; Lake View Grange, No. 970, of Westport; Stockton Grange, No. 316; Angelica Grange, No. 108; Akron Grange, No. 906; Stillwater Grange, No. 681; Honeoye Falls Grange, No. 6; Dewittville Grange, No. 480; Cayuga County Pomona Grange; Marathon Grange, No. 455; Ionia Grange, No. 903; Bristol Valley Grange, No. 1090; Canisteo Grange, No. 460; Sylvan Grange, No. 825; Columbia County Pomona Grange; Gergen Grange, No. 163; Camden Grange; Gowanda Grange, No. 1164; Hanover Grange, No. 505; Pittsford Grange, No. 424; Elma Grange, No. 1179; South Bristol Grange, No. 1107; Emerald Grange; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Alfred Grange, No. 1097; Granger Grange; Onondaga County Pomona Grange; Heuvelton Grange, No. 947; Gates Grange, No. 421; Bethlehem Grange; Westville Grange, No. 540; West Laurens Grange, No. 782; Richfield Grange, No. 771; Franklinville Grange; Bloomingburg Grange, No. 1197; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Denmark Grange, No. 535; Byron Grange, No. 395; La Fargeville Grange, No. 15; Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127; Dresden Grange, No. 1167; Berlin Grange, No. 966; Highland Grange, No. 22; West Groton Grange, No. 818; Perry Grange, No. 1163; Alsten Grange, No. 1138; Mapleton Grange, No. 613; Phoenix Grange, No. 920; Settlement Grange, No. 706; Kent Grange, No. 1145; Elkdale Grange; Cazenovia Grange, No. 1048; Clarendon Grange, No. 1083; Mentz Grange, No. 1156; Susquehanna Valley Grange, No. 1132; Upton Lake Grange, No. 802; Glendale Grange, No. 548; Mertensia Grange; Wallkill River Grange, No. 983; Orange County Pomona Grange; Seneca Castle Grange, No. 359; Russia Grange, No. 630; Hurley Grange, No. 963; Albion Center Grange; Plessis Grange, No. 629; Seneca Grange, No. 284; Cassadaga Grange, No. 659; West Groton Grange, No. 818; Five Corner Grange, No. 1000; Ulster Grange, No. 1065; Wawarsing Grange, No. 956; Weedsport Grange, No. 905; Floyd Grange, No. 665; Chaumont Grange, No. 855; Mapleton Grange, No. 1207; Scotch Bush Grange, No. 699; Pittstown Grange, No. 1311; Cottage Grange, No. 829; Ellery Grange, No. 353; Amherst Grange, No. 1131; Orange County Pomona Grange; Tully Grange; Kingsbury Grange, No. 1085; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; Clifton Park Grange; East Freetown Grange, No. 1187; Kent Grange, No. 1145; Whallonsburg Grange, No. 954; Westville Grange, No. 1047; Pamelia Grange, No. 68; Brockport Grange, No. 93; Subordinate Grange, No. 462; Cronomer Valley Grange, No. 982; Amherst Grange, No. 1131; Stockbridge Valley Grange, No. 1304; Machias Grange, No. 994; Granby Grange, No. 927; Rushville Grange; Marilla Grange, No. 1133; Newfane Grange, No. 1159; Darien Grange, No. 1063; Towlesville Grange, No. 430; Bethany Grange, No. 748; Fairport Grange; Almond Grange, No. 1102; East Schuyler Grange, No. 576; Gansewort Grange, No. 832; Perch River Grange, No. 626; Red Hook Grange, No. 918; Little Falls Grange, No. 611; West Sandlake Grange, No. 949; Pierstown Grange, No. 793; Watertown Grange, No. 7; Wolcott Grange; Delaware County Pomona Grange; Clintondale Grange, No. 957; North Manlius Grange; Saratoga Grange, No. 1209; Merley Grange, No. 988; Elbridge Grange, No. 220; Wiccopee Grange; Champlain Grange, No. 383; Penfield Grange, No. 750; Transit Grange, No. 1092; Clarksville Grange, No. 871; Owasco Lake Grange, No. 1074; Scottsburg Grange; Orwell Grange, No. 66; Chase Mills Grange, No. 985; Otisville Grange, No. 1020; Jasper Grange, No. 619; Albion Grange; Mount Pleasant Grange, No. 340; Barnes Corners Grange, No. 85; Ausable Valley Grange, No. 973; Old Chatham Grange, No. 925; and Jefferson County Grange, of the Patrons of Husbandry; and of sundry citizens of Solvay, Ballston Spa, Fort Edward, Syracuse, Albany, Medina, Otisville, Niagara Falls, Clay, Westtown, Ithaca, New York, Hillsdale, Belfast, Albion, Highland, and Oswego, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of John F. Godfrey Post, No. 93, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California, of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the passage of the so-called Sulloway old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURNHAM presented memorials of Narragansett Grange, No. 46, Patrons of Husbandry, of Bedford, and of Prospect Grange, of Mount Vernon, and sundry citizens of Swanzey, Ossipee, Franklin, Berlin, and Walpole, all in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 2.

Resolved by the Senate of the Eighteenth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Members of the Congress of the United States for the State of Colorado be, and they hereby are, requested to advocate in the Sixty-second Congress the time-honored principle of a tariff for revenue only, in that they demand an immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties; that articles in competition with trust-controlled products be placed upon the free list, and material reductions be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home, and graduate reductions be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis and render it impossible for private monopolies to find shelter behind high protective duties, whereby they are enabled to make combinations in restraint of honest trade and to raise the prices of the necessities of life to the American consumer; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be entered of record of the general assembly and copies be forwarded to the Representatives of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

STEPHEN R. FITZGARRALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, March 17, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on the 18th day of March, A. D. 1911, at 9.46 o'clock a. m.

JAMES B. PEARCE, *Secretary of State,*
By THOMAS F. DILLON, Jr., *Deputy.*

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 24.

Resolved by the senate, the house concurring, That the governor is hereby authorized and requested to protest His Excellency President William H. Taft against his approval of the Weeks bill, passed by the United States Senate on February 15 and now before the President for his approval or veto, as in the opinion of the General Assembly of Colorado such bill, if it becomes a law, would be inimical to the best interests of the West, as set forth in the senate joint memorial No. 11, which passed the senate on February 13, to which reference is hereby made.

STEPHEN R. FITZGARRALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, March 3, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on March 7, 1911, 10.46 a. m.

JAMES B. PEARCE, *Secretary of State.*
By THOS. F. DILLON, Jr., *Deputy.*

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 11.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, respectfully represent:

(a) That upon April 23, 1909, this body memorialized you, setting forth the injury and injustice inflicted upon the State through the maintenance and the administration methods of the forest reserves within its exterior borders and praying for relief therefrom.

(b) That such prayer has not been granted, nor any indication afforded of its favorable consideration.

(c) That, to the contrary, the officials of the Forest Service have, since that date, undertaken to correct the boundaries of the reserves, and while having caused the elimination of certain of those lands, contemporaneous with such proceedings, they have selected, designated, and recommended the addition of other lands—very largely strictly non-forest lands—far in excess of the eliminations, and which would thereby effect a net enlargement of the forest reserves within the State.

(d) That the President, in his message of December 6, 1906, recommended—

"That the limitation now imposed upon the Executive which forbids his reserving more forest lands in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, and Wyoming be repealed."

This, presumably, for the purpose of acting upon those recommendations and adding such lands to the reserves.

We feel justified in this conclusion by the evidence of his having so proceeded in the Territories, where the said act did not apply.

In addition to and in enlargement upon that said memorial of April 23, 1909, we, your memorialists, respectfully represent:

First. That H. R. 11798, commonly known as the Weeks bill, now pending before the Senate, while transparently masquerading as a measure pertaining to the navigation of navigable streams, as an excuse for violating the Constitution, is in reality an undertaking to extend the system of Federal feudalism, under the guise of forest reserves, throughout the United States.

Second. That the provisions of the said bill, if put into effect, would deprive the people of this State of the ownership and control of the waters of our streams from the head of navigation to their extreme source; would place the lands of the forest reserves practically outside the jurisdiction of the State; and would terminate and annul all unperfected lands and mining claims on such lands.

Third. That the waters and the right to their use belong to the people of the State under the terms of our constitution—a compact accepted and approved by the Federal Government when Colorado came into the Union.

The enjoyment of that ownership and right by the people of the State the officials of the Federal Government now undertake to deprive them of, because, incidentally, some of the public lands are in proximity thereto, and the application of the right of eminent domain by the paramount ownership denied.

The plan of these officials, as pertains to water powers, as enunciated in the last report of the Forester, is a provision for a tax of $1 per horsepower per year, by virtue of the arbitrary demand for Federal consent to the enjoyment of the people's ownership and right in those waters. Any provision whatsoever—as a possible benefit to the people in return therefor—in the nature of "conservation," a guarding against monopolies, or the protection of the consumer against exorbitant prices, is ignored and omitted. It is wholly and entirely a measure to impose a Federal tax upon our pepole in the enjoyment of their natural resources.

The United States Geological Survey estimates the possibilities of the water-power development of Colorado at from 1,000,000 to 2,117,000 horsepower. Accordingly, an annual tax of $1,000,000 to $2,117,000 on the consumers of our State to the Federal Treasury is of no mean proportions.

Fourth. That the principles involved in the above example, respecting water powers, are no more unjust to the people of our State than those forming the basis of the contemplated measures for imposing a like Federal tax upon our other natural resources, viz, coal, oil, natural gas, phosphates, and other minerals.

Had these principles been applied from the first, in the administration of the public lands of Colorado, and with such royalty as is proposed for Alaska, viz, $0.05 per ton, our people the past year would have paid into the Federal Treasury $600,000 for the privilege of digging their own coal. And, eventually—based upon the United States Geological Survey estimate of Colorado tonnage, viz, 371,000,000,000 tons—we would pay as such tax $18,500,000,000. This would effect a perpetual tax, and no less unjust than to tax the product of our wheat fields.

We would further respectfully request you to reflect that ours is not exclusively an agricultural State. And, in lieu of our territory being a vast and rich farming country, to afford us perpetual revenue, with which to maintain State governmental institutions, we, as a State, are entitled to whatever governmental revenue there may be arising from our natural resources.

Fifth. That the vast territory of public domain assumedly ordained to be administered in perpetuity; the great diversity of governmental undertakings incident thereto; the enormous business interests of our people involved; and the large number of people affected thereby demand that the government of the public domain be through definite laws and with readily available judicial hearings.

As an instance in illustration of this we point to the recent ruling of the Secretary of the Interior, reversing the ruling of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, permitting settlement upon the former lands of the Ute Indians, in the western portion of our State. This, like hundreds of others, was purely a legal question and should have gone to the courts in the first instance.

When it is contemplated that our mines, water power, oil, gas, phosphates, and other industries are to be subject to the supervision and domination of subordinate Federal officials, provision for the application of definite laws and relief through readily available judicial hearings should likewise be contemplated.

Sixth. That, in the ultimate, we adhere to the principle—and we believe it sustained by the Constitution—of Government ownership of the public lands as a trust, for their disposal; State authority in the regulation of the use of, and State benefit to all governmental profit or revenue arising from, the natural resources within the State, except profit to the Government to an extent in keeping with the long-established custom and practice of the Government in the sale of lands and timber; and except, also, its retention and administration of actual timber lands for forestry purposes.

Affirming, however, that this State will willingly and effectively preserve and develop to their greatest efficiency the forests within its borders whenever afforded a proprietary right thereto.

To these features of vital importance to our social, industrial, and political existence we point you, and respectfully pray for relief and protection.

STEPHEN R. FITZGARRALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, March 8, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 22.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring):

Whereas the Yellowstone National Park is nature's great wonderland, of very great interest to the whole people, and therefore has become the summer Mecca of many hundreds of persons of varied financial condition; and

Whereas it has come to our knowledge that certain concessions have been granted therein which are practically monopolistic of the hotel and transportation business, and that said hotels make it a rule not to furnish accommodations to such people as see fit to travel in their own conveyance or who attempt in any way to enjoy the privileges of the park without patronizing the transportation lines; and

Whereas travel by automobile has become quite universal and as safe as by horse and carriage, and the roads of the park are suitable to both means of conveyance; and

Whereas the good-roads movement is resulting in the building of roads through the States surrounding the park, aided and fostered largely by reason of the demand therefor by automobile owners touring the scenic routes through those States to the park: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the honorable Secretary of the Interior Department be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to require said hotels to be conducted in the interest and for the accommodation of the traveling public regardless of their means of conveyance in, about, or through said park, and that said transportation lines be conducted in the interest and for the accommodation of the traveling public regardless of whether or not such travelers patronize said hotels; and be it further

Resolved, That said Secretary be, and he is hereby, requested to change the rules of the Interior Department regarding the present limitation upon means of conveyance which may be used in the park, so that automobiles may hereafter be used by the owners thereof or others in the park.

The secretary of state is hereby directed to send a certified copy of these resolutions to the Secretary of the Interior Department and to each Member of the congressional delegation in Congress from this State.

STEPHEN R. FITZGARALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, March 3, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on March 7, 1911, 10.45 a. m.

JAMES B. PEARCE, *Secretary of State.*
By THOS. F. DILLON, Jr., *Deputy.*

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Brockton, Mass., remonstrating against placing boots and shoes on the free list. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROCKTON, MASS., *April 17, 1911.*

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, *Washington, D. C.*

HONORABLE SIR: Pursuant to a vote of the Brockton Board of Trade, the following resolutions are respectfully submitted for your earnest consideration:

"Whereas advices from Washington are to the effect that the farmers' free-list bill, so called, includes a provision to place boots and shoes on the free list, thereby enabling manufacturers in Canada and other foreign countries to bring their product into the United States free of duty; and

"Whereas the passage of the bill with this provision would operate greatly to the detriment of one of New England's most important industries, namely, the manufacture of boots and shoes:

"*Resolved*, That the Brockton Board of Trade registers its emphatic protest against this proposed legislation, on the ground that it would most seriously cripple this important industry without furnishing adequate compensating good to this or any other part of this country.

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Senators HENRY CABOT LODGE and WINTHROP MURRAY CRANE and Representative ROBERT O. HARRIS, and that a copy be sent to the secretary of the New England Federation of Business Organizations, with a request that the matter be put before that body and its affiliated organizations and similar action requested at once."

Very respectfully,

A. H. ANDREWS, *President.*
ELROY S. THOMPSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions adopted by the New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, remonstrating against placing leather, boots, and shoes on the free list. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 14, 1911.*

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE.

DEAR SIR: I beg to notify you that the following resolution in opposition to the proposal to place leather and boots and shoes on the free list was unanimously adopted by the New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association at a meeting held in this city yesterday:

"Whereas it appears from the published reports from Washington that the Democratic majority in the National House of Representatives contemplates making an effort to place leather and boots and shoes on the free list: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of this association is hereby instructed to communicate with our New England Senators and Representatives in Congress, urging them to strongly oppose such a proposal as being a menace to the prosperity of our American leather and shoe manufacturing industry and to the welfare of the thousands of wage earners employed in it."

Trusting you will do everything in your power to avert this threatened blow to our American shoe and leather industry, I am,

Yours, very truly,

THOS F. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry farmers and business men of Minnesota, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a memorial of Hurricane Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Overbrook, Kans., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a petition of Peidmont Lodge, No. 136, International Association of Machinists, of Salisbury, N. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Asheville, N. C., remonstrating against any intervention on the part of the United States in Mexico, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of 2,141 citizens of New York City, 1,854 citizens of Albany, 1,172 citizens of Cohoes and Waterford, 452 citizens of Troy, 308 citizens of Long Island City, 257 citizens of Oneida, 145 citizens of Schenectady, 134 citizens of Syracuse, and 51 citizens of Glens Falls, all in the State of New York, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry farmers and business men of Minnesota, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of Local Union No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, of Niagara Falls, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to equalize the duty on tea, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PAGE presented memorials of C. M. Belden and sundry citizens of Milton, Vt., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

OFFICIAL MAIL OF THE ORGANIZED MILITIA.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 844) to extend the free transmission through the mails of official mail matter of the Organized Militia of the several States, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 1328) for the relief of the Winchester Repeating Arms Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1329) for the relief of Daniel W. Boutwell; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1330) for the relief of Joseph B. Riley, alias Thomas B. Keesy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1331) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Puckett; and

A bill (S. 1332) granting an increase of pension to Dudley C. Rutledge (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1333) to provide for the erection at the National Capital of a monument to the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1334) to authorize the extension and widening of Colorado Avenue NW., from Longfellow Street to Sixteenth Street, and of Kennedy Street NW. through lot No. 800, square No. 2718 (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1335) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1336) to provide for the payment of the debt of the District of Columbia, and to provide for permanent improvements, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1337) authorizing the President to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Lloyd L. R. Krebs, late a captain in the Medical Corps of the United States Army, a major in the Medical Corps on the retired list, and increasing the retired list by one for the purposes of this act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1338) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Wigger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 1339) for the promotion of Capt. Lewis D. Greene, of the Regular Army of the United States;

A bill (S. 1340) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Murtaugh; and

A bill (S. 1341) to correct the military record of Isaac W. Reed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1342) to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 1343) for the relief of the heirs of Joannis O. Harris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1344) for the relief of John Mullin; and

A bill (S. 1345) for the relief of Elizabeth L. W. Bailey, administratrix of the estate of David W. Bailey, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1346) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin V. Carey;

A bill (S. 1347) granting an increase of pension to Marion Campbell;

A bill (S. 1348) granting a pension to James C. Moorhead;

A bill (S. 1349) granting an increase of pension to James J. Poyner;

A bill (S. 1350) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Grover;

A bill (S. 1351) granting an increase of pension to William H. Burgett;

A bill (S. 1352) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Foster;

A bill (S. 1353) granting an increase of pension to Newton T. Burnett;

A bill (S. 1354) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Curtis;

A bill (S. 1355) granting an increase of pension to Mollie E. Jenkins; and

A bill (S. 1356) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Wilkey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 1357) granting an increase of pension to Orson P. Matthews (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1358) granting an increase of pension to Benajah P. Stubbs (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1359) granting an increase of pension to Anderson C. Jones (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1360) granting an increase of pension to George Hollederer (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 1361) for the relief of John H. Dawe; and

A bill (S. 1362) for the relief of Frances Gurley Elderkin; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1363) granting an increase of pension to John E. Cram; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 1364) granting a pension to Mary A. Dodds; and

A bill (S. 1365) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Ruge, alias George Ruge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CURTIS. At the request of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] I introduce a bill amending section 1608 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend chapter 55 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,'" approved February 23, 1905.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, if there be no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood that it was to go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER. Those bills have always gone to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Minnesota indicated on the bill that he would like to have it go to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the reference will be to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think I will have to object. It has been the uniform custom to send those bills to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CURTIS. Then I suggest that the bill be withdrawn until the Senator from Minnesota comes in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be withdrawn for the present.

By Mr. CLAPP, subsequently:

A bill (S. 1366) amending section 1608 f of the act of Congress entitled "An act to amend chapter 55 of an act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,'" approved February 23, 1905.

Mr. CLAPP. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator from Minnesota what the bill particularly relates to. The title does not develop it.

Mr. CLAPP. It relates to changing the code with reference to serving notice in condemnation proceedings. My clerk had it noted to be referred to the Senator's committee. Relating to the code, I thought it naturally should go to the Judiciary Committee. The Senator from Kansas having advised me of the desire of the Senator from New Hampshire, I have changed it. The matter of its reference is wholly immaterial to me.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have in the District of Columbia Committee a subcommittee on the judiciary, and I think the bill ought to go to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 1367) granting an increase of pension to William J. Perkins; and

A bill (S. 1368) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Barnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 1369) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, to be used in researches in home economics, and regulating the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1370) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Moylan C. Fox, executor and trustee of the estate of Joab Lawrence, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1371) granting an increase of pension to Francis Weaver (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1372) granting an increase of pension to William M. Brobst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 1373) amending section 5 of an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 1374) giving to the soldiers and sailors of the wars of the United States a preference right to enter lands hereafter thrown open to settlement and entry; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRIGGS:

A bill (S. 1375) authorizing the increase of the limit of cost for a site for the public building at Bayonne, N. J., to $75,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 1376) to provide for a commission to investigate commissions and to make recommendations concerning the same; to the Committee on Public Expenditures.

A bill (S. 1377) to prescribe the conditions under which corporations may engage in interstate commerce, and to provide penalties for otherwise engaging in the same; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 1378) requiring alien immigrants to come to the United States in vessels of American registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1379) making appropriation to compensate Key West, Fla., for lands of the city taken for the use of the Government; and

A bill (S. 1380) to authorize the location of a branch home for disabled volunteer soldiers, sailors, and marines in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1381) providing for a survey of the unsurveyed lands known as the Everglades of Florida;

A bill (S. 1382) providing for the releasing of the claim of the United States Government to arpent lot No. 87, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; and

A bill (S. 1383) for the relief of A. Purdee; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 1384) for the relief of William Mickler; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1385) providing for the construction of a sea wall on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1386) to provide for a site and a public building at Lakeland, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1387) granting a pension to Palen S. Colson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 1388) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural delivery routes may be established; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. THORNTON:

A bill (S. 1389) for the relief of Arsene Camille Flory, widow of Elie Henri Flory, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

(For Mr. FOSTER):

A bill (S. 1390) providing for an increase of salary for the appraiser of merchandise at the port of New Orleans; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1391) providing for an increase of salary for the United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1392) for the relief of Charles P. Johnston, his heirs or assignees, to locate outstanding and unsatisfied military bounty-land warrants and unsatisfied certificates of location heretofore issued by the United States under the closing part of section 3 of the act of June 2, 1858 (11 Stats., 294); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 1393) for the relief of John Wise;

A bill (S. 1394) for the relief of John G. Young;

A bill (S. 1395) for the relief of William Foy and H. B. Lane, executor of Mrs. H. B. Lane;

A bill (S. 1396) for the relief of W. B. Whitfield;

A bill (S. 1397) for the relief of John Burke Morris;

A bill (S. 1398) for the relief of the heirs and distributees of H. W. Hargrove;

A bill (S. 1399) for the relief of the estate of William C. Lewis;

A bill (S. 1400) for the relief of Sidney T. Dupuy and George R. Dupuy the only surviving heirs of George R. Dupuy, deceased;

A bill (S. 1401) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Harriet Andrews;

A bill (S. 1402) for the relief of George A. Russell, administrator of Stephen Chadwick, deceased;

A bill (S. 1403) for the relief of the estate of W. F. Sanderson;

A bill (S. 1404) for the relief of Mary J. Tatham, heir of Robert D. McCombs, deceased;

A bill (S. 1405) for the relief of heirs or estate of William R. Tatum, deceased;

A bill (S. 1406) for the relief of the heirs of Isaac Brown;

A bill (S. 1407) for the relief of the heirs of William Parks, deceased;

A bill (S. 1408) for the relief of the heirs of Felix B. Parks, deceased;

A bill (S. 1409) for the relief of the estate of Thomas W. Maides, deceased;

A bill (S. 1410) for the relief of Thomas Monteith;

A bill (S. 1411) for the relief of Frederick Pate;

A bill (S. 1412) for the relief of William Lewis Bryan;

A bill (S. 1413) for the relief of Frank Gibble;

A bill (S. 1414) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Leecraft;

A bill (S. 1415) for the relief of Fannie E. Gardner;

A bill (S. 1416) for the relief of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.;

A bill (S. 1417) for the relief of the estate of L. G. Smith, deceased;

A bill (S. 1418) for the relief of George Jerkins;

A bill (S. 1419) for the relief of Ben Pigott;

A bill (S. 1420) for the relief of L. A. Garner, administrator of Samuel C. Garner, deceased;

A bill (S. 1421) for the relief of I. F. Hill, executor of W. E. Hill;

A bill (S. 1422) for the relief of James F. White;

A bill (S. 1423) for the relief of J. A. Denny;

A bill (S. 1424) for the relief of W. J. Craddock;

A bill (S. 1425) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Everitt, deceased;

A bill (S. 1426) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Barfield, deceased;

A bill (S. 1427) for the relief of Franklin Foy;

A bill (S. 1428) for the relief of Walter T. Dough;

A bill (S. 1429) for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt, widow of Eli A. Moffitt;

A bill (S. 1430) for the relief of the estate of H. D. Coley, deceased;

A bill (S. 1431) for the relief of John L. Brown and the estates of A. T. Redditt and William G. Judkins;

A bill (S. 1432) for the relief of the estate of Thomas S. Howard, deceased;

A bill (S. 1433) for the relief of E. M. Felts;

A bill (S. 1434) for the relief of David J. Middleton;

A bill (S. 1435) for the relief of the estate of John Henry Jackson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1436) for the relief of Mrs. A. M. Bacon;

A bill (S. 1437) for the relief of the heirs of Lemuel Freeman, deceased;

A bill (S. 1438) for the relief of Joseph B. Banks;

A bill (S. 1439) for the relief of the estate of D. L. Pritchard, deceased;

A bill (S. 1440) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Richardson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1441) for the relief of the heirs of Cicero M. Davis;

A bill (S. 1442) for the relief of C. G. Perkins;

A bill (S. 1443) for the relief of the widow of R. D. Hay;

A bill (S. 1444) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Askin, Arthus Ipock, and John T. Ipock;

A bill (S. 1445) for the relief of the heirs of D. W. Morton;

(By request.) A bill (S. 1446) for the relief of William C. Staples;

A bill (S. 1447) for the relief of Thomas D. Meares, administrator of Armand D. Young, deceased;

A bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Sidney Maxwell; and

A bill (S. 1449) for the relief of Calvin J. Cowles; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1450) for the relief of John E. Griffin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1451) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Ramsey;

A bill (S. 1452) granting a pension to James Carroll;

A bill (S. 1453) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah C. Rice;

A bill (S. 1454) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Freeman;

A bill (S. 1455) granting an increase of pension to John Clark;

A bill (S. 1456) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Madison Pruitt;

A bill (S. 1457) granting a pension to Jerry Ramsey;

A bill (S. 1458) granting a pension to Robert H. Cowan;

A bill (S. 1459) granting a pension to Stephen Rice;

A bill (S. 1460) granting a pension to Edward W. Trice;

A bill (S. 1461) granting an increase of pension to Malinda Bradburn;

A bill (S. 1462) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Revis;

A bill (S. 1463) granting a pension to Mary Church;

A bill (S. 1464) granting a pension to Mary E. Gosnell;

A bill (S. 1465) granting a pension to Henry Young;

A bill (S. 1466) granting an increase of pension to Silas A. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 1467) granting an increase of pension to Frederick White;

A bill (S. 1468) granting an increase of pension to William Norton;

A bill (S. 1469) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Loyd;

A bill (S. 1470) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Rector;

A bill (S. 1471) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stanley;

A bill (S. 1472) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Wilson;

A bill (S. 1473) granting a pension to Christopher M. Saunders (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1474) granting a pension to Greenwood Griffin (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 1475) granting an increase of pension to Amos Hoy; and

A bill (S. 1476) granting a pension to John Devinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK:

A bill (S. 1477) granting an increase of pension to Milton I. Woodard;

A bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to Anna Gewinner;

A bill (S. 1479) granting an increase of pension to John Dineen;

A bill (S. 1480) granting a pension to J. L. Cooper; and

A bill (S. 1481) granting an increase of pension to James Tompach; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 1482) granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Tucker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1483) for the relief of Thomas Jory, Jarry, or Jury;

A bill (S. 1484) for the relief of Ferdinand Tobe;

A bill (S. 1485) for the relief of William Mullally; and

A bill (S. 1486) to correct the military record of George G. Patterson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1487) for the relief of David W. Stockstill; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1488) granting an increase of pension to Josiah McElroy; and

A bill (S. 1489) granting an increase of pension to William L. Morris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 1490) to give effect to the fifth article of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, signed January 11, 1909; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1491) to make further provision for the accommodation of the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and Labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1492) granting an increase of pension to Ashel E. Dickinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BACON:

A bill (S. 1493) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 1494) for the relief of Eugene J. O'Conner and J. B. Schweers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 1495) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Greer;

A bill (S. 1496) granting an increase of pension to George Richards;

A bill (S. 1497) granting an increase of pension to James Deselm;

A bill (S. 1498) granting an increase of pension to Simon C. Strickland;

A bill (S. 1499) granting an increase of pension to Clem Reid;

A bill (S. 1500) granting an increase of pension to George W. Grisinger; and

A bill (S. 1501) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Stratton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1502) to correct the military record of Robert D. Magill;

A bill (S. 1503) to correct the military record of Daniel C. Graeber; and

A bill (S. 1504) to grant an honorable discharge to John Flaherty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1505) for the relief of certain officers on the retired list of the United States Navy; and

A bill (S. 1506) to correct the naval record of John Lindsay; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 1507) for the relief of the Pennsylvania Engineering Co., of the city of Philadelphia;

A bill (S. 1508) for the relief of the estate of Eliza B. Hause; and

A bill (S. 1509) for the relief of Mary Cairney; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1510) granting a pension to Sarah M. Chandler;

A bill (S. 1511) granting an increase of pension to John E. Larkins;

A bill (S. 1512) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Henninger;

A bill (S. 1513) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Wehr;

A bill (S. 1514) to increase the pension of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States during the War of the Rebellion;

A bill (S. 1515) granting a pension to Lucy M. Cooke;

A bill (S. 1516) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Deivert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1517) granting a pension to James H. Foote (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 1518) granting an increase of pension to Robert Bullen (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 1519) providing an additional 1,000,000 acres of land for the State of Oregon under the provisions of the Carey Act, permitting the drainage of certain swamp and submerged lands, and granting such lands to said State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1520) to remit the duty on pictorial windows to be imported by the Gate of Heaven Church, South Boston, Mass. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1521) granting a pension to Seth H. Shurtleff (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1522) granting an increase of pension to Woodbury Day (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1523) to constitute intoxicating liquors a special class of commodities and to regulate the interstate-commerce shipments of such liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1524) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River in Western Shawnee County, or in Wabaunsee County, in the State of Kansas (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1525) for the relief of John C. Farrell; and

A bill (S. 1526) for the relief of E. N. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1527) to correct the military record of William H. Gage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1528) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Duff;

A bill (S. 1529) granting an increase of pension to Smith A. Nicholson;

A bill (S. 1530) granting an increase of pension to Simpson Gossett;

A bill (S. 1531) granting an increase of pension to John Hedge;

A bill (S. 1532) granting an increase of pension to John C. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 1533) granting an increase of pension to E. A. Makepeace;

A bill (S. 1534) granting an increase of pension to James Dodwell (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1535) granting a pension to Mrs. F. S. Cowan (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1536) granting a pension to Laura K. Briggs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THORNTON (for Mr. FOSTER):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) authorizing the Secretary of War to return to the State of Louisiana the original ordinance of secession; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to discontinue the printing of private pension bills; to the Committee on Printing.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. BURTON, it was—

Ordered, That Lena D. Nickerson be authorized to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Azor H. Nickerson (S. 5144, 61st Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS, it was—

Ordered, That permission is hereby granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Samuel D. Jarman, late of Company F, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, no adverse report having been made upon the same.

Ordered, That permission be hereby granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in the case of Lucinda P. Fayette (S. 2642, 60th Cong., 1st sess.), granting a pension to, no adverse report having been made upon the same.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, It is the sense of the Senate: (1) That intervention by the United States in the existing revolution in Mexico would be without justification and contrary to the settled principles of this Government of noninterference in the domestic concerns of other countries; (2) that the extent to which the United States should go in the present emergency in Mexico is to enforce their neutrality laws with vigor and fully protect life and property within their limits along the Mexican boundary line. The rights of citizens of the United States residing in Mexico are those of neutrals in belligerent territory.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-second Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject that may be pending before said committee, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST LANDS, ALASKA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit to the Senate a list of all claims, locations, filings, or entries made under lands withdrawn from the Chugach National Forest in Alaska and "restored to the public domain" by the Executive order of October 28, 1910 (No. 1260), giving the date of each claim, location, filing, or entry, and the name of the person or persons who made the same and any and all action taken thereon, and if soldier's additional homestead scrip was used in acquiring any right therein to give the name of the soldier to whom each scrip certificate so used was issued, the amount of land taken under such certificate, and the name of each claimant or entryman who used the scrip certificate. Also what, if any, assignments of any of such claims, locations, filings, or entries have been made, and to whom.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I call up the motion entered on Monday last to refer the joint resolution respecting the election of Senators by the people to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas moves to refer to the Committee on the Judiciary the joint resolution referred to, which will be read the second time by its title.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States was read the second time by its title.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I do not rise to oppose the motion; but I do think that a statement should be made so that there may be no confusion in the future regarding the reference of resolutions of this character. I think that an examination of the record will show that for 40 years every resolution of this character had been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections until the last session of Congress, when, at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, a similar resolution was referred to that committee. No debate was had at that time, and no objection was made.

If it is to be the policy of the Senate in the future to refer resolutions providing for amendments to the Constitution on questions relating to elections to the Committee on the Judiciary rather than to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I think it ought to be fully understood, so that there may be no confusion whatever.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections during these 40 years has been presided over by men like Senator Morton of Indiana, from the year 1872 to 1877, followed by Mr. Wadleigh

until 1880; by Mr. Saulsbury, from 1880 to 1881; by Mr. Hoar, from 1882 to 1893, a period of 11 years; by Mr. Vance, from 1893 to 1894; by Mr. Gray, from 1894 to 1895; by Mr. Mitchell of Oregon, from 1896 to 1897; by Senator Chandler of New Hampshire, from 1897 to 1901; and from 1901 to 1911 by the former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Burrows.

During that period a number of different resolutions of this character have been referred to that committee. Elaborate reports have been made upon them, some favorable and some adverse. Were it not for the fact that, through an inadvertence, during the last session a similar resolution went to the Committee on the Judiciary, I do not think any question as to the reference of this joint resolution would have been raised. But that resolution went to the Committee on the Judiciary, received the consideration of that committee, was reported and debated, and now at this session several resolutions introduced into this body have also been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, while the House joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, in order that the facts from the record may go in with the statement of the Senator from Vermont, I will ask his leave to say that I have a memorandum, furnished by the Assistant Librarian of the Senate, which shows that since 1871 out of 22 resolutions on this subject which have been presented and referred, 3 of them have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the first in 1886, the next in 1898, and then the one to which the Senator from Vermont has just now alluded. I simply make that as a statement from the record of the Senate itself.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. What became of the other 19 resolutions?

Mr. CULBERSON. They were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes. Mr. President, as I stated in the beginning, so far as I am concerned personally it makes very little difference to which committee the joint resolution shall be referred, as I am a member of both of these committees, but I did think it better that before this motion should be adopted the Senate should be fully informed of the action of the Senate during the 40 years I have mentioned.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, in my judgment every proposed amendment to the Constitution ought to be considered by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and the fact that such resolutions as this have heretofore been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections does not affect my judgment in that respect. It happens now to be true that the Committee on Privileges and Elections is composed of lawyers, and that is always apt to be the case; but if a resolution of this character must go to that committee, then an amendment of some other character would be referred to the committee supposed to have jurisdiction over that subject. The other committees may or may not be composed of lawyers, and yet I hardly think that any Senator will gravely doubt the advisability, not to say the wisdom, of having matters so vital as proposed amendments to the Constitution considered by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. That committee always has been and is now composed of excellent lawyers, and it is to be hoped that it will always include in its membership the ablest lawyers of this body.

Without intending to invite any debate on another question, I am moved to say that if the amendment to the Constitution proposing an income tax had been subjected to the scrutiny of the Committee on the Judiciary it would not have since its submission been subjected to some of the arguments which have been urged against it. That circumstance, concurring with what I believe to be general propriety, moves me to believe that the motion of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] ought to be adopted; and I say that the more readily because, unlike the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], I am not a member of both committees. I am a member of the committee to which the joint resolution has been referred, and I am not a member of the committee to which, in my judgment, it ought to be referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONS OF NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is my intention to address the Senate to-day on the resolution I offered Monday last respecting the relations of this country with Mexico. But the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has given notice of his intention and desire to address the Senate at this time on another subject, and as a matter of courtesy to him I will yield the floor until he has concluded.

Mr. WORKS. I desire to express my appreciation of the kindness and courtesy of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in giving way to me on this occasion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territory of New Mexico and the Territory of Arizona.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am a new Member of this body. There is a belief abroad on the outside that it is an unwritten law that a new Member should remain silent in his seat until he becomes better informed as to the affairs of government and be guided by the wisdom and better understanding of those who have been longer in the public service. It would be most pleasing to me to sit at the feet of the distinguished Members of this body who have served their country here for so many years and who are so much better informed as to the history and needs of the Nation than I can possibly be; but, Mr. President, as I understand my duties and responsibilities as a United States Senator, they commence when I assume the duties of office and continue until I give way to my successor, and during all of that time the people of my State and of the whole country are entitled to the best service I am able to render as their servant.

It so happens that at the very beginning of that service this body is confronted with a great problem in which I personally and the people of my State, yea, the people of every State in the Union, are profoundly and vitally interested. A Territory, constituting a part of the great domain now under the dominion of this Nation, is asking to be admitted as one of the States of the Union, and to be allowed to take on the powers and responsibilities of a free and sovereign State. Her plea for admission is met not with the claim that she does not possess the necessary territory or population, or is otherwise not within the constitutional provision authorizing the admission of States into the Union—that has been determined by the enabling act providing for her admission—but solely because her constitution provides for direct legislation.

THE CONSTITUTION.

The National Constitution provides, Article IV, section 3—

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress.

This provision of the Constitution, with the exception of the limitations therein stated, which have no application here, leaves the question of the admission of a new State wholly to the judgment and discretion of Congress. Acting upon the authority thus given it, Congress passed an act providing for the admission of the Territory of Arizona into the Union of States. That act, amongst other things, provides for a constitutional convention to form a constitution for the State and the submission of such constitution to the people of the Territory for their approval; and, further—

> After organization they (the delegates to the convention) shall declare, on behalf of the people of said proposed State, that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall be and is hereby authorized to form a constitution and provide for a State government for said proposed State, all in the manner and under the conditions contained in this act. The constitution shall be republican in form and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

This enabling act requires that the convention shall provide by an ordinance, irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of the said State, amongst other things:

> First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; and that polygamous or plural marriages, or polygamous cohabitation, and the sale, barter, or giving of intoxicating liquors to Indians, and the introduction of liquors into Indian country are forever prohibited.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Fourth. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control; and that said schools shall always be conducted in English.
>
> Fifth. That said State shall never enact any law restricting or abridging the right of suffrage on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and that ability to read, write, speak, and understand the English language sufficiently well to conduct the duties of the office without the aid of an interpreter shall be a necessary qualification for all State officers and members of the State legislature.

It is further provided:

> SEC. 22. That when said constitution and such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted shall have been duly ratified by the

people of Arizona, as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same shall be submitted to the President of the United States and to Congress for approval, together with the statement of the votes cast thereon and upon any provisions thereof which were separately submitted to and voted upon by the people. And if Congress and the President approve said constitution and the said separate provisions thereof, if any, or if the President approves the same and Congress fails to disapprove the same during the next regular session thereof, then and in that event the President shall certify said facts to the governor of Arizona, who shall, within 30 days after the receipt of said notification from the President of the United States, issue his proclamation for the election of the State and county officers, the members of the State legislature, and Representative in Congress, and all other officers provided for in said constitution, all as hereinafter provided; said election to take place not earlier than 60 days nor later than 90 days after said proclamation by the governor of Arizona ordering the same.

The right of Arizona to be admitted as a State, subject only to a compliance with this act, was established by the act itself. Therefore the only question here is whether the Territory has complied with the conditions imposed or not. The one and only objection urged against its admission is that it has not formed a constitution "republican in form." If it has not done this, it must be admitted that this is a valid reason for refusing to allow the Territory to come into the Union as a State.

WHAT IS REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT?

The Constitution provides that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." It contains no definition of a republic or of a republican form of government. This can only be determined, so far as the Constitution is concerned, from its whole scope and tenor. But the assailants of this proposed constitution go further, and maintain that the republican form of government must be a representative form also, and as we shall see a little further along the only objection to the constitution presented here is that it is destructive of or inimical to the representative form of government that they claim is included in the term "republican." As the Constitution throws no direct light upon the question, we must look elsewhere to ascertain, if we can, what is meant by and included in the term "republican form of government" within the meaning of the Constitution. As the Constitution does not attempt to define it, we must assume that it was used in the generally accepted sense, if there be any.

Much learning and labor have been expended in the effort to determine what is a republic. In the general division of the forms of government into monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies a republic is classed with the latter, and is sometimes defined as a representative democracy to distinguish it from what is termed a pure democracy, where the people act directly and as a whole. It would be impracticable and profitless to enter here into any extended discussion of the varied and different views of the many writers on this subject.

I have chosen, for my present purpose, to take the late work, Introduction to Political Science, by Prof. Garner, as containing all that is needed to develop what I desire to call to the attention of the Senate. I call attention to some of its definitions.

First is the general divisions of states, as follows:

On the basis of the number of persons in whom the sovereign power is vested, states may be classified as monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies. A monarchy is a state directed by a single supreme will; an aristocracy is one in which the exercise of sovereignty resides in a comparatively small number of persons; while a democracy is one in which the exercise of sovereignty rests with the mass of the population.

Coming nearer to the matter we have in hand, the author says:

Democracies are of two kinds—pure or direct and representative or indirect. A pure democracy is one in which the will of the state is formulated and expressed directly and immediately through the people acting in their primary capacity. A representative democracy is one in which the state will is ascertained and expressed through the agency of a small and select number who act as the representatives of the people. A pure democracy is practicable only in small states where the voting population may be assembled for purposes of legislation and where the collective needs of the people are few and simple. In large and complex societies, where the legislative wants of the people are numerous, the very necessities of the situation make government by the whole body of citizens a physical impossibility.

Coming down to our own country, he has this further to say:

The Constitution of the United States imposes upon the National Government the duty of guaranteeing to the component States a republican form of government, but it does not attempt to define the essential characteristics of such a government, simply assuming that they are too well understood to admit of a difference of opinion. Madison, in The Federalist, said it was a government in which there was "a scheme of representation." It was, he said, "a government which derives all its powers, directly or indirectly, from the great body of the people and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior." The two "great points of difference," said Madison, "between a republic and a democracy are: First, the governing power in a republic is delegated to a small number of citizens elected by the rest; and, second, a republic is capable of embracing a larger population and of extending over a wider area of territory than is a democracy. In a democracy the people meet and exercise the government in person; in a republic they assemble and administer it by their representative agents."

As to the effect of such a government upon the people and the state the comments of the author are interesting and instructive, particularly in view of the almost universal demand of the people for a fuller share in the conduct of public affairs and the widespread dissatisfaction with and disapproval of the manner of selecting representatives and the almost universal distrust of the representatives so selected. He says:

By no one has the strength of democratic government in its representative form been so ably set forth as by John Stuart Mill, who defined it as that form in which "the whole people, or some numerous portion of them, exercise the governing power through deputies periodically elected by themselves." There is no difficulty in showing, he asserts, that the ideally best form of government is that in which the supreme controlling power in the last resort is vested in the entire aggregate of the community, every citizen not only having a voice in the exercise of that ultimate sovereignty, but being at least occasionally called on to take an actual part in the government, by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general. The only government, he continues, which can fully satisfy the exigencies of the social state is one in which the whole people participate, and the degree of participation should everywhere be as great as the general degree of improvement of the community will allow, and ultimately all should be admitted to a share in the sovereign power of the state. So far as the welfare of the community is concerned, the superiority of popular government, Mill goes on to say, rests upon two principles of as universal truth and applicability as any general proposition which can be laid down respecting human affairs. The first is that the rights and interests of the individual can only be safeguarded when he is able to "stand up" for them himself; the second is that the general prosperity attains a higher degree and is more widely diffused in proportion to the amount and variety of the personal energies enlisted in promoting it.

But the greatest glory of democratic government, in the opinion of its votaries, does not flow so much from its own inherent excellence as a political contrivance as from its influence in elevating the masses of the people, developing their faculties, stimulating interest among them in public affairs, and strengthening their patriotism by allowing them a share in its administration. Democracy refuses to concede that some are born to rule and others to obey, and that some should be citizens and others subjects. It recognizes no privileged classes, but puts all on a footing of political equality.

* * * * * * *

De Tocqueville has justly remarked that almost all revolutions which have changed the face of the world have had for their purpose the destruction of inequality.

The same author, in his study of democracy in America, dwelt repeatedly upon the interest which the American people take in public affairs, their high state of intelligence in regard to political matters, and their natural patriotism. He pointed out that one of the great advantages of a democracy is that it serves as a sort of training school for citizenship. Mill likewise laid great stress upon the influence of democracy in elevating the character and intelligence of the masses. The "most important point of excellence," he said, "which any form of government can possess is to promote the virtue and intelligence of the people themselves, and the first consideration in judging of the merits of a particular form of government is how far they tend to foster intellectual and moral qualities in the citizens." The government which does the best, he continues, is likely to be the best in all other respects. Government is thus an agency of education as well as an organization for managing the collective affairs of the community.

No careful observer of the times and the conditions that have led us up to this controversy can fail to see the dangers that confront the Nation and the several States if the Federal authorities shall refuse to admit a Territory into the Union of States for no better reason than that the people must be confined to a strictly representative form of government; and any attempt to extend the power of the people to the enactment of laws, under reasonable limitations and regulations, in order to protect them and the State from the corrupt election of representatives, and against the failure of such representatives to perform their duties as such, is an offense against our principles of representative government that must exclude them from entering into statehood. And yet that is precisely what is proposed by the opponents of this effort to bring the Territory of Arizona into the Union.

WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

Mr. President, this controversy presents an issue of transcendent importance to the people of this country. The eyes of the Nation are upon us. If the Congress shall refuse to approve the proposed constitution of Arizona on any such grounds as this, it is assuming a grave responsibility. The consequences may be far-reaching and disastrous. The people are aroused and most earnest in their demand for just such legislation as is contained in this proposed constitution. The conditions are such as to call for the most careful and conscientious consideration of the important questions involved.

My sense of the importance of the issue is my excuse for going more particularly into the real issues involved and what I believe may be the consequences of a refusal to approve this proposed constitution.

What is the real objection to the constitution? No one need be in doubt on that subject. It is one phase of the struggle that has been going on in this country between the common people and the privileged self-seeking interests, affecting the right to govern the Nation, the States, and the municipalities. The people are insisting that they shall be permitted to govern their own country and that it shall not be corrupted and gov-

erned by the power of money in the hands of men who care nothing for the Government except as a means of increasing their vast wealth. They insist that this country shall be a government of the people and not a plutocracy of wealth.

THE LORIMER CASE.

Mr. President, this widespread uprising against the corruption that, if persisted in, must eventually overthrow our representative form of government, is founded upon the most convincing evidence that corruption is eating at the very vitals of the Republic and threatening the perpetuity of our free institutions. We need not go outside of this Chamber to find evidence of this fact. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the past few months will disclose a condition that has brought the whole Nation to shame. It was charged that the election of a Member of this body had been procured by corrupt practices and the bribery of votes in the legislature. An investigation was made by a committee of the Senate, and it was found by a majority of that committee that the Member was entitled to his seat. A minority of the committee reached a different conclusion and submitted a resolution declaring that the Senator was not entitled to a seat in this body.

Mr. President, I need not enter upon a discussion of the evidence in that case. It is enough to say that it was clearly and sufficiently shown that corrupt practices had been resorted to in the election and that some votes had been purchased. By a small majority the Senate decided that the incumbent was entitled to his seat, and that was all that was decided. It was perfectly evident, however, that the case turned upon the question, not whether there had been corruption, not whether bribery had been committed, but whether or not enough votes had been bought to change the result. The rule of law, and of precedent in this body, that the title of a Member to his seat could not be forfeited by corruption or bribery unless it be shown that the corruption was such as to have resulted in an election, was invoked, and the most ingenious means of counting the vote and considering its effect were urged by distinguished Senators on this floor to save the Member's seat.

Mr. President, in an investigation of this kind, not being a contest between claimants for the office, this Senate was not bound by strict rules of law. In the consideration of such a resolution it is not sitting as a court to try an issue of law or fact. The proceedings of the Senate show conclusively that Senators so considered it. Evidence was received, without question, that would not have been allowed in a court of justice. There is no appeal from a decision of this body. If there were, and the proceedings were submitted to the review of a court, controlled by rules of law, error enough would have been found to reverse the case a dozen times over. But, Mr. President, when the final test came, when a decision was to be rendered, and that upon evidence much of which had been received in violation of well-settled rules of law, and then for the first time, the strict rule of law that enough votes to change the result must have been purchased to unseat the Member whose title to the office was in question was insisted upon and prevailed.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WORKS. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. HEYBURN. I rise to a point of order, Mr. President. It is not in order for a Senator in discussing any question upon the floor to impugn the honor or integrity of either a Member of the Senate or any committee of the Senate.

Mr. WORKS. Neither have I done so, nor intended to do so, Mr. President, as I shall show further on.

Mr. HEYBURN. I call attention to the rule:

RULE XIX.

* * * * * * *

2. No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

To charge that Senators comprising a committee of this body have disregarded evidence, or that they have refused to receive evidence that should be received, is within that rule.

Mr. WORKS. I will remind the Senator from Idaho that I have made no such statement at all.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will not pursue it further than to say that when the Senator reads his remarks in the RECORD tomorrow he may probably have his memory refreshed.

Mr. WORKS. My memory is clear on the subject.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am amazed, Mr. President, that a question should be raised as to any violation of the rule on the language which the Senator from California has used in reference to the case which was under contest in the last session. No word or line in the paragraph which has just been submitted by the Senator as a part of his argument here is a reflection upon any Member of the Senate or upon any committee of the Senate, and no strained construction of what he said could possibly put the Senator in that embarrassing position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from California understands the rule of the Senate, and he will proceed in order.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, as to the manner of procedure, I did not ask for any action. I merely called the attention of the Senator, as is proper, to the rule more in the nature of a suggestion of warning.

Mr. WORKS. I am greatly obliged to the Senator for his suggestion and warning, but I desire to say, Mr. President, that I have in no way violated the rule that has been read by the Senator, nor have I had any intention to do anything of that sort.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator from California will permit me, I would ask the Senator from Idaho if he contends that the rule which he has just quoted is applicable to a case involving the validity of the seat of a Member of the Senate, which necessarily involves a discussion of the manner of his election? If corruption is charged in the action of the legislature of the State from which he is credited, necessarily the very nature of the question involves a discussion of the integrity of the legislature of that State. Does the Senator from Idaho contend that such a rule would apply to that case?

Mr. HEYBURN. I think that question was not within the controversy. I referred to the remarks of the Senator from California as applied to members of a committee of the Senate, not as applied to the person who might be under consideration.

Mr. WORKS. I desire to remind the Senator from Idaho that I have not in any way referred to a committee of the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Has the Chair ruled upon the point of order raised by the Senator from Idaho?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Iowa that the Chair was not asked to rule upon it.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Idaho presented a point of order. It is either well taken or it is not well taken, and unless he withdraws it, I ask for a ruling of the Chair upon it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I read a standing rule of the Senate in support of the proposition that it is not in order to speak disrespectfully of a Member of the Senate in discussion. The words, I presume, are taken down, or the Senator may have them in manuscript.

The Chair, in order to rule upon that point of order, would of course have to pay attention to the expressions used, so as to determine whether or not they were in violation of the rule. It was no personal sensitiveness on my part; it was merely in the interest of orderly procedure. It is not customary, and it very seldom occurs in this body, that a Senator speaks with disrespect of another Senator.

Mr. WORKS. It has not occurred in this instance.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Idaho rose for a purpose. He stated his purpose to be to state a point of order. His point of order was that the Senator from California had violated the rule, which he proceeded to read. The Senator from California has either violated the rule in what he has said or he has not, and he is entitled and the Senate is entitled to a ruling of the Chair upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would state to the Senator from Iowa that he understood the Senator from Idaho when he rose to a point of order, as he stated, simply to state a rule of the Senate, and he did not insist that the Senator from California had violated that rule.

Mr. HEYBURN. I called attention to the rule.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not understand that there is anything in this Chamber such as admonition and warning on the part of one Senator toward another. I very clearly understood the Senator from Idaho to rise to a point of order and to state it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, the ruling which the Senator from Iowa calls for could only be made in case the Senator from Idaho called the

Senator from California to order, which he did not do. He rose to a point of order for the purpose indicated by him, to make a statement, and there is nothing to be decided unless the Senator from Idaho calls the Senator from California to order. If he does that, then, under the rule, it is the duty of the Senator from California to take his seat, and for the Senate, and not the Chair, to rule before he proceeds. But he has not been called to order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will proceed.

Mr. WORKS. It is not my purpose to reargue that case or to reopen it in any way. It is not for me to question the correctness of those proceedings or the conclusion reached. I am citing the case to show why the people of this country may justly claim a larger share in the selection of their officers and the control of legislation. It is one out of hundreds of cases where corrupt and illegal influences have been brought to bear to control elections and the enactment of legislation detrimental to the public at large. If such influences are allowed to control an election to the high office of United States Senator, if powerful influences are at work to control legislation by representatives chosen by such means, and otherwise amenable to such influences, what is the remedy? Are the people of this country helpless to protect themselves from such results under our representative form of government? Is there no way by which such evil influences may be met and overcome? Some Senators here seem to think not. When the people attempt to limit the power of their representatives and assume some of that power themselves by ignoring the unfaithful representative and acting directly at the polls, or by recalling him and substituting an honest and capable representative in his place, the cry is raised that this effort to control their own representatives and their own government is a violation of the Constitution of the United States and an encroachment upon the principles of our representative form of government.

Mr. President, this is the issue that confronts us to-day. The proposed constitution of Arizona provides for the initiative, referendum, and recall. Objection is made to the admission of this Territory as a State on this ground and this alone. I assume that no Senator on this floor will maintain that the ultimate power, the sovereignty of this Nation, does not rest in the people. Therefore it is not a question of power in the people, but as to how that power may be exercised. We have a written Constitution. It came from the people. The simple question is: Have they by their own act in forming the Constitution deprived themselves of the right of self-government through direct legislation? Are they compelled to submit wholly to the acts of representatives selected, not by them but by the powerful interests that are menacing the life of the Nation and forced upon them in many instances by fraud, corruption, and bribery?

POWER OF THE PEOPLE.

This is a grave question that reaches the foundation of the Government and threatens the integrity of our free institutions. It is not only the people of Arizona that are demanding the right to govern their State. Many other States already in the Union have enacted just such laws as are authorized in the proposed constitution of Arizona, and many other States are demanding and will soon enact such or similar laws. In my own State an amendment to the constitution authorizing the initiative, referendum, and recall has been, by the legislature, submitted to the people, and it will be adopted by an overwhelming majority. Congress need not delude itself with the belief that this demand for direct legislation comes from fanatics and radical reformers only. The demand is universal and is supported by the best citizens in the country without regard to party. It is the result of the widespread and well-founded belief that the affairs of state and of the Nation are, to too great an extent, governed by interests adverse to the best interests of the whole country and controlled by fraud and corruption. The absolute necessity for some legislation that will put the people in possession and control of their government and drive the interests and the political bosses out of politics and the official life of the Nation is too evident to admit of question.

The power to govern exists in the people. The necessity for a more direct exercise of that power is manifest. Therefore the sole question is: Have the people the right to enact and enforce the laws proposed to effect their objects, or are they precluded from so doing by the Federal Constitution?

In commenting on the clause of the Constitution providing that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government," the Supreme Court, in Minor *v.* Happersett (21 Wall., 162, 175), said:

> It is true that the United States guarantees to every State a republican form of government. It is also true that no State can pass a bill of attainder, and that no person can be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. All these several provisions of the Constitution must be construed in connection with the other parts of the instrument and in the light of the surrounding circumstances.
>
> The guaranty is of a republican form of government. No particular government is designated as republican; neither is the exact form to be guaranteed in any manner especially designated. Here, as in other parts of the instrument, we are compelled to resort elsewhere to ascertain what was intended.
>
> The guaranty necessarily implies a duty on the part of the States themselves to provide such a government. All the States had governments when the Constitution was adopted. In all the people participated to some extent through their representatives elected in the manner specially provided. These governments the Constitution did not change. They were accepted precisely as they were, and it is therefore to be presumed that they were such as it was the duty of the States to provide. Thus we have unmistakable evidence of what was republican in form, within the meaning of that term as employed in the Constitution.

In In re Pfahler (150 Cal., 71) the Supreme Court of California had under consideration the constitutionality of a provision of the charter of the city of Los Angeles providing for the initiative in the passage of an ordinance. It was held that the charter was not repugnant to either the Constitution of the United States or of the State of California. In passing upon that question and in commenting on the decision in Minor *v.* Happersett, just mentioned, the court used this language:

> It is unnecessary to here do more than to refer to the widely known and well-recognized form of local government that prevailed in several of the States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, known as the New England town government, under which all the inhabitants in town meeting directly exercised such legislative power as was essential to the conduct of local affairs. No difference material to the objection under discussion is to be found in the fact that they did this in public meeting rather than by secret ballot at the polls, as under the provision before us. The objection here made is that, under the republican form of government guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, such power can not be directly exercised by the people, and, so far as that objection is concerned, if the people may legislate directly in town meeting, they may do so by their votes at the polls. The constitutional provision was framed and adopted with full knowledge of this system of local government that then obtained in four of the States, and that system was continued under the Constitution without any question as to its validity.

Mr. President, the town meetings in the several States where they prevail constitute the most direct and democratic action by the people that could be possible. This manner of conducting elections and transacting public business was recognized by the Constitution as a valid and constitutional exercise of the power vested in the people. Its validity never has been questioned and probably never will be. But when a Territory presents a constitution for its government as a State expressly providing for this same direct exercise of power by the people it is denounced as not republican or representative in form. I submit, Mr. President, that this objection is wholly without force or reason, and should not influence the vote of a single Senator against the admission of the Territory as a State.

The referendum has been in force for certain purposes in almost, if not quite, every State in the Union from the beginning, and that in the most important of all questions—the adoption and amendment of constitutions—besides many other things.

Mr. Bryce, in his admirable work on the American Commonwealth, has this to say on that subject:

> So far back as 1843 we find Wisconsin referring it to the voters to decide whether or no banks shall be chartered. Minnesota declares that a certain class of railway laws shall not take effect unless submitted to and ratified by a majority of the electors. And she provides, by a later amendment to her constitution, that "the moneys belonging to the internal improvement land fund shall never be appropriated for any purpose till the enactment for that purpose shall have been approved by a majority of the electors of the State voting at the annual general election following the passage of the act." In this last instance the referendum goes the length of constituting the voters the ultimate financial authority for the State, withdrawing from the legislature what might seem the oldest and most essential of its functions. So in not a few States no debts beyond a certain specified amount may be contracted, except in pursuance of a vote of the people; and in others the rate of taxation is limited to a certain ratio to the total valuation of the State, subject to a power to increase the same by popular vote. And in California no law changing the seat of the State government is valid unless approved by the people.

Direct legislation has been in force in Switzerland for nearly 50 years, and has been adopted in many of the States and made a part of the law of a large number of the cities of the country.

The initiative and referendum has been in force in Oregon for some time, and the question of the constitutionality of such legislation has been before the supreme court of that State more than once, and the question as to what constitutes a republican form of government has, in some of the decisions of that court, received careful consideration. Of these decided cases I refer particularly to Kadderly *v.* Portland (44 Oreg., 118), in which, after a full statement of the scope and effect of the laws of that State on the subject, the court uses this language:

> Nor do we think the amendment void because in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, Article IV, paragraph 4, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government. The purpose of this provision of the Constitution is to protect the people of the several States against aristocratic and monarchical invasions, and against insurrections and domestic violence, and to prevent them from abolish-

ing a republican form of government. (Cooley Const. Lim. (7 ed.) 45; 2 Story, Const. (5 ed.), par. 1815.) But it does not forbid them from amending or changing their constitution in any way they may see fit, so long as none of these results is accomplished. No particular style of government is designated in the Constitution as republican, nor is its exact form in any way prescribed. A republican form of government is a government administered by representatives chosen or appointed by the people, or by their authority. Mr. Madison says it is "a government which derives all its powers, directly or indirectly, from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior." (The Federalist, 302.) And in discussing the section of the Constitution of the United States now under consideration, he says: "But the authority extends no further than to a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a preexisting government of the form which is to be guaranteed. As long, therefore, as the existing republican forms are continued by the States, they are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican form, they have a right to do so, and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is that they shall not exchange republican for antirepublican constitutions." (The Federalist, 342.) Now, the initiative and referendum amendment does not abolish or destroy the republican form of government, or substitute another in its place. The representative character of the government still remains. The people have simply reserved to themselves a larger share of legislative power, but they have not overthrown the republican form of the government or substituted another in its place. The government is still divided into the legislative, executive, and judicial departments, the duties of which are discharged by representatives selected by the people.

Under this amendment, it is true, the people may exercise a legislative power and may, in effect, veto or defeat bills passed and approved by the legislature and the governor; but the legislative and executive departments are not destroyed, nor are their powers or authority materially curtailed. Laws proposed and enacted by the people under the initiative clause of the amendment are subject to the same constitutional limitations as other statutes, and may be amended or repealed by the legislature at will.

OREGON SUPREME COURT CITED.

The same question came again before the Supreme Court of Oregon in the case of Kiernan *v.* The City of Portland (112 Pac. Rep., 402). In that case the court said:

To ascertain whether taking from the legislature and delegating to the municipalities, or to the localities affected, local self-government, or a right to enact, maintain, and alter their charters as the legislature formerly did, and whether the taking from the legislature the right to make special laws upon the subject violates this provision of the National Constitution, makes it important that we first ascertain what is meant by a republican form of government. It is an expression which all assume to understand, yet, judging from the many unsuccessful attempts of eminent statesmen and writers to give it a clear meaning, it would seem the phrase is not susceptible to being given a precise definition. Especially is this true when sought to be applied to the constitution of different States, concerning which Mr. James Madison, a member of the Constitutional Convention, said: "* * * If we resort for a criterion to the different principles on which different forms of government are established, we may define a republic to be, or may at least bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers, directly or indirectly, from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure for a limited period or during good behavior. It is essential to such government that it be derived from the great body of society and not from any inconsiderable portion or a favored class of it * * *." (The Federalist (Hamilton ed.), paper 39, p. 301). Another and more pointed definition appears in Chisholm *v.* Georgia (2 Dall., 419, 457; 1 L. ed., 440), by Mr. Justice Wilson, a member of the Constitutional Convention, who but a short time after the adoption of the Federal Constitution, in adverting to what is meant by a republican form of government, remarked: "As a citizen, I know the government of that State (Georgia) to be republican, and my short definition of such a government—one constructed on this principle, that the supreme power resides in the body of the people." From which it follows that the converse must be true; that is to say, any government in which the supreme power resides with the people is republican in form. (See also Mr. Justice Wilson's remarks to the same effect, reported in 5 Elliott's Debates, 100.)

Measured in the light of the above, it is difficult to conceive of any system of lawmaking coming nearer to the great body of the people of the entire State, or by those comprising the various municipalities, than that now in use here, and, being so, we are at a loss to understand how the adoption and use of this system can be held a departure from a republican form of government. It was to escape the oppression resulting from governments controlled by the select few, so often ruling under the assumption that "might makes right," that gave birth to republics. Monarchical rulers refuse to recognize their accountability to the people governed by them. In a republic the converse is the rule. The tenure of office may be for a short or a long period, or even for life, yet those in office are at all times answerable, either directly or indirectly, to the people and in proportion to their responsibility to those for whom they may be the public agents, and the nearer the power to enact laws and control public servants lies with the great body of the people the more nearly does a government take unto itself the form of a republic—not in name alone, but in fact.

When the question was before the Legislature of New Jersey, the question of the constitutionality of such legislation was referred to the attorney general of the State for his opinion. He declined to give an opinion of his own on the ground that the question presented was a purely political one. But he did present in his opinion an interesting account of the views expressed by other distinguished gentlemen that are worthy of our consideration. He says, in part:

The amendment proposed is, of course, inconsistent with our present State constitution and the existing form of government, but there is nothing to prevent the people from changing that constitution by the means provided in it, except such restriction as may be found in the Constitution of the United States. That Constitution, in section 4 of Article IV, provides that "The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the legislature or of the executive (when the legislature can not be convened), against domestic violence."

Whether the constitution of a State is republican in form is a political question which has been much discussed, and the opinions of statesmen have varied with the exigencies of the occasion. The antirepublican restrictions upon the right of suffrage in Rhode Island in 1841–42 were supposed by some to warrant the interference of the Government of the United States, but this view was not accepted by any department of the Government.

It was insisted in the arguments on reconstruction that a constitution which excluded a large portion of the people from suffrage on account of color was not republican in form. Others have insisted that the only object of the clause was to exclude the possibility of a monarchical government. The form of the governments of the several States composing the Union, as they stood at the time of their admission, it has also been insisted, was the proper standard by which to determine whether any afterchange in any of them makes its form of government other than republican. It is said that in the admission of a new State no judicial question is raised on which the courts could act, because the power is vested exclusively in Congress, and that no change in its government after its admission can make a State constitution other than republican which does not essentially alter its form or make it different in some essential particular from those of the other States at the time of their adoption.

Mr. Madison, in No. 43 of the Federalist, commenting on the clause, says: "But the authority extends no further than to a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a preexisting government of the form which is to be guaranteed. As long, therefore, as the existing republican forms are continued by the States, they are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican forms, they have a right to do so and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is that they shall not change republican for antirepublican constitutions, a restriction which, it is presumed, will hardly be considered as a grievance."

Mr. Story, in section 1815, adopts the view of the Federalist on this subject. He says: "The Federalist has spoken with so much force and propriety upon this subject that it supersedes all further reasoning. 'In a confederacy,' says that work, 'founded on republican principles, and composed of republican members, the superintending government ought clearly to possess authority to defend the system against aristocratic or monarchical innovations. The more intimate the nature of such a union may be the greater interest have the members in the political institutions of each other, and the greater right to insist that the forms of government under which the compact was entered into should be substantially maintained.'"

On December 14, 1867, Mr. Reverdy Johnson, one of the ablest debaters and best constitutional lawyers of his time, in the Senate of the United States expressed his views on this subject. He said, among other things:

"By some leading men in Congress it was then contended that a government ought not to be regarded as republican in form which permitted slavery or which excluded a portion of its citizens from participation in the government because of the color of the skin. The exigencies of the times made this doctrine acceptable. The reorganizing States were required to present constitutions forbidding slavery and establishing impartial suffrage. In the course of reconstruction, however, the question was warmly discussed whether, if the political departments of the Government should erroneously, arbitrarily, and, for partisan ends, determine and declare that a particular State government was not republican in form and therefore should not be recognised, such State or its citizens could have any appeal to the judicial tribunals. It was not doubted that if the case was one of a newly organized State applying for admission to the Union the decision of Congress upon its admission, however erroneous, unjust, or arbitrary, would be one the conclusiveness of which would not be open to discussion. Congress having full power to admit or reject new States, the insufficiency of the reasons which may have governed its action can not possibly affect its validity. But in other cases also it must be conceded that a State aggrieved by an unjust decision is equally without legal remedy. The courts can not aid it, for upon political questions they must accept and follow the conclusions of the political department. (Luther *v.* Borden, 7 How., 42; Texas *v.* White, 7 Wall., 700; White *v.* Hart, 13 Wall., 649.) In such a case the only redress possible is through an appeal to the people. Such is the conclusion of the cases above cited."

Our Government is a representative government. It has been called a representative democracy. Representation is one of the essentials of a republican form of government, and the United States can not fulfill that obligation without guaranteeing representation in the House. (Flanders and Hahn's case, 3d Feb., 1863, Dawes's Rep., 3 Contested Elections, 446.)

Mr. Cooley says: "The power of the people to amend or revise their Constitution is limited by the Constitution of the United States in the following particulars:

"(1) It must not abolish the republican form of government, since such act would be revolutionary in its character, and would call for and demand direct intervention on the part of the Government of the United States.

"(2) It must not provide for titles of nobility, or assume to violate the obligation of any contract, or attaint persons of crime, or provide ex post facto for the punishment of acts by the courts which were innocent when committed, or contain any other provision which would, in effect, amount to the exercise of any power expressly or impliedly prohibited to the States by the Constitution of the Union; for while such provisions would not call for the direct and forcible intervention of the Government of the Union, it would be the duty of the courts, both State and national, to refuse to enforce them and to declare them altogether void, as much when enacted by the people in their primary capacity as makers of the fundamental law as when enacted in the form of statutes through the delegated power of their legislatures." (See Cooley on Constitutional Limitations, p. 44.)

Prof. Parsons, in his chapter entitled "Twenty reasons for the referendum," gives the following synopsis of benefits likely to flow from legislation of this kind:

It will perfect the representative system by eliminating serious misrepresentation.

Better men will be attracted to political life.

It will simplify elections, separating the judgment of men from the judgment on issues, and disentangle issues so that each may be judged on its own individual merits.

It will lessen the power of partisanship.

It will elevate the press, voting will turn more on reason, and mud will be less in demand in the political market.

It will educate the people, intellectually and morally.

It will stop class legislation and give labor its rights. * * * Farmers and artisans are not fairly represented in legislative bodies, but at the polls they will have their due preponderance and can pass such laws as they please.

Direct legislation (i. e., the initiative) tends to stability * * * acting as a safety valve for discontent.

It favors wealth diffusion by depriving the wealthy of their enormous overweight in government and giving preponderance of legislative power to the common people whose interests are opposed to the vast aggregation of private capital.

Experience here and in Switzerland has proven the measureless value of direct legislation and the utter futility of all objections raised against it.

STABILITY OF GOVERNMENT DEPENDS ON INTEGRITY OF PEOPLE.

Mr. President, for myself I am not expecting the millennium to come in politics if direct legislation shall be universally adopted in this country. After all and in the final analysis the stability of our institutions must and does depend upon the honesty and patriotism of our people. No form of government will save the country from ultimate downfall if the people in whom the power to govern is vested are venal and corrupt. Late developments in some of the States indicate widespread corruption and buying of votes in some localities. If this kind of corruption has become general throughout the country, then indeed is this Republic in deadly peril of ultimate dissolution. The interests and the men who have cultivated this tendency to bribery and corruption are traitors to their country and should be hunted down and surely and severely punished in every community where votes are bought and sold. No change in the form of government, no increased power in the hands of the people to the exclusion of their representatives will remedy this deadly evil. The beneficial effects of direct legislation must, at last, depend upon the integrity of the people themselves. If the increased responsibility placed upon the individual voter shall make him a better, more loyal, and more trustworthy citizen, as I believe it will in most cases, then this reform legislation will have accomplished much for the country.

HOW FAR REFORM LEGISLATION SHOULD GO.

Mr. President, as to the extent to which such legislation should go, I am particularly anxious not to be misunderstood. I do not believe in a pure democracy. It is a form of government too weak and unstable to meet the demands of a Nation like our own, with the many great and conflicting interests that are struggling for supremacy, the important problems that must be met with judgment and firmness, and with our relations, as a great world power, with the other nations of the world. If our Government should degenerate into a pure democracy it will surely, inevitably, go to pieces. If I believed that the direct legislation reforms I am advocating would bring us eventually to that kind of government, I could not give them my support. But surely there is a happy medium, a middle ground between the unwarranted and corrupt power now exercised by our representatives, under our present system, which has created such nation-wide distrust on the part of the people, and a system which destroys our representative form of government and establishes a pure democracy in its place.

It is that middle ground that will preserve the rights of the people and so control the conduct of representatives as to render them amenable to the source of their authority that I am seeking. There must be some system of checks and balances whereby the people may act in a proper case where the representative wrongfully or corruptly refuses to act, may defeat action wrongfully taken by him in defiance of the interests of the public, and remove him from office and power where he has been unfaithful or corrupt. This much the people have a just right to demand. They are asking no more than this in demanding the initiative, referendum, and recall.

Mr. President, does any Senator on this floor entertain any doubt as to the necessity for these reforms in legislation? Is there a lingering doubt in the mind of any observing citizen of this great Republic that the power of the special interests and corrupt political bosses must be met and overthrown in some way to preserve the political freedom and independence of the people? Can any Senator suggest a better way than that of giving greater power to the people through the direct primary and the initiative, referendum, and recall?

BOSS RULE IN CALIFORNIA.

I speak from knowledge when I say that the corporate interests and political bosses of my own State have been utterly routed, our politics purified, the standard of citizenship elevated, and the confidence of the people in better conditions vastly increased, through these reforms alone. They have banished the political caucus and convention, the convenient tool of corruptionists, and made every voter independent to do his own will at the polls. It has enabled them to nominate their own candidates to offices where before the voter had no choice but to vote for candidates nominated by the machine or not vote at all. The result has been all that any good citizen could desire. Whereas, before, one great corporation, with its allied forces of evil, nominated and elected our officers, and the officers elected were its servants and not the servants of the people, at the first election after a primary election law went into force we elected an honest, courageous, and independent governor, a man who takes orders from no corporation machine or boss, a lieutenant governor of the same caliber, and the best legislature the State has ever had in its entire history. It was a complete transformation from corrupt, machine politics, dominated by special interests, and ruled by political bosses of their choosing, to honest, independent politics ruled by the people themselves. The Republican Party is again governed and controlled by Republicans and not by a railroad company and its hired political bosses. Does anybody suppose that this work of redemption, this work that has made the Republican Party and the people of our State free and independent, could have been accomplished without the aid of this reformative legislation that substituted the secret ballot at the polls for the caucus and convention that enabled political bosses and designing politicians to manipulate nominations and control elections as they pleased?

PROUD OF THE PEOPLE OF ARIZONA.

Mr. President, I am proud of the people of Arizona who have come here with this constitution, so framed as to protect them and their new State from fraud, corruption, and bribery in elections and in public office. I am glad they had the courage and the manhood to stand by their convictions and refuse to temporize and submit a constitution satisfactory to the interests and machine politicians in order to become a State. Arizona had better remain a Territory for all time than to stultify her citizenship and American manhood by surrendering her convictions and bowing down to the powers that be in the politics of the day. I hope, if the Federal authorities shall refuse them admission under such a constitution as this, they will stand on their manhood, as good and true American citizens, and stay outside until the politics of this country is purified, regenerated, and elevated so that their progressive and enlightened constitution will be their sure passport to statehood. They can afford to wait. The time will not be long. The issue presented here will be fought and won by the people very soon. The American people are alive to the situation. They see the evil that has dominated them and that threatens the very life of their country, and they know the remedy and have learned by the experience of a few of the more advanced States that they have the power to apply the remedy, and they will apply and enforce it.

THE RECALL.

But, Mr. President, the recall is singled out as the one indefensible provision in the proposed constitution and the right given to recall judicial officers is denounced as particularly obnoxious. I am in entire sympathy with the objection to the recall of judges. I objected to it in my own State in a letter written by me on the subject, in this language:

> I am glad you had the courage and good judgment to oppose the application of the recall to judges. The future of this country is greatly dependent upon a fearless and independent judiciary. Any conscientious man, who has served as judge, will tell you that he has been compelled by his oath and his sense of duty to render decisions that were unpopular with him, and if left free to exercise his own desires no such decisions would have been rendered. Indeed, the most difficult thing a judge has to do is to control his own feelings and decide cases according to law and not according to his own feelings of sympathy or the reverse.
>
> Such a judge will, of necessity, render decisions that are unpopular with the public as well as himself in the performance of his imperative duty. It will be just such unpopular decisions that will arouse public resentment and induce the recall of the judge who has the honesty and the courage to do his duty, often against his own feelings. The judge who will bow to his own feelings or to public clamor, often ill founded, will never be recalled, while the judge who does his duty will fall a victim to the public indignation based on wholly false ideas of the duty of a judge. We will still have judges that will do their duty fearlessly in spite of the big stick in the form of the recall. I hope we have courageous men enough in the legislature to resist the public clamor that is pressing for this legislation that will make the weak judge weaker and encourage the dishonest judge to decide cases in such way as to secure public favor instead of deciding the law without fear, favor, or affection. It will be a sorry day to this State when a law is passed that must, in the nature of things, degrade the judiciary and make it less honest, less fearless, less independent. No possible good can come of such legislation, while much harm may, and almost certainly will, result if any such law is enacted and attempted to be enforced.

I still maintain the views then expressed. But neither the governor of my State, whose absolute sincerity and honesty of conviction on the subject no one who knows him will question, nor the legislature, agreed with me. Much to my astonishment some of the judges of the State did not agree with me either, but seemed to want to have the legal right to be recalled. The

Legislature of California passed the resolution submitting a constitutional amendment providing for the recall of all officers, including judges, almost unanimously; the governor approved it, and the people of California will adopt it at the polls by an overwhelming majority, in my opinion. They believe in it whether I do or not, and they have a right to it if they want it and believe it to be right, however much some of us may regret it.

But, Mr. President, what has the question whether I or any other Senator does or does not believe in the recall of judges to do with the right of Arizona to be admitted as a State? The provision for the recall of judges and other officers is not in violation of the Constitution or any law of the United States. It is not in violation of any provision, requirement, or limitation of the enabling act. It is a question that affects Arizona alone and one that her people have a right to settle for themselves. I have no right to set up my judgment against theirs. It is not a matter that gives me any right to object to her admission as a State, and I shall not allow my own convictions as to the wisdom of such legislation to warp my judgment in so important a matter.

RECALL IN LOS ANGELES.

In my own city the recall of other officers has been in force for 10 years. I have seen the urgent necessity for it there and have seen it tested. In the beginning I was opposed to it. Experience has convinced me that it is one of the best agencies for the purification of politics and the elevation of the standard of official duty, obligation, and integrity that has yet been devised.

May I, Mr. President, give two instances in proof of what I say? A gentleman of good standing as a business man was elected mayor of the city. The city was largely Republican. He was a Democrat. He was elected by the political boss, the employee of the railroad company, at the last moment turning the machine Republican vote over to the Democratic candidate. Everybody who knew anything about politics in Los Angeles at that time—happily they have improved since—knew that this meant that the patronage of the office had been turned over to the political boss, and that the railroad company and its allies might plunder the city at their will. As a natural and inevitable consequence the city administration soon became so profligate and corrupt as to create a public scandal. The recall was invoked. The necessary petition was quickly obtained and an election called. But the mayor, who had so betrayed his trust, was not willing to submit his case to a vote of the people. He resigned the office and refused to be a candidate at the election, as he might have been under the charter. To make it still worse he confessed, in a public statement, that he took that course on the advice of the political boss who had elected him and ruined his good name. The other case was that of a member of the city council who corruptly voted to give the public printing to the newspaper making the highest instead of the lowest bid therefor. He clung to the office and was ousted from it by the vote of the people at the recall election. These are the only cases of the exercise of the power of recall in our city. They both were aggravated cases, and the right of recall was imperatively needed and righteously used.

The recall is not a matter of speculation or experiment with us. We have tried it and know its value and efficiency in dealing with corrupt public officials.

Mr. President, it should be admitted and carefully borne in mind that these are all extraordinary remedies, and should be resorted to only in extreme cases, and then with deliberation and caution. The one great danger to these great reform measures lies in the too frequent and unnecessary resort to their use. So far with us this has not been done, and I hope will not be in the future. Our people know their value, and nothing would induce them to surrender the right of their own free will.

There is one other phase of this question of the admission of Arizona that I wish to consider very briefly. It is maintained in some quarters that because the enabling act provides that Congress and the President may "approve" the proposed constitution, either would be justified in refusing to admit the Territory if there is any part of it that does not meet with their approval; for example, if the President shall not approve the recall of judges, it is claimed that he can not consistently approve the constitution or consent to the coming in of the Territory thereunder. In my judgment this is an unwarrantable construction to place upon the enabling act, and the refusal to approve the constitution on any such ground would be entirely unjust and illegal. The enabling act provides specifically what shall be done by the people of the Territory to entitle it to be admitted as a State. That statute is the full measure of its absolute right to admission. No official or representative of the National Government has any right to impose any other, further, or different condition or limitation of the right. It is too late now to impose new conditions. If the people of the Territory have complied with the terms upon which they were allowed to form a constitution, the Territory is entitled, as a matter of law and justice, to have the constitution approved, and no representative of the Government has any right to refuse to "approve" it. He has no right to impose any other test.

Now, Mr. President, may I in conclusion——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before the Senator from California concludes his remarks, will he permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was absent from the Chamber during a portion of the remarks which the Senator from California has made. Do I understand it to be the position of the Senator from California that the only duty which the President or Congress has to perform in this matter is to determine whether or not the constitution adopted by the people of Arizona provides for a government republican in form?

Mr. WORKS. And conforms to the enabling act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And conforms to the specific provisions of the enabling act?

Mr. WORKS. That is it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I recall the provisions of the enabling act, it authorizes the submission to the people of separate provisions—that is, any provision which the constitutional convention may desire to have submitted to the people separately from the main constitution may be so submitted. The language of the enabling act, in section 22, is:

SEC. 22. That when said constitution and such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted shall have been duly ratified by the people of Arizona, as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same shall be submitted to the President of the United States and to Congress for approval, together with the statement of the votes cast thereon—

And so on.

And if Congress and the President approve said constitution and the said separate provisions thereof, if any, or if the President approves the same—

And so on, then the State shall be admitted.

I ask the Senator from California whether that does not contemplate that Congress shall have an active duty to perform with reference to the separate provisions which are submitted?

Mr. WORKS. As I understand, the separate provisions are not a part of the constitution. They are in form of ordinances or an ordinance that accompanies the constitution. I may be wrong in that construction, but that is my understanding of it. It might be possible that Congress or the President might refuse to approve some of those separate propositions which are submitted by way of ordinance. But, as I understand, that is not a part of the constitution and would not prevent the coming in of the Territory in case it should be disapproved.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I perhaps did not read——

Mr. WORKS. I included the whole of that in my remarks, but it was not read, because I did not care to take up the time of the Senate and because I thought Senators were perfectly familiar with them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But the language is, if I may still further interrupt the Senator——

Mr. WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The language is:

And if Congress and the President approve said constitution and the said separate provisions thereof—

That is, if Congress and the President approve not only the constitution, but in addition to that approve the separate provisions thereof, then the proclamation shall issue and the State be admitted. But is not the converse of that true, that if Congress does not approve either the constitution or the separate provisions, then the proclamation shall not issue and the State shall not be admitted?

Mr. WORKS. Does the Senator from Utah take the position that if Congress or the President should disapprove one of the separate articles contained in the ordinance, it would defeat the whole constitution?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am asking the Senator from California. That seems to be the language.

Mr. WORKS. I am asking the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I say that seems to be the language.

Mr. WORKS. That is not the construction I place upon it, if you ask me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not definitely made up my own mind upon it. I am only calling the attention of the Senator from California to it. But the language seems to be susceptible of that construction.

Mr. WORKS. I am much obliged to the Senator from Utah for calling my attention to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I desire to ask the Senator from California whether he has considered the question of the power of Congress to admit the State of Arizona or any other State whether the enabling act has been complied with or not? It seems to me to be entirely competent for this Congress now to admit this State whether any provisions of the enabling act have been complied with or not. It is a violation of no provision of the Constitution and of no law of the United States. It is for Congress now to say whether or not this Territory is entitled to admission, and I am of opinion that Congress is not limited or restricted, so as to be unable to admit a State if it chooses to admit it now whether it has complied with the provisions of the enabling act or not.

Mr. WORKS. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that it is not necessary that any enabling act should be passed at all. I think Congress has the absolute power to admit the State without any such preliminary enactment of a statute, but in this case we are proceeding under the enabling act. Possibly the Congress might disregard that act at the present time, but I have taken it for granted that this matter would be presented upon the act that has already been passed by Congress. However, upon the question of law submitted by the Senator, I agree with him entirely.

WORD OF CAUTION AND WARNING.

And now, Mr. President, may I, in conclusion, indulge in a word of caution and warning? As I have said, I am a new Member here. I am sent by one of the great Western States that is growing rapidly in population and importance. I have communed with the people in every part of the State and know their sentiments on these important questions of political reform. The initiative, referendum, and recall are loudly and earnestly demanded by an overwhelming majority of our people of all political parties. I want to say to Senators on this side of the Chamber, representing the great Republican Party, that unless the party heeds this demand and responds to it by enacting and enforcing these reform measures, it will go down to defeat and final destruction and oblivion. I come from one of the great progressive cities in this great State of California. That city and the whole State had for years, until the last election, been in bondage, politically, to one powerful corporation and its corrupt political allies and bosses. It held not only our city but the whole State in its grip and dictated the policies of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, and controlled the election and appointment of officers—municipal, State, and Federal. At the last city election the good people of our city, both Republicans and Democrats, after enacting a nonpartisan election law, joined together and wrested the government of the city from corporate control and elected one of the best city governments of any city in the country. Our people were not content with this victory.

The State was yet to be redeemed from this same condition of bondage to the interests. Republicans who stood for independence and purity in politics formed an organization within the party, known as the Lincoln-Roosevelt Republican League. The league made its fight for the regeneration of the Republican Party and for the deliverance of the party and the State from corporate and boss rule. The movement was entirely successful. The league nominated its candidates at the primary election with few exceptions, and elected them at the final election by large majorities. The Republicans were not alone in this great work of redemption. They were aided by thousands of good, patriotic Democrats, who joined their forces because they believed in the principles of reform that the league stood for and were unable to bring them about in their own party that was not in power.

Mr. President, I had my share in this work of purifying the politics of my party, my city, and my State. But for the aid given this movement by me, however feeble my efforts may have been, as compared with other patriotic and devoted citizens, I would not be here to-day. I believe in these reforms. I know what they have done for my city and State. They may do the same for the whole Nation. If I did not, in my capacity as a United States Senator, defend them with all my mind and with all my heart and with all my strength, I should feel myself recreant to those great principles, to the people who sent me here, to the Republican Party, and to my country.

Mr. President, what I have said in the way of warning to this side of the Chamber may be said with equal force and pertinency to Senators on the other side. The Democratic Party needs to be redeemed as well as the Republican Party. If either of these great parties see the light, and in good faith takes up these reforms, it will sweep the country if the other party fails to respond to the popular demand. If neither of them shall conform to public sentiment on these great questions, both will be consumed by the fire of public condemnation and a new party will be built upon their ashes, a party that will represent the people and not the interests. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday.

The motion was agreed to.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 19) I submitted Monday last respecting the relations between the United States and Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution indicated by the Senator from Missouri, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. STONE on the 17th instant, as follows:

Whereas a condition of turbulence and disorder prevails throughout the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas as a result of such turbulence and disorder, it is reported that the lives of a large number of American citizens resident in Mexico are imperiled, and that their property is in danger of lawless appropriation by bands of irresponsible men; and

Whereas in conflicts between the military forces of the Mexican Government and revolutionists near the border line between the United States and Mexico several American citizens on the American side of the boundary line have been slain as the result of Mexicans firing across the line, and other American citizens while peaceably pursuing their avocations or while in their homes have been wounded; and

Whereas a great and important public work on the Colorado River in Lower California is being constructed by Americans, and for which work Congress has made a large appropriation, and which work is being constructed on the Mexican side by American engineers and contractors under an agreement made with the Mexican Government, is being obstructed and endangered by repeated interferences of lawless bands of Mexican revolutionists who have at different times appropriated property of the contractors engaged in the work and have so seriously delayed the work as to greatly endanger it by threatening the lives of workmen and thus disorganizing the working force; and

Whereas numerous leading newspapers in Europe, especially in London, report that certain European Governments, many of whose subjects and citizens reside in Mexico and have large property interests there, are contemplating some intervention by force in the affairs of the Mexican Republic, ostensibly for the protection of the lives and interests of their people; and

Whereas one European power has already landed on Mexican territory an armed force of marines from one of its warships under the pretense of preventing an attack upon a Mexican town by revolutionary forces; and

Whereas this unfortunate condition in the governmental and political affairs of Mexico appears to grow worse and more acute from day to day: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and hereby is, directed to make speedy inquiry into the facts recited in the preamble hereto and into such other facts as said committee may deem necessary to a complete explanation and exposition of the actual conditions prevailing in Mexico, and said committee is directed to make report of its findings, with such recommendations as the committee may deem advisable, respecting the duty of the United States in the premises, and which report may be made to the Senate in open or executive session, as the said committee may deem most expedient in the public interest.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it will require only a short time for me to say what I have in mind to say at this time, but because of the international importance of the subject in hand it behooves me, as it does all others, to speak with the utmost deliberation and caution. This is an hour when every responsible official of this Government should speak and act with deliberation, and not impulsively. The condition of public affairs prevalent in Mexico must, of necessity, be a source of profound regret to those connected with the Government of the United States, as well as to the people of this country as a whole. Mexico is our nearest neighbor on the south, being separated from us for a part of the way by a river and for a part of the way by what may be called an imaginary line, as it certainly is an imperceptible line. The Government of Mexico is republican in form, in large measure fashioned after the Government of the United States. The relations between the two countries, commercial and otherwise, are close. They are connected by international railways, which traverse the domain of each in continuous and unbroken lines. A large number of American citizens, estimated at more than 60,000, are residing in Mexico, scattered over and doing business in various States constituting the Mexican federation. These people, under our treaties with Mexico and the comity of nations, are lawfully there, and as long as they are peaceable and orderly are entitled to protection by the Mexican Government. Americans have enormous property interests in that Republic. It is said on apparently reliable authority that these property possessions aggregate approximately $1,000,000,000, and it is estimated that American holdings in Mexico are substantially

double those of all other foreign peoples combined. In these circumstances it is but natural that this Government and the American people should have a profound concern in whatever affects the happiness, prosperity, progress, and well-being of Mexico. It not only accords with our national sentiment, but also with our national interests, to maintain relations of amity and good will with the people of Mexico, and to contribute whatever we can to the development and welfare of that Republic. Our interest in this neighboring state, sentimental and material, is vastly greater, and, I believe, is founded on higher considerations than that of any nation over the seas. We do not want war in Mexico, but peace; we do not want disorder, but order. We want peace and order to prevail there because of our interest in the material growth and spread of the country; but above that also because of our deep anxiety to see all experiments in republican government on this hemisphere successful, and because we view with alarm all conditions, however arising, which seem to threaten the stability of such experiments and which tend to bring them into disrepute.

Mr. President, in what I have said I am confident I voice the feeling and judgment of the American Government and the American people. Nevertheless, we can not close our eyes to the unfortunate conditions now existing in Mexico; and, moreover, we not only can not close our eyes, but we can not remain passive and inactive and permit disorder to run riot to the peril of the lives, liberty, and property of American citizens lawfully resident in that Republic. There is unquestionably a solemn duty resting upon us in this regard which we can not ignore, however delicate it may be or however great the responsibility it may impose. But here I will take occasion to say that in the discharge of our duty and responsibility in this behalf we should move, and we will move, in our own time and according to our own way. We are both willing and able to fully perform the duty resting upon us, and in due time and on proper occasion we will perform it in all its bearings, both as it relates to Mexico and to other countries; but we will do it in our own way and will not be precipitately driven into any different course by any kind of outside pressure. I hear talk, mostly newspaper talk, that certain European powers are contemplating an interference in the affairs of Mexico. As to that, perhaps, at this time it is sufficient to say that in my opinion the American Government and people would view any effort, certainly any effort on an extensive scale in that direction, as an act of unfriendliness to the United States. The Government of the United States has not and will not shirk the full and proper performance of its duty, and whatever European powers might feel inclined to undertake in the direction indicated should only be undertaken in conjunction with and under the lead of the United States. Mexico is an American country with a republican form of government, and the world knows how sensitive the people of this country are on the subject of armed intervention by European or Asiatic powers in the affairs of American nations. In the main I concur in what the senior Senator from Maryland said in his interesting address before the Senate last week, in which he declared that the Monroe doctrine was not involved in the existing Mexican situation. But should European powers contend that if the United States insist upon carrying the Monroe doctrine to the point of regarding with pronounced disfavor any armed interference whatsoever in the affairs of American Governments, and especially of any armed occupation of the territory of any such Government, that we are thereby obligated to see to it that peace and order are maintained in the Central and South American Republics and in Mexico, we may still well answer that we must ourselves be the first judge as to when we should interfere and how we should proceed. We have not yet assumed the office of a policeman patrolling these American Republics, and even if other countries insist upon thrusting that station with its responsibilities upon us, we will at least object to those countries exercising a supervising jurisdiction over us and directing us when and how to proceed. Whenever grave questions arise, such as confront us now, I think that other foreign powers with whom we happily sustain relations of amity and friendship should recognize the fact that we understand and appreciate our duty, and that in the end we will so discharge it as to command universal approval. I indulge the belief that the reports of a contemplated interference by any European power in the affairs of Mexico are unfounded. The landing a few days ago of an armed force of marines from the British warship *Shearwater* at San Quentin, Mexico, is the only incident so far occurring that would give color of truth to these reports. The papers report that the landing of this force was for the purpose of preventing or resisting an attack by revolutionists on the town of San Quentin, and also that the battleship stopped at San Quentin for the purpose of taking aboard an English subject and two American citizens who desired to get away from the zone of danger. If this report be true, I have this to say about that incident: That the landing of that force was not necessary to enable the three men in question to board the vessel, and hence if the marines were landed merely to prevent a Mexican force attached to the revolutionary movement in Mexico taking possession of this Mexican town, the act was arbitrary, and being a hostile demonstration on Mexican territory was in effect an act of war if authorized or approved by the British Government. It was, perhaps, in itself an act of too little consequence to invite serious attention or to warrant particular criticism, nevertheless I express the opinion that it will be generally regarded with disapproval by the American people. Outside of this single incident I am in possession of no facts that would support the press reports of a purpose on the part of European powers to thrust themselves speedily into Mexican affairs. For the present I am disposed to regard these stories as fictitious and sensational. And here, Mr. President, I will digress long enough to confirm what the senior Senator from Illinois, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], a distinguished member of that committee, took occasion to say last week respecting widely circulated and oft-repeated stories connecting Japan with Mexico. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I was invited by the President, as were other members of that committee, and also members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to examine the diplomatic correspondence had between the State Department and American officials in Mexico, and between the State Department and the official authorities of Mexico, and all other papers and documents relating to the present disturbance in that country. I scrutinized these documents with the utmost care, and in addition to that I talked with the President at considerable length respecting the Mexican situation, and I wish to state in the most positive terms that there was not a word in this voluminous correspondence which indicated even remotely that Japan had aught to do with the troubles of Mexico, or that Japan was seeking any concession from or alliance with Mexico. Moreover, I violate no confidence in saying that the President assured me in the most positive terms that he had no information whatever connecting Japan with Mexican affairs, and that he regarded the newspaper stories to the contrary as the purest of fabrications. Mr. President, I have been greatly puzzled to know who it is or what interest it is that is so wantonly persistent in the dastardly and criminal enterprise of fomenting discord and hostility between the United States and Japan. I can not escape the belief that there is some powerful interest behind this activity, bent upon promoting ends most monstrous and criminal. This Government maintains a small army of detectives and inspectors of many kinds, and I venture to suggest that some of these high-salaried officials, many of whom have little to do, and much of that little mischievous, might be better employed than they now are if they should be detailed to discover and unmask this conspiracy against the peace of nations.

Mr. President, while I believe it to be true that these reports of a contemplated interference by European powers or by Japan are unfounded, that alone does not relieve us from, nor in any degree lessen, the obligations incident to our own duty and responsibility. I have said that widespread disorder prevails in Mexico. In the circumstances of the situation, as we see it and know it to be, what is the duty of the United States in the premises? This is a question we can not lightly put aside. We must answer it, and upon that answer we must act. What is the situation with which we are confronted? Let me summarize the facts, or the main facts, of the case. For a period covering the life of a generation Gen. Porfirio Diaz has occupied the Presidency of Mexico. For reasons that should be manifest, I think it best, in the circumstances of the hour, to withhold the expression of any opinion as to the wisdom of the same individual occupying and exercising the powers incident to the chief executive office of a great Republic for so long a period; but I can with propriety say that the progress of Mexico in all the arts of peace during the long incumbency of President Diaz has challenged universal admiration. But in spite of the fact that during the last three decades Mexico has in many important respects advanced with marvelous strides, it is not surprising that the long continuance in power of the same man, surrounded by his personal and political adherents, should result in such governmental conditions, and possibly such abuses, as would arouse intense opposition and excite resistance thereto even to the point of turbulence. However, it is not within the scope of my purpose to discuss the points of controversy between the opposing factions in Mexico, or to express an opinion upon the merits or demerits of their respective contentions. The issues between these factions do not enter into the questions I am

discussing. I think we can well afford to pass all that as being of less immediate concern to us. I am talking about American interests and the rights of American citizens, not about quarrels between warring factions in Mexico. It is sufficient at this time for us to deal with the situation which has grown up out of this controversy as it affects the people of this country. This controversy has resulted in a widespread insurrection or revolutionary uprising against the established Government of Mexico. This revolutionary movement is headed by Francisco Madero, jr., who is in general command of a large force, more or less organized and equipped, and operating in numerous Mexican States. There is no need to dwell upon this feature of the subject, as the entire reading public is well informed as to the extent, character, and progress of this insurrectionary assault upon the Diaz régime. The disorder incident to it is so great that in several States there is no responsible government in fact capable of maintaining the peace and protecting the lives and property of people who are taking no part in the sanguinary disturbances sweeping over the country. In some sections the conditions border upon absolute anarchy, and lives and property are at the mercy of roving bands of lawless men. In many of the cities and States of Mexico there is a strong anti-American feeling, and frequent expressions of grave apprehension on the part of Americans have come to our State Department that the Mexican Government would be unable to protect American citizens against hostile and vicious elements in case of an uprising against them. Demonstrations of hostility against Americans have been made on several occasions and at different points. These demonstrations have occurred at such large centers of population as Guadalajara, and even in the City of Mexico itself. A few weeks ago the governor of the State of Jalisco made a most inflammatory public speech at Guadalajara, accusing Americans of inciting and participating in the revolution, thus accentuating the strong anti-American feeling already existing there, and tending to foment riotous outbreaks. As a consequence, Americans in Guadalajara were in a state of fear amounting almost to panic, and naturally they sought the protection of their own Government. There are thousands of Americans scattered over the Mexican Republic, engaged in numerous employments and without means of self-defense. Numerous instances have been reported of the forcible confiscation and appropriation of the property of Americans by revolutionists or by bands of men supposed to be of the revolutionary party. In Lower California a state of practical anarchy exists now, and has existed for some time past. The great work being done for the reclamation and preservation of the Imperial Valley, for the construction of which Congress appropriated $1,000,000, has been greatly interfered with and endangered. That part of the work which is on the Mexican side of the boundary line is being done by American contractors, under the direction of American engineers, by virtue of an agreement with the Mexican Government. On several occasions bands of armed men have taken possession of construction camps and forcibly appropriated arms, commissaries, live stock, wagons, and so forth, belonging to the contractors, and have taken forcible possession of and used the cars and railroad tracks employed by contractors in the necessary prosecution of their work. They have threatened the lives of Americans and of Mexicans employed as workmen, and by these means have greatly disorganized the working force and seriously delayed the work of construction. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have already been expended upon this work, and by reason of these interferences and consequent delays the entire work already done is greatly endangered by the floods that always sweep down the Colorado River during the spring months. The work is at a critical point in its progress, and the contractors and engineers complain that these repeated interferences make it almost impossible for them to prosecute it with that diligence necessary to avoid probable disaster. Contractors have telegraphed that if not protected it would be next to impossible to go on with the work, and that in all probability these enforced delays would result in enormous losses, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. In addition to all these complaints from American sources, the Mexican Government has preferred complaints on its own account. That Government has repeatedly protested that the Government of the United States was not sufficiently active in enforcing its neutrality laws, or sufficiently observant of its obligations as a neutral power under international law. Among other things it has been charged by the Mexican Government that revolutionary forces were organized on American territory and were permitted to cross the line to wage war against the Mexican Government.

This summary, Mr. President, is sufficient to afford a reasonably clear insight into conditions in Mexico, and discloses the situation which confronted the President during the month of March. Such facts as I have detailed, and others of like import, were brought home daily to the attention of the President and his advisers. In view of this situation the President ordered a section of the Army, comprising about 20,000 men, to the Mexican border. These troops are distributed along the border in Texas, Arizona, and California, engaged chiefly on patrol duty. It was given out at the time by the President that these troops were sent down upon the border for the purpose chiefly of military training and maneuvering. I accept the President's statement that this was one of the objects he had in view in directing this Army movement; but, speaking for myself, I declare that in my opinion the President would have been fully justified in ordering these troops into positions near the boundary line for the purpose of better enforcing our neutrality obligations and to be in readiness for the better protection of American interests—by which I mean the protection of American citizens against assault and the protection of American property against wanton and lawless destruction—in case the emergency for quick and aggressive action should arise. I believe the country would, as it should, have supported the President if he had stated without qualification that that was the prime object he had in view. He is not only the Commander in Chief of the Army, but he is also the President of the United States. In view of the turbulent conditions prevalent in Mexico, and the ever-increasing menace to American lives and property, I believe the President would have been derelict and fallen short of his duty if he had not put the forces at his command in position and readiness for quick and effective action if unhappily the necessity for using force should arise. In emergencies of this kind, involving grave international complications, partisanship has no business in our counsels. There are times, and this is one of them, when we must rise above the plane of partisanship and view the questions before us solely from the standpoint of Americans. As a Democrat, esteemed by some friends on both sides of this Chamber as being sometimes somewhat too partisan, I wish unqualifiedly to indorse this action of President Taft in ordering troops to the Mexican border. In this connection, however, I must not neglect to say in ordering troops to rendezvous on our southern border it was not the intention of the President to initiate any offensive demonstration against either the federal or revolutionary forces in Mexico. The President, of course, is not clothed with power to declare war—that power being vested by the Constitution in Congress—and I will venture to say that the President questions, if he does not disclaim, his constitutional right to take any step which in itself would amount to an act of war without the express authority of Congress. I do not think I will violate any confidence if I say that when the President ordered these troops to the Mexican boundary he had no intention of intervening in Mexican affairs, or of using the troops to invade Mexican territory, except possibly in the event of the Diaz government falling during the recess of Congress without being succeeded by any responsible government able to maintain order, and then only to an extent absolutely necessary for the protection of American citizens. The President has in nowise authorized me to make this statement, but I assume the responsibility of making it on my own account as expressing my understanding of the President's attitude. As I understand his attitude, he does not believe that he is authorized under the Constitution to employ force against a foreign state unless authorized thereto by Congress, except to resist attack or to meet a situation the exigencies of which will not admit of delay. Believing this to be the attitude of the President, I give to it my hearty approval. I feel that the President has acted with wise discretion and has exercised a degree of good judgment that should command universal commendation.

Mr. President, since these troops were massed in Texas and along the border, and within the last few days, circumstances of a very serious nature, to which I have not yet adverted, have arisen. Both the Mexican Federal forces and revolutionists have been and are being concentrated in large numbers close upon the boundary line between that country and this. Some two weeks ago, in skirmishes along the Rio Grande below El Paso, Tex., bullets fired by one side or the other fell among American troops standing guard on the American side of the river, but fortunately without casualty. At Juarez, across the river opposite the city of El Paso, a Mexican Federal force in large numbers is encamped. A revolutionary force, reported to be numerically greater than the force in Juarez, is advancing upon that city, and a battle upon the outskirts of that city is daily threatened. A conflict at that point, of the magnitude this one would probably assume, would imperil the lives of thousands of Americans in the beautiful city of El Paso. Douglas, Ariz., and Agua Prieta are opposite to

each other and practically adjacent on the very edge of the boundary line. The revolutionists, a thousand strong or more, were in possession of Agua Prieta and fortified the town. Last week a Federal force of equal or greater strength attacked the revolutionists at Agua Prieta, and in the battle bullets fired by the contending forces were showered upon the American side, resulting in the death of several American citizens and the more or less serious wounding of others. The President, through the State Department, notified the Mexican Government at the City of Mexico of this tragedy, and the revolutionists were also notified, and both were warned against any repetition of the outrage which caused it; but in spite of this warning, and seemingly oblivious or indifferent to the peril to which they subjected our people on their own soil and in their own homes and places of business, these contending forces renewed the battle only a few days ago and during the present week, again resulting in the serious injury of several American citizens, and from the same cause. Mr. President, I presume these Mexican people have an inherent right to fight if they want to fight, and, generally speaking, to fight wherever they please on Mexican soil, but I deny that they have any shadow of right to deliberately enter into a furious conflict on the border line and within easy gunshot of populous American towns and cities, thus unavoidably and imminently endangering the lives and property of American citizens. I believe that an act of that kind is in effect an attack on Americans, and that it presents a case where the President would be justified in ordering our troops to take such action as might be necessary to put a stop to the fighting, even though it might lead to a struggle between the United States and Mexican forces. Mr. President, in situations like this, where two countries are separated as these two are separated, it should be a rule incorporated in the law of nations, if it is not by fair interpretation already so—a rule founded on high and just considerations of humanity and on the respect always due a neutral sovereign—that a zone of safety should be established and observed, within which the belligerents should not engage in battle. A violation of this rule should of itself be regarded as an act of such offensive and hostile indifference to the rights of the neutral nation as would justify it in taking instant and effective steps for its own protection.

The duties resting upon a neutral and a belligerent are reciprocal, and the duty of the one is as imperative as the duty of the other. William Edward Hall, in his work on international law, in speaking of the mutual obligations resting upon two sovereign States, one of which is engaged in war and the other of which is neutral, lays down this rule:

> Both are affected by the same duties as in peace time. The belligerent therefore remains under obligation to respect the sovereignty of the neutral. The neutral is under an equal obligation not to aid directly or indirectly, and within certain limits to prevent a State or private person from aiding in places under his control the enemy of the belligerent in matters immediately bearing on the war. If a wrong is done, the remedy is, of course, international.

Applying this sound and reasonable doctrine to the case immediately in hand, various, and sometimes intricate obligations, more or less particular in their nature and character, are imposed upon the United States to fairly and honestly maintain its attitude of neutrality; for example, it is the duty of the United States to use every reasonable precaution to prevent the organization of a hostile force on American territory for the purpose of invading Mexico to wage war in that country. On the other hand, it is equally the duty of Mexico to respect the sovereignty of the United States; for example, Mexico can not deploy its troops on American territory or use American territory in any way for the prosecution of the war upon which it is engaged, and the same rule is equally applicable to the Mexican revolutionists. The United States would have an undoubted right to regard such an invasion of their territory as an offensive and hostile act, and this Government would have an undoubted right to use whatever force might be necessary to resist such an intrusion. Reasoning from analogy, can it be contended that the opposing forces in Mexico can engage in battle on the very line separating the two countries, and employ their armaments—rifles, machine guns, and heavy artillery—in such a reckless manner as to result in the murder and dangerous wounding of American citizens and the destruction of American property on the American side of the dividing line? Can it be said that to cross the line on to American territory, not to attack Americans, but to obtain some advantage over the domestic enemy, would be an offense against the sovereignty of this country of so grave a character as would justify and even make it the duty of our Government on its own account and for the defense of its own integrity to use force in resisting and expelling the invaders, and yet have it said that to inflict such grievous injuries upon American citizens as I have indicated, and in the way indicated, does not afford a sufficient provocation or justification for offensive action on the part of our Government for the protection of its people? If that be true, then the territory of the United States is of higher concern and more sacred than the lives of our people.

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator, I should like to ask him a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. BACON. I do not wish the Senator to understand me as controverting his proposition. It is a very delicate question he is discussing, but while he has been presenting the picture from one side, the other side has occurred to me, and I would ask the Senator what would be the view he would take if conditions were reversed? Suppose that in the city of El Paso there was a rebellion against the authority of the United States and the rebels had taken possession of El Paso, including the Government buildings, the customhouse, courthouse, and so forth, and defied the authority of the United States. It is perfectly manifest that that authority could only be reinstated and made good by the United States through armed force driving those rebels out of El Paso, and it could not possibly undertake to do so without in some way in the conflict endangering Mexican citizens on the other side of the border. I should like to inquire of the learned Senator—I repeat, not for the purpose of controversy, but for the purpose of getting his view on the subject—what would he think would be the duty of the United States under such circumstances—to desist from the effort to recover its authority in El Paso on the ground that American troops might possibly injure some Mexican citizens on the other side of the border? Would it be justified in saying that for all time—because what is true of a day would be true of a year or of ten years, or of a hundred years—these rebels shall be permitted to set up an independent government in El Paso, to defy the authority of the United States Government, to resist its authority, and to maintain themselves in that condition of defiance and rebellion, because in the effort to reestablish its authority the United States must necessarily in such conflict endanger some persons on the opposite side of the Mexican border? I should like to know what the Senator would think would be the duty of the American Government under such circumstances?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think the actual cases stated by me and the supposititious one stated by the Senator from Georgia are parallel. I premise what I have to say by way of answer with this observation: That I would be most grievously surprised and disappointed if the United States, whatever else they might do, should, in the case supposed, so use their forces as to endanger the lives of the people of Mexico across the border or to destroy their property. I would consider the obligation upon the part of the United States to respect the sovereignty of Mexico in every respect as great as I hold it to be the duty of Mexico to respect the sovereignty of the United States. We would have no better right to endanger the lives of Mexican citizens than they have to endanger the lives of our citizens. As to what we could do in the case supposed, I will say, to begin with, that the United States would be abundantly able in their own way to take possession of El Paso without inflicting such an injury as I have described upon the neighboring and neutral sovereign. We could resort to some means of isolating the town of El Paso and so controlling its approaches that its early fall would be inevitable. Moreover——

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, the only way by which you could isolate the town so as not to endanger the Mexican people would be to move it away from the Mexican border, which I do not suppose would be practicable.

Mr. STONE. I do not see why it would be necessary to move it away to isolate it. We could——

Mr. BACON. To isolate it so that a fight going on between contending parties would not endanger the adjacent territory, you would have to move it away from the adjacent territory.

Mr. STONE. I think not; but in any event I hold that unless in the case stated the United States could advance and attack from one side or the other, or from two sides, instead of in the front, and so as not to endanger the lives of the people in Mexico, then the United States would do better not to move at all. If our forces should make an attack like that made by Mexicans near Douglas, and with like effect, I hold that the Government of Mexico would have not only a right to protest, but, if the protest proved unavailing, to take such steps as that Government might deem necessary for the pro-

tection of its own people and its own sovereignty, and in so doing would be justified by the considerate judgment of mankind. The United States could not, in order to maintain its own peace and sovereignty, invade the territory of a neighboring neutral State, or do any act that would amount to a hostile and offensive intrusion upon its rights or the rights and safety of its people. In a possible case like that it has been supposed might exist at El Paso, the forces of this Government could surround the city, provided it could not be attacked without danger to the peaceable residents of Jaurez and thus cut it off from all communication with or aid from the outside in the American interior. As to the opposite side of the line we would have a right, in the circumstances of the case, to ask and to expect Mexico, as a friendly neutral power, not to give aid to our enemy, directly or indirectly, by permitting the rebellious forces resisting our authority to use its borderland and resources so as to thwart our efforts to suppress the revolt. It would be the duty of Mexico to aid us in that behalf to the fullest extent. The obligations of two friendly sovereignties are always mutual.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will permit me, I would say that my view would be this: Every government has the right to protect itself against insurrection, and it has the right to go to any extent and resort to every means that shall be necessary to accomplish that result. If, in the accomplishment of that result, it injures its neighboring sovereignty, it is, of course, liable for the damages; but to say that if there is——

Mr. STONE. The Senator will permit me to say that he is undoubtedly right that in such a case the Government would be liable in damages, but that would afford poor comfort to the citizen who had been slain or to his dependent family.

Mr. BACON. That is all true, Mr. President. Every country has a right to go to war with any other country whenever, in its judgment, circumstances warrant; and if in the effort to reestablish the authority of the United States Government in the city of El Paso the United States in attacking the rebels in El Paso should inflict such injury upon the people of Mexico as to make the Government of Mexico think that it was a casus belli, that would be, of course, a circumstance under which they would be acting on their own responsibility, and the same is true with the conditions reversed. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. STONE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. If this is a sufficient casus belli, we have a right to go to war upon it; but the point about which I differ from the Senator is his suggestion, if I understand him correctly, that under such circumstances the President would have the right, upon his own motion, without a declaration of war by Congress, to invade the territory of Mexico with the Army. To that I do not agree, and I have no idea that the President would do so.

Mr. STONE. I have already stated what I understand the President's view to be upon that subject, and have also stated my own impressions as to his limitations, and this it is unnecessary to repeat.

The President's restraint in the face of the exasperating circumstances I have recounted illustrates his judicial temperament, and perhaps shows that he acted more wisely than my suggestion would imply he might properly and constitutionally have acted. But, without stopping to quibble about that or about any other minor consideration, we face the fact that Congress is now in session. Because the Congress is in session, no doubt the President thinks he has already gone as far as he should go without congressional sanction and authority, and in that he may be fundamentally right. The question, Mr. President, is now up to Congress. What are we going to do about it? I have presented the pending resolution directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to make speedy inquiry into and report upon the facts connected with this grave and momentous international situation. When considerations so serious as those we are now considering are involved, it becomes us to move with caution and deliberation; but the exigencies of the situation likewise demand that we should act with reasonable dispatch. I framed the resolution as it is, rather than to put it in a more drastic form, so that the subject might be remitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, among the membership of which committee are many of the most erudite and distinguished Members of this body, and so that the Senate might have the benefit of their united wisdom in outlining the policy our Government should adopt in this emergency. Perhaps I should refrain from going further at this time in expressing an opinion as to what the Congress ought to do. Nevertheless, I am going to say, whether I do right or wrong in saying it, that the Congress should at once and without delay authorize the President to employ whatever force may be necessary to prevent a repetition of the bloody outrage committed at Douglas, Ariz., and a repetition of which is threatened at El Paso, Tex. The President should be authorized by formal action, and the Congress should express its opinion in positive terms that it is his duty to use whatever force the circumstances may require to protect our people on their own territory and in their own homes from danger. His authority in this behalf should be extended far enough and have sufficient latitude to fully warrant him in using our military forces in whatever way he may deem expedient and necessary to accomplish the desired end, even though it should lead to an intrusion upon Mexican territory. Moreover, if any act done under this authority by the President for the proper protection of our own people on our own soil should lead to hostile demonstrations against American citizens resident in the interior of Mexico, the President should be authorized, not now perhaps, but later on, to use the military forces of the United States, if that is found to be necessary, to protect the lives and liberty of peaceable American citizens, wherever domiciled in any quarter of Mexico. Perhaps, as I have said, I might better have deferred this expression of opinion until a later date; but, after all, it seems to me that the time is here when no harm can come, but possibly good may come, in speaking out without too much reserve. I appreciate the importance of not offending the pride and sensibilities of others, but, above that, I am still more concerned about the protection of American men, women, and children from dangers that can well be characterized as the outgrowth of recklessness and brutality.

Mr. President, I greatly hope that the occurrence at Agua Prieta will not have its counterpart at any other point on the border line. I greatly hope that if the authority I have indicated should be given to the President by act of Congress no occasion will arise for asserting it. As a neighbor and friend of the Mexican people I view with genuine sympathy and sorrow the spectacle of their country being torn by warring factions, its great industries prostrated, and all of its wonderful possibilities of progress indefinitely arrested. The injury being done to the good name and material welfare of Mexico can not be overestimated. I would be rejoiced to see the storm beating on this Republic pass away, and to see the sun of peace and prosperity shine upon that unhappy land again. No man more than I could more deeply regret any breach of the peace between the United States and Mexico, or more regret any interruption of the amicable relations so long existing between the two countries; but intelligent Mexicans must recognize the gravity of the situation and realize that no Government can owe a higher or more imperative duty than that of protecting its own people against wrongs from any source or however committed. If without fault of ours the Mexican people themselves create a condition that makes it necessary for this Government to assume an offensive attitude, they can not complain. If we are compelled against our own desire and even against our own interests to assume an attitude of hostility, then the just judgment of mankind will approve what we do. Whatever we do must be right, and being right we can safely proceed without fear.

Mr. President, it was my intention, at the conclusion of the remarks I gave notice I would make, to move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BACON. Before the motion is put, I desire to say a word.

Mr. STONE. Just let me say what I have in mind.

On reflection I recall that the Committee on Foreign Relations has not been organized for service at this session of Congress. There are several vacancies on the committee yet to be filled. When that will be done is somewhat problematical. I have no particular objection to having the resolution go now to the committee, if that course is desired.

Mr. CULLOM. There will probably not be a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations until the committee membership is filled, unless an emergency requires it.

Mr. STONE. I was going to suggest that possibly it might be as well to let the resolution lie on the table until the committee is organized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. BACON. I desire, before the matter passes from the consideration of the Senate, to be heard for a moment.

Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss this question at the present time, and would prefer, really, not to say anything about it until after it has had the consideration of the Committee on Foreign Relations, by which committee I know it will receive the most careful and conservative consideration; and I only trespass for a moment upon the time of the Senate in or-

der that a position taken by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] may not go out to the country, by reason of any failure of expression to the contrary, as one shared unanimously, at least, I will say, by the Senate.

I do not yield to the Senator from Missouri in my recognition of the duty of the United States Government to protect its citizens both within our territory and, so far as may be proper, when they are within other jurisdictions; but I am not prepared to go to the extent of the Senator in the statement which he has made as to what he would conceive to be the authority which we should vest in the President at this time. So far as concerns the authority to protect citizens within our own borders, the President now has all the authority which Congress could confer upon him, so far as those acts are limited to actions within our own territory.

I do not desire to discuss it, for reasons which are manifest, and I make this statement now only for the reason I have already suggested, to prevent misconstruction as to the views which some of us may have upon this subject. I do not think the time has come, or that any events which are reasonably to be anticipated will bring that time, when Congress should vest in the President of the United States, in his discretion, the power to use the Army in Mexico for any of the purposes which have been indicated by the Senator from Missouri. That is a declaration of war. Whenever Congress authorizes the President of the United States to use the Army and Navy of the country in a foreign country, it is a declaration of war, and that is the most solemn and serious act which Congress can at any time take.

There are other methods of redress for wrongs which have been committed, and there are other methods of protection than the one suggested by the Senator from Missouri. I do not intend, as I repeat, to elaborate this or discuss it. I wish simply to express my dissent to that suggestion on the part of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. ROOT obtained the floor.

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator from New York permit me for just a minute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. I desire to say that the resolution by its very terms provides that the Committee on Foreign Relations in considering it should report such recommendations as the committee deems advisable. My suggestions were merely an expression of my own views. But I have already said that I not only preferred but would insist upon taking the united judgment of this committee.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, before the subject is passed over and the resolution laid upon the table, I wish to express my entire dissent from the assumption which seemed to me to be carried by the expression of opinion on the part of the Senator from Missouri. Granting that injuries have been done to American citizens which ought to be redressed, that wounds have been inflicted, that lives have been taken, that property has been destroyed, it does not follow, sir, that we should begin the process of securing redress for those injuries by a threat of force on the part of a great and powerful nation against a smaller and weaker nation. That, sir, is to reverse the policy of the United States and to take a step backward in the pathway of civilization.

There is no reason whatever, sir, to assume, if injuries have been done of the kind described, that the Government of Mexico is unwilling to make due redress upon having those injuries and claims for redress presented to her in the ordinary course of peaceful negotiation; and the passage of such a resolution as has been described, equivalent to a declaration of war, would be to preface the ordinary demand—the demand which it is the duty of every civilized power to make upon a friendly nation—with a threat that if the demand is not complied with force will be used.

Sympathy with the people of Mexico in their distress, a just sense of the duties that we owe to that friendly people, and the duties that we owe to the peace of the world must forbid our assenting to or yielding to any such course.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not rise with any purpose of discussing the question which has been before the Senate, for I deprecate all such discussion, and I regret that there should have been any discussion about it. I think it most desirable that the condition of affairs in Mexico and our relations with those affairs should not be discussed in Congress at present. It seems to me to be in the interest of peace and of harmonizing the difficulties that now exist in Mexico that there should not be discussion in either branch of Congress about it.

I desire to call attention to one important point that has been somewhat overlooked. When the President remits to Congress a question of difference with another country, the last step but one has been taken before a declaration of war. The Congress can carry on no negotiations; it can do nothing of a diplomatic character. Congress has but one power in dealing with another nation, and that is the war power. And when a President remits to Congress a question of that character and Congress gives him the power to intervene, it is a practical assertion of the war power.

That is the exact course which was pursued in relation to Cuba when the war with Spain began. President McKinley remitted the question to Congress, saying substantially that diplomatic methods had failed, and we conferred upon him the right to intervene, and that amounted to war.

Mr. President, we have nothing but the kindest of feelings toward the Republic of Mexico. We all, I think, universally regret the disturbances that now exist there. We have no outstanding grievances against Mexico. We have no questions between the two countries. The unfortunate incidents at Douglass and on the border are the results of the disturbed conditions in our neighbor to the South, and it seems to me that in every possible way we should use our best efforts to help Mexico to settle those differences; that we should show the greatest consideration, and that we should avoid in every possible way anything that looks like a threat or a resort to force.

I sincerely hope that the question will not be discussed in Congress, because when the time comes that it must be discussed in Congress we shall have reached a very serious point, indeed, and therefore I trust that the matter may end here, for the present, at least.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will lie on the table.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the resolution at this time, but merely to a question of practice, nor have I any objection to the resolution lying on the table if the Senator from Missouri desires to have it lie there.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was the request of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CULBERSON. My understanding, however, is that at the last session a resolution was adopted in effect continuing the committees of the Senate as organized in the Sixty-first Congress, and that it is proper to refer all these resolutions to committees now. That is the course I suggested this morning in introducing a resolution on this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. During the absence of the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Missouri requested that the resolution lie on the table.

Mr. CULBERSON. I say I have no objection to that.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator from Missouri will move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. STONE. I have no objection to its being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM. That is right.

Mr. STONE. It is immaterial to me whether the one course or the other is taken, and if it is satisfactory to the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator will now move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator from Illinois, as the head of the Committee on Foreign Relations, so desires, I ask that the resolution be referred to that committee.

Mr. CULLOM. I simply desire to say that in my judgment all matters of that sort, if discussed by the Senate, ought to be taken up in executive session. I did not think of making the necessary motion at the time, and I have no reason to feel now that we ought to have had the discussion in executive session, but in my judgment that ought to be the rule always.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 24, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 20, 1911.

ADVANCEMENT IN THE ARMY.

Each of the officers herein named for advancement in grade in accordance with the rank he would have been entitled to hold had promotion been lineal throughout his arm since the date of his entry into the arm to which he permanently belongs:

CAVALRY ARM.

Maj. William C. Brown, Third Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911.

INFANTRY ARM.

Maj. Harris L. Roberts, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Maj. Walter K. Wright, Eighth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 10, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Robert F. Ames, Twelfth Infantry, retired from active service March 9, 1911.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

Charles Lee Beeching, of Washington, D. C., to be first lieutenant from April 19, 1911.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander John H. Dayton to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as carpenters:

Thomas O. Covell, and
Caleb Whitford.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

Eugene C. Haynes to be postmaster at Centerville, Iowa, in place of Eugene C. Haynes. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1910.

MAINE.

Abial H. Jones to be postmaster at Wilton, Me., in place of Abial H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1910.

MINNESOTA.

Nicholas J. Kohn to be postmaster at Fort Snelling, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

OHIO.

Abraham L. Miller to be postmaster at Liberty Center, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

OREGON.

Lawrence M. Scholl to be postmaster at Hubbard, Oreg. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

PENNSYLVANIA.

W. Z. Clay to be postmaster at Emlenton, Pa., in place of William D. McGinnis. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1911.

RHODE ISLAND.

Frederick Webley to be postmaster at Greystone, R. I. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Carrie M. Hackett to be postmaster at Parker, S. Dak., in place of John D. Cotton. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1906.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20, 1911.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John J. Deane to be receiver of public moneys at San Francisco, Cal.

Ira L. Bare to be receiver of public moneys at North Platte, Nebr.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Truman G. Daniells to be register of the land office at San Francisco, Cal.

John E. Evans to be register of the land office at North Platte, Nebr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Charles E. Courtney to be a lieutenant commander.
Lieut. Edward C. Kalbfus to be a lieutenant commander.
Capt. Randolph C. Berkeley to be a major in the Marine Corps.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Lizzie McGann, Richmond.
Winifred C. Sheldon, Fairfield.
W. E. Walker, Biggs.

COLORADO.

Carrie James, Loveland.
F. M. Smith, Holyoke.
William M. Thorne, Lyons.

FLORIDA.

Susie M. Bryan, Fort Lauderdale.

IDAHO.

William S. Brainard, Wardner.

ILLINOIS.

William Knigge, Rockefeller.

INDIANA.

Seward S. Watson, Winchester.

IOWA.

James D. Hicklin, Wapello.
L. H. Hinkley, Sigourney.
Erastus T. Roland, Eldon.
C. E. Wallace, New Sharon.

KANSAS.

James A. Schilling, Sylvan Grove.

KENTUCKY.

W. Sherman Ball, Hardinsburg.
Rebecca Green, Barbourville.
Jesse C. Speight, Mayfield.
Thomas Sympson, Franklin.

MAINE.

Whitfield B. Hallett, Ashland.

MICHIGAN.

Benjamin F. Oakes, East Tawas.

MINNESOTA.

J. D. Haradon, Park Rapids.

NEBRASKA.

Timothy C. Cronin, Spalding.
E. S. Davis, North Platte.
Charles S. Hughes, Pender.
James H. Logan, Ponca.
Aaron W. Loucks, Falls City.
William W. McGaw, Wilsonville.
John H. McGuire, Benson.
Lewis H. McLaughlin, Emerson.
William B. Swindell, Minatare.
Otto Zuelow, Schuyler.

NEW MEXICO.

William H. Parker, Fort Sumner.

OKLAHOMA.

Bert B. McCall, Walter.

OREGON.

E. R. Ware, Echo.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

M. J. Spears, Lamar.

VIRGINIA.

Waverly S. Barrett, Dendron.
Annie E. Martin, Waverly.
James T. Waddill, Victoria.

WASHINGTON.

James Cadzow, Malden.
Walter W. Cloud, Conconully.
Elliott S. Moore, Ione.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn April 20, 1911.

Charles Brown to be postmaster at Montello, in the State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 20, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth, who hast set Thy glory above the heavens. Open Thou our spiritual eyes, that we may behold the light of Thy countenance. Unstop our spiritual ears, that we may hear the music of Thy voice. Make more sensitive our hearts, that we may feel the fructifying influences of Thy love; that as we pass on we may strew our paths with the flowers of golden deeds, and at the end hear the words, which will be sweeter than all music, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of Thy Lord." For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INVESTIGATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rules, submits a privileged report (H. Rept. 9), which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 103.

Resolved, That the Committees on Expenditures in the State Department, in the Treasury Department, in the War Department, in the Navy Department, in the Post Office Department, in the Interior Department, in the Department of Justice, in the Department of Agriculture, in the Department of Commerce and Labor, and on Public Buildings be, and they are hereby, instructed to proceed to examine into all the affairs of said departments as fully as is permitted to them and made their duty to do by the Rules of the House relating to said committees, respectively. And the investigations of said committees may cover such period in the past as each of said committees may deem necessary. And said committees, or any subcommittees thereof, shall have power to subpœna and compel the attendance of witnesses and to examine them under oath, and send for records, books, and papers and all other evidence that may be necessary to make the investigation full and complete, and that the Speaker shall have authority to sign and the Clerk to attest subpœnas during the recess of Congress. Said committees or any subcommittees thereof shall have authority to sit during any recess of this Congress.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Texas if this resolution is in the form in which it was submitted to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and in reply to his question I will say that it is in the exact form which we agreed upon. The gentleman understands why I submit it at this time, and I ask for the adoption of it.

Mr. MADDEN. As the Clerk seems to have had some difficulty in reading the resolution, I ask unanimous consent to authorize the Committee on Rules to employ a stenographer, so that resolutions may be presented in such form that the Clerk may be able to read them readily.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's request is out of order. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. Those in favor of it——

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. AUSTIN. I rise for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of this resolution a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the resolution provide for the necessary expenses of this investigation?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It does not include that, because that is left to the Committee on Accounts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MANN. I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has the floor.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The Speaker started to put the question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas must either fish or cut bait. He can move the previous question or yield the floor.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I did not understand that the gentleman desired any time. If he wants it, I will be glad to yield him some. There is no controversy, as I understand, about it.

Mr. MANN. All I wish to do is to ask a question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MANN. But when the Speaker starts to put the question, and the previous question has not been ordered, of course any gentleman is entitled to recognition. Does this resolution do anything that is not now authorized by the rules, except the matter of subpœnaing witnesses?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And authorizing the committees to sit during the recess of Congress and to go as far back in time as they may deem proper. I suppose they have that authority now.

Mr. MANN. I think they have that authority under the rules.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I think so; but we thought there might be some question about it and we put it in the resolution. It is a unanimous report of the Committee on Rules, and we think we have got about all the matters in that should be included.

Mr. MANN. Is one of the purposes of the resolution to lay a preamble for the bringing in of further resolutions for the appointment of clerks for these committees and to give them the power to print at the Government expense?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. There is no purpose in view except what is expressed in the resolution; that is all that is intended by it. The committees have certain power to print now.

Mr. MANN. I apprehend that it will be followed shortly by a resolution to provide clerks for these committees.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I am not advised as to that.

Mr. MANN. I suppose that is a part of the economy program.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman from Illinois imagine that these committees will be able to do any great amount of labor in investigating these departments for the last 15 years without several clerks to do the work? In the last Congress, although these committees did no work at all, they all had session clerks.

Mr. MANN. I notice that the gentleman from New York reported a resolution yesterday authorizing the appointment of seven or nine session clerks, some of which were employed heretofore by committees that are now abolished. I suppose that is a part of the economy program.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Texas will yield we will discuss that question when it is reached.

Mr. MANN. If we get a chance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And we will be able to satisfy the country, if not the gentleman from Illinois, of the propriety of these clerks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. You probably will be able to satisfy that side of the House that a little more patronage is to be distributed, but not the country that it is economy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to ask any further question? If not, Mr. Speaker, I will ask a vote on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HENRY of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL ARTS AND EXPOSITIONS.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 112.

Resolved, That the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just reported. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, my recollection is that this committee has enjoyed this privilege heretofore.

Mr. HEFLIN. It has.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.
The resolution was considered and agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GRAY, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence on account of sickness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WICKLIFFE, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Robert L. Pruyn, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with Canada.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, this measure should be adopted for two general and fundamental reasons. First, because it is in line with evolution, with the laws of progress, and the spirit of the times. Secondly, because it is a step in the reform of our fiscal and economic policies.

Our generation has witnessed unprecedented progress in mechanical science and in the mechanic arts, and the greatest progress of all has been in the domain of transportation. This progress has largely removed the physical barriers which separate the peoples of the earth. In every case the bringing of peoples closer together, whether within the same nation or of different nations, has proved beneficial to all concerned, verifying the lesson of all history that anything that promotes the friendly intercourse of peoples has been of general benefit. The full control of nature's forces through science can only come from the full cooperation of man. The widening realization of this great fact is speedily undermining the destroying spirit between men and nations and is bringing forth a new era for the whole world. In this era it will be realized by all that it is not necessary to harm others in order to help oneself; not necessary to kill others in order to live. The bird of prey is fast disappearing; the beast of prey has seen his day; the man of prey is fast being crushed; the business of prey is being uprooted; nations of prey are losing their commerce and their colonies. The real test for fitness to survive is no longer the might and brute force to destroy, but the capacity and willingness to cooperate and to serve. The greatest among men is to be no longer the conqueror, but the servant of all.

This great principle of cooperation and service should more and more dictate the policies of nations in their relations with each other. A nation should desire the prosperity and seek to promote the happiness of its neighbors, and the service rendered in such a spirit is sure to come back manyfold like bread cast upon the waters. It sounded like a chapter from medievalism when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] read from the speech of the Canadian premier of the advantages that would accrue to Canada from reciprocity, and urged the advantages to Canada as a reason why this bill should not be adopted by America. It indicated the baleful effect of our high-tariff wall policy upon the political education of our people, that this semi-savage argument should have received even the limited applause it did receive from Republicans. America, of all nations in the world, should be the first, and not the last, to adopt toward other nations the policy of commercial as well as political good will. As every other nation prospers, just so it will be able to afford and will consume more and more of the great world staples of which we are the foremost producer; "prosperity and progress for all other nations" should be the very foundation maxim for our foreign relations. It is not only true moral ethics, but also sound business policy.

The Dominion of Canada and the United States have the longest contiguous frontier of any two peoples in the world—a frontier offering less of physical barrier than that offered by the Mississippi River between the peoples on its east and west banks. The two peoples are more closely bound by ties of blood and ties of institutions than any two peoples of the world. The sociological barriers are about as invisible as those between our peoples east of the Mississippi River and those west of it or those north of the Mason and Dixon line and those south of it. Both peoples look across the Atlantic to the nations of Europe and across the Pacific to the nations of Asia. Both are marching along parallel paths of destiny, and it was decreed at the foundation of the world that they should march hand in hand.

Whom God and nature have joined together would blinded man put asunder. The thought of maintaining a permanent artificial wall between these people is abhorrent. This treaty does not go far enough, but it does begin the work of demolition, and should be ratified.

The second fundamental reason why this measure should be adopted is that it starts us in the direction of placing our industries on a sound economic basis and of readjusting our fiscal policies. I will not at this juncture discuss the question of taxation, but will enunciate for the purpose of suggestion this proposition—that the indirect system of taxation in this country must progressively give way to the direct system. The indirect system is fundamentally out of accord with republican institutions, for it practically eliminates the people from the control of taxation, as they never know or realize when they are being taxed, or how much they are being taxed, or who amongst them is being most or least taxed, or who is getting the tax money, whether the Government or special individuals or interests. It is true the indirect method is the easiest method of getting tax money, and all the monarchical governments of the world resort to it, as they raise money without the people realizing it. But the very fact that the money comes easy and without the consciousness of the people, makes the governments less accountable to the people and tends to extravagance and even the use of the people's money to keep the yoke upon the people's neck. It is untenable to hold that the money necessary to maintain the Federal Government could not be raised by direct taxation. A patriotic people are willing to pay the money needed for a just and economical administration of a government which they themselves control.

The question of taxation lies deep in the body politic of every Nation. The power to tax becomes the power to govern, and is the greatest source of gain the world has ever seen. Such a power should rest in the hands of the people. In a republic the people must regulate and control it, or special interests will seize it and threaten the Nation's prosperity and its liberties. Heretofore America has adopted the indirect system for its Federal taxation, and as a consequence to-day we have a condition of Federal taxation about which the American people are ignorant behind our tariff wall. For every dollar of customs revenue that the Government collects to-day, it is estimated that private interests collect $7. No people would submit to such a system of taxation if they knew about it. This reciprocity bill is the first step along the path that will lead to the needed change in our system of taxation, and it is a step toward placing our industries on a more permanently sound basis.

The foundation for prosperity and greatness for a people of high industrial capacity is close access to nature's resources, from which to supply the means for subsistence and the materials for manufacture. Throughout the opposition to this measure and to all reform of the tariff runs the fear that we can not compete with the people of other lands.

Who are the American people that we should fear to accept competition with the world?

The eloquent remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, lately the Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON], on this floor yesterday give a complete answer. He stated that the people of the United States, about 92,000,000 in number, produce in agricultural products and in manufactured products, constituting the two great classes of products, about as much as the 350,000,000 of the peoples of Europe. He also stated that we spend for the education of the American people four and one-half tenths, nearly half the money spent for education in all the world.

Prof. William G. Clark, a noted economist, estimates that the annual output of the average American producer is $2,450 worth of wealth a year; the average for the Canadian is $1,456; the average for the Australian is $900; for the Frenchman, $640; for the Englishman, $556; for the German, $460; which gives the American a ratio of more than five times the productiveness of the average German, more than four times the productiveness of the average Englishman, more than three and a half times the productiveness of the average Frenchman, two and a half times the productiveness of the average Australian, and more than one and a half times the productiveness of the average Canadian.

To maintain and even increase this relatively great industrial capacity of our people we should not only continue to develop our educational system, particularly for the masses of our people who only reach elementary grades, turning our atten-

tion in these grades to industrial instruction, but we should bring in a wider market and keener competition. Our great industries should no longer be confined to the home market and relieved of competition, but should get the discipline of universal competition and should conquer the great markets of the whole world and escape the wide fluctuations of booms and depressions that are inevitable with a single market. Being sure of the industrial capacity of our people, the supreme consideration for our statesmen is to furnish them access to the natural resources of the world. For the undeveloped lands of the world our true policy is equal opportunity guaranteed by the "open-door policy," fair chance for all, colonization and political control by none. Toward the occupied and developed lands of the world our true policy is reciprocity. The most important people of all with whom we should have reciprocity are the people of Canada, whose products are largely supplemental to our own, who possess boundless resources within the shortest distances along natural lines of communication.

It seems almost incredible that any sensible man could maintain that having access to these vast and new resources would harm the American people. Under such a theory the great domain of the Western Reserve should never have been opened up for fear of adverse effects upon New England and the Atlantic seaboard. Under such a theory it was a grave mistake to open the vast stretch of country beyond the Mississippi River, a fatal mistake to make the Louisiana purchase, the Florida purchase, the Gadsden and Alaska purchases. Under the same theory it was fatal to the people of Kansas that Oklahoma was opened up; it is a fatal mistake for us to proceed with the extension of irrigation and the reclamation of arid regions of the West and Southwest.

The facts are that in every case the opening up of new resources not only built up the new country, but added to the prosperity of the older sections.

It is semiludicrous to hear such Members as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] pleading the cause of the American farmer. The chief opposition to this measure does not come from the consistent friends of the farmer, but from the apostles of a high prohibitive tariff, who in their zeal for the manufacturer have always fought the farmers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If you analyze the motive behind the limited but desperate resistance to this measure you will find that it comes from those who fear to let the levee of high protection be broken even by a crawfish hole, and their fear is well grounded. This reciprocity treaty is the first real break in the levee of high protection. It will be followed by other breaks in rapid succession, and will lead to the revision of our fiscal policies and the placing of our industries on a sound economic basis by giving us, through a widening policy of reciprocity, a wider access to the natural resources of this hemisphere, and by giving our industries the discipline of competition and the conquest of the markets of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend at this juncture to discuss at length the unsound position in which our industries have been placed by the persistence of the policy of high protection. I will only point out what must be clear to anyone with a knowledge of human nature, that an industry getting the large profits within a high protective wall will not be interested in the business of world's markets beyond, where the profits under competition are comparatively small. Instead of going out for the larger markets, the men controlling the industry will spend most of their time stifling competition at home, so as to gain full benefit of these tariff walls. After filling the home market the industry stops developing. For more than 10 years the industries of America have been hampered in their development. With our great natural resources supplying the raw materials and the power, and with the wonderful skill and adaptability of our people, our industries ought to have gone out these last 10, 12, or 15 years to the conquest of the markets of the world. The profits on a single article would have been smaller but the volume of business would have been much greater. The industries would have grown beyond anything in their experience, while the whole American people would have gotten the benefit of lower cost of living. They would have required vastly more laborers and the increased demand for labor would have raised the price of wages far beyond the present level. The astounding fallacy is advanced that this policy of continued high protection has been adopted for the protection of American labor, when in all the legislation on the books of the land you will not find one clause imposing a tariff on the importation of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Labor is the one thing in this country that has never received the real consideration of the priest of high protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] On the contrary, the evidence is full and complete that vast interests getting the benefit of the high tariff wall, and relieved of competition themselves, are the very agencies that have encouraged, if they have not subsidized, the influx of vast hordes of labor from Europe all on the free list. They have encouraged the sending over of the cheapest labor of Europe. They have gathered up the paupers in the highways and byways, and, dumping them on our shores, they did not guide them to the fields in need of cultivation, but directed their footsteps to the mine and the factory, and there the pauper labor of Europe has stood upon the neck and shoulder of American labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have been accused of being afraid of other nations in behalf of my own country. I have studied America in comparison with other nations, and our civilization in comparison with theirs, and two great facts stand out. First, the weakness of our civilization, a weakness shown by every Republic since the world began, is the lack of preparation for military defense. Secondly, the strength of our civilization is economic, and lies in our commercial and industrial productiveness.

In what is being added to the increase of the world's wealth by industrial labor, America to-day is adding the equivalent of almost all of the rest of the world combined. We need never fear for our country in a fair competition in the markets of the world. The American who can produce four times as much as any man in the world need not fear the labor competition of the pauper. I will tell these gentlemen who plead for American labor that an American unarmed can not meet even a pauper armed. We need not fear for our country in the domain of its irresistible commercial and industrial strength, but our concern should be to safeguard the Nation in the line of its great weakness, lack of measures for defense. Our concern should be to see to it that our American man of peace who goes unarmed has a fair chance in the markets of the world, and is allowed to continue unmolested his peaceful productiveness which places him beyond the competition of all of the rest of the people of the earth. The true, sound, and wise policy for us to pursue at this juncture is to try to insure that this peaceful civilization of ours shall not be interfered with in its progress by the military power that others have prepared, though weaker in resources, and then, to lay the foundation for a permanent industrial greatness through the further educational development of our people, through the discipline of competition in the markets of the world, and through access to the great natural resources and the markets of the world. And this would dictate the adoption of this resolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS].

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to express to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] my appreciation of this opportunity to say a few words upon the pending question. As a new Member of this House, conscious of my inability to add anything new to this discussion, I am loath either to occupy your time or ask for your indulgence. My only excuse is that I represent a constituency that is perhaps interested more directly in this measure than any other community in the United States.

The district I have the honor to represent is practically unanimous for the passage of the pending measure. The city of Detroit, with a population of 465,000 people, is perhaps more directly and vitally interested in the ratification of this agreement than any other community in the United States. Our manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and laboring classes generally, with complete unanimity, are asking for freer commercial intercourse with Canada. The people of Detroit are an intelligent people; they have given careful and earnest consideration to this question. They do not ask for Canadian reciprocity solely because they believe it will benefit them, but because it will prove an advantage to the entire country. They recognize it as a national and not a local question. They are intelligent enough to realize the community of interest that exists between the city and the farm. If they believed the ratification of the proposed agreement would seriously affect the great agricultural classes they would not favor it. In short, they understand that the prosperity of agriculture is essential to the happiness and contentment of all our people.

The city of Detroit is but 2,600 feet away from our Canadian neighbors. It is estimated by the immigration authorities that about 3,500 people from Windsor, Walkerville, and Sandwich cross the Detroit River daily and earn their livelihood in Detroit. It is also estimated that about 1,400 Detroit people cross the river each day and earn their livelihood upon the Canadian side. The freest thing that crosses and recrosses that great artery of commerce is labor, and with free trade in labor we feel that

we have a right to insist upon free trade in the products of labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I wish to advert to the statements made by enemies of reciprocity on the Canadian side that this measure is merely the forerunner of annexation. If there is any sentiment in this country in favor of annexation with Canada it ought to be found in Detroit; but it can not be discovered there, because it does not exist. This talk of annexation is inspired merely for the purpose of frightening the people of Canada and defeating the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement.

Much has been said upon this floor of the disaster that will overtake the farmers if this measure becomes a law. Much has been said of the evil effects of opening our markets to Canadian wheat, grown, as the opponents of this measure tell us, upon cheap land by cheap labor. To my mind these fears are unfounded. I have always believed, and believe now, that when a country produces more of a given commodity than it can consume the surplus must find a market abroad and the price abroad will regulate the price at home. If this be true, it matters not, so far as the effect upon our market is concerned, whether Canadian wheat is grown upon cheap land or dear land. Both the United States and Canada produce a surplus of wheat which must be sold abroad. The Canadian surplus meets the American surplus in the markets of Liverpool and London. Does anybody in these markets ever inquire whether this or that particular wheat was grown upon cheap land or dear land; by cheap labor or dear labor? [Applause on the Democratic side.] In many of the counties of Michigan you may find farms valued at $50 per acre and farms valued at $100 per acre. The wheat grown upon each of these farms is hauled to the same market and sold at the same price.

In considering the price of wheat we are considering a world-wide proposition. If my position is correct, the importation to-morrow of every bushel of Canadian wheat into the United States would not break the American market. There would be the same number of bushels of wheat and the same number of mouths to feed. The abnormal demand created in Canada by the withdrawal of her wheat would maintain the price here. The farmer does not fix the price of his wheat. He does not figure the interest on his investment, the cost of seed and labor, and say to the consumer, "You may have it for so much." The price of wheat is fixed by the law of supply and demand, and speculation is the only thing that can interfere with the operation of that law. A tariff upon wheat benefits no one except the gambler who would "corner" his country's supply of wheat. [Applause.]

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON], for whom I have the highest respect, and whose popularity at home is attested by his long-continued service here, contended that the tariff upon wheat raised the price. With much eloquence he declared that he was opposed to farming "on shares" with Canada and selling the surplus abroad. I think perhaps the gentleman's argument is influenced somewhat by environment and force of habit. I have lived all my life among Michigan Republicans. Knowing them as I do, and having witnessed the regularity with which they roll up their 100,000 majority at every election, I am convinced that they are opposed to doing anything on shares. He declared in the course of his eloquent speech that as the Canadian farmers paid nothing to support our schools and build our highways and bridges, they should be forced to contribute something to maintain the Government when they availed themselves of our markets. If the gentleman is correct when he says the tariff upon wheat raises the price, it may be pertinent to inquire who does the contributing, the Canadian producer of wheat or the American consumer of bread? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the opponents of this measure are right and the tariff does actually raise the price of wheat, it ought not to be imposed. A high price for wheat means a high price for flour, a high price for flour means a high price for bread, and, Mr. Chairman, a tax on bread is a crime against humanity. The loaf is small enough now. Had I the power I would make it larger instead of smaller.

While the ratification of this agreement will not and can not lower the price of wheat, it will, in my judgment, have a tendency to reduce the cost of living, especially in the towns and cities adjacent to the Canadian border. I certainly hope so. At certain seasons of the year, and when market conditions are favorable, we ought to be able to get more butter, more eggs, more potatoes, more poultry, more vegetables. In the consideration of this question we ought to look conditions squarely in the face. It was but a few years ago when the farmers constituted one-half our population. To-day they constitute but one-third. Population has been centralizing in the large industrial centers, and this country to-day is short on food and long on manufactures. What we need is more food and a broader market. I am in favor of this measure because I believe it will have a tendency to give us both. [Applause.]

The distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], in the course of one of the most scholarly speeches on this question to which it has been my good fortune to listen, declared that the farm was a home as distinguished from a factory. I think that is true. The American farm is the finest home upon which the sun shines—and the American farmer is the most independent man within the confines of the two oceans. In all his experience he has never felt the pangs of hunger, and never will. With his broad, fertile acres he is never called upon to worry over where the next meal is coming from for his wife and his children. I do not believe the time will ever come in this country when, in order to make one-third of our population prosperous and contented, it will be necessary to visit privation and want upon the remaining two-thirds. If so, there is something fundamentally wrong with our industrial and social system.

Free trade has made the United States a great manufacturing and agricultural Nation. More commerce passes through the Detroit River in eight months than enters and clears the ports of New York, Boston, Liverpool, and Glasgow in an entire year. If you seek the great contributing cause of this country's marvelous growth, you will find it in that provision of the Federal Constitution which guarantees free trade between the States. What reasons exist for freedom of commerce between the States which can not be urged with equal force for freedom of commerce between the United States and Canada? To my mind there is no more excuse for a commercial barrier between these two countries than there is for a commercial barrier between Ohio and Michigan or between the upper and lower peninsulas of Michigan. [Applause.]

This measure would benefit the American farmer by enlarging the market for many of his products. Canada is not, and never will be, a great fruit-producing country. For the year ending March 31, 1910, we sold to Canada 59,000 barrels of apples against a tariff of 40 cents per barrel. We sold her peaches to the amount of 4,797,000 pounds against a tariff of $1 per 100 pounds. We sold her quinces, apricots, and pears to the amount of 4,941,000 pounds against a tariff of 50 cents per 100 pounds. We sold her cherries to the amount of 318,680 pounds against a tariff of 2 cents per pound. We sold her clover and timothy seed to the amount of $748,742 against a tariff of 10 per cent ad valorem. With the tariff against these and other products removed we would be able to sell Canada much more.

Some gentlemen on the other side are worrying over the future of the bean growers of this country if this measure should become a law. The total Canadian bean crop for 1909 was 1,324,600 bushels. Why, Mr. Chairman, the State of Michigan alone raises annually five times this quantity of beans. The production of beans in Canada is so small, compared with our own production, that the farmer has little to fear on that score.

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], whose judgment I would be willing to accept on almost any question except the tariff, is much worried over the fate that will befall the hay producers of this country in the event this reciprocity agreement is ratified. He fears the Canadians will be able to flood our markets with cheap hay. Let us consider the hay question for a moment. In 1909 the Canadian farmers produced 11,877,100 tons of hay and sold it at an average price of $11.14 per ton. In 1909 the total American yield was 64,938,000 tons, the product selling at an average price of $10.62 per ton. In 1908 the total Canadian yield was 11,450,000 tons, selling at an average price of $9.96 per ton. In the United States the total yield for that year was 70,798,000 tons, selling at an average price of $8.98 per ton. My authority for these statements are the Canada Yearbook for 1909 and the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1909. It would not appear from these figures that the American hay producer would be in any immediate danger from ruin by Canadian competition. In this connection I wish to direct attention to the fact that progressive American farmers to-day are not raising hay for the market, but are feeding it to their stock, and thus putting it back upon the land. They have learned by experience that they can make more money by this process than by selling their hay.

Reciprocity with Canada is no experiment. Under the reciprocity treaty of 1854 both manufactures and agriculture prospered as they never did before. In 1854, the year the treaty was ratified, our exports to Canada were $15,533,101. In 1862 they had increased to $25,173,157. In 1854 Canada sold to us

to the amount of $8,649,002. In 1862 she sold us to the amount of $15,063,730—a balance of trade in our favor for that year of over $10,000,000. In 1853, the year before the treaty, our imports from the Provinces were $7,550,718, and our exports thereto were $13,140,642—a balance in our favor of less than $6,000,000. The change was so great in 1855, the year after the treaty, that our exports increase to $27,806,020, or more than double those of 1853. As our imports in 1855 from the Provinces were $15,136,734, the balance of trade in our favor was $12,600,000, or more than we ever sold to Canada before in any single year, except one.

Mr. Chairman, if this measure will increase the Nation's supply of food, it ought to be passed without delay. [Applause.] The millions who reside in our large cities are entitled to some relief from existing conditions. They are at the mercy of the great trusts that stifle competition and fix the price of nearly every item of human necessity. They buy their cotton goods at prices fixed by the Cotton Goods Trust; woolen goods at prices fixed by the Woolen Goods Trust; hosiery at prices fixed by the Hosiery Trust; products of iron and steel at prices fixed by the Iron and Steel Trust; rubber goods at prices fixed by the Rubber Trust; meats at prices fixed by the Meat Trust. They work for wages fixed by the law of supply and demand and buy the plainest necessities of life in a restricted market controlled to a large extent by these great combinations. Rapidly advancing prices have so decreased the purchasing power of a dollar during recent years that the struggle for existence has become a particularly hard one.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the days of high protection in this country are almost numbered. Henry Clay, the ablest apostle of protection in American history, entered the Senate of the United States in 1806, and for 30 years contended that the Government should protect by tariff legislation our young and growing industries. He never contemplated, however, that a high protective tariff would be imposed forever. He believed that the time would come when our manufacturing industries would be upon an independent footing and be able to defend themselves successfully against foreign competition. In 1832 he introduced a tariff bill which provided for a gradual reduction of duties until 1842, by which time he estimated that the tariff would be upon a revenue basis, or an average ad valorem duty of about 20 per cent. Imagine his surprise, could he return to earth, upon learning that the so-called stand-pat element of the Republican Party, masquerading as the friends of American labor and assuming to be advocates of the principle for which he contended nearly a hundred years ago, had succeeded in fastening upon this country a tariff largely in excess of that for which he contended when our industries were young.

Protection as represented by the Payne-Aldrich bill is an instrument of oppression and a badge of dishonesty. It fetters legitimate business, curtails the world's markets for our products, burdens the consuming millions, and robs labor of its honest reward. It was not designed to protect American labor. It was designed to give to the American manufacturing and producing trusts an advantage to which they are not entitled, and by which they are to-day plundering the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us pass the pending measure and relieve, if we can, the oppressive conditions that burden our great industrial classes. Why continue to legislate against trade, the only thing that ever made a nation industrially or financially great? The time has gone by when the American people can live by trading among themselves. The much-vaunted home-market theory of 30 years ago will not do to-day. The great need of the present is a larger market for our surplus products. It is said that our cotton mills can turn out in six or seven months enough goods to supply the American people for a year. The surplus must find a market abroad or the mills will close. The prosperity of this country is dependent upon the prosperity of other countries. Strike down, if you please, one-third or one-quarter of the manufacturing industries of England and Continental Europe and the fires will die out in our own furnaces and the American farmers' surplus will go a begging in the markets of the world.

Let us abandon the policy of exclusion and retaliation and usher in the spirit of peace, commerce, and friendly trade relations with our neighbors. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NEEDHAM].

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Chairman, I propose in the time allotted me to confine myself strictly to the concrete proposition which is now before this body. This is a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada. Under the terms of the Payne Tariff Act the maximum tariff of the United States would have become effective against Canada on April 1, 1910, unless prior to that time the President of the United States had proclaimed that the Canadian tariff did not discriminate against the United States. It should be remembered that the last tariff bill as it passed the House provided for a maximum and minimum tariff, and that all countries should be entitled to our minimum tariff, and the maximum tariff was to be applied only to countries that practiced tariff discrimination against the United States. The Senate, however, amended the theory of the maximum and minimum provision so that the maximum tariff should be applied to all countries unless the President of the United States should be satisfied, and so proclaimed, that no undue discrimination existed in the tariff of any country against the United States. The difference between the House bill and the Senate bill in this regard was radical, and, in my humble judgment, the position of the House upon the question was more consistent with our theory of the tariff than the position of the Senate. However, the adoption of the conference report on the last tariff bill carried with it the adoption of the Senate provision in regard to the maximum and minimum tariff.

The negotiations between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, with a view of giving the former the benefit of the minimum tariff rates of our law, offered an opportunity for the President of the United States to indicate to the representatives of Canada the willingness of the administration to take up the question of an agreement between the two countries for reciprocal trade relations between them. I am convinced that the President, in making this suggestion to the representatives of Canada, acted in conformity with the overwhelming public sentiment of the people of the United States. I am convinced that, disregarding all selfish interests and looking at the question from the broad standpoint of national policy, the President of the United States in taking the initiative in negotiating and in consummating a trade agreement with our neighbor, Canada, which provides mutual trade advantages, rendered a service which will stand out as a conspicuous accomplishment of his administration. [Applause.]

In prophesying the effect upon the commerce between the two countries which the ratification of the pending agreement will have we have the record of the years between 1854 and 1866, when the Elgin-Marcy reciprocity treaty was in force. Notwithstanding that during the greater portion of that period the growth of our commerce with all countries, owing to the Civil War, was necessarily seriously interrupted, yet the record of the increase of trade between Canada and the United States under this reciprocity treaty is indisputable. The opponents of the present legislation have intimated that the abrogation of the Elgin-Marcy treaty in 1866 was due to a depressing effect upon certain American interests by reason of Canadian competition. I think, however, that a fair consideration of the question will lead the unbiased mind to the conclusion that the chief factor which led to the abrogation of that treaty in the year 1866 was because of the attitude of Great Britain toward the United States during the Civil War. It can hardly be disputed that the intense antipathy of the people of the United States toward Great Britain and Canada because of the attitude of the British Empire toward the United States during the Civil War contributed largely to the abolition of this treaty, and thus marked a historical step backward in the trade relations between the two countries.

The agreement with Canada now before us is more comprehensive than the Elgin-Marcy treaty and includes commodities of various classes.

Briefly speaking, the provisions of the agreement now pending may be summarized as follows:

First. Reciprocal free lists on leading primary food products, such as wheat and other grain; dairy products; fresh fruits and vegetables; eggs and poultry; fish, cattle and sheep, and live animals; and tin plate. Also certain commodities now free in one country are to be made free by the other, for instance: Cotton-seed oil will go free into Canada, and rough lumber will come free into the United States. Barbed-wire fencing is to be admitted free into the United States.

Second. Mutual reduced identical rates on secondary food products, such as fresh meats, canned meats, bacon and hams, lard and lard compounds, canned vegetables, cereals, and other foodstuffs partly manufactured.

Third. Mutual reduced rates on a list of manufactured commodities, including motor vehicles, cutlery, clocks and watches, sanitary fixtures, satchels and leather goods, plate glass, brass band instruments, printing ink, and miscellaneous articles. Under this head, also, Canadian duties on agricultural implements are reduced to the present United States rates.

Fourth. On certain commodities special rates by each country are made, as, for example, Canada reduces her duty on coal and cement, while the United States reduces its duties on iron ore, dressed lumber, aluminum products, and so forth.

In order to get a comprehensive idea of the effect of the agreement in a broad sense, it is necessary to refer somewhat briefly to statistics and figures.

The following statistics and figures are taken by me from a speech delivered by John Ball Osborne, Chief of the Bureau of Trade Relations, Department of State, before the Economic Club of Portland, Me., on March 15 last, and they show that the present foreign trade of the Dominion of Canada amounts to $655,000,000, of which the imports are valued at $375,800,000 and the exports at $279,200,000; exactly 50 per cent, or one-half of the total trade of Canada, to wit, $327,700,000, is with the United States, while 36 per cent, or $234,800,000, is with the United Kingdom, the balance of the trade being with other countries.

Of the total importations into Canada just given above, and amounting to $375,800,000, the United States furnishes $223,500,000, or 59.4 per cent, of the total imports into that country; the United Kingdom imports 25.3 per cent, amounting to $95,800,000; the balance of the imports are from other countries.

Of the total Canadian exports Great Britain and the United Kingdom receive approximately one-half, or $139,500,000; the United States comes next, with 37.3 per cent, amounting to $104,200,000; while the balance goes to various countries.

A study of our foreign markets shows that the Dominion of Canada stands third as a foreign market for the exports of the United States, being in this respect surpassed only by the United Kingdom and Germany. However, as a source of our imports Canada stands sixth, being surpassed by five countries, namely, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Cuba, and Brazil.

These statistics show the great importance of our trade with the Dominion of Canada. The showing is remarkable when we consider both the highly protective and the preferential features of the Canadian customs tariff. Since 1897 Canada has had highly protective rates, and at the same time has had preferential tariffs to the mother country and conventional tariffs with other countries, which have undoubtedly hampered the freedom of commerce between Canada and the United States.

The preferential rates which Canada offered to the mother country in 1897 were, first, a flat rebate of 12.5 per cent. This preferential rate was increased in 1898 to 25 per cent and then again in 1900 to 33.33 per cent in favor of the mother country, and has averaged about that rate since. Notwithstanding these preferences, the commerce of the United States with Canada has constantly grown, and, with the removal of the barriers provided for in the pending agreement, I am satisfied that the growth of commerce between the two countries will be by leaps and bounds. [Applause.] If the commerce of the United States with Canada has actually increased as statistics show, and we have, in fact, a greater share in the markets of Canada than the mother country, who can predict the share in that commerce which the United States would obtain should the agreement under consideration be enacted into law? [Applause.]

I said a moment ago that the United States now furnishes 59.4 per cent of the total imports into Canada and the United Kingdom 25.3 per cent. In 1884 England furnished approximately 40 per cent of the Canadian imports, while the United States at that time furnished between 46 and 47 per cent. In other words, the percentage share of England in the imports of Canada decreased, notwithstanding the preferential tariffs granted, from approximately 40 per cent of the total imports in 1884 to approximately 25 per cent in 1910, while during the same period, notwithstanding the highly protective tariff of Canada, the percentage share of the United States in the imports of Canada increased from approximately 46 or 47 per cent in 1884 to nearly 60 per cent in 1910.

These extraordinary, striking figures, under the conditions, demonstrate the enormous advantage and value of our commerce with Canada, and they clearly indicate that the mutual advantages to the two countries will be of incalculable benefit to each when freer trade relations, such as is contemplated by the agreement under consideration, are made a reality.

The large and important commerce which the United States now enjoys with the Dominion of Canada, notwithstanding the tariff barriers between the two countries and the preferential convention tariffs granted by Canada to other nations, justifies the belief that with the removal of these barriers to the extent provided in the agreement which we are now considering the commerce will be enormously augmented to the mutual advantage of both countries.

The policy of reciprocity has been a subject that has come before the American people frequently. I can not recall of a proposal for reciprocity with any country within recent years but what has met with violent opposition. A study of our various reciprocity agreements which have been presented for consideration fails to disclose with any degree of accuracy that they have been based upon any definite policy; that is, it can not be accurately stated that the reciprocity agreements heretofore negotiated by Republican Presidents have been confined to noncompeting products. Certainly all of the reciprocity treaties negotiated by the McKinley administration and known as the "Kasson treaties" provided for reciprocity in competing articles. I have a very vivid memory of these treaties, because they were pending for ratification at the time I entered Congress, 12 years ago. A large number of these treaties ruthlessly sacrificed many important California industries, and I had occasion to study their terms with a considerable degree of care, and pride myself that to some extent I had something to do with their defeat. To declare, therefore, as it has been done on this floor during the consideration of this agreement, that McKinley stood only for reciprocity in noncompeting articles is certainly not historically true, if we are to consider, as we must, that he approved of the acts of his own administration. It seems to me that the conclusion which every fair-minded man must reach is that the only safe way in considering reciprocity agreements is to consider each agreement by itself. In other words, each reciprocity agreement must stand alone.

The language of McKinley, in his last Buffalo address, in no sense bears out the assertion that he was opposed to reciprocity in competing products. I quote the gist of that speech:

A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities—a mutual exchange—is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade.

We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. What we produce beyond our domestic consumption must have a vent abroad. The excess must be relieved through a foreign outlet, and we should sell everywhere we can and buy wherever the buying will enlarge our sales and productions, and thereby make a greater demand for home labor.

The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly trade relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

If perchance some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to extend and promote our markets abroad?

Mr. Chairman, whatever may have been the position of the Republican Party in the past, and whatever may have been the real sentiments of McKinley and the other great leaders of the party upon the question of reciprocity, it seems to me that at this time there is no occasion for division of sentiment upon this question because the Republican Party, in its last national convention, which is the last authoritative declaration of the party upon the subject, and should therefore be the guide of the party, made a definition of the policy of protection, when, in substance, it declared that the tariff should be limited for the purposes of protection to the difference between the cost of production in this country and the cost of production abroad, with a reasonable profit to the American producer.

I am willing, Mr. Chairman, that my vote for or against the pending measure shall be determined by the principle of the last Republican national platform. [Applause.] If anyone can convince me that the difference in the cost of production of any of the articles mentioned in the pending agreement is substantially less in Canada than the cost of the production of the same articles in this country, then I should feel that under the definition of protection in the last national platform, as a Republican, I was bound to vote against the measure. But my study of the agreement and the evidence submitted convinces my mind that there is no substantial difference. I agree with President Taft, who said in his speech at Springfield, Ill., on February 11 last.

The conditions of production and of manufacture in the United States and Canada are substantially the same. Wages may differ in one part of Canada from another part, just as wages differ in different States in this country, but taken by and large, the character of the laborers, their intelligence and their skill, and the price paid them per unit of work, are not substantially less in Canada than they are in this country. * * * With that in view, still adhering loyally and sincerely to the principles of protection where it is needed to maintain our important industries, I did not hesitate to give the widest latitude to the Secretary of State and the commissioners who represented this country in offering to Canada a reduction of duties on goods and products coming into this country from Canada in consideration of the establishment of the same duty, or freedom from duty, on similar goods going into Canada.

After having made several visits to Canada myself I am convinced that the advantage is with the producer in the United States in competition with his competitor in Canada, generally speaking. The long, severe winters of Canada, the distance of the Canadian producer from the consuming centers of population, place a handicap upon the Canadian that greatly inures to the benefit of his American competitor. Of course there may be exceptions to this rule, but I am satisfied that, speaking broadly, the cost per unit of production of the competing articles provided for in the agreement under consideration are at least no greater, if not less—and, in my opinion, less—than in Canada, and in this view the report of the Tariff Board, set forth in Senate Document No. 849, Sixty-first Congress, third session, is a substantial confirmation.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. NEEDHAM. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not this measure conforms, so far as paper is concerned, with the last Republican platform?

Mr. NEEDHAM. I think it does.

Mr. DALZELL. You think there is no difference between the cost of making paper in Canada and in this country?

Mr. NEEDHAM. I think there is no substantial difference.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no substantial difference!

Mr. NEEDHAM. The report of the board, however, is before the Congress, and Members can determine it for themselves, but my study of the agreement and of this evidence convinces me that there is no substantial difference.

I find quite a few of the Members of this House who are now violently opposed to the pending agreement on the ground that it is an abandonment of the policy of protection were very substantial promoters and sponsors in passing through this House the legislation necessary to provide for reciprocity with Cuba. How the gentlemen referred to can reconcile their action is quite a mystery to me. Who will pretend that the labor conditions in Cuba are in any sense equal to our own, or that they in any degree approach the labor conditions in Canada? I opposed with what little ability I possessed the legislation providing for reciprocity with Cuba, because I felt it was an abandonment of the principle of protection, and because I felt an apprehension that the competition of the industries of that island would be injurious to the industries of the State of which I have had the honor to, in part, represent upon this floor for over 12 years. But our experience thus far under the policy of reciprocity with the Cuban Republic has not as yet had the effect such as I feared, and I have a strong conviction that the disastrous results which I apprehended may never materialize, and I am constrained to prophesy that the dire disasters which are apprehended by those on this side of the Chamber as a result of the enactment of the legislation now under consideration will also fail to materialize.

Now that we Members of the Republican Party have adopted a definition limiting the application of the policy of protection so that in fixing tariff duties they shall equalize the cost of production in this country and abroad with a fair profit to the American producer, and as there is no other country in the world where the conditions of production are as near an equality with our own as the Dominion of Canada, I sincerely trust that we may enact this measure into law and thus test the productive capacity and the competing ability of our people along lines of production and competition on substantial equality of terms.

Firmly believing that the putting into effect of the agreement under consideration will harm no substantial industry, but, on the contrary, will bring mutual benefit to both Canada and our own country, I shall support this great measure of a Republican President and a Republican administration. [Applause.] If, however, this measure should be put into force and effect and shall prove by its actual operation that the prophesies of those who now oppose it have been well founded and that we who now support it are mistaken, I will be the first to join in a movement for its abrogation.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill was before the House at the last session there was much discussion as to the effect the entering upon the policy of reciprocity with Canada would have under "the most-favored nation clause" of our treaties with other countries. It was vehemently asserted at that time, and may be again reiterated, that those nations which have treaties with the United States containing what is known as "the most-favored nation clause" would have the right under such clause to demand admission for their products into the ports of the United States upon payment of the same duties granted to Canada. I have given some study and attention to this matter, and I find that the decisions are uniform in the Supreme Court to the effect that under such conditions the clause does not apply. The Customs Court handed down a decision within the last 10 days unanimously affirming this policy. This question is treated quite exhaustively in volume 5 of Moore's Digest of International Law, pages 257–288, and I will not take the time to read any of these decisions, but anyone interested can examine these references if he desires.

The effect of these decisions and holdings is to make it the policy of the United States to refuse to grant the rates of duty provided for under reciprocity to any other nation than the one with whom the treaty is made. "The most-favored-nation clause" does not apply, because the rule is "Identity of treatment under identity of circumstances and conditions," and the conditions and considerations which would prompt our Government to grant tariff concessions to one nation under reciprocity are not the same, and in the nature of things can not be the same, as would induce the granting of similar rates to other countries with whom we have "the most-favored-nation clause" treaty.

Thus far I have not discussed, except in the most general way, the schedules of the proposed agreement. I have not attempted to analyze the effect which the treaty may have upon any single industry. My belief is that under the policy of protection, as defined in our last national platform, the cost of production in Canada being substantially the same as in this country, a tariff duty upon any of the articles enumerated in the agreement above that provided is not demanded in the interest of protection, and therefore my hope and belief is that the agreement itself will not, when it becomes operative, be disastrous to any American industry.

If incidentally the enactment of this legislation shall prove that the definition of protection limiting it, as was done under the terms of the last national platform, is insufficient for the play of industrial forces and the development and maintenance of our industrial conditions on a plane of healthfulness and prosperity, then that in itself will be an experience worth the experiment which this agreement contemplates. The people of this country will never continue any policy which will hamper our means of production and development or in the slightest degree imperil our standard of living. The American Nation is irrevocably committed to the policy of protection. [Applause.] We on this side of the Chamber may differ, and honestly differ, as to the amount of duty that should be granted to an industry to enable that industry to maintain the American standard and to meet the competition of the same industry of another country of lower standard. There are no differences here as to the necessity of maintaining the principles of protection. While I do not desire to assume to be opinionated, I venture to assert that those adherents of very high tariff rates are not the best supporters and advocates of the protective policy. In other words, rates in excess of what is known to place the domestic producer on a par with his foreign competitor may furnish an incentive, especially under present trade and industrial conditions, to monopolistic tendencies which would unduly burden the domestic purchaser and consumer. The true protective policy at no point requires its advocates to demand or defend excessive or unnecessary duties. [Applause.] I am persuaded that the following from a recent speech of President Taft should be most carefully considered by all protectionists, when he said, in speaking of the agreement now under consideration:

> There are those conservative protectionists who hang back from an approval of this agreement on the ground that it is a departure from the principle of protection and is the opening wedge to let in free trade. My own view is that no step could be taken more in the interest of a reasonable policy of protection than the approval of this treaty. The very existence of the policy depends on our abolition of the tariff where it is not really needed under the principle of the last Republican platform. If we persist in retaining it in these times of high prices and gradually exhausting food supply and base our retention on protection principles, we shall rouse an opposition that will know no moderation and will not cease radical economic changes until it has removed from the statute book the last trace of a protective tariff.

[Applause.]

But it is contended with great earnestness by those who oppose this legislation, that it will prove disastrous to the farming interests of our country. An attack upon the farmers of this country, or even a failure to properly guard their interests, would prove disastrous, and rightfully so, to those responsible for such a movement. I represent a district and in part a State where the leading industry is that of agriculture. The various branches of agriculture in my State, coming as they do in direct competition with the lowest paid labor in the world, where the conditions and where the standard of living is among the lowest, I fully appreciate that the farming industries of my State could not exist for a season with such competition except for the imposition of an adequate tariff. I would be the last individual upon this floor to cast a vote, and my State would

never tolerate a vote by any of its Representatives that would imperil or seriously affect the farmers of any portion of our country. [Applause.] I freely concede to every Representative upon this floor who may feel constrained to oppose this measure the utmost sincerity and honesty of purpose, and I only claim for myself the same honesty and sincerity which I freely concede to others. But after the best attention which I have been able to give to this subject in all its bearings I am unable to find that its enactment into law will imperil or appreciably affect the farming interests of the country, or of any particular section.

I appreciate the tremendous force which is included in any rallying cry made in behalf of the farmers of the country, but not being convinced that it is based upon truth and, furthermore, having a suspicion that there is possibly behind it something of selfish interests not allied with agriculture, I may be pardoned if I look with some degree of suspicion upon the forces and the motives of those who have inaugurated this protest. [Applause.]

There has been during the last few years a great prominence given to the subject of conservation. Tremendous interest has been created in the subject, and there is a widespread public sentiment that, with the enormous growth of our population and the consequent drawing upon our natural resources, the augmentation of these resources, and thereby to some extent prevent their exhaustion and impoverishment, is the part of wise statesmanship. Reciprocity with Canada must of necessity be chiefly confined to food and forest products, and the addition of these two great natural resources, bringing them within the reach of our fast-growing population, is a measure of conservation of greater importance than any that have yet been suggested.

Mr. Chairman, I have purposely refrained from discussing this legislation from the standpoint of any community or from the standpoint of any particular industry. This is an agreement between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America which requires concurrent legislative action by both countries in order that it may be made effective. Any change by amendment, however strongly I might favor certain changes, would of necessity throw the whole proceedings into negotiations again between the two countries, with the consequent delay and possible failure of any agreement at all. We are therefore compelled to either accept or reject the agreement. That is the practical question before this body. We have got to either vote it up or vote it down. Anyone pretending to be in favor of the agreement, but who is desirous of amending it, is in reality opposed to the agreement. Such an attitude will not deceive anyone acquainted with the real situation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as a protectionist and a Republican, I find no difficulty in bringing myself to the support of this great economic measure of the administration of President Taft. Long after the petty bickerings and jealous criticism of his administration shall have been forgotten the action of our President in bringing this measure before the Representatives of the American people will stand out as among the great accomplishments of an administration singularly conspicuous for the constructive measures which have become enacted into law. [Applause.] My judgment tells me that from the standpoint of the national welfare we should enact this legislation. I believe with President Taft when he said:

> Now is the accepted time. Now Canada is in the mood. She is at the parting of the ways. Shall she be an isolated country, as much separated from us as if she were across the ocean, or shall her people and our people profit by the proximity that our geography furnishes?

[Loud applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOWMAN].

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, this measure has been very ably debated from every side excepting possibly one, and that is from the standpoint of a Member from the State of Pennsylvania and of a miner or producer of fuel. I rise only from a sense of duty to express to this body, the greatest representative body in the world, some sense of the obligation which the State of Pennsylvania and the district I represent owes to the Province of Canada. I represent the heart of the anthracite coal regions of the State of Pennsylvania. I live in the Wyoming Valley, the land celebrated by the poetry of Campbell, celebrated through the life and work of the Moravian missionaries among the Indians, celebrated as the birthplace of the greatest race of aborigines the world ever knew, and celebrated, I believe it will be, as the birthplace of the greatest race that this country will ever produce. We have there today as the basis of our population the English, the Irish, the Welsh, the German, and the Scotch. There has been introduced within the last decade new elements of the best laboring blood of Europe. We have the Piedmontes and others of the best from Italy, the Lithuanian, the Pole, and the Slovak, and I tell you as one who has had opportunities to observe, that they will make as good citizens as any that this country has heretofore produced.

The State of Pennsylvania sent into the Province of Canada in the year 1910 a large part of over $33,000,000 worth of fuel bought by that country. Over $14,000,000 of that amount was anthracite, upon which we did not pay a cent of duty. They also used over $17,000,000 worth of bituminous coal, and upward of $2,000,000 worth of coke, upon which the inhabitants of that country paid over $3,000,000 in duty for the sake of burning it. That country, gentlemen, can never become an industrial nation. Why? Because they have no adequate supply of fuel. What can we get from them? That country is fitted by nature to produce food to help feed our industrial population. Boundless natural resources fit this country, with their help, to support an industrial race beyond computation.

Less than $98,000,000 covers the total imports of Canada into this country. You will note they paid us for fuel alone over one-third that amount and over $182,000,000 more for other merchandise. Should we not have some feeling of gratitude toward them?

Continue to build the tariff wall that now exists between us higher and wider and before you are through with it you will only have openings through it from which cannon will point from each side to the other.

This is not a question of a tariff; it is a higher and broader question; it is a question of the universal advancement of the human race. I listened with a great deal of interest to what was said by the gentleman from New York City [Mr. GEORGE]. The population in my city is very much like it; they need sympathy and help. But I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina, who called attention to the low wages paid in the State of Pennsylvania, that in the district that I come from we pay as good wages for labor performed as are paid in any place in the world.

We have serious accidents that excite the deepest feelings in man's nature. I once walked up to a shaft where a child was sitting and said to her, "What are you sitting here for, my child?" "I am waiting for my father." Her father had been buried in that mine through an accident that happened more than a week previous.

A fund was raised to relieve the necessities of those who were dependent upon the men who lost their lives in that disaster. I will say for the bankers of New York, however they may be traduced, we found their hearts open to the plea of distress. They, with the other good people of this country, established a fund which has been distributed in that mining district from that day to this, nearly 15 years.

In that connection I want to say that a lady from one of the principal cities of this Nation came to our city to ascertain what the conditions were, and whether it was necessary for her to do anything to ameliorate them. After visiting the whole community, she said to me, "There is more distress in one alley in my city than in your whole district." She visited homes that for months had not had a male protector to help them.

Gentlemen, I repeat, this is not a tariff question.

We are protectionists in my district. We believe in the protective tariff to the limit of competition, with a fair percentage to protect the manufacturer from surplus stocks. We claim that this is a protective measure, presented by one of the greatest Presidents this country ever produced—not the greatest politician, but a man with a broad judicial mind, deeply interested in the welfare of the people—and I submit that a fair majority, in my district ninety-nine one-hundredths of the Republicans and most of the Democrats, are with him.

Gentlemen, I shall vote for this measure [applause] because I do not believe it transgresses a single Republican principle, the principle of protection to American industries, and I do not believe it transgresses a single principle that protects the farmer in the best market for his product, the home market. Look over the reports of prices, the prices for to-day, of farm products in the United States, and there will be found as much difference in the various parts of this country as there is between those of this country and Canada. In the words of our Chaplain this morning, "Let our spiritual ears be unstopped and spiritual eyes be opened," that we may see in this measure one that is far above local conditions, one that tends to the advancement of the race, bringing together these two peoples who are one in lineage, one in their purpose—the elevation of the human race. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. "Reciprocity is only an international form of protection." This definition from the Standard Dictionary correctly describes reciprocity. It was this conception of reciprocity that caused the Republican Party to write in its platform:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for that which we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

This bill, introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], contains none of the elements of reciprocity. It provides not for protection but for free trade in the United States and protection in Canada. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A DEMOCRATIC MEASURE.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has said that this bill presents a political and not a partisan question. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] contends that it is both political and partisan, and that it is a Democratic measure, presented to this House in response to a resolution passed by a Democratic caucus, and that it is in full harmony with the declarations of the Democratic platforms.

I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and I, for one, am perfectly willing that the Democratic Party shall stand sponsor for this bill and shall be held responsible for its evil effects should it become a law.

The advocates of this bill content themselves with an academic discussion of reciprocity. They fail to point out wherein it is reciprocal and decline to analyze its provisions or the real effect which its enactment will have on the producer and consumer alike.

PROPOSED TRADE NOT RECIPROCAL.

By the provisions of this bill all the products of the Canadian farm are brought into competition with the product of the farms of the United States. It surrenders to the farmers of Canada the markets of the United States for all their produce. For the surrender of these markets it is proposed to reduce the duty on the farm implements manufactured and imported from Canada. This is practically the only reciprocity provided for in this bill.

Let us place in parallel columns, first, a list of the produce of the farm, and, second, a list of the farm and other machinery on which it is proposed to reduce the tariff, with the amount of such proposed reduction, and see if it is a fair and equal trade and if it is reciprocal. On the other side we have a list of practically everything grown on the farm, from which all tariff is removed and which is brought into direct competition with the cheaper farms and the cheaper farm labor of Canada. On the other side we have a list of manufactured articles upon which the duty is reduced and by which it is alleged the farmers of this country will profit all that they have lost through the placing of farm products on the free list:

What the American farmer gives and what the Canadian farmer gets.	*What the Canadian farmer gives and what the American farmer gets.*	
FREE LIST.	REDUCED DUTIES OF FARM IMPLEMENTS.	Per cent ad valorem.
Cattle, horses, swine, sheep, mules, poultry, wheat, rye, oats, buckwheat, barley, dried peas, cowpeas, beans, corn, hay, straw, potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables; apples, peaches, pears, grapes, and berries; butter, cheese, milk, cream, eggs, honey, cottonseed, linseed, and other oil seeds, including clover and timothy seed, and other articles.	Farm wagons	2½
	Plows	5
	Harrows	5
	Harvesters	2½
	Reapers	2½
	Seed drills	5
	Mowers	2½
	Horse rakes	5
	Cultivators	5
	Thrashing machine parts, baggers, weighers, etc	5
	Parts of thrashing machines, for repair	2½
	Portable and traction engines, no change.	
	Horsepowers for farm use, no change.	
	Hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, and hay tedders	5
	Motor vehicles, except for railways	5

Who can discover any real reciprocity in this trade? The injury it would work to the agricultural interests of this country is apparent. The benefits which we would receive are so small that they can not be discovered. No one has pointed them out.

CANADA'S DEMAND.

For more than a century the Dominion of Canada has knocked at our door for the free admission of her agricultural products, and at all times she has maintained the right to protect her manufacturers, as well as the manufacturers of Great Britain. She has desired free trade in agricultural products. At the same time she has demanded that her manufacturers be protected from importations by the American manufacturer.

Let us not, therefore, delude ourselves into believing that the reduction of from 2½ to 5 per cent in ad valorems on farm machinery will be of any benefit to the farmers of the United States. The Canadian farmer desires to enter into free competition to feed the 100,000,000 people of the United States and Canada, but the Canadian manufacturer is unwilling to enter into free and open competition with the American manufacturer in supplying the market of the two countries with manufactured articles. As long as Canada maintains her present position there can be no such thing as reciprocity between Canada and the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The simple fact is that it costs more to produce the products of the farm in the United States than it does in Canada. As shown by the report of the Tariff Board, farm labor and farm land is higher in the United States than it is in Canada. Under these conditions it can not truthfully be said that the cost of production is the same in the two countries.

LOWER PRICES TO FARMER NOT FOLLOWED BY LOWER PRICES TO CONSUMER.

It necessarily follows, therefore, that the price at which the farmer will be compelled to sell his produce will be affected by the enactment of this law. The extent to which the value of our farm products will be affected no one can say. But it does not follow that because the farmer will be obliged to accept lower prices for his produce that the ultimate consumer will be able to purchase his food supply any cheaper.

These positions are not inconsistent. By our complex method of production and distribution big interests profit by the loss to the original producer, and the price to the consumer is seldom affected. The best example of this is to be found in the removal of the duty on hides. I recall the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] when he discussed the provisions of his bill. He contended that the duty on hides did not benefit the farmer, but, as he expressed it, only benefited the "big four," and that the removal of the duty on hides would not lessen the price of hides to the producer.

By the Payne tariff law hides were taken from the dutiable list and placed on the free list. On August 7, 1909, the Shoe and Leather Reporter gave the wholesale price of hides, No. 1 packers' native steers, at 17 cents per pound. On February 4, 1911, the same grade of hides was quoted by the same authority at 14 cents per pound. Everyone who is familiar with the subject knows that the farmer received 4 cents per pound less for his hides on February 4, 1911, than he received on August 7, 1909; but where is the buyer of shoes or of any other article manufactured from leather who could purchase such article cheaper on February 4, 1911, than he could on August 7, 1909?

HIGH COST OF LIVING—IS TARIFF RESPONSIBLE?

In the memorable campaign that ended on the 7th day of last November the principal issue was the high cost of living. The Democratic Party contended that the Payne tariff law was responsible for high prices. That election is far enough in the past and the next election is far enough in the future so that we ought to be able to consider the question of the high cost of living dispassionately and purely as a business proposition, separate and apart from factional strife and political clamor.

The argument presented by our Democratic friends in support of this measure is a most ingenious and conflicting one. It all depends upon the person making the argument. Many of the arguments are based on the theory that this bill will not reduce prices, while others bottom their arguments on the express proposition that cheap food products will flow from the agreement authorized by this bill. By this bill they would lower the cost of living.

HOW DEMOCRACY WON.

I desire, therefore, to consider the question of the effect that recent tariff legislation has had on prices. First let us inquire if the issue of the high cost of living was fairly and honestly presented in that election. What are the facts? A few days before election, in practically every congressional district of the North our Democratic friends distributed circulars entitled "High cost of living," in which was placed in parallel columns a two weeks' store bill for October, 1896, and October, 1910. Such a circular was used in the district I have the honor to represent in this House. But, mind you, this circular was distributed only in the cities and towns. Our Democratic friends were very careful to see that this circular should not fall into the hands of the farmer, for it was only the price of farm products that this circular assailed.

DEMOCRACY WOULD LOWER PRICES ONLY ON FARM PRODUCE.

If the statements contained in this circular were good argument to the wage earners on the subject of the high cost of

living before the election, they ought to be good argument to the farmers after election. I shall, therefore, for the benefit of Democratic and Republican farmers alike, print this circular in the RECORD. It assails only the product of the farmer, and points to the year of 1896 as a year presenting ideal conditions and ideal prices. The circular is as follows:

VOTERS AND HOUSEHOLDERS, READ THE WITHIN CAREFULLY—HOW TO SAVE YOUR MONEY—TAKE INTO BOOTH WITH YOU WHEN YOU VOTE—VOTE FOR YOUR FAMILIES.

High cost of living facts—Read carefully—Ponder well—Vote right—Prices, 1896 and 1910.

The Republican Party has been in complete control of every department of the Government since 1896—President, Senate, and Congress. They have given you a government of trusts—Beef Trust, Sugar Trust, Flour Trust, Clothing Trust, and the "daddy" of them all, the Tariff Trust. See the result below:

St. Louis prices.

TWO WEEKS' STORE BILL.

OCTOBER, 1896.		OCTOBER, 1910.	
2 pounds salt pork	$0.10	2 pounds salt pork	$0.40
5 pounds pork chops	.50	5 pounds pork chops	1.25
5 pounds pork ribs	.30	5 pounds pork ribs	.75
4 pounds smoked shoulder	.30	4 pounds smoked shoulder	.54
2 pounds sausage	.15	2 pounds sausage	.35
5 pounds lard	.35	5 pounds lard	.85
5 pounds corned beef	.25	5 pounds corned beef	.62½
4 pounds butter	.40	4 pounds butter	1.20
2 dozen eggs	.20	2 dozen eggs	.50
1 pound cheese	.13	1 pound cheese	.25
1 barrel flour	3.50	1 barrel flour	5.65
4 pounds chicken	.40	4 pounds chicken	.72
21 pounds sugar	1.00	21 pounds sugar	1.16
2 pounds steak	.20	2 pounds steak	.35
5 pounds roast beef	.50	5 pounds roast beef	1.00
	8.28		15.59½

Look at these two store bills. Vote to protect your pocketbook. Your table bill has doubled; have your wages doubled? You pay 100 per cent more for your clothing, blankets, and household goods; has your salary kept pace with the increased cost of living? Your rent is higher and your fuel is higher; how much higher is your weekly wage check? Don't you think you had better help put the trusts that have doubled the cost of living out of business? Congressman GOOD'S vote helped to make the bill $15.59½ instead of $8.28.

FARMERS NOT ENTHUSIASTIC OVER DEMOCRATIC PRICES OF 1896.

I hope the farmers will study this circular. When they come to read it, let them take the first item, "Two pounds of salt pork, 10 cents," and ask themselves how much they would be obliged to sell their hogs for, allowing for offal, packers', jobbers', and retailers' profits, in order that salt pork could be bought at 5 cents a pound retail. Let me appeal to them to apply the same test to every item in this circular and then ask themselves the question, without regard to political affiliation, if they are in favor of this Democratic demand that the price of farm products that prevailed in 1896 shall be restored and shall permanently prevail. [Applause on the Republican side.]

DID PAYNE TARIFF INCREASE PRICES?

But is the Payne tariff law responsible for the cost of these articles? How can it be honestly charged that it increased the cost? The Payne tariff bill did not increase the duty on a single article named in this circular. One of the articles named in the circular was placed on the free list. On 8 of the 15 articles the duty was reduced 25 per cent and on the 6 remaining articles the duty was unchanged. So we have presented here the very amusing claim of our Democratic friends that by placing 1 of the 15 articles on the free list, by reducing the duty on 8 25 per cent, and by allowing the duty on 6 to remain unchanged we have thereby increased the cost of these articles to the consumer. For lack of a better name, I can only call this kind of reasoning Democratic logic.

It is a familiar saying of our Democratic friends that "the tariff is a tax, and the consumer has to pay it," and as corollary to this proposition it is also claimed that the removal of the tariff on an article by that much does it reduce the price to the ultimate consumer.

Let us apply this rule to some of the notable reductions in the Payne tariff law and ascertain if there has been a corresponding reduction in the price to the ultimate consumer.

Of the articles enumerated in this circular, the duty on pork, lard, and beef was reduced 25 per cent, and yet the retail price of these articles for 1910 advanced, if the information set forth in this circular is correct.

The tariff on cabbage was reduced 33 per cent, and yet where is the householder who is able to buy cabbage more cheaply because of the reduction in the tariff? The tariff on bituminous coal was reduced 33⅓ per cent and on agricultural implements 25 per cent. There was a reduction of 55 per cent on harness and of 60 per cent on boots and shoes, yet the purchasers of these articles at retail saw no reduction in the price after the tariff was lowered.

The tariff on barbed wire was reduced 37 per cent; on nails, spikes, and tacks from 20 to 50 per cent; and on starch 33 per cent; but where is the person who purchased any of these articles at retail who experienced any of the benefits of lower prices, which our Democratic friends proclaim would flow from a reduction in tariff duties.

But our friends on the other side of the aisle will say that these reductions were too slight, and that in order to benefit the ultimate consumer by lower prices the reduction should have been greater. The answer to this argument is that we took the tariff all off of several things which, or the products of which, are in general use, and in those cases there has been no reduction in the price to the ultimate consumer.

We placed hides, posts, and petroleum and its products on the free list. What was the result? The farmer is compelled to take 4 cents per pound less for his hides, but who receives the benefit of the reduction? Certainly not the ultimate consumer. The ultimate consumer is not interested in the price of hides. He is interested in the retail price of boots and shoes or of harness or of some other manufactured product of leather. Notwithstanding the fact that we took all the tariff off of hides, to the detriment of the farmer, and took 60 per cent of the tariff off of shoes and 55 per cent off of harness, the ultimate consumer of boots and shoes and of harness is obliged to pay more for both of these articles to-day than he could buy them for before this reduction. Fence posts were placed on the free list, but the purchaser of fence posts at retail realizes no reduction in the price.

Petroleum and its products were placed on the free list, but the users of kerosene and gasoline oils are looking, and will continue to look, in vain for a corresponding reduction in the retail price of these articles because of this reduction in the tariff.

TRUSTS AND NOT CONSUMERS BENEFITED.

Should the agreement which this bill authorizes be entered into, the unorganized and unprotected farmers of the North will have strong competition and will be forced to sell their raw materials at reduced prices, but the ultimate consumer—the user of shoes, not hides or leather; the purchaser of oatmeal by the package, not oats by the bushel; the buyer of flour by the sack or bread by the loaf, and not wheat by the bushel; the user of starch and not the purchaser of corn in the shock or in the crib—will find that the Canadian farmer has a better market and a better price for his product. Yes; he will then learn that the American farmer is compelled to sell his product in a more restricted market and at a reduced price, but that he, the ultimate consumer, will be compelled to pay the same price for what he eats and for what he wears that he paid before the enactment of this law.

The result is that the farmer who raises and sells the raw product of the farm must take a lower price. The manufacturer and the jobber, who are organized and control the situation, secure a larger profit; the ultimate consumer pays the same or a higher price.

This is a condition to be deplored and to be corrected, but the tariff, except where it is excessive and on noncompetitive articles, is not responsible for it. Large manufacturers, importers, and distributers practically control the output of the necessities of life and dictate the price. Take coffee, for instance, which has been on the free list for years. Rio No. 7 on August 1, 1909, sold for 7¼ cents per pound at wholesale. On February 4, 1911, the wholesale price of the same grade of coffee was 12⅞ cents per pound. The cause of the advance in price in coffee can not be attributed to the tariff; nor can the increase of the price of the articles named in this misleading and unreliable circular.

HIGH PRICES WORLD-WIDE—WORLD-WIDE CAUSES.

If gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have any real desire to get to bottom of the question of the high prices, and the relation of the tariff to them, they will not proceed far with their investigation until they discover that the tariff, except in cases of excessive duties and duties on noncompetitive articles, has little, and in almost every case absolutely nothing, to do with the retail prices to the ultimate consumer. They will also find that supply and demand, overproduction and shortage in crops, cold storage and monopoly—these and other agencies control the entire question of the rise and fall of prices. They will find that these same causes obtain in free-trade England as well as in the United States.

The difficulty in considering the question of the tariff and its relation to prices is that we have considered it from a very narrow and restricted viewpoint. We have not considered the question of the prices of food from the standpoint of the markets of the world. We have not compared our market of food products with the market of like products in other countries. The only comparison that has been made compares the price of articles at a time when the country is prosperous with prices of like articles at a time when the country was locked in the

paralysis of hard times, when everybody had labor or the product of labor to sell, and when but few had the money with which to buy. In 1896 prices were low, and there was no market for many of the products of the farm or the factory, even at bankrupt prices, and I hope and pray that those times and those prices shall never again come to this country. [Applause.] It means hardship and suffering.

WHAT AN AGE OF CHEAPNESS MEANS.

Is it an age of cheapness that is desired? I very much doubt it.

Where shall we begin in this crusade for cheaper things? Some one says cheaper rent—cheaper homes. The home is the foundation of our institutions, the bulwark of our Republic, and nothing is more to be coveted than homes at fair and reasonable prices. But what does this mean? Cheap rent and cheap homes mean cheaper labor in the stone quarry, cheaper labor in the limekiln and the cement factory. It means lower wages for the stonemason, the bricklayer, the carpenter, the lather, the plasterer, the plumber, the painter, and the laborer. Rent is high, but the labor that built the house is high, and all the material that went into it is high, and that material in turn was largely the product of labor.

We can not have high prices for labor and low prices for the product of labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Cheap homes mean cheap labor, and so it is with everything that we eat and everything that we wear—it is largely the product of labor. Cheap food and clothing mean cheap labor on the farm, in the factory, and in the shop. Laborers of this country, do you want it?

I do not want to be understood as approving all of the increases in the cost of the necessities of life, nor do I contend that labor has always had its just share of that which it, jointly with capital, has produced. It too frequently happens that the avarice and selfishness of men robs labor of its just share in the progress of its time. All too often men in their avarice exact too high prices for the necessities of life. It was always so; it always will be so. These inequalities and injustices are seen in every period of the world's history. They have existed, not by virtue of any law but in spite of statutory enactment. Much as these conditions are to be deplored, no political party and no government has yet discovered an easy or a complete remedy.

Our Democratic friends say that this is a proposition of give and take. I admit it. It takes protection from the farmer and gives it to the trusts. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have compiled from Bulletin 77 and from the bimonthly bulletin of the Bureau of Labor a comparative table, showing the increase in prices of 11 principal products, and also the increase in wages in 11 principal occupations for the years 1899 to 1907. I shall append this table to my remarks, for it shows that the increase in the price of labor has kept pace in the cost of food products.

The increase in the prices of food is not confined to the United States, but is a world-wide movement. A comparison of the retail prices of the necessities of life in this country with prices of similar articles abroad will reveal the fact that the increase in prices abroad has been as rapid and almost, if not fully, as great as in this country.

In an editorial in the Independent the editor says:

> The fact that prices have risen the world over—in England, in Russia, in China, and South America, although not as much as here—proves a world-wide cause.

Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, and one of the best posted men on the conditions of labor and the prices of the necessities of life in the world, says:

> Mentally contemplating the many cities I have visited, and having in mind the conversations I had with workingmen who had lived both in Europe and America, I believe that I may assert that whether the cost of living in Europe or America is greater to the workingman depends entirely upon the standard of living he adopts while in America. If he voluntarily lives the life of self-denial in this country that he compulsorily lived in his native land, his outlay in money will remain about the same. Even then he will hardly be able to escape gaining something from the superior supply of the good things of life in America.
>
> Living is cheap to the wage earner of Europe only because he does without what in America soon becomes a necessity to him—food in good quantity and quality, presentable clothes among his aspiring fellow workmen and their families, and a comfortably furnished home in quarters responding to his awakened desire for equality with his American neighbors, and in general a larger and freer life.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> How often do these people eat meat? is a question the American in Europe finds himself asking when looking about among wage workers. Meat is usually from 25 to 100 per cent higher in price than in the United States.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The immigrant coming to America finds that if he can buy in quantity (in cases where he need not) his flour, fuel, potatoes, oil, sugar, coffee, salt—the essentials for his plain table—all cost less than they ordinarily do in the land he left. The cheapness and abundance of many varieties of fruits and of our melons and tomatoes is a surprise to him. Closely after the most pressing necessities comes a line of things cheaper than in Europe—cotton clothing, including overalls, jumpers, shoes.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The main conclusion as to housing is the same as that relating to food: If the immigrant to this country is willing to continue living here at the same level he is obliged to accept in his native land, he can find it for the same money.

WHAT DEMOCRACY PROPOSES.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], a member of the Ways and Means Committee which reported this bill, says: "This is a step, and only a step, in the right direction." The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has introduced another bill, which has been favorably reported to this House by the Ways and Means Committee, in pursuance to the action of the Democratic caucus. This bill is the next step which our Democratic friends propose to take to reduce the price of the products of the farm. Under the guise of putting farm machinery on the free list, when they know or ought to know that the American farmer would profit nothing by the enactment of such a law, for but few foreign-made implements are suitable for or would ever be used on the American farm, it places the American stock raiser in direct competition not only with the farmers of Canada, but with the farmers and stock raisers of the entire world. This farmers' free-list bill places beef, veal, mutton, pork, and all kinds of meat on the free list. If this free-list bill proposed by our Democratic friends shall become a law, the stock raisers of Iowa and the Middle West—and every farmer in that section is a stock raiser—will be forced to compete with the cheap land, cheap labor, and cheap live stock raised in Mexico, in Argentine Republic, and the other South American countries. [Applause on the Republican side.]

WHY PROTECTION FOR SOUTHERN PRODUCTS ONLY?

This Democratic program is the most unreasonable and unfair proposition ever submitted to the Congress of the United States. If these two Democratic measures shall become laws, everything that is grown on the farms in the North will be on the free list, while everything that is grown on southern farms will be protected by tariff duties. Is this fair?

The Republican policy of protection provides for the "imposition of such duties as will equal the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries." It measures the protection that the farmers of the South shall enjoy with the same rule that it measures the protection granted to the farmers of the North.

And this is as it should be. If we are to have free trade in the farm products of the North with all the world, then let us have free trade with all the world in the farm products of the South. If we are to have free wheat, free flour, free corn, free hay, free oats, and free barley, why not have free oranges, free lemons, free bananas, and free citrus fruits? If free beef, free veal, and free meats of all kinds are so much to be desired, why not free sugar, free rice, and free tobacco?

Why should we grow free popcorn in the North and protected peanuts in the South? [Applause and laughter.] In a word, why free trade for the products of the farms of the North and high protection for the products of the farms of the South? Real reciprocity with Canada is a good thing for both countries, but reciprocity between the different sections of our own country is better.

PROTECTION JUSTIFIES WISDOM OF THE FATHERS.

The United States and Canada! What untold possibilities are embraced in these! Separated only by an imaginary line, the people of the United States and Canada, having a common ancestry, engaged in common pursuits, living under natural conditions in all respects similar, speaking a common language, having a common religion, have not enjoyed, either individually or nationally, the same degree of prosperity. Why?

The early settlements in these two countries were made about the same time. The area of the United States is less than that of Canada, yet under the policy of protection to American industries our country's growth has been unparalleled, and to-day we number 92,000,000 people. Under a policy of granting to the mother country preferential rates of duties, which stimulated manufacturers in Great Britain and gave but little or no encouragement to them at home, Canada's growth and development has been so stunted and retarded that to-day her total population numbers less than 7,500,000 people.

The annual yield of our farms aggregates over sixteen times more than does the farms of Canada. The value of our farm animals is eight times more than the value of the farm animals in Canada. The value of the manufactured products in the Dominion of Canada in 1905 was only $1,308,000,000, while in the same year, under the policy of protection, the products of our factories aggregated the stupendous sum of $14,802,000,000.

PROTECTION ASKS FOR NO APOLOGIST.

Mr. Chairman. I have no desire to defend the policy of protection. That policy needs no champion, no apologist, no defender. In the beginning the fathers laid deep and wide the foundations of protection. The first law signed by George Washington as President of the United States was a statute providing for protection to American industries, and from that day to this protection has been our beacon light, lighting the way to an industrial and commercial supremacy unapproached in all the history of the world. The record of our achievements under this policy is the industrial history of the Republic, portraying a progress unrivaled and unchecked, except when the policy of protection was abandoned. Under this policy ours has become a nation of individual prosperity, a land of opportunity, a country of such marvelous industrial and commercial achievement that it is the hope and inspiration of the world. Others may tamper with these foundations, but I, for one, shall vote to keep the faith. [Applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Comparative table showing the increase in the price of food products and the price of labor from 1899 to 1907 (increase shown in percentages).

[Compiled from Bulletin 77 and the Bimonthly Bulletin, Bureau of Labor.]

PER CENT OF ANNUAL INCREASE IN THE RETAIL PRICE OF FOOD.

Years.	Wheat flour.	Chickens.	Eggs.	Fish.	Beef roasts.	Mutton.	Veal.	Pork.	Butter.	Potatoes.	Beans.
1899	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1900	.....	.....	.....	6	2	2	1	5	3	.....	10
1901	.....	1	4	1	6	6	4	15	5	21	14
1902	.....	11	17	4	14	11	11	26	14	21	17
1903	7	16	23	7	9	9	10	24	13	19	18
1904	26	18	29	7	8	11	11	21	11	26	17
1905	26	21	30	9	8	14	13	24	15	14	16
1906	14	26	32	16	11	21	18	35	21	14	15
1907	24	29	36	20	14	26	20	40	30	25	19

PER CENT OF ANNUAL INCREASE IN WAGES.

Years.	Bricklayer.	Boiler maker.	Carpenter.	Compositor.	Laborer.	Machinist.	Painter.	Plasterer.	Plumber.	Stone mason.	Hod carrier.
1899	4	1	3	3	.....	1	4	6	3	2	8
1900	6	6	10	3	.....	3	10	9	4	4	7
1901	12	7	15	7	8	6	14	14	7	10	9
1902	18	7	23	10	12	10	19	23	10	19	14
1903	24	9	30	13	14	13	24	31	17	26	22
1904	27	13	29	15	14	12	27	33	24	29	23
1905	32	15	33	16	14	13	29	39	28	29	24
1906	36	18	41	20	22	16	36	48	31	35	34
1907	40	23	51	24	29	20	42	53	48	39	35

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, as a Republican and an admirer of our great and good President I frankly confess that I enter upon the discussion of the measure before us with somewhat of embarrassment. But if as a Republican and a believer in reciprocity I have some embarrassment in opposing this bill, which has been labeled a reciprocity measure, how much greater must be the embarrassment of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, who but recently commissioned by the American people, as they understand it, to revise the tariff along Democratic lines—whatever that may be—find themselves confronted at the very threshold of their opportunity and responsibility with the necessity of accepting from a Republican President this measure which they present as the first fruits of their promises to the American people in the last campaign. If we recollect what they promised aright, it was that they were to remove the duty from certain trust-made goods, that they were going to reduce certain so-called "iniquitous schedules" of the Payne tariff bill, but lo and behold, this triumphant and vociferous majority, immediately upon being convened in special session, accept from a Republican President a measure prepared under his direction and present it without the opportunity of amending it by so much as a word, a line, or a syllable. It occurs to me that this must be a trying situation for the gentlemen on the other side.

I have no criticism to make of anyone connected with the executive departments of the Government with regard to the negotiation of the agreement, the fruit of which is presented in the measure before us. The President in his message to Congress presenting the agreement gave to us the reasons which actuated him, and referred to the conditions and circumstances which in his opinion warranted an effort on his part to make a trade agreement with Canada which he hoped, of course, would be advantageous to the people of both countries. The President having secured the best agreement he could under the circumstances—and how far that agreement before us differs from the hopes and expectations with which the negotiations were undertaken we can not say—it became his duty to transmit the finished product to Congress for its consideration.

RESPONSIBILITY RESTS WITH CONGRESS.

He did his duty, he accepted his responsibility. The measure is before us, the responsibility is now ours. We have now our duty to perform, and it occurs to me that what we shall do with regard to this measure depends very largely upon what we view to be our duty and responsibility under the circumstances. This being the case, I would like to propound this query to gentlemen on this side of the Chamber.

Had this measure come as an original product of the labors of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, had they initiated the legislation and presented it to us without opportunity to amend, how many votes would there have been on this side of the Chamber for the measure when the vote came upon its passage? In my opinion, very few. On the other hand, is there anyone who in the wildest flight of fancy can picture a condition under which the Democratic majority, elected on the promises that temporarily swept them into power, would upon their own motion and their own volition have presented to the House this measure in its present form? Had anything of that kind occurred, had this been the handiwork and product of a Democratic Ways and Means Committee of the House, and presented without the opportunity of amendment, how many votes would there have been for it on that side of the Chamber? And, gentlemen, our duty and responsibility is in nowise lessened or affected by the fact that this "pact," as it is called on the other side—and it is "packed" with disaster to American industries, from start to finish—that this pact did not originate in the House of Representatives, where under the Constitution it should and by the law it must originate, but originated elsewhere. Our duty remains the same as though it had originated in a constitutional way and been presented in the ordinary course of business. Whatever others may think about it, Mr. Chairman, I shall deem it my duty, touching this measure, to vote against it, as I would have voted against it had it originated in a committee of this body.

NOT TRUE RECIPROCITY.

This is called a reciprocity agreement; but who ever heard of a reciprocity agreement in competing articles? That is a curious and jaundiced view of reciprocity which says to the farmers along 3,000 miles of our border, "You must surrender your magnificent markets to your only formidable competitor, because, forsooth, the Canadian Government proposes to lower the duty on coal for the benefit of its own people in central Canada." What sort of reciprocity is that which assumes that the stockmen throughout the length and breadth of the land shall be pleased with the arrangement because, while their industry is to suffer from the competition of all of the surplus of Canadian live stock, at the same time and in the same pact the Canadian Government is endeavoring to give its people cheaper cottonseed oil and early tomatoes? There is no reciprocity in the measure from a Republican standpoint, but rather the surrender of the markets of our farmers and stockmen in the hope of helping not them but other classes of our citizens.

AS TO "SPECIAL INTERESTS."

Few arguments have been made for the measure, that I have heard; but in lieu of arguments there has been a lot of declamation, and some gentlemen have suggested that we should support the measure because certain "special interests" are said to be against it.

The only "special interest" I have heard from that is against the measure unanimously and everywhere is the special interest upon which rest the foundations of this Republic, the special interest which is the bone and the sinew, the hope and the defense of the Union—the farmers and the stockmen of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But while we are talking about "special interests," let us not forget that there are powerful special interests moving heaven and earth in its support. For instance, there is the special interest that speaks every day with a million tongues that is for the pact because of the hope that it will give them, the great newspapers, temporarily at least, cheaper print paper, though it may destroy American industries employing tens of

thousands of American workingmen. Great railroad systems on both sides of the international boundary are for it because it will increase their business. Great coal interests in Pennsylvania and West Virginia are for it because they indulge the fond hope that of the 8 cents reduction in the Canadian coal duty they will get a small crumb; I hope they, at least, will not be disappointed, for they are the only American citizens who can ever get any benefits under this bill without injury to their fellow citizens. The great milling interests are for it because they believe it will help their business.

WORSE THAN IT APPEARS.

The agreement is bad enough on its face in all conscience—the surrender of five millions of duty upon the remission by Canada of half that sum; the surrender of the splendid market of 92,000,000 people in the hope of obtaining the uncertain market of 7,500,000 people, 65 per cent of which we already have in spite of the preferential tariffs in favor of other countries. But these facts, writ in letters so plain that he who runs may read and the wayfaring man, though a fool, may not err therein, tell only half of the story. The fact is that for those products to which we give free entry into our ports we furnish an absolutely unlimited market, while as to those products for which Canada gives us free trade or a lower duty we either have the market now or conditions are such that it is utterly impossible for us to increase our trade there.

Does anyone doubt who understands the great grain and milling business of the country that with this agreement in force all the surplus of Canadian wheat will come through our ports, and that, great exporting nation that we are, we will purchase all those grains and give them the benefit of our splendid channels of export, and that the same thing will occur with regard to live stock? As for print paper we will furnish an unlimited market. And what do we get in return? A reduction of the duty on cottonseed oil, a slight reduction of the duty on coal, reductions that by no possibility can be of any advantage to American citizens or extend American trade.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

But the gentlemen have said that we must not mind that, that this pact or agreement was entered into for the purpose and with the expectation of reducing the high cost of living, and that it will have a wonderful effect in that direction.

A month ago it might have been worth while to have spent some time arguing against that proposition, but it is scarcely necessary now, for the proponents of the measure have themselves been spending all the time they have spent in argument in trying to prove that they did not mean what they originally said and to assure us that by no possibility can the tearing down of the tariff wall as against Canadian products reduce the price of American farm produce. Ah, the trouble is the gentlemen started in originally to prove too much, and now they are endeavoring to prove too much in the other direction. The fact is that this agreement will not furnish the ultimate consumer any product of the farm, the mine, or the forest cheaper than he is now obtaining it, but will largely reduce the income of the American producer in those lines.

Everyone who knows anything about the farming business knows that a difference of 10, 15, or 20 cents a bushel in the price of a farmer's wheat means the difference between a fair profit and absolute loss. We all know that the difference of a dollar or $2 a head in cattle or of 50 cents or a dollar a head for sheep means to the stockman the difference between success and disaster. And yet who is there who believes that such reductions would ever reach the table of the ultimate consumer or benefit those who consume the products?

Wheat must pass through the hands of the miller, the jobber, the retailer, and to the baker, and the difference in price, which to the Dakota farmer spells ruin, will never be discovered in the price of the loaf of bread upon the table of the consumer. Cattle and sheep must go to the packing house and pay heavy freight charges on the way, pass on to the jobbers, to the butchers, and finally come to the table of the consumer; and a reduction in price, which to the stock growers in my country means disaster, will never be noted in the price which the consumer pays for the product in the butcher shops of the country.

ENCOURAGING CANADIAN DEVELOPMENT.

There is an objection to this agreement which appeals very strongly to the people of the intermountain States who are desirous of seeing their country settled and developed. For a number of years past there has been a strong tide of immigration from the United States into the Canadian northwest; mostly of substantial farmers and business men of some means, the very classes we need the most for the settlement and development of our region. These people have been passing through our territory by the thousands, lured to Canada by extensive advertising, setting forth the liberality of Canadian land laws compared with ours and therefore the better opportunity of securing a home and a farm cheaply. This agreement, providing, as it does, that the immigrant to the Canadian northwest shall enjoy additional advantages by having free access to our markets for his produce and his live stock, will tend to further encourage and increase the settlement of Canada by American farmers, thus retarding and delaying the settlement and development of our Intermountain States.

I take off my hat to the gentlemen who, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, negotiated this treaty. [Applause on the Republican side.] No longer may the Yankee pride himself on being the great trader of the world. I commend to him our Canadian cousin. Those gentlemen knew the trade and industries of their country, and they drew an agreement every line of which gave them the advantage of the wonderful markets of the most wonderful country on earth in exchange for seeming advantages in the markets of a land where, in spite of all preferential tariffs against us, we now practically control all the markets worth while.

INTERESTING DETAILS.

Here is an illustration of one of the minor matters not overlooked in this pact. Up on our northern boundary, west of Lake Superior, is a great railway line, and the heroic builder of that great overland system is an exceedingly earnest supporter of this measure. That railroad is, I believe, the largest single importer of coal from Canada into the United States. Under the Dingley bill the duty on lump or run-of-mine bituminous coal was 62 cents and on slack or fine coal 15 cents per ton.

It so happened that by certain Treasury decisions the importer of coal came to receive the slack rate upon an estimate of all the fine coal in every shipment, with the result that the importer was only paying the higher rate upon about two-thirds of our importations.

This, of course, was a fraud on the Treasury, for commercially slack is the fine dust, cuttings, and broken coal produced in the process of mining and screening. It is sold at a low price. Oftentimes there is no market for it, but at any rate it is always cheap compared with commercial grades of coal selling at from one-fifth to one-third of the price; therefore this being a cheap product is entitled to a comparatively low rate. Under the Treasury ruling referred to, however, the importer received the slack rate on as great an amount of every shipment of the higher priced coal as he could badger the customs officials into accepting as being fine enough to pass through a half-inch screen. In order to put an end to this practice a provision was placed in the Payne bill in which the rate on coal was reduced to 45 cents per ton and the slack rate remained at 15 cents, to the effect that the slack rate should only apply to slack produced at the mine and shipped as such; and behold, the percentage of slack in our importations decreased from about one-third to about one-sixth or less of the total importations, though the same proportion of actual slack was imported as before. In this agreement we find a provision which, while it does not change the slack rate, does restore the language of the Dingley bill.

The railroad to which I refer imports, I think, about three-quarters of a million tons of coal a year, and if under this change of phraseology we shall go back to the old practice under the same language, I estimate that the difference in duty paid will amount to a very neat sum of money per annum, possibly somewhere between $60,000 and $75,000 on the importations of that one railway.

This is only one of the details which indicate that while no one here seems to have known anything about the details of this agreement during the time that it was under consideration, yet some interested people must have known much about it during the days of its negotiation.

REVIVAL OF DOCTRINE OF MACHIAVELLI.

Mr. Chairman, if I had time I should like to go into the agreement in some considerable detail, but my time is brief, and I want to close by referring to the fact that the consideration of this measure has developed a very remarkable philosophy, a philosophy pronounced and promulgated some centuries ago in Florence, but against which the good sense and the fairness of the world rebelled, a philosophy at this late date resurrected and reincarnated, apparently to serve the purposes of a temporary majority on the other side of the aisle. This philosophy has been stated in varying terms by several gentlemen on the other side, among them the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KONOP]. But the gentleman who most clearly stated it to the House was the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] in his speech to the House when this measure was for-

merly under consideration. Before I refer to what he said, I want to refresh your memory with the fact that it has been admitted by speakers who are defending the measure on both sides of the Chamber that it is unfair, unjust, inequitable, and full of inequalities, but nevertheless ought to be passed. This is the contribution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania:

> Again, while many features of the agreement reached by the parties will work injury, at least temporary, and possibly injustice to some particular sections of each country, if the common good of the entire people of either country is subserved by the agreement as a whole, it is the part of statesmanship for the Government of the country so affected to disregard the local or sectional disadvantages and injuries and consider only the total net result of the contract.
>
> THE COMMON GOOD.

When did it happen, gentlemen, that the common good was ought else but the sum of individual and local well-being? When did it occur that common good could be founded upon inequality, upon injustice, upon the destruction of industry? When was it considered good governmental policy to sacrifice a part of the people for the benefit of others? Not since the days of Machiavelli, whose name has become synonymous with that discredited philosophy which would sacrifice a large portion of the people in the hope of benefiting others. According to this philosophy, American citizens, American industries, American communities are to be considered as pawns upon the chessboard, to be sacrificed without mercy and without consideration if by their sacrifice some temporary gain shall be had in a desperate political game. From this doctrine of Machiavelli, from this doctrine of selfishness and injustice I appeal to the Republican doctrine of true reciprocity and protection for all citizens and all industries. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, under Republican reciprocity the people of both countries, of both peoples to the agreement, are benefited, and no one is injured. Under Republican reciprocity and protection the benefits extend to every citizen and every industry. We seek the common good, not through injustice and discrimination, but through benefits conferred upon all alike, by surrounding this great Nation with its high standard of living, with its high-wage scale, with its splendid opportunities, on all sides by the tariff wall of protection, without which you can not keep out the inundating tides of the products of pauper labor and peon conditions and maintain American standards and promote American ideals. From the new doctrine of the temporary majority on that side—that it is proper and right to sacrifice American communities here and there, in the vain hope that other American communities may prosper thereby—I appeal to the beneficent policy that for the last 50 years, under the leadership of the Republican Party, has built up, established, and maintained here the most universally prosperous conditions ever known among men. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, I belong to that verdant class known as the new Members. I recognize the courtesies and precedents of this floor, which dictate that new Members should be seen and not heard, and I came here with a chastened resolve to respect that custom; but the course of this debate has simply made it impossible for me to keep still, and this is my only explanation or apology for fracturing a custom or breaking my own chaste and strong resolves.

I come from a section of the country where agriculture is its principal source of wealth. While we are not all farmers in Iowa, we all realize that it is impossible to injure the agricultural interests without affecting every department of business.

This fact makes this situation embarrassing to me. I am a firm believer in Canadian reciprocity, and for years have been a humble advocate of it on the prairies of Iowa. I advocated it, however, because I believed that it would be of benefit to the agricultural interests of my State; that it would have a tendency at least to break the power of some large organizations that had monopolized the American market, and were exacting unreasonable prices from the farmer. I never advocated it for the purpose or with the hope that it would reduce the price of agricultural products.

I am now puzzled with the dilemma of supporting or opposing a measure that represents the principles I have advocated, but so applied as to produce exactly opposite results from what I had intended should be accomplished by it.

Instead of putting upon the free list the articles of monopolistic manufacture in this country, this bill safely protects and guards them, while the agricultural products alone are made to feel the withering effect of free competition with the cheap, fertile fields of Canada. The advocates of this bill now have the affrontery to tell us that because we have been advocating reciprocity we are now getting just what we asked for. They seem to overlook the fact that we asked for bread and they have given us a stone, or, at least, a lemon.

They pass the bottle with the good old label on it, but the real thing has been removed and the bottle has been refilled with a bitter concoction, and when some are disposed to make faces and grimaces they simply point with an assuring smile to the good old label.

Now, even in Iowa, prohibition Iowa, I am not quite certain that all of her people would be satisfied with a mere label, and I am suspicious that the constituents of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Kentucky would not be satisfied with mere labels, however assuring or inspiring. We are not satisfied with a bottle labeled "reciprocity," we want some of the real thing in it.

My objection to the Payne tariff bill was not so much that the duties were too high, but that they were adjusted in such a manner as to be unfair; unfair, if you please, to the great agricultural Middle West, of which my State is a part.

I never could see any justification in putting hides upon the free list while retaining the products manufactured from them upon the protected list.

The farmers of my section of the country, however, were consoled by the assurance that if they allowed the tariff to be taken from hides that they would be recompensed for their loss by an equal or greater reduction in the price of boots, shoes, and other leather products which they bought.

The agricultural West has certainly waked up and found that they were handed a lemon in that matter. While hides have steadily gone down, boots, shoes, and all other leather products have speedily gone up. While being compelled to sell their own products for less, they are compelled to pay more for what they buy. They have been hit both coming and going.

Now, gentlemen, that is unfair. I find lurking in this proposed reciprocity agreement the same element of unfairness. In fact, it is accentuated. The Payne bill only puts hides on the free list. This measure, now fathered by the majority, puts not only hides, but hoofs, horns, and tail, and all between on the free list, and still leaves boots and shoes on the protected list. Can anyone tell me why wheat should be on the free list and flour on the protected list? Are not the millers of this country, with their large capital, extended experience, splendid mills, and latest improved machinery as able to compete with the millers of Canada in the manufacture of flour as are the farmers of the United States able to compete with the farmers of Canada? If not, why not?

The tenets of my party prescribe that we shall have a tariff sufficiently high to equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. Every man, I believe, who has spoken upon this subject in this Congress or the last, has admitted that the cost of production of wheat is less in Canada than in the United States. Why is not wheat, under the tenets of our party, entitled to that much protection? Practically every man who has spoken upon the subject, either at this session of Congress or the last, has admitted that articles could be manufactured in this country, on the whole, as cheaply as they could in Canada. If this is true, the tenets of our party, honestly applied, would remove protection from manufactured articles rather than from agricultural products.

The advocates of this measure make this strong argument in its defense on the ground that it will bring cheaper food to the laboring man. If that is the real object, why should there be protection upon flour? The laboring men of this country eat flour, not wheat. [Applause.]

It is plain that there is a combination between the large milling interests of this country to maintain prices on flour. If that is true, what advantage can the consumer of flour receive by an agreement that allows wheat to be bought by the miller cheaper but protects him from competition? The miller can still hold his price just as high as he did before.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman vote with us for free flour?

Mr. PROUTY. With Canada?

Mr. HARDY. Yes; and with the balance of the world.

Mr. PROUTY. No, sir.

Again, if the stock raisers of this country are compelled to raise cattle and sell them in competition with those raised in Canada, why should not the American packer be compelled to sell meat products in competition with the Canadian packer? Is it possible that the American packer can not compete with the Canadian packer, if he gets cattle at the same price?

What are the conditions which make it necessary to protect the packer and leave the stock raiser open to the effects of competition?

It is not an idle guess that the great packers of this country are in a conspiracy to maintain prices and throttle competition in this country. They are under indictment for that very act, and the only defense that they have so far offered is that they have been at it so long that it is now barred by the statute of limitation, and that the Government knew it so well that it is now entrapped. [Laughter.] Is the Government under obligations, while prosecuting them for conspiracy, to maintain prices to shield them from foreign competition so that they may be able to hold up prices? Our recently elected United States Senator from Iowa is going to stop at Chicago on his way from Des Moines to Washington long enough to put some of those fellows in the penitentiary. [Laughter.] What good will that do the consumer if the monopoly is still protected?

I would like for some one to show us how it will make cheaper beef to the consumer if the packers have a monopoly. If they have a monopoly, as soon as cattle come into their possession, whether from Canada or the United States, they are subject to the same conditions, and they can, they have, and they will fix the price to the consumer with very little regard to the original cost of cattle.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, but I can not spare the time.

If the United States is going to secure cheaper meat products to the laboring men of this country, they must devise a system that will maintain competition not only at the point of production, but clear up to the point of consumption. If they want to help the laboring man, they must keep in mind that laboring men eat beef, not cattle; they eat pork, not hogs; they eat mutton, not sheep. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.] Why, then, put upon the free list the things they do not use and leave protected the things they do?

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. HARDY. I want to answer the gentleman.

Mr. PROUTY. No; not answer. That should be in the gentleman's own time, not mine.

Mr. HARDY. I want to say that we do not think it necessary to give a duty on meat; that we favor free meat, too.

Mr. PROUTY. Why, then, do you not put it in the measure that you propose to railroad through with the gentle assistance of the steam roller?

Mr. HARDY. Because we know that some of you on that side want to kill the treaty by adding something that will not go through. That is, it will that way be held in the Senate. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PROUTY. Again, if by this reciprocity treaty it was intended to furnish cheaper lumber to the farmer as an offset for those losses that he sustains, it, in a large measure, fails in its purpose. While it puts rough lumber on the free list, it leaves all kinds of manufactured lumber still on the protected list. Everyone familiar with the consumption of lumber in this country knows that by far the greater per cent of it is used in manufactured form; that is, it is planed on one side or both; on one edge or both edges; grooved, flanged, or otherwise prepared. This necessarily must be done by the mills. The rough lumber will therefore be bought by the mills in Canada, and before distribution in the United States, as is claimed, the lumber of Canada will be subject to the same conditions as the American product is now. While it will enable the mills to secure cheaper rough lumber, I fail to see how it will assist very materially in enabling the ultimate consumer to receive cheaper dressed or otherwise manufactured lumber. Take the duty off all kinds of lumber, and then you will enable the farmer to get cheaper lumber, because it will enable the Canadian mills to ship their product direct to the farmyard in the United States, and thus avoid the combination of the American lumbermen.

It is claimed that the manufacture and sale of agricultural implements in this country is monopolized; that one concern controls the trade. Can anyone tell me why the Government is under obligations to protect their product from competition while leaving exposed to competition the man who uses them? Can anyone give me a rational reason why the man who makes the plow should be protected more than the man behind the plow?

The Government has recently indicted and is pressing for trial the members of the Bathtub Trust.

This is a trust that controls plumbers' supplies in the United States. What justification can there be for the Government to prosecute these people for combination to maintain prices and at the same time afford them protection from competition so that they may maintain prices? I venture the assertion that the removal of the duty on plumbing material would do more in a nighttime to destroy that trust than all the grand juries and district attorneys could do in 10 years.

The reason I am not satisfied with section 3 in the bill proposed by the majority is because it is indefinite. It does not declare for any policy. It simply authorizes and requests the President to continue negotiations, without marking out any course along which these negotiations should proceed. I believe it is not only within the province but it is the duty of Congress, as the representatives of the people, to declare for a national policy.

If it is the judgment of this Congress that the President of the United States should continue negotiations for the purpose of putting upon the free list pumpkins, turnips, and popcorn—which seem by accident to have been omitted from the free list—let us do so; but if, on the other hand, we believe these negotiations should be continued with the view to putting on the free list some articles which would, in a measure, compensate the agricultural interests of this country, let us have the courage to do so.

In the substitute I shall offer for section 3 I have described with detail the articles that I believe should be put upon the free list, if it is intended to secure compensating benefits to the agricultural interests of this country. If the amendment I offer shall carry, I believe it will compensate the farmers of my section of the country sufficiently to warrant me in supporting the measure; but if it is not so amended, I shall be constrained to vote against it.

I can easily understand and comprehend the situation on that side of the House [pointing to the Democratic side]. Its majority and leadership come from a section of the country whose staple products will not be affected materially by this measure. They can not raise cotton, cane, rice, or peanuts in Canada. But I apprehend that if there was a large and fertile tract of land skirting the Southern States where these commodities would grow better and could be raised cheaper than in their own territory, and it was proposed to tear down the tariff wall, we would be permitted to witness girations and contortions on that side of the House [pointing to the Democratic side] that we will not be permitted to see to-day.

In the high and patriotic ideals of Democracy there still seems to be room for the homely rule "that it makes a difference whose ox is gored." But I wish to remind the gentlemen from the South of the eternal truth that "what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander." If we of the North are to furnish free popcorn for the boys of the South, you gentlemen of the South should furnish free peanuts to our girls of the North.

There are some men on this side of the House [pointing to the Republican side] who are opposed to this measure for exactly the opposite reason that I am. They fear that it will establish a precedent that will lead to the including of manufactured articles as well as agricultural articles in the free list with Canada. I am frank to say to you that if I were sure that it would lead to that result I would favor it.

I might be able to say to my agricultural friends in Iowa that while they had lost in the price of the product they had for sale they were perhaps reaping a substantially equal benefit from the reduced price of the things they had to buy.

The agricultural districts of the United States are simply asking for justice, not favors. They simply insist that that which they sell and that which they buy must be either on the free list or on the protected list. Now, that is fair.

The agricultural interests of this country have been held to the cause of protection from the time of the institution of the system by the argument that it was to the advantage of the farmer to build up a home market; that is, to bring the factory alongside the farm. With full belief in that theory, and with full faith in their Government that when they had once built up that market they would be allowed to preserve it for themselves, the agricultural interests of this country have for more than half a century borne the burden of protecting American manufactures, and I can not help but feel that it is grossly unfair to this industry to take away this market, that their own sacrifice has built up, and open it up to the foreigners, who never contributed a dollar for its upbuilding, and just at a time when the conditions of national production and trade makes this market of special advantage and interest to the American farmer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentlemen who are now offering this bill seem to admit its unfairness to the American farmer, for they announce that they have another bill putting upon the free list most or all the items of which I have made complaint. Now, these gentlemen know that while that measure may possibly pass the House it can not pass in its present form the Senate, and if perchance

it should pass both Houses of Congress it can not pass the veto of the President. And this Congress will adjourn with farm products on the free list and everything the farmers buy still on the protected list. The gentlemen in charge of these measures know that. But they only smile, and think it a good joke on the Republicans. It may be a good joke on the Republicans, but it is a hard one on the farmer.

While there are many things in that bill for which I should be glad to vote, there are some things in it that will prevent its receiving my approval. I might be willing, as a reciprocal arrangement, to have the American farmer put in competition with the Canadian farmer, but I am not yet willing to allow the American farmer to come into competition with the world.

This bill, which they have designated as the "farmers' free-list" bill, puts upon the free list beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all kinds of meat. This would throw the American farmer into direct competition, not merely with Canada, but with Mexico, Argentine Republic, and the other countries to the south of us, where everybody knows cattle can be raised for less than one-half what they can in this country. If you will take the tariff off the beef and mutton from the Argentine Republic, it will drive the product of Iowa, Illinois, and Nebraska from the markets of all the eastern cities. Right now mutton in refrigeration is being shipped from Argentina into the New York markets, and after paying a duty of a dollar and a half per hundred is still able to compete with the American product. How long would it take to drive out the American mutton if the tariff was removed?

The reason I favor putting these matters in the reciprocity agreement is that we could not include it in the general tariff law and make it applicable to Canada alone. This would be a violation of what is known as the "favored nations" clause in our treaties with the principal nations of the world. It could be put into a reciprocal agreement with Canada without opening up the markets of the South. American farmers could probably stand the competition from the north, but they are not able to stand the competition of the south, and for that reason I am not able to give my support.

The reason I do not like this treaty is that it is unfair to the agricultural industry of this country. It puts upon the free list practically everything that the farmer produces and puts scarcely nothing on the free list that he consumes. Now, this is unfair. Very many able men have, however, said upon this floor that this reciprocity agreement would not materially injure the farmers; that it would not reduce the price of their commodities. That may be true, but I am afraid of it. To say the least, it is experimental, and it seems to me that it is time some of these experiments should be tried on some other department of industry.

This whole situation reminds me of a condition that existed in a certain family in the neighborhood of my early childhood. There was a wealthy and aristocratic family that had an unfortunate, demented girl. Her name was Sally. Everybody called her "Silly Sally." The family used her as a kind of an experimental station. When they had a mess of greens, and were not quite certain whether they were mustard or poison weed, they first tried them on Sally. If they had a mess of parsnips and were not quite certain whether they were tame or wild, they first tried them on Sally. If they had edibles from the timber and were a little bit in doubt as to whether they were toadstools or mushrooms, they tried them on Sally, and if they did not kill her, then the rest of the family partook. Poor Sally, even in her demented condition, finally comprehended the purposes for which she was being used, and one day in her desperation kicked over a pan of real mushrooms.

Now, I want to serve a notice—a mild and possibly verdant notice—upon the Members of both sides of this House, that the American farmer is getting rather tired of playing the rôle of "Silly Sally," and is now demanding that these experiments, or some of them at least, be tried on other members of the family. [Long laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration provides for the approval of the so-called Canadian reciprocity treaty. If this bill becomes a law and the Canadian Parliament enacts corresponding legislation, the agricultural products of Canada will be admitted into the United States free of duty, our farmers will be placed in direct competition with the farmers of Canada, and agriculture, the most important industry in the United States, will be robbed of any direct benefit from our protective-tariff policy.

This measure comes to us with the indorsement of a Republican President. I entertain the highest regard for our present Chief Executive, the Hon. William Howard Taft. I have confidence in his judgment, respect for his opinion, admiration for his ability, faith in his sincerity of purpose, and recognize that in negotiating this trade agreement and in urging its approval he has been actuated by the purest of motives, with no other object in view than to render to his country and countrymen the highest service possible. I regret exceedingly that in this matter I can not follow his leadership.

Free trade in farm products with Canada will result in irreparable loss to the farmers of the United States. Agriculture is the foundation of our wealth, the bedrock on which rests our industrial fabric, the pillar that upholds our free institutions, and the mainstay of our national strength and greatness.

Depression in agriculture means paralysis in trade transportation, mining, and manufacturing. Prosperity to the 10,000,000 persons employed on our 6,000,000 farms means prosperity to all—prosperity to the 5,000,000 persons employed in trade, commerce, and transportation; prosperity to the 7,000,000 persons employed in mechanical pursuits and manufacturing establishments; prosperity to the 1,000,000 employed in our mines; prosperity to the 5,000,000 persons employed in personal and unclassified service; and prosperity to the one and a quarter million of persons employed in professional pursuits.

Any legislation, any national policy that lays the hand of adversity upon the farmers of our country, will start in motion a great tidal wave of disaster, that will go on and on, increasing in force, until it envelops every industry and business in the land.

Canadian reciprocity as exemplified by the proposed legislation has not been in recent times an issue before the American people. It was not an issue in the campaign of 1908. It was not an issue in the campaign of 1910. No national convention of any political party has made a declaration thereon. Senators and Representatives in this Congress, as a rule, were not elected on this issue. We have not discussed this question before our constituents. It is a new question. The facts have not been presented to the people. The farmers and others who feel that this measure would affect them injuriously have had no opportunity to be heard. No intelligent, trustworthy public sentiment has been formed on the subject. In great questions like this, affecting vitally the national interests of the people, Congress should follow public opinion. It is our duty to crystallize public sentiment into law. As Representatives in Congress there is no safer guide for us than the will of the people. In this matter no man can say he is following public sentiment, for no real public sentiment has been formed. Without an intelligent public sentiment to guide us, without opportunity to fairly discuss this question before the American people, the advocates of this measure propose to enact legislation that will be more far-reaching in its influence upon the business interests of this country than any other law that has been passed since the close of the great Civil War.

There is no emergency calling for immediate action. Our country is facing no crisis. No great national peril confronts us. We are at peace with the people of Canada and with all the rest of the world. Times are good. Our workmen are employed at good wages. Internal commerce is flourishing. Our railways are busy. Our industries are active. The country is prosperous. Under these conditions it is unwise to hastily enter upon a long voyage of doubt and uncertainty, knowing not whether we shall land in a harbor of peace and safety or go down in a wreck that will be the result of our own folly and madness.

FARMERS' WORK IN BUILDING NEW STATE.

I have no apology to offer for standing here in defense of my farmer constituents. I was born and reared on a farm. I know something of the difficulties with which the farmer contends. I know from personal experience the hardships he must endure, and the struggle he must make to maintain himself and family.

Twenty-two years ago to-day I stood on the border, near the line between Kansas and Oklahoma. I was waiting for the gun to be fired at 12 o'clock noon, April 22, 1889, giving the signal for the start in the first great race for homes in the new promised land of Oklahoma. With that great rush I went into the new Territory and have resided there continuously ever since. In this 22 years I have been intimately associated with the farmers of that country. I know the sacrifices our homesteaders have made in the founding and building of the new State of Oklahoma. I know that it has been through the industry, the toil, the sacrifices, the persistence, the pluck, energy, and intelligence of our farmers that Oklahoma has attained such eminence in wealth and population and has made such a splendid record in the building of homes, churches, and schools, and in the founding of social and political institutions.

CONSTITUENTS IN CITIES.

All my constituents are not farmers. Oklahoma City, within my congressional district, contains 70,000 or 80,000 population. I have many smaller cities. I owe to my constituents residing in the towns and cities the same consideration that I do those residing upon the farms. I can not, however, comprehend how I can help those residing in cities by injuring those who reside in the country. Oklahoma is essentially an agricultural State. The merchants, bankers, clerks, professional classes, as well as all those engaged in mechanical pursuits, manufacturing and transportation, must realize that they are dependent for their own prosperity on the prosperity of our farmers. I am informed that in Oklahoma City there are nearly 5,000 men who are members of trade unions and labor organizations. But not a single one of these men has written me asking me to support this trade agreement with Canada.

GYPSUM ON FREE LIST.

Before I discuss this bill as to its general effect upon our country, I desire to register my objection to the provision that places crude gypsum upon the free list. I regard this provision a discrimination against Oklahoma, and especially against the industrial interests of the second congressional district. There are gypsum deposits in 16 States of the Union and also in Arizona and New Mexico. But in no State are the deposits so abundant and of such excellent quality as in the State of Oklahoma. The greater portion of this lies in my congressional district. The use of gypsum has largely increased in recent years. In 1897 there were but 188,000 tons of gypsum produced in the United States, while in 1909, only 12 years later, 2,252,785 tons were produced. The value of the product in 1909 was $5,906,738. The use of gypsum is being rapidly extended, and in view of the abundance of the deposit in the United States it is apparent that the further extension of its use will prove a blessing to mankind. Under the Dingley tariff law, approved in 1897, a tariff of 50 cents per ton was placed on crude gypsum. This was the first duty that was ever levied upon gypsum. Under this law there were large importations of gypsum from Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Cape Breton, Canada. This gypsum was not manufactured in Canada, but brought down by cheap water transportation to gypsum mills in New York and other ports along the northeastern Atlantic coast line. These manufacturers and the owners of gypsum beds in Canada demanded that gypsum be placed on the free list. Under the bill as reported from the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and as it finally passed the House, the duty on gypsum was reduced from 50 cents to 40 cents per ton. But this was further reduced by the Senate bill to 20 cents per ton; but as the bill finally became a law the duty on crude gypsum was fixed at 30 cents per ton.

The reduction of the duty on gypsum resulted in about 20 per cent increase in the imports of crude gypsum in the year 1909 compared with the year 1908. With crude gypsum on the free list the importations of crude gypsum from Canada will largely increase. This will mean that just so much less of our own gypsum will be mined, manufactured, and consumed in the United States. In 1910 the United States collected over $100,000 in duty upon crude gypsum. The placing of gypsum on the free list will rob the Treasury of that much revenue. Canada will be several hundred thousand dollars richer in disposing of an increased amount of her crude gypsum. But the people who consume gypsum products in building and other purposes will get gypsum products no cheaper, as the gypsum mills of New York and other eastern cities will have in that section a monopoly of the trade.

My State, and especially my congressional district, has an inexhaustible supply of gypsum. In my district there are now some eight or nine gypsum mills in which large capital has been invested. These mills give employment to a large number of persons. It requires no argument to show that the increase in the importation of Canadian gypsum into the United States will decrease the demand for the products of the gypsum mills of Oklahoma, retard the expansion of the industry, and reduce the amount paid out for wages. In brief, free gypsum from Canada will to some extent at least injure the gypsum industry of my congressional district, and this is one of the reasons why I can not vote for the so-called reciprocity treaty with Canada.

GENERAL PROPOSITIONS.

Before we pass this bill we may well pause and consider what results must follow if this reciprocal trade agreement shall be put in operation.

First. How will it affect the farmers of the Untied States?

Second. How will it affect the farmers of Canada?

Third. How will it affect the masses of the nonfarming population of the United States?

Fourth. Who will reap the chief benefits from Canadian reciprocity?

Fifth. The general effect and influence this new policy will have upon us as a Nation.

RECIPROCITY WILL INJURE OUR FARMERS.

Free trade with Canada in agricultural products will inevitably injure the American farmer. There is no escape from the result.

If the proposed reciprocal trade agreement shall be put in force, its effect upon the farmer of the United States may be summarized as follows:

1. Reduction in the extent of his market.
2. Reduction in the price of his products.
3. Reduction in the value of his land.
4. Reduction in his annual profits.
5. Reduction in his ability to support his family.
6. Reduction in his value as a citizen.

These results are so certain, sure, and inevitable that they seem to be outside the realm of discussion. We can not, of course, determine to what extent these reductions will be made. But reductions all along the line will come.

REDUCTION IN MARKET.

First. There will be a reduction in the market of the farmers of the United States. This proposition needs no argument. There are over 90,000,000 of people in the United States. Two-thirds of these people are nonfarming population. These people are customers of the farmers. Through their ability to consume, the market of our farmers is created. With this law in effect the farmers of this country must divide their customers with the farmers of Canada. This means a reduction in the number of customers which our farmers now have. It means a division in the market. If you divide this market, you make it smaller. Our farmers can not give away part of what they have and still retain all they have.

REDUCTION IN PRICE OF PRODUCTS.

Second. There will be a reduction in the price of our farm products. This will come, first, as the result of increased competition, and, second, under the inexorable decree of the law of supply and demand. Free trade in Canadian farm products will place our farmers in direct competition with Canadian farmers. Free competition always means lower prices. Competition, even on equality of conditions, may mean loss. Even if our farmers have equally as good conditions, there is still danger in competition. There would still be the absolute certainty that this competition must, from the nature of things, reduce the prices of the products of our farmers. The very object and purpose of the tariff on farm products is to relieve our farmers from foreign competition. The assertion, so often repeated, that the tariff upon farm products does not in any way affect the price of these products is untrue. There are two markets for everything we produce—the home market and the foreign or world's market. The protective tariff protects the farmer in the home market. It gives him that market practically free from competition abroad. Our home market is the best market in the world, because the customers in that market have the ability to buy and to pay good prices. With the home market largely free from competition, our farmers are then better equipped to go into the world's market and compete with all other nations in disposing of their surplus products.

The protective tariff affects the farmer in precisely the same way that it affects the manufacturer. It is said that the price of wheat in Liverpool fixes the price of wheat paid to our farmers. I do not concede this proposition. Our manufacturers sell their surplus products abroad. In 1909 our manufacturers, in finished products, sold in the world's markets goods valued at $440,229,407. They had to compete with the manufacturers of all other nations in the markets of the world. They met these foreign competitors in prices, in quality of goods, and in ability as salesmen. But no one pretends that these foreign markets where our manufacturers sell their surplus products control the prices our manufacturers receive at home.

If Canadian farm products come into our market free of duty, importations will be largely increased. In other words, the supply of farm products in our markets will be largely increased. There will, however, be no corresponding increase in the demand for these products. Then the law of supply and demand comes in and decrees that the price must go down. We may repeal the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, but neither the Congress of the United States nor the Imperial Parliament of Canada or Great Britain can repeal the law of supply and demand in its effect upon prices.

REDUCTION IN VALUE OF FARM LANDS.

Third. There will be a reduction in the price of farm lands in the United States. The price of farm products is the greatest factor in measuring the value of the land. This is demonstrated by what has taken place in the last 15 years in this country. There has been a large increase in the price of all farm products and a corresponding increase in the price of farm lands.

Eleven years ago the total value of our annual agricultural products was but $4,417,000,000. In 1909 these products in value reached the enormous sum of $9,000,000,000. In the meantime there had been a large increase in the value of farm lands, this per cent of increase being practically in the same ratio as the increase in the value of agricultural products.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOUSTON). Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to ask the gentleman one question. The gentleman says it would affect the price of the farmer's products in this country. How would it affect the price of the farmer's products in this country if this reciprocity measure were adopted?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the effect would be to make prices lower; it will put them down.

Mr. CULLOP. Are prices in Canada lower than they are here?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that prices in Canada, as a rule, are lower on farm products than they are in the United States.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I can not stop for a number of questions.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to be right, and I suppose the gentleman does——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. MORGAN. For one more question.

Mr. CULLOP. Wheat was quoted yesterday at Winnipeg, Canada, at 93 cents a bushel and only 86 cents in St. Louis. Now, would the higher price of wheat in Canada lower the American farmer's price?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know what the quotations were yesterday at St. Louis; but, generally, wheat in the United States averages in price about 12 cents per bushel higher than the average price in Canada.

REDUCTION IN PROFITS.

Fourth. There will be a reduction in the profits of the farmers. This follows naturally the other three propositions. A reduction in the farmer's market, a reduction in the price of his products, and a reduction in the value of his land must mean a reduction in his profits.

To what extent the proposed Canadian reciprocity will reduce the general profits of the farmers of the United States no one, of course, can definitely determine. But whether a reduction of these profits be great or small, it will in the aggregate be of utmost importance to the farmers of this country. Last year the total value of our farm products amounted to $9,000,000,000. If the loss should be 1 per cent on the total value of products produced, it would mean a loss of $90,000,000 to the farmers of this country. If the losses amounted to 5 per cent, based upon the total value of farm products, the losses would amount to $450,000,000 per annum. But whatever the loss may be, the Congress of the United States should under no circumstance enact any legislation that means the loss of a single dollar to the farmers of the United States.

REDUCTION IN ABILITY TO SUPPORT HIS FAMILY.

Fifth. Canadian reciprocity will reduce the ability of the farmer of the United States to provide for his family. The welfare of the family of the farmer may well challenge our most earnest consideration. On an average the boys and girls of the farmers of the United States do not have equal opportunity with the boys and girls in the family of the nonfarming population of this country. The family of the farmer is greatly restricted in social, educational, and religious advantages. They are often remote from the school, from the church, and from the social center. These conditions make farm life nonattractive and to a large extent are responsible for the desertion of our farms.

REDUCTION IN VALUE OF THE FARMER AS A CITIZEN.

Sixth. We reduce the value of the farmer as a citizen of the United States. When you have divided and circumscribed the market of the farmers, reduced the prices of his products, reduced the value of his land, curtailed his profits, reduced his ability to provide his family with the necessary comforts and advantages of life, it must then follow that you have thereby made the farmer a less valuable citizen. Not less valuable because the farmer will cease to be patriotic, but because by legislation you have shorn him of the means whereby he might serve his country.

EFFECT ON THE CANADIAN FARMERS.

Having determined what this reciprocity agreement will do to the farmer of the United States, let us briefly consider what effect this trade agreement, if put into force, will have upon the Canadian farmers. Naturally, the very reverse will come to the Canadian farmers. Free trade with Canada in agricultural products will have the following effect upon the Canadian farmer:

1. It will increase and extend his market.
2. It will increase the price of his products.
3. It will increase the value of his land.
4. It will increase his annual profits.
5. It will increase his ability to provide for his family.
6. It will increase his value as a citizen of his country.

Before this bill passes the title of the bill should be amended so as to make it read: "A bill to encourage Canadian agriculture, extend the market of the Canadian farmer, increase the prices of his products, augment the value of his land, magnify his annual profits, and make him a more valuable citizen of the British Empire."

For one I shall cast my vote for the farmers of the United States rather than for the farmers of Canada. I stand for a policy that will extend the market of our farmers, increase the price of their products, augment the value of their land, increase their profits, and make them more independent, prosperous, contented, and happy.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MORGAN. I decline to yield.

Mr. CULLOP. I want to ask you just one other question.

Mr. MORGAN. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I would be glad to do so if I had more time.

EFFECT ON THE NONFARMING POPULATION.

The proposed reciprocal trade agreement will not greatly benefit the great masses of the nonfarming population. The hope of a reduction in the cost of living will not be realized. The high cost of living is not mainly due to the prices the farmer receives for his products. The farm prices of products are not now too high. On the average, the consumer pays double the price the farmer receives. The middlemen are responsible for any exorbitant prices that are paid for food products. The cost of distribution is excessive.

The real difficulty lies in the fact that food products after leaving the farmer's hands too frequently go into the hands of monopoly. The farmers are unorganized. There is free competition between the 6,000,000 of our farmers. Why not Congress strike at the real disease with which our Nation is suffering? Why not enact laws that will control all the private monopolies of our country?

If we have not the power now, let the Constitution be amended so as to give the National Government the power to control our great industrial corporations that have it in their power to control the prices of the necessaries of life. This would be a step in the right direction, and a step that would be effective. Canadian reciprocity, as now proposed, will reduce the prices our farmers receive for their products, but will not reduce the price the consumer pays, because the great corporations fix the prices paid by the consumer. Canadian reciprocity in farm products simply means untold injury to our farmers, with no benefit to the masses of the nonfarming population of this country.

WHERE THE BENEFITS GO.

All will concede that the proposed agreement if ratified would greatly augment the trade and commerce between the two countries. The material advantage from this increased trade in this country must go largely to those engaged in trade and commerce. Transportation companies, manufacturers, and merchants are the persons that will be benefited by this additional trade and commerce. Our great railway lines will be benefited, because it means an increased volume of business. The great cities will be benefited, because there our railways center, and it is from these centers that trade and commerce proceed.

This reciprocity agreement if put into effect means greater dividends for owners of stock in our railways, more business for our merchants in our great cities on the north, and greater profits for that portion of our population engaged in trade and commerce. It means to our great cities lying within reasonable

proximity to the Canadian border more business, increased trade, additional commerce, larger population, enhanced values in real estate, more wealth, and better opportunities in life. These benefits will go to the men of means rather than the poor; to the directors of corporations; to merchants with capital; to men employed at large salaries; and to professional classes. The men employed in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits and by transportation companies will receive no special benefit from the proposed reciprocal trade agreement.

WILL DESTROY OUR INDUSTRIAL INDEPENDENCE.

The United States is to-day the most independent nation on earth. We have the ability to feed and clothe and house and equip our own people. We produce an abundance of all the necessaries of life. From an industrial standpoint we are independent of the world. We lead all other nations in the four great industrial pursuits—internal commerce, mining, manufacturing, and agriculture. We are well balanced in our industrial strength. We were first a nation of farmers. Agriculture was the chief pursuit of our people. That day has passed. Manufacturing has overtaken and surpassed agriculture. Our annual manufactured products are valued at $14,000,000,000; our annual agricultural products are valued at only $9,000,000,000. It is not our manufacturing interests but agriculture that needs encouragement to-day. But instead of encouraging agriculture by this bill you are enacting a law that will depress agriculture.

If we pass this bill and the reciprocal trade agreement shall go into effect, from that time on the United States has lost one of the chief props that makes her to-day the greatest nation on earth. We have lost our industrial independence. We cease to feed our own people. We look to Canada for bread. In peace and in war we look to a foreign nation to supply us with the "staff of life." Think of the folly of a great country like the United States, blessed with a soil and a climate that should always make agriculture her chief industry, giving up in the contest and entering upon the policy of buying her bread from a people that owe allegiance to a foreign flag. If such a policy is to be pursued, if such a result must come, it must come without my vote, without my support, and without my approval.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that I might be able simply to say "Amen" to the splendid sentiments that were so eloquently expressed by the Democratic Member from Massachusetts on the Ways and Means Committee of this House of Representatives [Mr. PETERS], and that has been my purpose during the long time since this debate has been going on. But although I am unable to get in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of to-day a transcript of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, the former Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON] during the course of the debate yesterday said:

> And now I want to say one word more to you men of Massachusetts. I love Massachusetts. She has done more than any other State in shaping the sentiment and promoting the civilization of the Commonwealths of the country; more than any other State in the great Republic. Did you vote for Foss?

That was the query of the former Speaker.

> He was elected. Is that the permanent sentiment of Massachusetts? When the penalty comes, as it will between now and 1912, and consumption and production are narrowed, are you still going to support Foss? Is he your leader?
> This agreement might well be labeled—

Continued Mr. CANNON, in his inimitable manner—

> "By the grace or the punishment of God and the aid of the Secretary of State and Foss of Massachusetts." Choose ye.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say, in reply to those questions, that we, the people of Massachusetts, have chosen, not after the short season of an autumnal campaign, but we have chosen after a contest for Canadian reciprocity that has covered at least 10 of the last years in the political history of the Commonwealth which I have the honor in part to represent; and it is only because I know something of that political history and because I have been permitted to have some small share of leadership in the campaigns that have been conducted that I crave the indulgence of the House for the limited time at my disposal to address myself to these queries.

Did we vote for Foss—Foss, who in 1902 and 1904, as a Republican candidate for Congress in the Back Bay district of Boston, tried to come to this Congress on the issue of reciprocity with Canada? He was practically driven out of the Republican Party because of the insistence with which he supported resolutions in Republican conventions favoring this doctrine of Canadian reciprocity. I say he was practically driven out, because, while the gentleman himself has always insisted that he was driven out by our brilliant senior Senator, HENRY CABOT LODGE, I have lately discussed the matter with the Senator, and he says that there never was any driving, but that he always had the most kindly sentiments for Canadian reciprocity.

I suppose that reciprocity became a live issue in the politics of Massachusetts in 1892. I have found that in the national platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties of that year, 1892, reciprocity was first mentioned; that in the Democratic platform of 1892 the language used was:

> Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity, which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges, by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products, with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

I conceive that was good Democratic doctrine in 1892, and I believe, sir, that it is equally good Democratic doctrine now in 1911. I want to contrast, in the record of this House, as I have contrasted in my own mind, the declaration of the Republican Party in that same year on the "triumph of reciprocity." Why, you would believe, from reading the Republican platform of 1892, that reciprocity then had ultimately triumphed, and that under no possible condition of circumstances could it be a matter which in 1911 would engage the attention of the American Congress for the length of time that we have given to it during the past week or 10 days.

> We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity—

Says the Republican platform—

> under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic Party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the limited study that I have been able to give to the history of this question makes me believe that possibly there was a time in the history of our country when reciprocity was a live thing in our commercial system, but that, sir, was before it was "executed" by a Republican administration.

It was nearly 10 years after these party platform declarations, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of Canadian reciprocity came entirely to the front in the political and economic discussions of our State, but by that time it was clear to all that the matter would have to come to a final settlement.

Mr. Foss, Mr. Henry M. Whitney, the men who composed the Reciprocity League and the Free Trade League, and many others kept insisting that the making of an agreement like that contained in the pending bill would be of tremendous advantage to the Commonwealth and to the country, and their views were given wide publicity by the great newspapers of Boston and the State.

Senator LODGE was the chief spokesman of the many who were opposed to the views of these men, at least to the form in which those views were presented, if not, indeed, to the substance of them. I want to have printed in the record of this debate certain speeches that I have read again with interest in the wonderful Library of Congress that we have here, during the short time since this session has been sitting. I believe these speeches will do more to clarify the minds of the country and of this Congress than any words or original thoughts that I might attempt to contribute to the discussion at this time.

Let me read, therefore, so much of Senator LODGE's speech before the Home Market Club on April 2, 1903, as relates to reciprocity with Canada, that you may determine for yourself the extent of interest that he had at that time in the measure and the kind of interest that he was taking.

> It is very evident that the Democratic Party in the failure of all their other issues propose to fight the next national campaign upon the tariff and its allied questions. Under the soft and deceptive name of tariff reform or tariff revision they propose to renew their old attack upon the protective policy. Signs of their purpose abound on all sides, not the least significant being the pleasing recrudescence of Mr. Cleveland. So high, indeed, is their enthusiasm rising that evidence lately taken in the city of Boston indicates that zealous tariff reformers in certain parts of this city, not content with a single vote, have severally voted, three, four, and as often as seven times for the promotion of the cause they have so much at heart. Therefore, Mr. President, it will not be out of place for me to say a few words in regard to a phase of the tariff question which has been the subject of some recent discussion.
> I refer to Canadian reciprocity. From the utterances of the free-trade newspapers one would suppose that Canadian reciprocity was some solid, tangible object, which, if obtained, would shower wealth upon the United States, and that we are prevented from grasping it in our hands solely by the malign opposition of the Republican Party. Another idea emanating from the same source and which I saw repeated in a speech the other day in our legislature, appears to be that Canada is longing to open her markets to American manufacturers, and that the Republican Party will not permit her to do it. All this is, of course,

an utter misconception. Reciprocity with Canada, as with any other country, is a commercial agreement reached through negotiations in which each country makes concessions in return for similar concessions on the part of the other. Canada is not seeking to open her markets to our products. On the contrary, she has, thus far, steadily refused to do so, and reciprocity with Canada has not only not been prevented by the Republican Party, but the Republican Party is the only party which has made and is making any effort to bring it about. Let me briefly trace the history of Canadian reciprocity, for that will give us the facts, which are, on the whole, more comfortable to live with than large phrases and vague vaporings.

In 1854 the Elgin treaty of reciprocity went into effect for 10 years and was terminated by notice in 1866. In the treaty of Washington in 1871, under the administration of Gen. Grant, a Republican, there were reciprocal provisions with the Dominion relating to export duties, goods in transit, the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and the fisheries, limited to 12 years. In 1883 the United States notified Great Britain of her intention to terminate the fishery clauses, and they were accordingly terminated on July 1, 1885. President Cleveland, Democrat, then made a fishery treaty which was so injurious to our fishing industries that it was rejected by the Senate, 30 Senators voting against ratification and 27 in favor. When it is considered that a treaty requires two-thirds majority in order to pass, the magnitude of the defeat may be easily understood.

Mr. Cleveland, however, made no effort to bring about a treaty of general reciprocity with the Dominion of Canada. President Harrison, a Republican, through Mr. Blaine, his Secretary of State, also a Republican, opened negotiations for a treaty of reciprocity with Canada, but the negotiations were broken off because Canada declined even to consider opening her markets to our manufacturers. You will observe the Republican Party tried to obtain reciprocity at that time, but was thwarted by Canada, and it is well for those who shout loudly for Canadian reciprocity to remember that the United States does not make a treaty by itself alone, but with another country, and that the other country has something to say. So the Harrison attempt failed through the refusal of Canada to admit our manufacturers at reduced rates. During the next four years of Mr. Cleveland, a Democrat and a free trader, no attempt was made, so far as I am aware, to establish reciprocity with Canada.

President McKinley, a Republican, came in in 1897. He immediately took measures for a negotiation with Canada to establish reciprocity and to settle certain other pending differences. The joint commission appointed for this purpose met in the summer of 1898 and again the following winter. The insistence of Canada upon certain claims in regard to the Alaskan boundary, which our commissioners regarded as untenable, and her refusal to separate the Alaskan question from the other matters under discussion, led to the adjournment of the joint commission without action. Again the negotiations had failed through the action of Canada. President McKinley then endeavored to make other arrangements for the Alaskan question, and England refused. The same effort was made a year ago by President Roosevelt, a Republican, and that likewise failed through England's refusal.

This year Mr. Hay, a Republican, succeeded in negotiating a treaty, under which the Alaskan question has been referred to a separate commission. This was an absolutely essential step toward making possible any negotiations for a convention of reciprocity. I had some part in securing the ratification of this Alaskan treaty by the Senate, and one of my principal motives was that it cleared the way for a renewal of the negotiations of 1898 and the establishment of reciprocity thereby, so far as reciprocity was possible. It seems to me that the negotiation of this treaty by Mr. Hay and its ratification by the Senate, thus removing the obstacle to reciprocity negotiations, was a more practical service to the cause of Canadian reciprocity than talking about it in the newspapers or passing resolutions.

The commission of 1898 will soon be called together, and among other questions they will consider that of reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States, and will endeavor to reach an agreement upon that and other points. Thus it will be seen from this statement of facts that the Republican Party and Republican Presidents alone have done all that has been done to bring about Canadian reciprocity, and that the failure of the negotiations since 1888 has in every instance been due to the attitude of Canada. These plain facts will have, I am aware, no effect upon those servants of truth who discuss Canadian reciprocity in the columns of the Boston Herald and the Springfield Republican. They will continue to portray the Republican Party as endeavoring to prevent Canadian reciprocity and myself in particular as its bitter opponent. Personally, I have always supported the Republican policy of reciprocity with Canada, and I have not only done this winter what I could to remove the obstacle to reciprocity negotiations by securing the ratification of the Alaskan treaty, but I introduced a bill for reciprocity in coal and should have pressed it as an amendment to the bill removing the duties on coal for one year, if I had not been convinced that to do so would have delayed the passage of that measure so much desired by the country at that moment of stress and exigency.

Experience has convinced me that reciprocity by convention with competing countries generally in competitive products is impracticable, and that the result we desire in that direction can be reached only by legislation.

But I have felt, and still feel, that with Cuba and Canada, which adjoin the United States, we still might make reciprocity agreements. We have made a reciprocity treaty with Cuba. Apart from all moral and political considerations, that treaty in its reciprocal provisions was the most advantageous to the United States of any reciprocal treaty I have ever seen, yet the extreme difficulty of securing reciprocity with Cuba, either by law or treaty, has been made manifest to the country, and it is well for the Democratic newspapers and orators who are trying here to make an issue out of Canadian reciprocity to be reminded of the fact that with a single exception every vote in the Senate against that Cuban treaty of reciprocity was cast by a Democrat. I hope that the commission which is to meet again to consider our differences with Canada will be able to make a reciprocity arrangement beneficial to both countries, but I do not propose to mislead anybody by painting bright visions of the prosperity which is to pour in upon us under such a treaty. I was told this winter by a leading member of the Canadian Parliament that Canada would never make a reduction on manufactured products, for she desired to continue her preference to England; that all Canada wanted was reciprocity in natural products; and, with the exception of coal, I do not see much advantage to New England in that proposition. I have seen it stated also in the newspapers that the coal interests of Canada have passed resolutions against reciprocity in coal. Nevertheless I hope we shall be able to make some mutually advantageous trade arrangements with Canada.

I do not think they are likely to be very extensive, and none will be made that does not give to the United States an adequate return for any concessions made by us. I have now stated the whole case of Canadian reciprocity. If it is ever brought about so as to be in any measure beneficial to our industries and our trade, it will be through the efforts of the Republican Party alone, for the party of protection is the only party that will ever make reciprocal arrangements, because the free-trade Democratic Party is by the very nature of their belief opposed to a policy like reciprocity, which can of necessity come only through the existence of a tariff.

Let me pass next to a particular phase of reciprocity with our neighbors on this continent, as embodied in the convention now pending in the Senate between the United States and Newfoundland. This is a treaty of reciprocity in tariff duties. Some people appear to think that reciprocity means that some other country will admit our products free of duty or at lowered rates if the Republican Party out of pure malevolence does not prevent it.

Other persons seem to suppose, if we may judge by what they say, that a reciprocity treaty consists in admitting the products of some other country to our markets at lowered rates of duty or entirely free. The first conception is ridiculous and the second is merely an effort to get free trade in spots. True reciprocity is neither of these things. Reciprocity in trade, as I have said, is an arrangement between two countries by which, in consideration of mutual concessions, mutual advantages in tariff rates are supposed to be given. There is, therefore, only one test to be applied to a convention of this kind, and that is whether in return for the concessions which we make we receive a proper equivalent. We must examine first the concessions made by us and weigh their effect upon the domestic industry or industries involved, and we must then see whether we receive in return adequate concessions from the other party to the convention.

In the Hay-Bond treaty the price which we pay to Newfoundland for the concessions which she is supposed to make to us is at the expense of a single industry. Under this convention we agree that substantially all the important products of the deep sea and shore fisheries, as well as salmon, trout, and salmon trout, shall be admitted to our markets free of duty, with the single exception of fresh codfish. This is a very sweeping and a very large gift, and in it are involved the fortunes of a great industry. The men who carry on that industry, without a dissenting voice, testify that this removal of duty means to them substantial ruin, and they are the people who can judge best and who must first be considered. I will not enter into the details of their case, for time forbids. I will merely state the principle involved and one fatal objection.

The removal of all protective duties from cured or salt fish will result in the transfer of our salting and curing establishments to Newfoundland, because Newfoundland is nearer the fishing grounds and the labor there is cheaper. But that is not all. Where the great packing and curing establishments are placed there will the fishermen go, and if the packing and curing establishments are transferred to Newfoundland the fishing fleet of New England will follow them and become English and Canadian. This is the united testimony of the men whose all is at stake on the fisheries, and it can not be disregarded or brushed aside. I have been accused of being sectional and local and of abandoning the interests of the country at large to Gloucester, because I have opposed this sacrifice. Do you imagine that it is Gloucester alone whose interests are at stake? I would fight long before I would sacrifice the interests of Gloucester, that historic, gallant town, even if she stood alone; but she does not stand alone, and those who think she does simply disclose their ignorance of our fisheries. When you strike Gloucester you strike the men of Essex, who build her fishing fleet; the men of Swampscott, who build her dories; the factories which make her nets; the paper mills of Springfield and Holyoke, which make labels for her products and the boxes in which her fish are packed; and the great railroad which she helps to feed with freight and passengers. That is Gloucester alone.

Now, come down here to Boston. Forty-eight of the firms who deal in fresh fish in this city and own your fishing fleets protest against this treaty. Ninety captains, who go out from the port of Boston and from Cape Cod to reap the dangerous harvest of the Grand Banks and the Georges, have protested to the Senate against this treaty. Provincetown protests against it. Pass out beyond our borders; the State of Maine, with 17,000 fishermen, protests against it through the representatives of the industry and through her Senators and Members of Congress. The fishermen of the Chesapeake in Maryland have been heard against it. The menhaden fisheries, whose establishments dot the coast from Rhode Island to North Carolina, have formally protested against this removal of the duties on fish. The Pacific coast, with its great and growing fisheries in Alaskan waters, joins with their brethren of the Atlantic and protest. These are some of the facts, and yet some persons say it is a local interest and we must not sacrifice everything to a single town.

I repeat, these fishing industries declare that the removal of the duties will be ruinous to them. Bear that in mind, for one great industry must not be sacrificed in the mere hope of helping others or on the vague promise of general advantages. Now, what do we get in return? First, the privilege to take bait without a license. The only people who use bait are the fishermen, and they are the only people entitled to speak on this point. They declare unanimously that the bait privilege is of no value. Last year two vessels from Maine and about thirty-five from Gloucester took out bait licenses at a cost of something over $4,000. The amount was trifling and the fishermen do not care whether they pay or not.

They do not need licenses now, and they do not care whether Newfoundland refuses them bait or not, for with modern refrigerating arrangements they can supply themselves perfectly well from Eastport or Gloucester. It is but yesterday that Provincetown shipped two cargoes of bait to the French fishermen at Miquelon. Therefore, so far as the fishermen are concerned, they get nothing whatever for the removal of duties which now protect their product. Let us pass next to what the United States at large will get by sacrificing her fishing industries. Seventy-one articles are enumerated in this treaty as on the free list. I asked the gentlemen who appeared in support of the treaty how many of these articles were already on the free list. They did not know. I did, for I had taken the trouble to look it up.

Sixty-three of the 71 articles enumerated in the treaty as on the free list are on the free list now. Of the remaining eight, seven are agricultural implements, and those can only be imported free by residents of Newfoundland when not for sale; that is, we can not export them free of duty to Newfoundland, and the apparent concession is nothing. There remains one article, "gas engines covered by patent," taken by the treaty from the dutiable list and placed on the free list.

Do you think we can build up a trade in "gas engines covered by patent" sufficient to compensate for the loss of the fisheries? I take leave to doubt it. We now come to the dutiable list mentioned in the treaty. There are 16 of these articles. On bacon, ham, tongue, smoked beef, and sausages there is a reduction of three-quarters of a cent a pound, of 20 cents a barrel on peas, and 10 cents a barrel on oatmeal.

The other 9 articles remain at the present rate. I asked the gentlemen who appeared in behalf of the treaty whether there was any reduction in flour. They said no; that 25 cents a barrel was the existing duty, and so far they were correct, but they were so ignorant of their own case that they apparently were not aware that there was a punitive duty on flour of 50 cents a barrel directed against any nation placing a duty on Newfoundland fish.

The punitive duty would come off if the treaty was ratified, but I do not believe in making concessions to any people in return for the removal of punitive, discriminating duties. I believe in giving advantages to our friends and discriminating against those who discriminate against us. Does the treaty provide that these rates shall remain? Not at all. It simply provides that if rates are raised they shall not be raised against us higher than against anybody else. Why did not Newfoundland admit to her free or reduced list boots and shoes, rubber boots or woolen blankets? That would have been of some benefit to the industries of New England and the United States. But those are left untouched and with a preference to England on both blankets and rubber boots. What does the Newfoundland market amount to? There are 210,000 people in Newfoundland, according to the last census.

In Massachusetts and Maine alone there are 100,000 directly dependent on the fisheries, without adding those who live by the allied industries, and they are consumers who give you an exclusive market. Of this Newfoundland population 55,000 are engaged in the fisheries, 1,547 are farmers, 2,682 mechanics, 1,258 miners. How many farm implements or gas engines do you think we should sell to that population? And on the articles chiefly used by three-quarters of the population, who are engaged in the fisheries, we get no reduction. The total imports of Newfoundland in 1900 were $7,500,000 from all countries. When you remember that the exports of domestic products from the United States in 1902 was $1,300,000,000, the amount of the entire Newfoundland import does not seem very imposing, and our actual export to that island of $2,000,000 still less so.

But I will give you a better comparison. The manufactured shipping value of Gloucester's products alone was $6,000,000 in 1901. If we should get the entire value of all the Newfoundland imports it would not much more than cover the value of the fisheries of Gloucester alone, and the value of the product of the fishermen of the United States is $46,000,000. We want to think carefully before we endanger an industry whose annual product is $46,000,000 in seeking a market where we now sell only $2,000,000 and to which this treaty opens no additional door. The gentlemen who appeared before the committee were the representatives of a Newfoundland steamship company, an Englishman engaged in Newfoundland business in New York, Mr. Hall representing the Boston Chamber of Commerce, and Mr. Osborne Howes, who is connected with the business of insurance and is the principal editorial writer on the Boston Herald. The first three gentlemen argued for the treaty on the general ground that it would improve our trade relations with Newfoundland and tend to prevent the island from becoming a part of the Dominion of Canada. They did not show, and were unable to show, that there was any direct benefit to our trade in this treaty, and their testimony as to the fisheries was slight and of no value, because they had no personal knowledge of them and were not engaged in them.

They all testified, however, that in their opinion the removal of the duties proposed in the treaty would not lower the price of fish in the United States, so that the treaty, according to its advocates, would be of no benefit whatever to the American consumer. I should like to see general trade relations with Newfoundland improved, I should be glad to make a treaty with Newfoundland, but I want something in the treaty which shall be of advantage to us and satisfactory to our fishermen. Mr. Osborne Howes, the last advocate of the treaty before the committee, used one argument peculiar to himself and which I can not pass over in silence. He said that the fishing vessels of Gloucester were no longer manned by native-born Americans, but largely by men of foreign birth. He explained this fact by the statement that "it is a dangerous business, and that is the reason Americans do not care to enter into it." In my opinion he exaggerates the fact, and I am certain that his explanation is utterly wrong.

Native-born Americans have abandoned many employments because they can find others more remunerative, but they never abandoned anything through cowardice and fear of danger, either in war or peace. He also undertook to show from a single death roll that these men were not, as a rule, naturalized. This last proposition is incorrect. There is a large percentage of foreign-born men among our fishermen, but most of them are naturalized and a very large proportion remain in the United States and bring up their families there. Three hundred and thirty men from Gloucester enlisted in the War with Spain. Of these 287 resided in Gloucester. One hundred and sixty were American citizens, many of them native born. Of the 170 remaining more than half had taken out their first papers, leaving about 85 to be classed as foreigners. This, I think, is a fair statement of the proportion.

Mr. Howes's argument was that the fishermen having ceased to be in large proportion native born, were no longer entitled to protection. That to me is a new doctrine. The man who carries the naturalization papers of the United States has the same rights in every way to the protection of the Government as the man born on the soil. Mr. Howes, who has the temptations which beset all great rhetoricians, referred to these men as "the mercenaries of the sea," who are willing to face perils which the native born, according to Mr. Howes, are too cowardly to encounter. He has a well-known faculty of making telling phrases. It is to his vivid pen that we owe the sentences that "the flag is a piece of textile fabric" and "patriotism is a virtue of barbarians." But, Mr. President, when we talk about "the mercenaries of the seas," it seems to me that, although he declared that he used the word without disrespect, he is applying a harsh term to men who gain their living in a hardy and dangerous pursuit, too dangerous, as Mr. Howes says, for the native born.

The "mercenaries of the sea!" Why, then, any man who works for wages is a mercenary if he happens not to have been born on American soil. Men who come to New England and toil in our mills are, under his teaching, the "mercenaries of the factories." Mr. President, I confess that I revolt against such an idea, and I think it would be just as fair to say that the man who earns a large income by instructing us in the columns of the Herald how this Government ought to be run is a mercenary of the press. Just one word in conclusion before I leave this matter of the fisheries. There is something more to me in this question than balancing dollars and cents and imports and exports.

Mr. Howes sneered at the argument for the fishermen based on sentiment. I do not. I can not forget that before Endicott landed at Salem the New England fishermen were established on Cape Ann. I can not forget the record of the Gloucester men in the Revolution and the War of 1812. I know that whether native born or foreign born they sent more men in proportion to their population into the Navy of the United States in the Spanish War than any other city or town in the country. I know that of their recruits 76 per cent passed the physical examination, against 14 per cent in Boston and 7 per cent in New York.

I know from the lips of captains and admirals that they were men fit for any duty as soon as they came on board the ship. There are 6,000 of them on that fishing fleet, and when you want them in the day of great stress you can have them for the asking. Do not forget the peril of their calling. Over 2,000 men from this one town have given up their lives in this industry in the last 25 years—nearly a hundred a year. Go down to Gloucester in the autumn and you will hear the annual death roll called. You may read of it in the words of Kipling in "Captains Courageous." If you had been there a month ago, you would have seen the other yearly ceremony of Gloucester. They can not lay wreaths upon the ground where their dead sleep, but the children go out by the edge of the sounding sea and cast flowers upon the waves, for there in that pathless, unmarked waste their dead are buried.

Gloucester represents only part of the great American fisheries, but I say again—and you may call me local, if you will—that if Gloucester with her history stood all alone I would not in the face of that history desert her, and I would plead her cause as best I might at the bar of the Senate of the United States. I shall not be called upon to do so, but if I were I should not plead in vain. Massachusetts would be with me, and the United States from California to Maine. They would be with me, because the patriotism in war and the silent courage in peace of these poor fishermen ranging daily through gray northern seas are known to the world, and patriotism and courage are beloved of the American people and never are out of fashion.

I commend this speech to the Republican Members of this House who are disposed to be timid about supporting the pending legislation, for, whatever charges we Democrats of Massachusetts have at any time been disposed to make against Mr. LODGE, we have always known that he is a most brilliant exponent of regular Republicanism; and when he assures us, as he does in the speech that I have read, that the Republican Party has always stood for reciprocity with Canada, but that Canada has always stood in the way of it, we have the right to expect at this time, when Canada stands not in the way, the vote of every Republican who would stand true to the teachings of his party.

Can it be that in this instance Mr. LODGE was wrong in his exposition of Republicanism on the matter of reciprocity? Surely the Republican speeches that we have listened to in this Chamber during the sessions of this Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union bear some testimony against his views.

Can it be that the Republican Party has only stood for reciprocity with Canada when Canada has stood in the way of it?

Those of us who hail from Massachusetts would not be greatly surprised to find that this is so, for we know the treatment that was accorded to Mr. Foss in Massachusetts when he tried to put the Republican Party there on record in favor of it. We have not forgotten that he was hooted down in a Republican State convention when he tried to exercise his right as a delegate to have a resolution adopted in favor of it, and we have not forgotten that he told those who hooted him down that some day the people of the Commonwealth would listen with interest to his words.

We have not forgotten the points that he made in speeches and in writings in favor of reciprocity, and I am glad to be able to read to you from another bound pamphlet that was given to the Boston Public Library, as the bookplate says, "by Eugene Noble Foss."

This pamphlet has an address on the "Trade relations between the United States and Canada," which was made in Boston, Mass., in 1904, while Mr. Foss was yet active in the ranks of the Republican Party. Let me read this speech to you, rather than tell you what it says, so that you may know exactly what the views of Mr. Foss at that time were:

MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN CLUB:

I confess that I am beginning to feel at home here. This is the third time I have been made the recipient of your courtesy, and I believe that our meeting has helped us to understand each other better.

Now, Mr. President, I am not assuming that your members and guests are on one side of the reciprocity fence and I on the other; or even that our distinguished guest from over the line is so far from our point of view that he can hold nothing in common with the friends of commercial reciprocity in the United States.

You will recall that at a former meeting of this club your guests were a leading Canadian journalist and a prominent manufacturer from Ontario; and you will remember that after we all had had our say, we discovered that the ideas, or fundamental principles, for which each of us stood were broad and liberal enough to enfold us all. I trust we will reach the same conclusions to-night.

CANADIAN SENTIMENT NOT MISUNDERSTOOD.

It is a mistake to suppose that we who have led in the movement for closer trade relations with Canada do not understand what present conditions are. In fact, the logic of the situation, the unmistakable index of the facts bearing upon it, has compelled us to accept very much of the Canadian view. Notwithstanding our wealth, our power, our resources, our influence, we have regarded the small group of neighbors at the north as competitors to be feared and excluded, not as friends and customers to be given the hand of commercial welcome. We have massed our seventy-five millions of people against their five millions and entrenched ourselves behind a wall over which the frightful shapes of our supposed commercial enemies could not climb. They have

planted a 25-foot wall against our trusts and we have builded a 50-foot wall against their farmers and fishermen.

I am neither unpatriotic nor unrepublican in thus admitting the mistaken course which the United States has pursued with respect to Canada. I quote these facts merely to show to some of our Canadian friends who apparently think otherwise, that many of us who have been foremost in the reciprocity movement have not been blind to the unequal conditions which exist. In all the agitation which has been going on so incessantly the past few years, our main request has been that our own people appreciate these conditions. I have no sympathy with the political jingoism which would make these conditions an excuse for doing nothing to correct them.

We have not the right to ask anything of Canada that is not for her interest. We shall only make ourselves ridiculous if we do. The burden is upon us to prove that freer trade between the two countries will benefit both; for times have changed, and it is not now Canada that is seeking reciprocity.

I believe in the principle of protection, which is fundamental in this country. By the same token, I can have no criticism to offer of the growing desire of the Canadian people to protect themselves from destructive foreign competition. I can, however, properly point out that protection carried to the point of exclusion is not protection, it is imposition; and I can suggest that our Canadian friends will do well to learn this truth from our experience and not from their own.

EXCLUSION IS NOT PROTECTION.

I would like to ram this fact home with another; and we can also supply the object lesson in this case. We have built up our own country in spite of domestic competition fiercer than Canadian industries ever can be called upon to suffer. If we can do this here, what can we not do for Canada under fair and reasonable trade conditions? So far the Dominion has shown her wisdom in refusing to cut herself off from the facilities with which we can help her to develop her immense resources. Does she now contemplate fastening upon herself the heaviest possible form of indirect taxation merely because we have refused her tariff favors which other countries are disposed to grant? Or, on the other hand, shall the blindness and arrogance of our own stand-pat contingent be permitted to force such a policy upon a friendly customer?

Granted that the markets of Great Britain are of more present importance to Canada than those of the United States, shall we forever continue to ignore the value of our Canadian trade, whether it be coming or going? These are questions which the people of both countries will do well to ponder.

Fortunately for a partial solution of the vexed question of trade relations, our own necessities bid fair to force our Government to look the Canadian question squarely in the face. In several commodities our demand already has outrun our supply, and we are buying heavily, regardless of tariff taxes. In others the exchanges between the two countries are so general, for geographical and other reasons, that a lively trade in competing products has developed both ways. In practically all these products the tariff serves no useful purpose, but adds a burden of expense which is without profit to either party to the transaction. In still other cases where the demand is great, the United States tariff is yet so high that no purchases are attempted.

HERE IS A BASIS FOR RECIPROCITY.

These three classes furnish the basis upon which a consistent scheme of tariff revision must rest. You will notice that I use the current phrase, "tariff revision," but by it I mean "reciprocity." And I wish to say right here that I do not believe in any kind of tariff revision or tariff legislation which does not recognize reciprocity as a fundamental principle. I wish to declare, and this is as good an opportunity as any, that reciprocity is just as much and just as great a principle, a system, a primary economic policy, if you will, as free trade or protection, as they are commonly understood.

I believe that it will not long hence become recognized as a practical working system infinitely superior to either stand-pat protection or free trade. It will recognize your friends, customers, and allies in a commonsense and common-justice fashion, instead of attacking them as does stand-pattism, or favoring your enemies at your own expense, as does doctrinaire free trade. Any good business man or good neighbor will go a great way and sacrifice much to favor and benefit these by whom he lives or profits largely. Hence, I go in for some system of tariff revision in the future which shall aim to benefit, as well as ourselves, countries which make their prosperity ours. This is simply good business as well as good morals, Gen. Draper and William Whitman to the contrary notwithstanding.

I have said that the basis of tariff revision, or reciprocity, as far as Canada is concerned, must rest upon three classes of articles; that is to say, articles which each country must buy of the other, duty or no duty, or in which they make a mutually profitable interchange under natural conditions.

As an illustration, I have prepared a table showing the principal articles in which the two countries have an interchangeable trade. These figures show our exports to Canada and dutiable imports therefrom of practically identical articles in 1903:

United States exchanges with Canada, 1903.

	Exports.	Imports (dutiable).
Horses	$2,121,000	$295,000
Sheep	174,000	986,000
Breadstuffs[1]	5,532,000	843,000
Coal (bituminous)	9,668,000	4,811,000
Eggs	78,000	18,000
Fish	743,000	2,859,000
Fruits[2]	1,008,000	133,000
Hay	108,000	2,236,000
Hides	521,000	1,186,000
Iron ore	264,000	320,000
Dairy products	192,000	24,000
Vegetables	651,000	493,000
Wood, unmanufactured	4,766,000	13,830,000
Wood pulp	38,000	1,867,000
Gypsum		319,000
	25,864,000	30,220,000

[1] Exclusive of corn. [2] Varieties common to both countries.

ABOLISH SOME TARIFFS, REGARDLESS OF CANADA.

Now, here is a natural and necessary trade of $55,000,000, and which might be two, three, or four times that amount, hampered and harassed by tariff restrictions, which are of no possible benefit, but, on the contrary, work absolute injury to every interest concerned.

Now, I believe for one—and I intend hereafter to insist upon the belief to the limit of my power—in making a start toward reciprocity by either abolishing or radically reducing the duties on all the articles in this list. If Canada prefers to keep on her more moderate duties, where she levies them, to her own privation, let her do it, but that is a poor reason why we should.

The Home Market Club has finally been forced to concede us coal and iron ore, and William Whitman gives us lumber. Everybody but Col. Clarke wants free hides; and here you have at once accounted for three-quarters in amount of the products under discussion.

In regard to hay, meats, vegetables, fruit, and eggs, I doubt if a government could stand against the demand for a removal of the duties on them, if the people should make this a distinct issue—as they will before long.

In regard to one more prominent item, breadstuffs, it is now fully recognized among those whose opinion is worth anything, that we must either make wheat free, and promptly, too, or prepare to suffer disaster in our milling industries.

As to barley, the outrageous duty upon that and upon the malt made from it is the heaviest burden which our great brewing industries are called upon to bear.

Where can there be any argument or controversy on this great question as I have here presented it?

SOME QUESTIONS FOR THE POLITICIANS.

It is the evident purpose of some of our legislators at Washington to refuse to reduce the tariff on Canadian goods because, as they will say, Canada will make no concessions. This will be the pretext on which they will maintain the status quo.

The only real thought in their minds is to discover the cleverest excuse for standing pat. We understand very well the purpose of these statesmen, and I want to ask some of them who are beginning to profess a tardy love for reciprocity, what they intend to do to show their good faith. They profess to believe in reciprocity in competitive articles. Will they introduce bills lowering our schedules to somewhere near Canada's, or will they prefer to relieve the necessities of the country by direct legislation and place on the free list coal, iron, lumber, wheat, hides, wood pulp, etc.?

This is the practical question we business men purpose to put right up to these politicians until we know exactly where they stand and what they are going to do. We purpose to find out whether those professions made just before election meant anything or not. It is not enough for them to say that they are in favor of reciprocity which will be "mutually advantageous" to both countries. We are willing to concede that the United States should take the initiative. We not only owe it to Canada, in view of her attitude in the past, but we owe it to ourselves as the larger of the two countries, and from the further fact that Canada is our best customer in manufactured goods and our neighbor at that; and from the further overshadowing fact that Canada's commercial policy still remains liberal toward us and gives us such generous access to her markets.

HOW TO MAKE A START.

Now, let us make a start by putting some of these things which we are in desperate need of on the free list, whether Canada reciprocates or not. By so doing we will be not only helping ourselves, but we will be helping Canada to pay a portion of her debt, at least, in commodities instead of cash.

Every business man here knows that treatment of that sort on our part will not conduce to less purchases on the part of Canada. On the contrary, where we are now selling her one hundred and thirty millions we should soon be selling her two hundred millions per annum, if we would only show a disposition to take in payment what she has to offer and what we stand in need of.

Every business man knows that this is the soundest kind of business sense. No one of us ever lost anything yet in trying to help a good customer sell his product. As President Roosevelt said in his Minneapolis speech, "We must also remember that in dealing with other nations, benefits must be given where benefits are sought."

SHALL WE FOLLOW SPAIN AND PORTUGAL?

Both in the United States and in Canada we find those who are no doubt conscientious in their opposition to reciprocity between the two countries. In the United States they are known as the "standpatters," and are represented by the Home Market Club. They represent the ultrahigh-tariff element in the Republican Party. They honestly confuse protection with prohibition.

In Canada they are represented by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. To my mind these two elements propose to do for the United States and Canada practically what Spain and Portugal once did in adopting a policy of selfishness and exclusiveness which, as Hon. John A. Kasson has shown, "other nations would not tolerate, and long-continued wars followed—wars of conquest, which led to the impoverishment of the nations which persisted in their career of international selfishness. Spain and Portugal," continues Mr. Kasson, "once in the forefront of national prosperity and greatness, are now at the rear of the column and apparently without the power of recuperation."

Now, Mr. President, the policy of the Home Market Club and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, carried to its logical conclusion, would bring these two countries to the same end.

From an economic point of view there appears to be every reason why Canada and the United States should come together commercially. We must all admit that the tendency all over the world is toward amalgamation and consolidation, in the interest of economy and the elimination of ruinous competition. We all know that the United States and Canada are competitors in the markets of the world, and are to be so more and more each year as the development of Canada goes on.

COMMERCIAL UNION A NATURAL POLICY.

For instance, Liverpool makes the price for the export wheat, not only of the United States but of Canada. And so of the other exports, whether natural products or manufactures, of both countries. Now, the natural and logical policy for these two contiguous countries is commercial union; an amalgamation, if you please, which will protect the interests of both. If a complete commercial union were possible, it would be the best solution of the whole problem. That is, that trade should be as free and unrestricted between the United States and Canada as it is between the several States of our own country.

This is what I should like to see, for it would mean not only the greatest possible development of both countries in every direction, but it would furthermore insure for all time peace and good will.

IMPROPER SYSTEM OF TAXATION THE BASIC FAULT.

But I recognize that at the present time commercial union may not be practicable from the fact that Canada, like ourselves, has not yet been educated to the principle of direct taxation. When we shall have advanced in civilization to the point where we will not shrink from levying our taxes upon the sources from which they are justly due, and not through class legislation, we can then treat this great business proposition on a business basis. The systems of taxation of the two countries are to-day the only obstacle to the fulfillment of one of the greatest and most beneficent unions in the history of the world. I have faith to believe that before long the people of both countries will remove this artificial barrier to their greatest happiness and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, the Foss of those days was the Republican of Massachusetts who was crying in the wilderness for the recognition of this doctrine. I do not know whether or not he was driven out of the Republican Party for daring to express these views; but I do know that he became convinced that within the ranks of the Republican Party in Massachusetts there was no opportunity for him to develop this doctrine, and in 1909 he joined hands with the Democrats of Massachusetts, became our candidate for lieutenant governor on the ticket with Hon. James H. Vahey for governor, and the Republican majority of many thousands of previous years was, in the short limits of a six weeks' campaign, cut down to six or eight thousand votes.

I know, too, that in the spring of 1910 he was impressed into service as a Democratic candidate for Congress in the district long represented here until his death by the late Hon. William C. Lovering, and we went into that district and we preached the doctrine of reciprocity with Canada and honest revision of the tariff. And the fourteenth Massachusetts district, that had been sending a Republican Congressman by nearly 15,000 majority, sent here Eugene Noble Foss, a Democrat, by nearly 10,000 majority. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

I know, too, that in the fall of 1910, because of the forceful, businesslike way with which he had presented this and other similar issues to the people of our Commonwealth, he was chosen by the Democrats of the State to be our candidate for governor and was triumphantly elected under most unfavorable Democratic circumstances during the early part of the campaign.

You might say that these victories are entirely personal; you might say that these things mean only that our standard bearer has been a great success as an individual candidate. Let me refer you, then, to the Manual for the General Court of Massachusetts of this year, 1911, where may be found the official votes for Representatives in the Sixty-second Congress in each of our 14 districts. I took time to-day to total the vote for Democratic candidates for Congress as well as the vote for Republican candidates for Congress at the last election in our Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

We have in this Chamber 10 Republican Congressmen from Massachusetts and only four Democratic Members. You might well suppose, as I have learned in conversation with many of you that you really believe, that we are only able to get an occasional victory here and there in our State. But, sir, I find that the total Democratic vote for Congressmen in Massachusetts last fall was 204,639 as against a total Republican vote for Congressmen of 203,136. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when I point out to you that in the ninth district, which I represent and which is the most strongly Democratic district in the State, I not only had to compete with the Republican candidate, but also with an Independent, who had served as a Democrat for eight years in this body, you will readily see that these totals do not altogether tell the story. The fact is that last fall we were at least 10,000 votes stronger on the matter of sending men to this Congress than our Republican brethren, although they have a large majority in the delegation here. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I make the point not because of any vainglorious spirit, but simply to show you how Massachusetts stands to-day on current political questions as a result of the campaign made these many years by Eugene N. Foss and Henry M. Whitney and the members of organizations like the New England Reciprocity and Free Trade Leagues. I make the point, too, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may know.

Yes, sir; we did vote for Mr. Foss, and we say that he typifies the permanent spirit of the old Commonwealth, about which the former Speaker seems to be solicitous. I subscribe most heartily to the splendid tribute that he paid to the old State that has done so much in the development of this country, and I say to him he need have no fear that the spirit of that Commonwealth differs to-day from what it has been in the great historic past.

The spirit of Massachusetts yesterday, on the 19th of April, 1911, when he asked his question, was the same spirit that characterized the Minute Men at Concord and Lexington on the 19th of April, 1775. [Applause.] The spirit of Massachusetts yesterday, on the 19th of April, was the same spirit that characterized the men of Massachusetts on the 19th of April, 1861, when they marched through the streets of a then hostile Baltimore and began a long line of brilliant achievements in the great Civil War. [Applause.] The spirit of Massachusetts yesterday, on the 19th of April, was the same, sir, as it was on the 19th of April, 1898, when we started out to fight our War with Spain. [Applause.]

And I believe it is because he so vitally typifies that splendid Massachusetts spirit that Eugene N. Foss was the Democratic Congressman elected from an overwhelmingly Republican district, and is to-day the wise chief executive of a great State in a great Union. [Great applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I regret more than any Democrat in this House can regret the necessity which impels me to make a speech on this subject. I had intended to say nothing on the floor of the House in reference to the Canadian treaty. I had intended to content myself with casting my vote according to my conscience and my duty to my people and no more. But certain recent strictures from my own colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] have made it imperative that we who differ with him should say something with reference to our position in order that our people may know why we are opposed to this measure.

I want to offer my sincere thanks to my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for yielding to me the time to address this House. He is in favor of the treaty, but, like the magnanimous gentleman he is, has yielded enough time for me to state my position in order that my fellow Members and my constituents may know why I oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I have never regarded modern reciprocity as a Democratic doctrine. If I had the time, I believe I could convince any fair-minded Democrat or Republican that it is not Democratic doctrine. I believe that in 1854 reciprocal free trade between the United States and Canada was a Democratic doctrine, but mark you, my friends, the wonderful difference between the reciprocal free-trade agreement between Canada and the United States in 1854 and this so-called reciprocity treaty, which is no more than a revision of the tariff laws between the United States and Canada. Reciprocal free trade of 1854 put practically everything that was produced in the United States and Canada on the free list.

That was genuine reciprocity, fair to both countries and to all the people concerned. In that agreement flour, breadstuffs, bread, meats, coal, and lard, and all of the people's necessities were placed on the free list, which is not so in the present measure, but on such necessities a high protective tariff is left.

That is the last we heard of reciprocity from the Democratic Party until about 40 years afterwards, in 1892. In the meantime, James G. Blaine appeared upon the scene with his modern doctrine of reciprocity, which was like the sample we are now discussing. I do not wonder that my young friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] stands here and sings the praises of reciprocity. It is strictly a New England cult and of New England origin. It was born in that section of the country which has always clamored for cheap or free raw materials which she has to buy and for a high protective tariff on what she manufactures and has to sell. That is why New England to-day is advocating so strongly free trade in farm products and raw material. They are willing to put the other fellow's products on the free list, but whenever you take away some of their protection on what they produce then you will hear them squeal loud and protest much. New England has always had free cotton for her big cotton mills and high protection on her cotton manufactures. She secured free hides two years ago in the Payne bill and held to protection on shoes, and she now hopes to put all other farm products on the free list. Then her selfish plan will be consummated. James G. Blaine is the father of modern reciprocity. He first presented the scheme to Benjamin Harrison in 1890. He urged Mr. Harrison to send his message to Congress in 1890 advocating reciprocity. President Harrison did so, and who was it that introduced the reciprocity provision as part of the Republican tariff law of 1890? None other than Nelson W. Aldrich, highest protectionist, I suppose, that this country ever saw. He was responsible for section 3 of the McKinley Act of 1890, which has ever since been known as the reciprocity provision of that tariff law. When that section was voted on in the Senate my recollection is that every Democrat in that body voted against it, including the two great Senators from North Carolina, Vance and Ransom, while all the Republicans, led by Mr. Aldrich, voted for it.

Under this section 3 various reciprocity agreements or treaties were negotiated by the President. I might say, in passing, that Gen. Grant was for reciprocity, and so was President Arthur, and certain treaties were negotiated by that administration. When Mr. Cleveland came to be President he withdrew them, so much opposed to sham reciprocity was he. In 1892 the Democrats carried this country and elected a Democratic Congress. What happened? At that time, when they met here in Congress on the 4th of March, 1893, various reciprocity treaties were in operation, and when the Wilson-Gorman law was passed those treaties were, ipso facto, repealed by the Democrats. In 1892, 38 years after the real reciprocity treaty with Canada in 1854, the Democrats put in their platform a provision which said that trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored Democratic doctrine; that is, reciprocal free trade between countries, which was the only reciprocity ever theretofore advocated by the Democratic Party, and hence the only kind referred to as being time honored; but here is what our party, in the same clause, said about modern reciprocity, the genus we are now considering:

> We denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

Mr. Chairman, I interpret that Democratic declaration as a condemnation of the present treaty, and that is why I say this treaty appears to me to be a sham and a fraud. I quoted that portion of the Democratic platform in a recent published interview for the purpose of showing the party had condemned this kind of treaty, which I consider to be a sham and a fraud and essentially unjust.

When the Democratic Party repealed the reciprocity treaties in 1894 the Republican Party in their platform condemned the Democrats for it. Not only that, but they congratulated themselves on the success of the reciprocity treaties in the following language: "We [the Republican Party] point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity." In 1897 various bills were referred to the Ways and Means Committee after the Republicans had regained control of the House, and this book which I hold in my hand contains practically the history of reciprocity legislation in this country. A majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, which was Republican, brought in a report to the House of Representatives in which they stated that the repeal by the Democratic Party of the reciprocity treaties was "a public calamity, and that the policy that they represented shall be permanently adopted in our tariff legislation." Who signed that report? Nelson Dingley, jr., who was the father of the Dingley tariff law that every Democrat in the United States has denounced; Mr. SERENO E. PAYNE, the progenitor of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and who now favors this treaty; Mr. JOHN DALZELL; Albert J. Hopkins; Charles S. Grosvenor; Jonathan P. Dolliver; George W. Steele; Martin Johnson; Walter Evans; and our high-protectionist friend, James A. Tawney. That was the Republican view of modern reciprocity as expressed by the Republican Ways and Means Committee, and that is the view Mr. Taft now seems to take. Now, what did the Democrats on that committee say about reciprocity? Here is what they said in concluding their report:

> We conclude that there is little evidence of any marked benefits flowing from reciprocity agreements. We conclude that uniform rates of duty, applying equally to the products of all nations, is the only safe policy to pursue, as it can give occasion to no complaint of unfair treatment such as must arise under a scheme of discriminating duties.

That minority report was signed by Benton McMillan, of Tennessee, a Democrat who served on the Ways and Means Committee probably longer than any other southern Democrat; Joseph Wheeler, another great Democrat from the South; and H. G. Turner, of Georgia.

It is not fair to other nations to give Canada this advantage while at the same time refusing to give it to other countries. We believe in equal justice to all nations, as well as equal rights to all men. This treaty violates that great principle. The object of free farm products, as found in this Canadian reciprocity, is to give somebody an advantage over somebody else, and this is just as undemocratic and unfair as protection, which is nothing more nor less than giving one class of people an advantage over another class.

I quote from the Democratic campaign handbook of 1902:

> Moreover, such a policy disregards Washington's wise advice and substitutes for this noble rule of conduct the sordid bargains, the unequal and ever-changing discriminations of trade treaties. This great Republic ought to govern its foreign policy by principles of justice and sound economic laws and treat all nations alike. Then it would need no commercial treaties and few political ones.

I say, therefore, that I have never regarded this kind of reciprocity as a Democratic doctrine. I know this treaty is not a Democratic measure, and my Democratic friends on this side will agree that it is not. Is there a Democrat on the floor of the House who will stand up here and say this treaty is Democratic doctrine—a Democratic measure? I have no idea there is. But it is said that it is a slight step, a mere step, in the right direction. My colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]—and I am sorry he is not here—wrote a letter a week or two ago to a personal friend, Mr. McMichael, in our State on this question, and this friend published the letter in a newspaper and I have here a copy of the letter, and in that letter my friend [Mr. KITCHIN] says "that the Canadian reciprocity agreement is a short hobble-skirted step, but still a step." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, ever since that particular kind of feminine dress was introduced into this country I have despised it. I do not like hobble-skirted dresses and I do not like hobble-skirted treaties. [Applause.] And yet my colleague from North Carolina—who made his strenuous effort here Saturday, lasting three hours—I thought, tried to convince the country that this is a simon-pure, genuine-blown-in-the-bottle Democratic measure; and yet he writes to a friend in North Carolina that it is only a "short hobble-skirted step." I noticed a woman walking down the Avenue yesterday who had on a hobble skirt. [Laughter and applause.]

I wanted to see just what distance this treaty carries us in the Democratic direction. Now, mark you, it is not a hobble-skirted step, but it is a "short hobble-skirted step"; and I picked out the tightest-skirted woman I could find [laughter and applause], and while I did not have a policeman's cyclometer to measure the length of each step she took, yet, according to my eyes—and I am a reasonably young man—she did not step more that 6 inches. [Laughter and applause.] I say again that it appeared to me she did not progress more than 6 inches each step; so, if that is the actual distance this treaty is to carry us toward the Democratic goal, it is a ridiculously short one to have so much ado made about it in the Halls of national legislation.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEBB. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. SIMS. Without the treaty the woman can not even step 6 inches. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, my friend says he would rather take 6 inches than no step at all. The doctrine of de minimis lex non curat—the law does not regard little things—applies here, and the people care nothing for a distance of 6 inches on the long road from a Republican tariff law to a Democratic measure. I am not admitting, however, that it is a 6-inch step in the right direction. I think it several miles in the wrong direction.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman says he measured it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEBB. Oh, I measured with my eye the distance the woman stepped; but what I am talking about is the infinitesimal distance, according to my colleague, that this treaty carries us toward the goal of Democratic doctrine, and I do not even admit that it is in the direction of Democratic doctrine at all, but I strongly deny it. I say it not only carries us no distance toward Democratic doctrine, but, on the contrary, it is toward Republicanism, for it is a species of reciprocity which Republicans have always advocated since the Civil War, and it was drawn by a Republican Secretary of State, urged upon us by a Republican President of the United States, and advocated by many distinguished Republicans of the House and Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I was first elected to this body in 1902. It was a proud honor the good people of the ninth North Carolina district conferred on me. I carried with me throughout the district in that campaign what most young men think is the regular Democratic Bible, namely, a Democratic campaign handbook. That is where I received my first "larnin," as the darky would say, in reciprocity. And here are some expressions in that handbook. In that year, mark you, the national Democratic congressional committee was composed of Gov. W. W. Kitchin, of North Carolina, Gov. Harmon, Clark Howell, and many other distinguished Democrats, among them my friend from Texas, Mr. RANDELL, who is now a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee. They sent out this handbook, which I hold in my hand, to the voters of the country, that contains these expressions about reciprocity, and, in my opinion, they size up exactly this treaty we are considering:

> Reciprocity looks like free trade, but tastes like protection. It is really a new sugar coating prepared by the Republican tariff doctors for many patients who are refusing to take their protection pills straight.
>
> In practice reciprocity is worse than protection.
>
> Our farmers are not sending delegates to Washington to threaten Congress if it does not pass reciprocity legislation. There is nothing in it for farmers. To them it is a sham and a fraud.

And I say, with all the emphasis I am capable of now, that this treaty, as far as the farmer is concerned, is a sham and a fraud. [Applause.]

Reciprocity is based upon the same false theories as is protection, and, like protection, is a sham and a humbug, and to most people has been and will ever continue to be a delusion and a snare.

That expression describes this treaty precisely. All the arguments that have been made in behalf of this measure are to the effect that it will not hurt the farmer. I have not heard any Member argue that it will help the farmer, but before I get through I will point out how the big manufacturers and trusts of this country are going to be benefited and how it appears to me that the farmers' interests are being traded off for the benefit of the big trusts and manufacturers of the United States.

Another expression from the handbook:

Reciprocity is put forward to save protection and to stave off the demand for genuine tariff revision.

I say that when Mr. Taft sent this reciprocity bill to Congress, in January, on the eve of the assembling of the Democratic Congress, it was sent here, it seems to me, for the purpose of embarrassing the Democratic Congress; and I say here now, with no idea of being contradicted, that it has embarrassed us. It has embarrassed you, and you, and you, and a hundred, probably, of good Democrats of this Congress. Many Democrats are going to vote for it who do not want to do so. I do not like President-made laws, anyway. The people of the United States pay Congressmen about $4,000,000 a year to make laws. This is exclusively the function of Congress under the Constitution, and it is the duty of the President to execute those laws when so made; but this tariff-law treaty was made by the President and his Secretary of State and sent to Congress for our ratification, with a careful warning that the people's elected representatives must not change it, even to dotting an "i" or crossing a "t." This is usurping the duties of a great lawmaking body, and I object to it seriously.

Daniel Webster once said:

The contest of the ages has been to rescue liberty from the grasp of executive power.

The Chief Executive, Mr. Taft, not only directed the making of this treaty law, but is now actively using all his tremendous influence and power to have it ratified by Congress.

James G. Blaine said that reciprocity was the handmaid of protection, and I could quote on and on from leading Republican authority, Mr. Chairman, if the clock did not warn me that my time is fast running away. Here are the Republican platform declarations in 1896 in reference to reciprocity:

We believe that the repeal (by the Democrats) of the reciprocity arrangements negotiated by the last Republican administration was a national calamity. * * * Protection and reciprocity are twin measures of Republican policy, and go hand in hand. Democratic rule has recklessly struck down both, and both must be reestablished.

Hon. E. J. HILL, a distinguished Republican Member of this body and who is thoroughly versed in the history of his party, in a speech a few days ago, fervently advocating this treaty, said on the floor of the House that the treaty "is in full accord with the practice of the Republican Party in the past and also with the provisions of the national Republican platform at the present time, and that it (the treaty) squares with the Republican doctrine of protection."

My Democratic colleagues, we were elected last fall in a tariff-revision-campaign fight, and I declare to you that it does not set well on me to have us assemble here in extra session and begin our cuttings and revisions, begin our tariff reductions by placing all Canadian farm products in free competition with our own farmers—the tillers of the soil—whose labors feed the world and whose chivalry and bravery have fought all the battles this country has won. [Applause.] The little tariff on farm products hurts no one, yet the first gun is aimed at him. There are glaring, monstrous inequalities in the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill that we might attack first and foremost; but, no; they are left for another day, and we are led by the President to an attack on the little tariff there is on the farmer's products and induced by him to place all he produces on the free list.

Mr. Chairman, there are four or five different classes of advocates of this reciprocity treaty, it seems to me, and the first of these advocated which I shall mention are those who believe in the annexation of Canada to the United States. Among that distinguished class I would place my Republican friend from Connecticut, Mr. EBENEZER J. HILL. And there are others, not only on the floor of this House, but all over this country who want this trade-treaty agreement with Canada, thinking that it will bring about annexation finally. For my part, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to annexing Canada. Fisher Ames once said that "this country is big enough." And it is too big now. Continental United States is capable of sustaining a thousand million souls, and then our country would not be as thickly settled as Massachusetts is to-day. Continental United States could sustain every human being in the entire world, and then our population would be no more dense than Belgium's. We have enough territory at present; we do not need any more.

Mr. POU. Or the Philippines.

Mr. WEBB. No; I would like to swap them off or give them away. I fear they will be a source of unending trouble.

In addition to this there is a large proportion of Canadians of the Latin race, and it is an historical fact that no Latin race has ever accepted a republican form of government with any staying fidelity. They are natural monarchists; they will always look to a king and to the monarchy. There is no reason why we should annex Canada. We do not need her, and there is no reason, in my mind, for giving Canada an advantage, as we do in this treaty, over other friendly nations. Why should we not give to the people of England, our Anglo-Saxon brethren, the same privileges and benefits as we extend to this mixed population in Canada?

There is another class of men advocating this treaty who believe in what is known as the doctrine of free raw material, with a revenue tariff or a protective tariff on all manufactured articles. For my part I do not believe in this doctrine. I believe in the doctrine of that great statesman, Robert J. Walker, the father of our tariff faith, who worked out a policy which, if steadily pursued, would have put us as a party in power more often in the past and would carry us into power more surely in the future; who believed in putting a tariff on practically everything that is imported, whether raw material or manufactured articles, making the tariff low according to the necessity of the article and high in proportion to its luxury, so that if a tariff is a blessing everybody shares it, and if it is a burden everybody bears it.

My Democratic friends, when you abandon that doctrine and go to substituting for it the doctrine of putting a lot of products on the free list that men produce in this country, then there is no end to the possible free list, and the ultimate extreme to which you are driven is free trade. And I conceive that, under the Constitution that we have lived by and have loved for 120 years, and under which we live to-day, that so long as that Constitution exists in its present form we are compelled to levy a tariff tax in order to raise revenue to run the Government.

I look upon the tariff as a tax, and therefore I would make that tariff fall equally and justly and impartially upon the shoulders of all our people, not giving to some men the right to buy in the cheapest market and sell their products in the highest market and compelling some to sell their products in the cheapest market and buy in the dearest, because that is unfair and unjust. Whenever you create a long free list and retain a long protected list you thereby give to some an advantage over others. If you put all raw material on the free list, you give the manufacturer a double advantage, an advantage at both ends—the right to buy in the cheapest market and the privilege of selling in the highest market. I believe in the historic Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue, so levied as to make the burdens of the tax fall equally and justly upon all.

Mr. Chairman, there is still another class advocating the treaty, and that class consists of those extreme free traders who are willing to swallow the big protection hook that is hidden in this treaty in order to get the free-trade bait. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE], I believe, said in his speech that he was a free trader. Now, free trade is a Utopian dream at present. The Constitution will have to be amended materially before we can adopt free trade. We are now legislating under conditions that actually exist and not under those that may be hoped for. Every Democrat and every Republican knows that as long as we have to raise $350,000,000 annually by import duties we are compelled to levy a tariff tax. Therefore in levying the tariff tax we should levy it on practically everything and give no one an advantage over anybody else, and not give to some the right to buy their goods from a free list and require that others must buy protected articles. That would be taxing some and letting others escape taxation altogether. That would be as unfair as taxing all farm lands and letting city property escape altogether.

There is still another class, and that class is composed of those who favor this treaty from purely selfish motives. Gentlemen, all life nowadays seems to be selfish. You can scarcely go about the streets of this city, you can scarcely move anywhere, without seeing selfishness stick up its ugly head.

And I tell you, my friends, I believe that selfishness and privilege and advantage are doing more to ram this treaty through Congress than any other single cause. Selfishness? Yes. Where is the man who will deny that the great metropolitan newspapers in the United States to-day who are advocating this treaty, many of them because they expect to get free wood pulp and print paper, are actuated by pure and unadulterated selfishness? I declare unto you, my friends, and unto them, that the great newspapers of this country are no more entitled to free wood pulp and print paper than is the poor toiler on the farm in my country and the poor laborer entitled to free woolen clothes or free sugar. And yet you will not think for a moment of putting these necessities of all the people, poor as well as rich, on the free list. If not, why not? They are as much entitled to cheap sugar and cheap clothes as the newspapers are entitled to cheap paper. Yes, we have many of the great city newspapers back of this treaty because there is a big saving in it to them by taking the tax off their print paper. There is no promise on their part to reduce the price of the paper to their readers or the cost of advertising space, but they see cheaper print paper and therefore bigger profits if the treaty passes. I do not blame them. This is such a selfish world that every man has to look out for self, just as many of the big newspapers are doing in supporting this treaty.

There is still another class of individuals who are supporting this treaty for selfish purposes. I am going to charge, and do charge, that the United States Steel Corporation, the biggest trust in the world, organized by J. Pierpont Morgan, the wizard of finance, who received $100,000,000 for organizing it, favors this treaty and is helping to pass it. I make the charge that that great corporation is advocating this treaty. I call upon my friends from Pennsylvania, the whole congressional delegation, many of whom I see before me, to deny that all the steel corporations in Pennsylvania are backing this treaty to-day and are advocating it. Why are they advocating it? I will show you a little later that it is because they are getting a big advantage in it. In the treaty Canada reduces her tariff barrier against United States iron and steel manufactures, which are exported to Canada, and as a quid pro quo Canada induces us to reduce our tariff barrier against her farm products in order that she may export them into the United States with greater ease and at bigger profits to her farmers.

The General Electric Co. wants this treaty ratified. This company is controlled and owned by J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller, and is probably the closest trust in America, because many of its trust advantages are based upon patents. Why are they for it? They have to use a great deal of mica in the manufacture of electrical machinery and appliances. They get their mica duty free under this treaty, although mica has never before been placed on the free list since it was discovered in the United States. It was put on the dutiable list in the tariff law of 1890; it was put on the dutiable list in the Democratic tariff law of 1894; it was put on the dutiable list in all the other tariff bills since that time. Zeb Vance, the great commoner from North Carolina, one of the best-loved men that ever sat in the Senate of the United States from my country, assented to a duty on mica; Gov. Jarvis, that noble old Roman from North Carolina, Matt Ransom, who defended our State in war and peace, John T. Morgan, of Alabama, Senator Vilas, and other great Democrats voted for a duty on mica, and where their footsteps lead I gladly follow. This treaty puts mica absolutely on the free list and allows Morgan's trust to buy it from Canada without any tax, while retaining the same high Payne-Aldrich tariff rates on all of the trust's finished products, electrical machinery, which people everywhere are compelled to buy at the same extortionate prices.

Mr. PALMER. Where is mica mostly produced in this country?

Mr. WEBB. It is produced in North Carolina and in Mr. WEBB's district. [Applause.] If the trusts are fighting for their interests in the treaty, I shall not forget my people in the fight, for I have never gotten any bigger than the people of my district. [Applause.] It is contrary to human nature to get too big to represent your own folks, they who love and honor you, and whenever any man gets too big to do so, he ought to be put out of Congress. That is the doctrine that Zeb. Vance laid down away back more than 20 years ago when twitted about the tariff on mica, and I reiterate it here to-day, and when I get too big to represent the interests of my district I hope my people will beat me. I need not express the hope, for I know they will do it. [Applause.]

There is another group of interests back of this treaty, known as the Hill railroad interests. James J. Hill said in an interview that he did not see how a man with any sense could oppose it, or something to that effect. That was selfishness again speaking. Mr. Hill's railroads run into Canada and the United States, back and forth, and he wants to increase the trade between the two countries in order that dividends on his railroad stock may be enhanced and more money put into his pocket. Oh, yes; Mr. Hill, with all his power and influence, controlling about 30,000 miles of railroad, enough to girdle the earth, is advocating the treaty, and we can easily understand his interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WEBB. May I have 15 minutes more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should be glad to give that time to the gentleman, but I have not got it. I will yield him ten, and that is all I have to my credit.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield the gentleman 15 minutes, and we will have to run a little longer.

Mr. WEBB. I thank the gentleman very much. I realize that I am speaking under high pressure, because I have to put two hours' talk into 40 minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another class of citizens anxious to have the treaty passed, who, I believe, are deceived as to its effect on the cost of living, and that is the big-city dwellers. If every Member of this body were left to vote on this question without caucus action or other influence, I believe it would be the first time in the history of the United States that the big cities would be arrayed against the country districts. I believe the rural districts would vote against the treaty and the cities would vote for it, because the "interests" and many big dailies have put it into their heads that the cost of living is going to be reduced; and yet advocates of the treaty on this floor tell us that it will not affect the cost of living, for they know if they do so argue it is bound to be reduced at the cost of the farmer, and this they do not want the farmer to believe. If the framers of the treaty really wanted to reduce the cost of living, instead of taking the duty off wheat alone they would also have taken it off flour, too. The laboring man can not eat wheat, but he can eat flour. Wheat is put on the free list, while flour is taxed. And yet they leave the duty on flour instead of taking it off, and thus tax the people's bread. Then instead of taking the duty off cattle they would have taken it off meat also. You can not eat a steer, but you can eat beef. The man who drew the treaty, a former employee of the Steel Trust, left beef on the protected list at a cent and a quarter a pound, which will enable the Beef Trust to collect a royalty of more than a cent a pound on all beef the poor man carries home in his tired hands. Let me point out how the Beef Trust shows its fine hand in the making of this treaty. Cattle, the Beef Trust's raw material, are put on the free list, so that thousands can be driven across the Canadian border or shipped on the Hill railroads into the United States to be sold to the trust at the lowest competitive prices; but after the cattle are converted into meat, see what a tight grip the trust holds on the consumer. It generously consents to a reduction of one-fourth of a cent a pound tax on dressed meats coming into the United States, which is prohibitive and will keep out all Canadian competition in this great article of food, for last year Canada only sold the United States $84,000 worth of meats and lard; but this is not all. The friends of the trust induce Canada to reduce her tariff against American meats and lard three-fourths of a cent a pound on lard, and on meats 1¾ cents per pound, while last year the trust sold Canada 10,000,000 pounds of lard and large quantities of fresh meats, all aggregating—that is, lard and meats—$2,400,000 worth. Therefore the treaty keeps out of the United States trust competition in meats and lard and makes the Canadian market easier and freer for the trust.

If you want sincerely to reduce the cost of living, put things that men eat on the free list—meat and bread. This treaty will give the trust cheaper cattle and wheat, but continues the power of the trusts to rob the people, as heretofore, on flour and meat and bread.

I take the position that the treaty is unjust to the farmer. I said this when I first read it, and I am more firmly convinced now than ever that it is an injustice to him. In fact, the Ways and Means Committee have this morning brought from the press their report on the free-list bill which we will be called to vote upon pretty soon and which I wanted to make a part of this treaty as section 2, and in that report they admit that it is an injustice to the farming class of this country. I want to read you briefly an extract from that report:

In fact, action on the Canadian agreement involves the necessity of further and immediate action in removing a number of duties on imports from other countries, in order that justice may be done to the great army of our great agricultural producers, who in the Canadian agreement are to have all the alleged protection removed from their

products without a corresponding or reciprocal removal of the protective duties most burdensome on the commodities they must purchase as necessary to sustain their lives and industries.

Now, gentlemen, I declare unto you that this is an admission by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], Mr. KITCHIN, and the other Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee that this treaty, which is nothing but a new tariff law between us and Canada, is an injustice to the farmers of this country. I take the position that it is unjust, for the reason that all of the farmers' products are put absolutely on the free list, while the Canadian farmers now sell to the United States, even with the present tariff tax against them, more than our farmers export to Canada. However, of the manufactured products the reverse is true, and our exports into Canada are a thousand fold more than Canada sends into the United States, making the market for American manufactured articles easier, but making the competitive struggle of the American farmer with Canada fiercer.

The treaty places practically all agricultural products on the free list, thereby giving the large manufacturers and trusts of the country the right to buy farm products at the lowest price and compel the farmers to pay the manufacturers for finished products the highest price. The Republican Party for 40 years has maintained a system of tariff taxes which has enabled manufacturers to charge our people not only the world price for their manufactured articles, but the world price plus the tariff, while on the other hand the toiling farmer of the country, who has been producing more than our home market could consume and therefore shipping much abroad, has been compelled to receive only the world price for the product of his toil. Naturally they have not shared in the legislative-made prosperity, and many of the farmers and farmers' boys during the last two decades, feeling the inequality in the race for the accumulation of anything in life, have left the farms and gone to the cities and manufacturing centers where they might enjoy some of the artificial tariff profits.

This movement has drained the farms of splendid laborers until now the time has arrived when the farmers' products have not kept pace with the increasing population, and therefore our exports of farm products are smaller, and necessarily the price of our farm products has risen during the last few years and the farmer has been getting fairer prices. But now what do we behold? These great tariff-made barons and millionaire manufacturers are not willing that the farmer should receive an increased price for his products, and so in order to hold him down and compel him to accept the world price for his goods they propose to turn all the farm products of that great Dominion to the north of us into the United States to compete with every farmer that earns his living by the sweat of his face, and compel him to work harder and remain poorer than the tariff-protected industries of the country which have fattened at his expense.

Former Gov. Bachelder, of New Hampshire, now master of the National Grange, composed of 6,000,000 farmers, said that these 6,000,000 farmers were united in opposition to this treaty, and said he voiced this protest against free trade in farm products while protection was continued on manufactured articles, which the farmers were compelled to buy.

It has been truly said:

The farmer is the progenitor of the human race, and was the first to stand in the presence of the Creator to receive from him the decree of the Divine mind on the question of labor.

Mr. Chairman, all human progress and prosperity depend upon his industry and success, and our mighty commercial fabric, which dazzles the whole world, rests upon his broad back. All of the splendid ships sailing all the seas and docking at all the ports of earth are absolutely dependent on the corn fields, wheat fields, and cotton fields of the farmer. Without his industry and prosperity the railroad irons of our great national highways would soon turn to rust and the scream of the locomotive would soon become a strange noise in the land. Were it not for the humble tiller of the soil the owls and bats would infest the lofty spires of our magnificent cities, and they would soon fall to ruins as complete as those of Herculaneum or Pompeii.

The President of the North Carolina Farmers' Union thinks this treaty unfair and unjust to the farmer. He is one of the most intelligent and fair-minded men in that great State, and after careful study of the treaty here is what Dr. H. Q. Alexander, president of this great organization, says:

I approve of your course in opposing the reciprocity treaty with Canada as it was presented to the House by the President. That treaty is not fair or just. It seeks to lower the cost of living, but taxes the farmer with the reduction without in any way compensating him for his loss. And I am not sure that it would even lower the cost of food products to the consumer. All articles put on the free list are in the raw state. No manufactured products are admitted free. The farmers and laborers produce the raw materials. Capital converts it into the finished product. Capital is protected. The man must fight unaided for his living. The dollar is placed above the man.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer does not demand any special privileges, but he demands equal justice. This he is entitled to and with nothing less will he be satisfied.

Lands are undoubtedly cheaper in Canada, hence taxes are lower, and the Canadian farmers' cost of living is cheaper than to our farmers, for the Canadian pays a lower tariff tax on his necessities. The following table shows this:

Article.	Tariff paid by Canadian farmer.	Tariff paid by American farmer.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Tinware	15	45
Hats	20	55
Sugar	35	80
Hose	25	87
Underclothing	22½	45
Axes	20	45
Scythes	15	45
Stoves	15	45
Chains (iron)	5	45
Knives and forks	20	60
Window glass	7½	60–75
Jute bags	15	45
Cotton thread	17½	45
Glassware	15	60–100
Lamp chimneys	20	60
Lamps	20	45–60
Rubber coats	15	35
Rubber boots and shoes	15	35
Blankets	Free.	40–150
Clocks	20	45

Thus the Canadian farmer can produce farm products cheaper than our farmers, for his burdens are lighter, expenses less, and this treaty throws our farmers absolutely into the unequal struggle for competition with his Canadian rival. The treaty places on the free list, which will reduce our revenue about $5,000,000, something like 54 articles produced on the farm, including wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, butter, eggs, and so forth, while the Democratic Walker tariff law placed a tariff on all the farmer's products as well as on the manufacturer's; the Wilson-Gorman Democratic tariff law of 1894 did the same thing.

My friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] yesterday spoke in glowing terms of the fact that barbed wire was put on the free list in the treaty. Oh, my friends, what a ridiculous proposition! Does anyone think the farmer can be thus fooled? We have not imported a pound of barbed wire from Canada since it became a province of England; but we do export into Canada about a million dollars' worth a year. Now they take the tariff off barbed wire in order that it may come into the United States from Canada to compete with the Steel Trust in the farmers' interest. The only barbed-wire manufactory in Canada is a subsidiary corporation belonging to the United States Steel Trust. Now, when you have the United States Steel Trust in Canada competing with the United States Steel Trust in the United States will it not be a glorious competition and will not the price fall rapidly? This is a joke. To mention it is to laugh.

Yes; the Coal Trust gets in its work, too. The duty on coal going into Canada is 53 cents a ton. This treaty reduces the duty on coal going into Canada from 53 to 45 cents a ton, but keeps the same strangle hold on the people on all coal coming into the United States by retaining the Payne-Aldrich duty. The Coal Trust, of course, wants the treaty because it is giving easier access to Canadian markets, but keeps the same exclusive tariff on all coal coming into the United States; and the price of coal will not be reduced to our people. Canada shipped only $512,000 worth of coal last year to the United States, while the United States Coal Trust sold into Canada $11,000,000 worth. This treaty keeps out material competition with the trust, but makes the Canadian market easier and freer for the trust.

Let us take up the Agricultural Implement Trust. That trust has had the people of the United States by the throat, especially the farmers, for years. It gets the lion's share in this treaty. Plows, hoes, rakes, diggers, thrashing machines, drills, and all sorts of agricultural implements are going into Canada hereafter, when this treaty is passed, at a reduced Canadian rate. The ordinary Canadian rate against agricultural implements is from 25 to 17½ per cent. This treaty reduces the Canadian tariff against agricultural implements down to 15 per cent. Therefore, the Agricultural Implement Trust will sell more of these articles to Canada and reap bigger profits.

But, mark you, the treaty gives this trust the same Payne-Aldrich protective duty on all agricultural implements coming into the United States, so as to insure the old-time robbery of our farmers. Our entire purchases from Canada of agricultural implements during the year 1910 were only $74,000, if this book which I hold in my hand is correct, while the trust sold to Canada $2,230,000 worth of agricultural implements in that year, and this treaty simply makes the Canadian market larger and freer to that trust by lowering the Canadian tariff wall, but enables the Agricultural Implement Trust to rob the American farmer as it has in the past.

The Cement Trust was remembered, too, when this treaty was being framed, you might say, in secret, for the public and all Congress was kept in ignorance of it until it was ready to be sent to us, with orders that it must not be amended in the slightest particular, but that it must go through Congress with a hop, skip, and a jump or a dire extra session would be called. Well, the Cement Trust induces Canada to reduce her tariff on cement 1½ cents per hundred pounds, but the obliging treaty makers were careful not to lower the protective duty on cement coming into the United States, but kept the same Payne-Aldrich rate on it. So cement will sell no cheaper to our people, but the trust gets an easier market in Canada.

In the few remaining moments that I have I desire to make a personal explanation. Last Saturday my friend and colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], against whom I have no unkind feeling and with whom the most cordial relations exist, delivered somewhat of a lecture to those of us who could not see the situation as he does. He said that we were in mighty bad company, and even suggested that Mr. DALZELL had actually come over and influenced or fooled—I have not seen his speech, for it has not yet been published, and do not recall his exact words—the North Carolina Democrats in Congress, six of whom are against the treaty. Now, my friend Mr. KITCHIN did not mean that. He could not have meant it, and yet it has gone over my State that he said it. I do not have any idea that he meant that Mr. DALZELL could corrupt Mr. GUDGER, or Mr. PAGE, or Mr. POU, or Mr. DOUGHTON, or Dr. FAISON, or myself, or anybody else from North Carolina. However, so far as the company is concerned, in view of the gentleman's present companions in support of this treaty, I must conclude that even Mr. JOHN DALZELL is pretty fair company, because it has not been two months ago since we had up what is known as the tariff commission board bill, and when the vote was taken on the measure I find my good friend, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK, the Democratic Speaker, and Mr. OSCAR UNDERWOOD, the present Democratic floor leader, broke away from Mr. KITCHIN and voted with Mr. JOHN DALZELL. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DALZELL did not corrupt or fool Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. CLARK; of course not. That kind of reasoning on the part of my colleague is not argument, but it is a species of an attempt to prejudice people's minds, and if I were as gifted in that sort of suggestion as my friend Mr. KITCHIN is, I would say that he is in rather bad political company, too, because around him stand the progenitor of the Payne-Aldrich bill, Mr. PAYNE, and our friend Nelson W. Aldrich is very anxious to have this treaty passed. The horrible Aldrich is for the treaty and so is Mr. KITCHIN. [Laughter.] The Steel Trust is for the treaty and so is Mr. KITCHIN. Andrew Carnegie, who boasts that he has made 43 millionaires in his lifetime and who is afraid that he will die rich, so much money has he made off the people, is for the treaty, too. The Beef Trust is for the treaty and so is Mr. KITCHIN. The Cement Trust wants it, too. Judge CRUMPACKER, who has always ardently favored cutting down southern representation in Congress on account of the Negro vote, is for the treaty, and Mr. KITCHIN is going to vote with him. The Agricultural Implement Trust is bending every energy to have the treaty passed and so is Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, who wields more power and influence than any throned monarch and whose financial will Presidents of the United States dare not contrary, supports the treaty. In that bouquet of great financial wizards, powerful, heartless trusts, and high-protection Republicans my friend KITCHIN at present finds himself safely ensconced as the central flower. [Laughter and applause.]

He twits me because I am not willing that mica should go on the free list. Here again I refer to my former statement. Yes; mica is produced in North Carolina, in the mountains of my good State and district. Many poor people up there are paying the Steel Trust a high tariff tax on their picks, axes, and shovels with which they dig out this mineral, and are selling it for the best price that monopolistic buyers will pay them. Now comes along this treaty, this new tariff law, framed by friends of the great trusts, and places mica on the free list, although mica is the best revenue producer in all the list in comparison with the amount produced in the United States and imported. Why, in 1907 there was paid $435,000 duty on mica. Now a large portion of this revenue will be destroyed and remitted to the trust, and the taxes will be increased on the necessities of the poor in order to make up this loss of revenue. He stated that if you scratched a little deeper into my position on the treaty you would find mica. No; you do not have to scratch to find where I am on any question.

I told my fellow Democrats in the caucus that last fall when my people in the mountains wanted to know how I stood on the tariff and mica that I said to them that I would not promise that I would not vote for a reduction of the duty on mica, but being a Democrat and believing in a tariff for revenue, as the fathers of our party believed, and as there had always been a duty on mica, and since the Wilson-Gorman Democratic tariff law put a tariff on mica, that in view of this record of my party that I would not vote to put that article on the free list, and, my friends, I am not going to do it. [Applause.] Certainly not at the behest of a trust and a Republican administration. The caucus at once excused me from voting for the treaty.

Now, my friends, I do not care to be personal, but if I had the gift of innuendo and was willing to use it against political friend and foe as my colleague did in his long speech on Saturday, I might say that if you will scratch a little deeper under his advocacy of this treaty you might find peanuts.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to the fact that Mr. KITCHIN is out of the Chamber.

Mr. WEBB. I am very sorry he is not present. I did not know when I was to speak; if I had, I would have notified Mr. KITCHIN; but, after all, Mr. Chairman, I am saying no more about my colleague than he said about me. I understood from a colleague that he would be here to-day. This hour is the only time I could get to speak, and I must avail myself of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say I am sorry that my friend and colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is not here. There is no feeling between him and myself. We married in the same town, we attended the same church, graduated from the same institution, belonged to the same college society, are members of the same church and affiliate with the same political party, so there is absolutely no feeling between us. [Laughter.] I am only replying to him in kind and in the kindest way, and as he suggested mica as the moving cause for my position on this treaty, I would suggest that my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] has a large peanut-growing district. More peanuts are produced in his district, possibly, than in any district in the United States. Now, I do not insinuate that a little thing like a peanut would influence a great big man like my friend KITCHIN. [Laughter.] But it is a fact that Canada now levies a tax of 3 cents per pound on imported shelled peanuts and 2 cents a pound on unshelled peanuts, and by this treaty Canada is to reduce the duty on peanuts 75 per cent, and it should be remembered that she is the greatest purchaser of American peanuts. But, mark you, the duty of 19½ per cent protection on peanuts coming into the United States is retained in the treaty, which is the Payne-Aldrich protection duty.

Mr. KITCHIN says, in the McMichael letter, that the treaty will enlarge the peanut market and not hurt United States peanuts, because Canada produces none.

I do not say that this fact is the moving cause behind my colleague's zeal for the treaty, but I do say that it seems to me to be a little unfair for him to accept a protective tariff of 19½ per cent on his peanuts and then use every effort to take all the tariff off mica produced in my district and place it on the free list. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to even up the time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, we in the State of California are somewhat familiar with the subject of reciprocity. We know from actual experience how detrimental reciprocity treaties are to home industry. We are protectionists in that State, for the doctrine of protection as applied to the products of our State has brought great material prosperity to that Commonwealth.

I was an insurgent in this House in the Fifty-seventh Congress when Cuban reciprocity was before it. At that time Cuba was producing about 600,000 long tons of sugar per annum. The beet-sugar industry in this country, and especially in the State of California, was an important and a growing one. We felt that if Cuban reciprocity should be enacted into law

it would materially injure the beet-sugar industry in that State. But Cuban reciprocity was enacted, and in 1910 1,800,000 long tons of sugar were produced in Cuba, much of it controlled by the Sugar Trust. The cost of sugar to the consumer has not been reduced a fraction of a cent, and the 20 per cent reduction on Cuban sugar under the Cuban reciprocity bill, which, according to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] on this floor the other day, amounts in all to about $77,000,000 up to the present time, has practically gone into the pockets of the Sugar Trust. The people of the United States as consumers have not profited a single cent as the result of Cuban reciprocity.

Some years before that the Hawaiian Islands entered into a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and sugar came free from those islands. The consumer did not get the fraction of a cent benefit, but a half dozen men became multimillionaires. They, and they alone, were the beneficiaries under Hawaiian reciprocity. So that we have had actual experiences that ought to have taught the American people a lesson on the subject of reciprocity agreements. During the McKinley administration some half dozen reciprocity treaties were negotiated with as many countries, and those treaties were sent to the Senate for ratification. They were negotiated by Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, on behalf of the United States. Every one of them contemplated the reduction of duty on some product of California, and the Californians in this House and in the Senate fought with all their might to prevent the ratification of those treaties. We helped to defeat them, and the people of California applauded our course. And I feel to-day that every other State in the Union is equally entitled to that measure of protection for its industries that those industries may require. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I was rather entertained the other day when this reciprocity question came up on the floor of this House by the colloquy that occurred between the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and some of my Republican friends on this side of the Chamber who are opposed to the pending measure. It seems to me that some of my Republican brethren are not altogether consistent. They want to put wheat on a pedestal because it happens to be the product of their particular section of our country, but they are willing to sacrifice the industries of other sections, which said industries probably require protection just as much as does wheat. I believe that the industries of every section of this country, if they require protection, should be protected. I do not believe that because my district happens to produce something that requires protection that that commodity should be protected and that the duties on products of other districts should be lowered simply because my constituents have to purchase those commodities. That kind of near protection—"mercerized protection," if you please—does not appeal to me. Either the protection principle is right or it is wrong. I believe it to be right, and in my humble judgment it must either stand or fall as a principle and in its entirety.

The bill now before this House materially affects some of our industries in the West. We have in California a comparatively new one, an infant industry in the true sense of the word, one that has been built up within the last three or four years, the industry of manufacturing whale oil. Under this bill whale oil will be admitted from Canada absolutely free. Under the Payne bill it pays 8 cents a gallon duty. Whale oil is used largely in the manufacture of soap. Now, the ships that are engaged in that industry in the State of California are built in American shipyards. They cost about $80,000 apiece. The Canadian ships, on the other hand, are built in Norwegian shipyards, and they cost about $23,000 apiece. The crews that man the American ships get wages of about $75 a month per man, and the owners of the vessels have to feed the men. It is claimed that the expense of feeding the men is about $1 per day per man. The crews on the Canadian ships get about $40 a month per man, and they feed themselves, because they are principally Chinese and Japanese.

On the other hand, the men on the American ships are principally American citizens. Besides, the harpoons, bombs, and other paraphernalia used in this industry are manufactured abroad, and when brought into this country pay a duty to our Government. On the other hand, the same kind of implements brought into Canada for use on Canadian whaling vessels pay either a much lower duty or none at all. If this bill should pass, either the industry will be destroyed, so far as the United States end of it is concerned, or those engaged in the industry in this country will have to hie themselves to Canada, put their vessels under the Canadian flag, and thus give another blow to the American merchant marine.

The following letters set out the situation regarding the whale-oil industry quite fully:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, April 3, 1911.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
2712 Webster Street, San Francisco.

SIR: The inclosed copy of a letter received by this chamber from the Barneson-Hibberd Co., protesting against the enactment of the legislation which will permit the free entry from Canada of whale oil into the the United States, has received the unanimous indorsement of the board of trustees, and by their direction it is referred to you for your favorable and courteous consideration.

Yours, very truly, C. W. BURKS, *Secretary.*

BARNESON-HIBBERD CO., (INC.),
149 CALIFORNIA STREET,
San Francisco, Cal., March 31, 1911.

Capt. WILLIAM MATSON,
President Chamber of Commerce,
San Francisco, Cal.

DEAR SIR: We desire to invite your attention to a clause in the reciprocity act with Canada which, if passed, will permit of the importation of whale oil into the United States of America free of duty.

At the present time there is a duty of 8 cents per gallon on this article, and, as we are manufacturers of whale oil, we desire to obtain the assistance of your honorable body in an endeavor to have this article stricken out of the reciprocity act, for the following reasons:

We have invested up to this time the sum of $400,000 in steamers and plant in southeastern Alaska, which includes our two whalers. Our annual cost of operation is $150,000, all of which money is spent in San Francisco and on Puget Sound. To build boats for the purpose of this work we are compelled, under the laws of this country, to have them constructed in the shipyards of the United States, where they cost us $80,000 fully equipped for the purpose of whaling. At our station we pay a wage of 25 cents an hour and board to from 75 to 100 employees during the season.

On the west coast of Vancouver Island there are situated three whaling stations in operation, and at this time these people are building three more stations. They have just brought out from Norway 5 Norwegian-built whalers, making a total of 12 boats, which they will operate this season, and, we understand, plans are already drawn for more boats for next season. These boats cost them in the neighborhood of about £4,000 in Norway, or $20,000 American money. To operate their stations they employ Japanese and Chinese coolies, to whom they pay a wage of about $40 per month, these men boarding themselves, as against our cost of $75 per month and board, which amounts to $1 per day per man. Their expense of operating their steamers is also one-half of what it costs us to operate our boats.

At the time we formed the company for operating this whaling industry we went into the matter carefully, and while we fully realized the vast difference in the cost of operation on the American side, as compared to that on the British side, we concluded that the 8 cents per gallon duty on this product protected us enough so that we could make a success of the business. Should this duty be removed we will be powerless to operate in face of the competition of our opponents on the British side, and it will result in the total loss of our investment.

In addition to the above we invite your attention to the fact that we are compelled to use the Norwegian hemp line for our whaling and also Norwegian harpoons, guns, etc., on all of which class of goods we are compelled to pay a heavy bounty when bringing them into the country.

The Tyee Co. are the pioneers for making this class of whale oil in the United States, and in addition were compelled to create their own market.

When this company first commenced to manufacture this product we we not able to sell a single barrel in the United States, and were forced to send our output to Glasgow, where it was sold at a heavy loss.

In competition with the product of the cheaply operated foreign plants, as we have only 2 steamers against 12 of our competitors, you can readily see there is not much chance for this infant industry if it is not afforded this protection, particularly as at the present time the American markets are not taking care of our whole production.

We have gradually educated the consumers of America to the fact that they can use this product for the manufacture of soap, and at the present time the different soap manufacturers, both on the Pacific coast and Atlantic seaboard, are using the greater part of our output, but still making it necessary for us to dispose of a portion of our output in the foreign market at a loss.

Our annual output is about 10,000 barrels, on which the duty is $36,000. This amount represents more than our season's profit for the work of the entire plant, which is an investment of $400,000. If this duty is withdrawn, we will not only lose the profit, but our markets will be invaded by several times that amount of oil from British Columbia, and the value of our plant will thereby be entirely destroyed, as the markets at the present time will not take up all of our output; and if our competitors, with their cheap production, are allowed to come in and compete with us they will be able to drive us entirely out of business and destroy the value of our plant.

In view of the foregoing facts we respectfully ask that your body take prompt action to protest against the admission of whale oil into the United States from Canada free of duty.

We operate our whaling industry under the name of The Tyee Co.

Yours, respectfully,

BARNESON-HIBBERD CO.,
I. N. HIBBERD, *Vice President.*

Take the paper industry, and in that very connection let me call your attention to that feature of the Republican platform that has been so often referred to on this floor, that the measure of protection should be the difference between the cost of production here and abroad plus a reasonable profit. The report of the Tariff Commission, submitted by the President to the Senate on February 28, 1911, shows that as to news print paper alone in various sections of this country there is a variation in the cost of production of $14.19 a ton. In other words, news print paper can be manufactured in some sections of our country at $14 a ton cheaper than it can be produced in some other sections of the country.

Now, how are you going to get at the true measure of the difference in the cost of production of a commodity abroad and in this country when the variance in our own country is as great as that? [Applause.] This is what the Tariff Commission has to say about it:

COST OF PRODUCTION OF NEWS PRINT PAPER.

As will be seen from Tables 3 and 4, the total cost of production of news print paper in bulk at the mills varies from $25.38 to $39.57. This represents a variation of $14.19, equal to an excess of 55.9 per cent over the lowest cost. To account for this difference we find that the difference between the highest and lowest cost of ground wood is $10.75, and that $7.58 represents the difference in cost between the highest and lowest for sulphite, making a total difference in cost of pulp per ton of paper equal to $18.33, or more than the entire difference in the total cost of production of paper. The differences in the cost of production of pulp, both ground and sulphite, have been explained above.

The cost of other materials per ton of paper ranges from 31 cents to $3.08. These other materials are made up of fillers, alum, bleach chemicals, color, and sizing. The difference in the cost of these items per ton of paper is due partly to the difference in prices paid by various concerns and partly to the lack of uniformity in practice in the use of these materials resulting in a great deal of waste in some mills.

The cost of manufacturing labor per ton of product equals $3.25 on an average for the entire industry. It represents a variation from $2.19 to $6.06 per ton. * * *

Other costs, representing miscellaneous supplies, repair labor, operating expenses, etc., vary from $5.44 to $8.55, the average for the entire industry being $7.07. The most important item included in this group is the expense for repairs, consisting of repair materials and repair labor. On the item repair materials (Table 4) the cost per ton of paper varies from 6 cents to $2.14. This wide divergence has been referred to in the explanatory statement preceding the tables. Taking the unrevised figures, the high charge may be due to the fact that extensive repairs were made in a single year, instead of being distributed, or the differences may be due to divergence in equipment and age of machinery in the various plants.

The average cost of producing a ton of paper for the entire industry is $32.53. Nearly one-fourth of the tonnage investigated was produced at an average cost of $26.07 per ton; nearly one-half was produced at a cost of $32.90; and the remainder at an average cost of $37.25. All of these costs represent the charges actually carried on the books of the companies, including any profit charged on wood pulp, and without allowance for depreciation.

But a still more interesting statement, which shows the difference of the cost of production in the mills of the United States and Canada, is the following:

Table 9 gives the comparison of lowest cost, highest cost, and average cost in the mills of the United States and Canada. Attention should be called to the fact that in these tables * * * the totals do not equal the separate items, except in the case of the column for average cost. This is to be expected, as where lowest costs are given, the lowest figure is taken for each separate item, and no single mill has the lowest cost on all items. Consequently, the lowest total cost must be in excess of the sum of the preceding items. For exactly similar reasons, in the column giving highest costs the highest total cost will be below the sum of the separate items in the same column.

Lowest, highest, and average costs of production of pulp and news print paper in the United States and Canada.

Items.	Lowest cost per ton of product.		Highest cost per ton of product.		Average cost per ton of product.	
	United States.	Canada.	United States.	Canada.	United States.	Canada.
Ground wood pulp:						
Wood	$7.33	$5.74	$15.01	$9.71	$10.64	$7.07
Manufacturing, labor	.98	1.50	3.78	2.46	2.12	1.93
Other costs	.29	.82	7.00	3.30	2.02	2.14
Total cost in bulk at mills	10.13	9.57	20.07	14.72	14.78	11.13
Sulphite pulp:						
Wood	13.28	12.02	25.89	18.04	19.08	14.32
Manufacturing, labor	2.09	2.87	4.83	5.45	3.63	4.15
Other costs	7.48	7.29	13.02	9.51	10.01	8.87
Total cost in bulk at mills	24.11	24.09	38.43	33.00	32.72	27.34
News print paper:						
Ground wood pulp	7.79	7.18	18.54	10.88	12.61	9.22
Sulphite pulp	6.31	3.71	13.89	8.54	8.43	6.50
Manufacturing, labor	2.19	2.97	6.06	3.55	3.25	3.25
Other costs	6.75	8.44	11.63	10.12	8.24	9.42
Total cost in bulk at mills	25.38	25.17	39.57	30.27	32.53	28.39

From this it would appear that the difference in cost of production of news print paper in the United States and Canada is $4.14 per ton in favor of Canada. This does not include the reasonable profit referred to in the Republican platform, but simply the difference of cost of production. And yet the duty on news print paper is only $3.75 per ton under the Payne law. Small wonder that the paper manufacturers of the United States, with their $300,000,000 of invested capital, are vigorously protesting against this Canadian reciprocity measure. And I honestly believe that if it were not for this particular item of print paper and its twin sister, wood pulp, there would be "none so poor to do it"—the pending measure—"reverence."

The attitude of the Pacific coast paper manufacturers is well stated in the following letter:

WILLAMETTE PULP & PAPER CO. (INC.),
San Francisco, Cal., March 27, 1911.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please note the inclosed copy of a letter which we understand has been sent to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Washington by Mr. Howarth, president of the Everett Pulp & Paper Co. The arguments set forth therein have our thorough approval, and the facts as stated are not only correct as regards the effect upon the general paper industry, but are especially pertinent when considered with reference to the manufacture of news print paper.

The difference in cost of stumpage in Oregon or Washington and British Columbia is equivalent to about $2.50 per ton of finished paper in favor of British Columbia, and the exemption from taxes and from labor restrictions, also from duties upon articles used in manufacture, constitutes enough more difference to warrant the present tariff of $3.75 per ton. If that tariff should be taken off, British Columbia would have at least that advantage over manufacturers of the Pacific coast located within the United States.

We therefore ask that you do your utmost to protect one of the important industries of this coast by opposing the reciprocity treaty and leaving the duty on printing and other paper as it now stands, so that future expansion of the industry on this coast will not be confined entirely to British Columbia, and the capital which might otherwise be invested in the United States be diverted there.

Asking your thoughtful consideration of these questions and your support of the tariff upon our manufactured product, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

WM. PIERCE JOHNSON, *President.*

The President having called an extra session of Congress expressly for the purpose of considering the Canadian reciprocal treaty, we desire to lay before you facts bearing upon the same as affecting the pulp and paper industry.

As manufacturers of paper and pulp we are vitally interested in this so-called reciprocity, and danger lies in the different interpretations of the provisions which can be put upon same by Congress or the Treasury Department.

Paper makers might contend that paper or pulp can not come in free unless all restrictions are taken off by all the Provinces on wood cut on Crown lands, while the other interpretation would be by the publishers and users of paper that it can come in. Certain Canadian Provinces absolutely prohibit the export of pulp wood from Crown lands and refuse unconditionally to modify or in any way change from that position. There is sufficient wood and water power, other than the Crown lands of the different Provinces of Canada, to produce enough paper, mechanical and chemical pulp, to make inoperative many of our well-established concerns if Canadian paper products are permitted to come in free.

The whole paper industry of this country, in which there is invested some $300,000,000, would be in great danger in the future without a more definite understanding.

The manufacture of high-grade book papers, which next to newspaper is the most important in this country and in which great sums of money have been invested under the protective system, find a clause in the proposed treaty in the McCall bill "provided such paper and board valued at 4 cents per pound or less is to be admitted free."

The foregoing affects all paper and pulp industry of this country making paper from wood pulp below the value of 4 cents per pound.

Particularly in regard to the manufacture of book and magazine papers, of which grade this concern is the only one west of the Missouri and located on the Pacific coast, would we submit these facts.

During the investigation of the paper industry by the United States Government in 1908, a full report of which is now on file at Washington, D. C., this company made a sworn statement, as will be found on pages 1862 to 1866, inclusive, of such record, in which, on page 1865, we give reasons why the placing of newspaper, book, and magazine paper on the free-tariff list would mean the crippling, if not the annihilation, of our industry. (Excerpt from report hereto attached.) All of which reasons hold good to-day.

In consequence of the proposed free tariff being only with Canada, this makes our case more aggravated and furnishes stronger reasons for carrying out our contention, viz, the seeking of a location in British Columbia.

The further reasons other than those as contained in the attached excerpt are:

First. The concessions or subsidies offered by the British Columbia Government to encourage the establishing of pulp and paper industries in that Province, by which certain pulp-wood limits are assigned upon a nominal stumpage of 15 cents per cord for all pulp wood used during the first 21 years of operation, the stumpage to be paid thereafter being a matter of agreement, with privilege of cutting the timber on said wood limits into lumber upon paying a nominal rental as provided under timber limits, and a further stumpage charge of 50 cents per thousand on whatever is cut. In that way the best part of the tree is used for lumber and the balance for pulp and paper making, thus gaining two advantages.

Second. The granting in fee simple of water powers without cost other than cost of development.

The stumpage value to-day in the Pacific northwest of the United States of America for pulp wood not suitable for lumber is from 50 cents to 60 cents per cord, with yearly increase, and even if present concerns own their individual requirements, due to interest on investment and taxes, the difference at present values makes an advantage of about $1 per ton of paper made in favor of Canada, on pulp wood only, without taking into account the further advantage of lumber operation in connection with a pulp and paper mill. The stumpage value in Puget Sound district of the State of Washington to-day of similar class of timber to that in British Columbia, equally available to transportation by rail or water, is from $2 to $3 per thousand feet.

Third. Certain raw materials used by us in the manufacture of paper upon which there is a duty into the United States are admitted free into Canada, and which makes an increase in our cost of raw materials

compared with Canada of about $12,845 per year, or $1.50 per ton of paper produced, viz:

	Duty into Canada.	Duty into United States.	Increased cost to us.
English china clay	Free	$2.50 per ton	$3,750
Bleaching powder	Free	¼ cent per pound	4,800
Alum	Free	½ cent per pound	795
Copper wire cloth	17½ per cent	45 per cent	1,000
Aniline dyes, ultramarine colors.	Free	30 per cent and 3 cents per pound.	1,000
Paper makers' felt ings and jacketings.	30 per cent.	44 cents per pound and 60 per cent.	1,500

Fourth. The employment of Japanese, Hindustani, and oriental labor, which are not employed in the States of Washington or Oregon in paper-mill operations, means an advantage in British Columbia of approximately $6 per ton of paper made.

It is surprising that in such an important matter, affecting as it does one of the largest industries of the country, viz, paper industry, the facts recited have been overlooked and, briefly stated, are:

1. Subsidies or concessions granted by Canada to encourage the locating of paper industries placed the United States paper industries at a disadvantage.

2. Unequal duties on raw materials entering into the manufacture of paper placing United States pulp and paper industries at a disadvantage.

3. The employment of cheap oriental labor.

4. The ambiguous language as to the export duty on wood used in the manufacture of paper, board, or wood pulp applying to Crown grant, pulp licensed, leased, or any other timbered lands.

The action of the President in suggesting practically free trade between Canadian Provinces and America on paper will, if followed by an act of Congress agreeing thereto, be a decided blow and serious menace to manufacturing of that kind of product on the Pacific coast of the United States.

At the time of the investigation by the United States Government in 1908 we made an exhaustive investigation of the conditions and advantages of location of pulp and paper industries in British Columbia, with the view of making all our additions in that Province, and we were then and are now prepared to consider seriously the removal of our plant to that country in case of the removal of the protective duty, for in addition to the adverse tariff action proposed by the President we are harassed on this coast by very stringent labor laws, labor commissions, and employers' liability laws, extraordinary taxes, both franchise and other, and, in fact, a generally arbitrary assailment of a legitimate manufacturing enterprise. By contrast the Canadian Government is extending all sorts of concessions to investors in that country.

A large plant is now under construction in British Columbia a little north of Vancouver, and will be absolutely unrestricted as to labor, whether white or oriental, will have practically no taxes to pay, and has received the most flattering concessions regarding timber limits from the Canadian Parliament.

If these suggestions of the President become law, we look for no further development of the paper industry on the Pacific coast of the United States.

We most respectfully ask your kind consideration of the facts as stated herein, and if after fully satisfying yourself that the general good of this country can be better served by the elimination of that feature of the Canadian reciprocal treaty affecting the pulp and paper industry we then believe your sense of duty will rightly direct your decision.

Yours, sincerely, ——— ———.

But, sir, this reciprocity measure strikes another important industry of the United States a serious blow. In the last Congress the cause of the New England fishermen was admirably presented by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] Now, the Pacific coast codfisheries represent an industry of no mean proportions. The men engaged in that industry on our western seaboard are just as bitterly opposed to this Canadian reciprocity bill as are their colleagues on the Atlantic seaboard. This is what one of the leading concerns in the codfishing industry on the Pacific coast has to say about the matter:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SAN FRANCISCO,
San Francisco, March 1, 1911.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The inclosed communication received by this organization from the Union Fish Co., protesting against the enactment of Federal legislation having for its object the free entry of Canadian salt fish into the United States, has received the unanimous approval of the board of trustees.

In behalf of the board the undersigned begs to commend the matter to your favorable and courteous consideration.

Yours, very truly,

C. W. BURKS, *Secretary.*

SAN FRANCISCO, *January 31, 1911.*

Mr. C. W. BURKS,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco.

DEAR SIR: There is a matter which we would like to bring personally to your attention and to that of your officers and members of the chamber of commerce, but the absence of our president and vice president from the city prevent our doing so, and we are therefore compelled to present the subject to you in writing.

The matter referred to is in the nature of a protest against the Canadian reciprocity treaty now before Congress. This treaty provides for the free entry into the United States of green fish; that is, fresh fish, or fish salted and not dried, and would include codfish in bulk, as usually brought into port by regular codfishing vessels, and means a direct and unrestricted competition between the American codfishing firms and the codfishing vessels of Newfoundland, Canada, the Canadian Provinces, and British Columbia.

Our own interest lies, first, in our competition with the Atlantic coast. The present duty prevents any competition from there except with the American-caught fish. In very good years their nearness to the fishing grounds enables them to produce codfish more cheaply in Massachusetts than we can here, and enables them to sell quite close up to the Pacific States. When they have short catch we find a considerable market for Pacific-coast product through the Middle West and sometimes clear on to the Atlantic seaboard. Should this treaty become ratified the American codfish man on the Atlantic would be driven out of business entirely and the market there would be supplied by the Canadian and Provincial fishermen. The still shorter distance that they would have to go for their fish and, more particularly, the lower cost of labor in those countries would enable them to produce the fish so much more cheaply that they would not only displace the Massachusetts fishermen, but their fish would be shipped into our Pacific coast markets at such prices as would be almost sure to drive us out of the business. Any little trade that might otherwise remain to us would undoubtedly be absorbed by codfish caught in the North Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea by vessels fitted out from British Columbia. The certainty of this would necessitate our either going out of the business or removing our headquarters to some British Columbia port and transferring our vessels to the British flag. This, of course, would enable us to import Canadian fishermen to the British Columbia side and prosecute our business over there, utilizing for our product the markets of the United States, which would be made free to us by this treaty.

The figures of the Pacific coast codfishing industry are given in the telegram annexed to this, which has been forwarded on to our Representatives in Washington, being as follows:

Amount invested in Pacific coast codfisheries	$1,000,000
Amount employed in outfitting, annually	150,000
Amount of disbursements at close of season, annually	250,000

Our interests, of course, are entirely on the American side of the Pacific coast. We are all American citizens, and are attached by ties of birth, loyalty, and patriotism to this country. We do not want to surrender our business and our investments in favor of any of the Canadians, nor do we want to remove ourselves and our investments into their territory.

Hence, our request to you that the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce voice our protest on behalf of our city and State and of the Pacific coast. We would add that we have forwarded telegrams to our Representatives, as per copies herewith, and in doing this we have been joined by all the other codfishing companies on the Pacific coast, and by some of the fresh-fish producers, who have themselves sent similar telegrams, all of which efforts we hope to have seconded by your body.

As a further general reason for this action we would add that there are even now too few American sailors and too few methods of increasing their number. That one of these few yet remaining is the deep-sea fisheries of the United States. And to ruin these or drive them from this country would be to remove this last nursery of the American seamen and still further lessen our chance and our hope of ever getting an American merchant marine or American sailors for an American Navy.

We trust that the reasons advanced in the foregoing will be sufficient to warrant official action of your body in making this protest and in urging it upon our Pacific coast Representatives, both in the House and in the Senate.

We remain, very truly, yours,

UNION FISH CO.,
J. W. PEW, *President.*
C. P. OVERTON,
Vice President and Manager.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to judge of the future by the experiences of the past, the farmers of the Northwest have every reason to be fearful of the consequences if this measure should become a law. With free entry of their cereal products into the United States and a greatly reduced rate of duty on practically all of their farm products, the output of the Canadian Provinces will increase enormously and will literally swamp the American farmer. The large increase of the production of sugar in Cuba after the enactment of the Cuban reciprocity law gave a staggering blow to the beet-sugar industry of the United States. Many of these beet-sugar refineries, seeing no future in the business in this country, sold out to the Sugar Trust, and it is universally known that the Sugar Trust now controls a large number of the beet-sugar refineries in this country. And so, in my judgment, this enormous increase of the products of the Canadian farmers will not reduce the cost of living to a single "ultimate consumer" in the United States, but it will largely increase the profits of the trust magnates. It will undoubtedly help to demoralize the farming industry of the West and the Northwest, just as the rapid development of those sections of our country demoralized the farming industry of New England and New York in the years gone by. But the New Englander and the New Yorker turned their attention to manufactures, and they have prospered. The farmers of the West and the Northwest have cheerfully stood for the protective tariff on the manufactures of the eastern section of our country, for they realize that with the mills, the factories, and the workshops busily engaged in turning out American wares there was a home market created for the products of the American farmers that would enable them to sell those products at remunerative prices.

If now the manufacturers of New England and elsewhere refuse to stand for the protection of the products of the American farmer against those of his Canadian competitor, those very manufacturers may awake to find that the American farmer, for his part, will refuse to stand for the protection of the products of the American manufacturer. The passage of this measure will, I fear, lead to reprisals. You are sowing the wind; take heed that you do not reap the whirlwind.

During the progress of this discussion I have heard many references made on this floor to the iniquitous trusts, and I believe that every effort should be made to destroy those trusts that seek to throttle and ruin competitors in order to be able to advance prices and control monopolies. Many of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber persist in charging up these trusts to that protective-tariff system that has brought such a great measure of prosperity to the American people. But let me remind them that England, which is generally looked upon as a free-trade country, is thoroughly honeycombed with trusts. In fact, it was there, I believe, where the trusts originated. And I would not be surprised to learn that much English capital is invested in American trusts. I would not be surprised to hear that English financiers and English capitalists own large percentages of the bonds and stocks of American trusts. Naturally, this English capital wants to see this Canadian reciprocity bill passed. I venture the prediction that the trusts, and the trusts alone, will reap all the reward if this measure shall be enacted into law.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, when this measure was before the House in the last Congress I was opposed to it, but contented myself with simply voting against its passage, having faith in a Republican Senate that it would fail of enactment during that Congress, and that before the Sixty-second Congress would convene in regular session the sentiment of the people would be crystallized into such an opposition against it that the President would not again submit it. It happens, however, that the President, in his wisdom, has assembled the Congress in special session and has submitted this measure and urged its ratification. It is with great reluctance that I am compelled to oppose any proposition put forward by the President of my own party, and by one for whom I entertain as great an admiration and respect as I do for President Taft. I do not blame him for favoring this measure, and am disposed to take the same view as my good friend from Wyoming has taken in his remarks to-day, and that is to give him the credit of doing what he believes to be his duty, and having secured the best agreement that could be obtained, and being in a sense committed thereto, he has felt that he ought to submit it to Congress and recommend its acceptance. In doing this I say he is probably following what his conscience suggests to be his duty in the discharge of the high obligation resting upon him as the Executive, but having done what he has, namely, sent the agreement with his message to Congress, his obligation for the present ceases, as stated by the gentleman from Wyoming, and it is now for Congress to exercise its judgment and perform its duty as the Members thereof may in their best judgment decide. As one Member of the House, actuated by a feeling that otherwise I can not honestly and conscientiously discharge that duty in justice to my constituents and the people of the whole United States, I shall not only oppose it but vote against it, as I did in the last Congress. My reasons for opposing the proposition, and why in my opinion it should not be accepted, in a very brief way are as follows:

It is a measure inconsistent with the position of the Republican Party, as repeatedly declared in its platforms, and its enactment will be an injury to the agricultural interests of the country, and that will mean disaster to our general welfare, for you can not legislate against the prosperity of our farmers without indirectly affecting all our industries and injuring all of the people. That it is not a Republican measure admits of but little argument, and I shall not enter into any extended discussion to demonstrate this fact. I maintain, without fear of successful contradiction, that the Republican Party has never declared for reciprocity upon noncompeting products, neither has any great Republican, prior to the presentation of the pending proposition, ever taken any other position. President McKinley, in his inaugural address in 1897, defining reciprocity, said:

> The end in view always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

Charles Emory Smith, who was Postmaster General in the McKinley administration, in defining it, said:

> When rightly understood, the principle is axiomatic. Brazil grows coffee, but makes no machinery. We make machinery, but grow no coffee. She needs the fabrics of our factories and forges, and we need the fruits of her tropical soil. We agree to concessions for her coffee; she agrees to concessions for our machinery. That is reciprocity.

This, I think, most clearly and accurately states the position of the Republican Party on what reciprocity is, and that is what the people have been taught to understand is meant by it.

Much is said about President McKinley's last speech at Buffalo, and it is asserted by the proponents of this measure that in that speech he modified his position on the subject of reciprocity, but a reference to his words fails to disclose anything to indicate that he would favor the reciprocity proposed by this proposition, and this one statement clearly indicates to the contrary, namely:

> We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

He could not have made that statement if he intended that he would favor a measure that would benefit and promote the manufacturers of the country at the expense of the farmer, and if anything is to be gained by accepting this measure it will be by the manufacturers.

That it is not a Republican measure is further demonstrated by the fact that in the last Congress it was opposed by a majority of the Republican Members of this House, 87 voting against it, while only 78 voted for it. The Democrats made it their party measure by adopting it in a caucus, and on the passage of the bill, with the exception of five, they all voted for it. A Republican Senate refused to consider it.

In this Congress I apprehend a majority of the Members on this side of the House are still opposed to it, and most of them will so vote, while the Democratic majority has again declared for it in a caucus and it is said that nearly all of them will vote for it.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri who to-day is the recognized leader of his party, in fact the most prominent Democrat in the country and who may be chosen in the next campaign as the standard bearer of his party, and I am sure he has the respect and the good will of every Member on this side of the House, a man who is recognized as a partisan in politics, at present the Speaker of this House, in a newspaper interview on the 5th instant, stated that this is a Democratic measure, and I know of no one better capable of properly christening it from a Democratic standpoint than he, and therefore, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept his denomination of it and to regard it as a Democratic measure and to accord to him and his party the full responsibility for its enactment and the full benefit of any good that may come therefrom.

I may say in passing with reference to the distinguished gentleman, to whom I have just referred, that he represents the true position of Democracy upon the tariff question, as will appear by his frequent utterances in this House during the last 20 years. If he can have his way in dictating the legislation that will be enacted by this Congress relative to the tariff, it will mean his defeat in the next election, if he is nominated for the presidency, and the retirement of his party from control of this House for many years to come.

The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, in a three-hour speech in this House on Saturday last, declared it to be Democratic doctrine, as did the distinguished gentleman from New York, who declared himself for absolute free trade with all the world.

I have the honor of representing, in part, in this body an agricultural State and an intelligent people—a people who read and think for themselves and a large majority of whom usually vote the Republican ticket. In 1896, however, I regret to say, we elected for the first and only time in the history of our State two Members of this House who occupied seats on that side of the Chamber, and our electoral vote was cast for the Democratic candidate for the presidency.

In 1898 we redeemed the State and sent to the House two Republicans, of which I had the honor of being one. As our people had an opportunity to experience the benefits of Republican legislation, the McKinley tariff law, and to contrast the times with the four years of Democratic misrule, from 1893 to 1897, they became stronger and stronger in their Republican faith, each year giving a larger majority to the Republican ticket. I will not take the time to go into details as to our wonderful progress during the last few years, but I do want to mention that the last census discloses that in 10 years there has been an increase in the value of farm lands in South Dakota of 376 per cent, and there is also a very large increase in the value of farm buildings, farm implements, and live stock; our bank deposits are enormous and our people as a whole are prosperous and happy.

As an evidence of the conditions in our own State at present relative to the value of farm lands, I want to say that within

the past 30 days the commissioner of school and public lands disposed of about 20,000 acres of school land in the different counties, all unimproved, and it sold at an average price of $52.60 per acre, and most of it was purchased by the farmers living in the localities, buying it for actual farming purposes.

Much has been said about the Payne tariff act passed by the last Congress. It was criticized and condemned probably more than any other tariff measure ever enacted, due largely to a hostile press. My colleague and I in the last campaign went before the people of our State and defended the measure, and, while admitting that it is not perfect, we declared it to be the best tariff act ever enacted, and we had the satisfaction of being returned to this House by an increased majority of about 5,000 over the majority we received in 1908, notwithstanding that was a presidential election. We each had a majority of more than 32,000 over our Democratic opponents. This shows what our people think of the Payne tariff law. They will be satisfied at least for the present if it is left alone. The President, in his Winona speech, denominated it the best tariff law ever enacted, and certainly there was no reason to believe that he would suggest any legislation changing or affecting the agricultural schedule, at least not in advance of a report from the Tariff Board, or until there is evidence that the schedules are too high. In presenting this proposition, judging from the President's speech at Springfield in February, he assumed that the tariff plank in the platform of the last Republican convention carried to its logical conclusion would lead to substantial free trade with Canada, and in his speech he said:

> With that in view, still adhering loyally and sincerely to the principles of protection where it is needed to maintain our important industries, I did not hesitate to give the widest latitude to the Secretary of State and the commissioners who represented this country in offering to Canada a reduction of duties on goods and products coming into this country from Canada in consideration of the establishment of the same duty, or freedom of duty, on similar goods going into Canada.

He also said:

> The conditions of production and of manufacture in the United States and in Canada are substantially the same.

In other words, he assumed that conditions here and in Canada are the same. In this he is in error, as can easily be demonstrated, but I will only briefly comment thereon. Owing to an advantage in the tariff the Canadian farmer can buy manufactured articles lower than can the American farmer; he also has an advantage in cheaper land, cheaper farm labor, and, against our eastern farmers, a soil that does not require fertilization. The National Grange asserts that by official reports it is established that the average value of farm lands in Canada is less than one-half the value of lands in the United States, and that the wages of farm labor in this country are from 20 to 25 per cent higher than in all of Canada except in the northwestern Provinces, where the wages are about the same as in our Northwestern States.

We hear it said that wheat is not affected by the tariff and that the price is fixed by Liverpool. No one will deny but what there has been an average difference of 10 or 11 cents in the price of wheat in Minneapolis and Winnipeg in favor of Minneapolis, and it dropped to less than four when it was known that this treaty was in negotiation and to less than 2 cents within a few weeks after the treaty was signed. My distinguished friend from North Dakota [Mr. HANNA], who speaks from personal knowledge on the subject of the price of wheat, gives us the prices at Portal and North Portal, the two places being one and the same—Portal in North Dakota and North Portal in Canada, across the street. On December 31, 1910, the price of wheat on the North Dakota side was 86 cents, while on the Canada side it was 75 cents, a difference of 11 cents in favor of the United States. That prices on farm products are high it is admitted, and yet not higher in proportion to labor and practically everything else.

Mr. HANNA also gives us the prices paid on January 9, 10, and 11, 1911, on barley and flax between points in North Dakota and Canada, only a short distance apart, and without repeating all of the towns that he mentions I will simply compare Pembina, in North Dakota, and Emerson, in Canada. The price paid for barley on the dates named at Pembina was 67 cents; Emerson, 42 cents; flax, Pembina, $2.32; Emerson, $1.93.

I want to briefly refer to the barley industry of this country and how it has developed since it was protected by a duty of 30 cents per bushel, and show what an injustice it would be to the barley growers of the United States to take away from them that duty and compel them to grow barley in competition with Canada.

In the report of the Tariff Board, submitted in response to Senate resolution of February 23, 1911, Senate Document No. 849, on page 99, Table 15, it gives the production of barley and farm prices in 1910, per bushel, in specified States, compared with Canada. The table is as follows:

Barley—Production and farm price in 1910, per bushel, in specified States, compared with Canada.

	Production.	Average yield per acre.	Farm price per bushel.
United States:	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	
Maine	248,000	31.00	$0.760
New Hampshire	52,000	26.00	.720
Vermont	465,000	31.00	.680
New York	2,207,000	28.30	.700
Michigan	1,742,000	26.00	.580
Wisconsin	22,429,000	25.90	.640
Minnesota	26,985,000	21.00	.603
Iowa	15,045,000	29.50	.560
North Dakota	5,428,000	5.50	.550
South Dakota	18,655,000	18.20	.510
Montana	1,456,000	28.00	.620
Total	162,227,000	22.40	.578
Canada:			
Prince Edward Island	159,600	28.00	.572
Nova Scotia	264,000	30.33	.766
New Brunswick	73,000	35.29	.670
Quebec	2,547,000	24.49	.713
Ontario	20,727,000	29.75	.583
Manitoba	13,826,000	20.21	.390
Saskatchewan	3,598,000	26.18	.358
Alberta	3,953,000	20.32	.383
Total	45,147,000	24.62	.474

It will be noted that there is an average difference in price of 10 cents per bushel. The production in the United States, in round numbers, as shown by this table, is 162,000,000 bushels, which is about double the production prior to the enactment of the Dingley law, putting on a duty of 30 cents a bushel. The Tariff Board confirms this statement, and I quote the following from page 105:

> Previous to 1897 the rate of duty on barley was 30 per cent ad valorem. By the law of 1897 this duty was changed to 30 cents a bushel. Under the former rate of duty there were large importations of barley from Canada to the United States. In 1894 more than 2,000,000 bushels were imported; in 1897, over 1,000,000 bushels. After the imposition of the duty of 30 cents per bushel the importations dropped to somewhat more than 124,000 bushels, and in 1909 only 2,420 bushels were imported.
>
> The price of barley in Canada is generally below the price in the United States.

I would like some one to tell me how, in the face of these statistics and the statements of the Tariff Board, the enactment of this measure is not going to harm the farmers of the United States who are engaged in raising barley. Perhaps those who support this proposition can justify it on the grounds of lower prices. I presume they are concerned to cheapen the manufacture of beer, in order to increase the profits of the brewer, for certainly no one will contend that to cheapen barley 10 cents a bushel will affect the price of a glass of beer.

We hear a great deal about lower prices. We had low prices from 1893 to 1897, but no one will say that anyone was benefited thereby. What difference does it make how low prices are if you have no money? A man when he is hungry must eat, and the price does not cut any figure if he has not the wherewith to buy a meal. I maintain that when prices are high prosperity usually prevails and there is little complaint of lack of money to buy with, and the people live better than ever before. Who, if anyone, is going to benefit if this measure is enacted into law? Principally the packing houses, the millers, the brewers, the large users of wood-pulp manufactures, and those who will directly profit by the transportation of Canadian farm products. I doubt if it will directly benefit the ultimate consumer, for in my judgment the tariff on food products is too small to directly affect the retail price. No one will say that 10 cents on a bushel of wheat will cheapen the price of a loaf of bread or even a sack of flour, and so by cheapening the price to the producer, if there is any gain, it is to the manufacturer and the middleman.

I said that I represent an agricultural constituency and a thinking people. The American farmer generally thinks for himself, and I want to say to those who represent manufacturing and city constituents that before they strike down the small amount of protection that the farmers now enjoy they had better think twice, for there is likely to be retaliation, and you who believe in protection want to remember that you never would have had any McKinley law or any Dingley law and that the Payne law would not now be upon our statutes if it were not for the farmers of our country.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of the Northwest, particularly in the States of Minnesota and North and South Dakota, have recently been holding conventions in the different parts of those States and adopting resolutions showing what they think of this measure, and now that this debate is about to close, and before a vote is taken on this bill, it seems to me proper and appropriate that the farmers of the Northwest should be heard. Therefore in order that they may have that opportunity, in order that this House may know their position, and in order that the country may know it, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read a copy of the resolutions adopted by the farmers of Brown County, at Aberdeen, in my State, on Friday last, the resolutions being substantially the same as those adopted in mass conventions by the farmers of the other States that I have named.

The Clerk read as follows:

We, the farmers and business men of Brown County, S. Dak., in mass meeting assembled, do most earnestly and sincerely protest against the ratification by Congress of the pending treaty with Canada in its present form.

In doing so we hereby announce and publish the following reasons:

First. That the treaty is unfair, unjust, and discriminating against the agricultural interests of the United States, giving these interests practically nothing in return for what it deprives them of.

Second. That it will inure to the disadvantage, loss, and suffering of our producers without any prospect of cheaper manufactured products to the consumer.

Third. That the removal of the duty on wheat will accrue solely to the benefit of the miller, that of barley to the brewer, that of flaxseed to the linseed mills, and that of live stock, hogs, poultry, and dairy products to the packers and middlemen, and while not benefiting the consumer will mean a great loss to the producers.

Fourth. It creates an unfair competition, inasmuch as it will compel our farmers to compete in our own markets with cheaper-produced products of alien competitors. We contend that our home market belongs in the first instance to our own citizens.

Fifth. This pact, if agreed to, will retard and set back the progress toward a higher and better standard of farm life, which has become so noticeable during the recent prosperous times; it will tend to bring on again that struggle for existence, so well remembered by our pioneer farmers, a struggle in which many went under; it will lessen the opportunities for a better education of our farmers' children, and thus encourage them in leaving the farm.

Sixth. It will lessen the purchasing capacity of our American producers to the extent of millions of dollars annually by depriving them of a legitimate and fair price for their products. All of this will represent a corresponding loss to the commercial interests of our country, as the farmer's profit invariably finds its way into all the channels of trade. Our commercial and manufacturing interests stand to lose as much in this way as they will gain by the expansion of their business.

FARMERS MAKE COUNTRY.

Seventh. Our American farmers, by their thrift, energy, and frugality, have made this country what it is; they have made it possible for the great commercial interest to become wealthy and powerful; without the farmer this would have been impossible. In view of this our commercial interest should now stand by the farmer. To do otherwise lays them open to the charge of commercial greed and selfishness.

Eighth. The term "reciprocity" as applied to the Canadian treaty is a misnomer. Reciprocity means an equitable trade or exchange between two countries of products one country produces and the other does not or which it produces only in insufficient quantities. We produce everything in this country that is produced in Canada.

Ninth. It constitutes an agreement made secretly and without regard to any settled polices of our tariff laws. It means free trade for the farmer and protection for the manufacturer, and as such is discrimination in its rankest form.

Tenth. That in trading off our home market of more than 90,000,000 people, a market that is, and has been, abundantly supplied by our own producers, a market that has been built up by American thrift and frugality, and which, by every inherent right and heritage, belongs to our producers, for that of 8,000,000 Canadians, with its doubtful increased advantages to commercial and manufacturing interests, would not only be unfair and unjust to our own producers, but foolish and reprehensible.

Eleventh. This proposed treaty, when divested of its sentimental features, can and will appeal only to those who are selfishly interested and who expect to gain thereby. As a whole, it will be a damage rather than a benefit to our country. We are opposed to its passage in any form which puts agricultural products on the free list and protects manufactured interests.

Twelfth. We repudiate the action of President Taft, large manufacturing, chambers of commerce, and the management of the Great Northern Railway, in attempting to force the so-called reciprocity agreement through Congress without giving the people at large an opportunity to give it due consideration or to express their opinions. We regret exceedingly that the city press has failed to give publicity to both sides of this most important question.

WILL NOT REDUCE LIVING COST.

Thirteenth. The proposed pact would not reduce the cost of living. It would not benefit the laboring man, the mechanic, or artisan in the great cities, as the exorbitant prices paid by them for produce is not occasioned by the price received by the farmer, but is the result of the excessive charges made by the railroads and middlemen. The farmer only receives 35 per cent of the price paid by the consumer, while the transportation companies and middlemen receive the other 65.

Fourteenth. We hereby express our thanks to all those newspapers of our State who in this controversy have risen above considerations of selfishness and have defended farming interests against this threatening danger, and we mention expressly the Aberdeen Daily News, and we also thank those citizens who have interested themselves in calling this meeting.

Fifteenth. We urge on all of our citizens who are in favor of fair play and equality before the law to make continuous and effective agitation against this treaty.

Sixteenth. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that this measure will pass this House, but let it pass unassisted by Republican votes and be understood that it is Democratic doctrine. I appeal to the Republican membership of this body to stand loyally by the principle of protection which hitherto has been applied by Republican administrations to American industries without discrimination as to class. Let us keep fath now with the American farmer, who has been the bulwark of the Nation since the foundation of the Government and without whose allegiance no Republican administration ever was inaugurated at the National Capital. Our defeat will be but temporary if we remain true to Republican policies, policies that have made the Nation great beyond the dreams of prophets. Let us on this side of the House realize that dishonor can come to us in defeat only to the extent of our acceptance of this strange faith. Those who stand faithful in this trial will retain their self-respect and in the near future will form the nucleus of an invincible party that will again carry the Republican banner to victory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I regret that only a few minutes' time has been allotted to me to discuss this great question which is now before the House. Had I been permitted to enter into this discussion earlier, the limited time now given me would have been more appropriate, for I should not have desired to have said as much as I now feel like doing, for as each day and hour goes by many facts and statements are made, wholly or partially true. On the other hand, much misinformation has been spread upon the records. Hence to even do the subject partial justice would require hours instead of minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in what I shall say I shall endeavor, as far as possible, to refrain from indulging in any statements of a partisan nature. This proposed legislation deals with matters that are purely nonpartisan, for it is a subject in which the American people as a whole are vitally interested. Much has been said during this discussion on both sides of the Chamber as to who is responsible for the initiation and the continued insistence of this legislation. Aside from any political advantage to be obtained therefrom or any responsibility therefor, be it a Republican or Democratic measure, it is immaterial, as far as its beneficial or nonbeneficial qualities to the American people as a whole are concerned. While it is a fact that this measure during the last session of Congress was presented to us by our esteemed President and was reported to the House by a Republican Ways and Means Committee and passed by this branch of Congress while the majority was Republican, yet it failed of ultimate passage. Now it comes before us from a Democratic source, reported by a Democratic Ways and Means Committee, and indorsed by the majority party as a caucus measure. On our side of the Chamber there is a great division of sentiment as to its merits, and with less division on the Democratic side. Be it Democratic or Republican, to my mind it is manifestly unjust, and wherever the votes come from, North or South, East or West, Democratic, Republican, or Socialist, if this so-called reciprocity measure is enacted into law, I believe it ought to be named the legislative mistake of 1911. I predict that every man who votes for it will in the future regret that he did so.

All of our great leaders have designated and proclaimed reciprocity as a trade agreement between foreign countries in noncompeting products. That is, products that are indigenous to one country and not to the other. In no instance have I been able to find where free trade between two countries in the same products was ever considered or designated as reciprocity. This pact or trade agreement is chiefly confined to agricultural products between the Dominion of Canada and the United States upon a free-trade basis. Hence, our farmers are asked to compete with the farmer of the great Dominion lying immediately to the north.

The great industries of our country have been fostered and built up under the protective system for more than 50 years. At this time in nearly all the manufacturing industries we are equal to, if not greater, than any in the world. Originally our industries were small and needed protection against the older countries of Europe, and the great majority of our people cheerfully granted this aid. The agriculturist and the professional man, the clerk and the laborer were of one mind, believing it to be better to convert the raw material into the finished product within our own borders than pay for transportation to and from the foreign factory. By this protective system we have

been enabled to pay the laborer in our factory just wages, thus enabling him to purchase the produce of the farm at a living price.

For many years our farmers have been told that with the increase of our manufacturing industries and the many workmen who would be employed that the time would come when consumption on this continent would equal the production of their farms and thus they would greatly profit thereby. That doctrine has proven true. At this time the production of the farm is very little, if any, in excess of home consumption. Heretofore while the tariff schedules show that a high protective duty was placed upon the cereal and live-stock production of the farm, yet until recently the direct benefit to the farmer was only negligible, for he had no competitor. Within the past few years, however, our neighbor on the north, with his vast area of fertile land, is producing millions of bushels of all kinds of grains and great herds of live stock. This Canadian production is also at greatly reduced cost. While the cost of labor is comparatively equal, yet the value of the farm lands is hardly one-half in Canada to that of our own, while the production per acre, owing to the newness and fertility of soil, is about one-third greater.

Let us examine as to the magnitude and quality of our Canadian competitor. There are five great fertile Provinces in Canada, any one of which is almost equal in area to four or five of our Middle West States. I shall describe only three of them, however. Manitoba has 27,000,000 acres of as fine tillable land as any on this continent. Saskatchewan, with its total area of over 160,000,000 acres, has 86,826,200 acres of tillable land surpassed by none, while Alberta has 100,000,000 acres of the same kind of land. The average production of wheat per acre during the year 1909 in all of these three Provinces was 21.1 bushels; that of the United States for the same year was 15.8 bushels per acre. Thus it appears from these figures that the productive quality of the Canadian land is much greater than our own. This same ratio of productiveness applies to the yield of barley, oats, and flax, while the value of the land per acre is almost double in the United States as compared with Canada. There is but one conclusion—the American farmer can not successfully compete with his Canadian neighbor. But one result can follow—the Canadian land must raise in value or the American land must decline. Probably one will go up and the other down, to the great detriment of our people and the advantage of our neighbor. The statistician and the expert in figuring percentages inform us that the Canadian in the past has produced very little compared to us; but let us examine into the truth of this assertion. The Canadian crop of wheat in 1909, in round numbers, was 167,000,000 bushels, grown upon about 8,000,000 acres of land. The total yield of oats for that year was 353,466,000 bushels; barley, 55,398,000 bushels; and flax, 2,232,000 bushels. To show the rapidity with which the cereals of the Canadian farmer in the Province of Saskatchewan alone have advanced in the total yield, I will insert in the RECORD, with permission of the House, the following table:

Growth of wheat production, Saskatchewan.

	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Flax.
1898	4,780,440	1,589,412	182,859	
1899	6,083,508	2,518,248	160,604	
1900	3,443,671	1,604,561	150,822	
1901	11,956,069	5,517,886	354,703	
1902	13,110,330	6,975,796	298,632	153,709
1903	15,121,015	9,164,007	655,593	285,697
1904	15,944,730	10,756,350	589,336	166,434
1905	26,107,286	19,213,055	893,396	398,399
1906	37,040,098	23,965,228	1,316,415	710,689
1907	27,691,601	23,324,903	1,350,265	1,364,716
1908	50,654,529	48,379,838	3,965,724	2,589,352
1909	90,215,000	105,455,000	7,833,000	4,448,700

It may be interesting to note that in this Province, in 1898, with only a very small portion of its land under cultivation, there was raised only 4,780,000 bushels of wheat. Eleven years later, with only about 12 per cent of her occupied land under cultivation, there was raised over 90,000,000 bushels of wheat. The increase from 1908 to 1909 was nearly 40,000,000 bushels. The increase in the yield of oats from 1908 to 1909 in this Province, in round numbers, was 57,000,000 bushels.

Without reading this schedule, I call the attention of the House and country to it, that it may be seen how rapidly production in Canada is increasing. Should this proposed measure become a law and the Canadians be given the great advantages of our home market, it would be folly to assert that this ratio of increase in production would not continue.

Mr. Chairman, this is the free-trade competition that we are tendering to our agriculturists. We are asking them to share with the stranger the market which they have built up by over a hundred years of sacrifice and toil. We say to the Canadian: Enter into this paradise, with your immense area of cheaper and more fertile lands, and reap the reward which should belong to our own people, without price. I for one, Mr. Chairman, can not subscribe to this doctrine.

The section of the country from which I come and the district I represent is in the spring-wheat, barley, and oats belt of the great Northwest. It is sometimes designated as the home of the No. 1 hard and No. 1 northern wheat. My own State of Minnesota is the banner wheat-producing State of the Union. This Northwestern section can have only one competitor, and that is the Dominion of Canada, for that is the only other territory on this continent where this most excellent quality of grain is grown. It is frequently asserted on the floor of this House that Liverpool fixes the price of our grain, and especially of wheat. This I deny. The price of this wheat is now and always has been fixed at Minneapolis and Duluth, Minneapolis being the largest primary wheat market in the world and its flouring mills the greatest. Liverpool does at times have a tendency to fix the price upon a considerable portion of the winter wheat and other soft grades of wheat raised in the United States.

But for the No. 1 northern and No. 1 hard spring wheat it never has and never will, unless perchance it does after the passage and enactment into law of the measure now under consideration. Without wearying the House with voluminous statistics I assert that for many years past the price on this grade of wheat has been higher in Minneapolis than in Winnipeg or Port Arthur on an average of at least 10 cents per bushel. Frequently during many years the differences in price has been as great as 15 cents. Again, I am informed that the distance from Winnipeg to Liverpool is about 500 miles nearer than from Minneapolis to Liverpool, with equal rail and water transportation facilities. Such being the case, if Liverpool fixes the price and Liverpool is the destination for the surplus grain of Canada, why is it that the Minneapolis and Duluth price is from 10 to 15 cents per bushel higher? Why is it that all along the border line between Canada and the United States at every point where wheat is purchased the Canadian price is from 9 to 15 cents per bushel lower than on the American side? I assert that this difference in price did exist just prior to the day when this Canadian reciprocity agreement was submitted to the House for its consideration on January 26, 1911. At many points where this difference in price existed the distance between them was only from 2 to 30 miles.

Mr. Chairman, in proof of my statement I shall insert in the RECORD a statement showing comparative prices in wheat and barley in the United States and Canada.

Comparative prices of wheat and barley in United States and Canada.

WHEAT.

Date.	Name of town in United States.	Price per bushel.	Name of town in Canada.	Price per bushel.	Difference in price.	Distance apart.	Tariff per bushel.
1910.						*Miles.*	
Dec. 31	Kermit	$0.90	Estevan	$0.76	$0.14	15	$0.25
1911.							
Jan. 10	Pembina	.97	Emerson	.82	.15	4	.25
10	Neche	.96	Gretna	.81	.15	2	.25
1910.							
Dec. 31	Portal	.90	North Portal	.75	.15	(1)	.25
1911.							
Jan. 11	Walhalla	.96	Haskett	.83	.13	6	.25
1910.							
Dec. 31	St. John	.91	Boissevan	.81	.10	15	.25
31	Hannah	.90	Snowflake	.77	.13	4	.25
31	Neche	.91	Gretna	.81	.10	2	.25
31	Sarles	.89	Clearwater	.75	.14	(1)	.25
1911.							
Jan. 10	Westhope	1.00	Colter	.85	.15	15	.25
10	do	1.00	Lyleton	.84	.16	20	.25
10	do	1.00	Malita	.86	.14	30	.25
10	St. John	.96	Boissevan	.86	.10	15	.25
10	Hansboro	.90	Cartwright	.77	.13	8	.25
1910.							
Dec. 31	Antler	.91	Lyleton	.78	.13	6	.25
1911.							
Jan. 10	Portal	.92	Boscurvis	.75	.17	15	.25

BARLEY.

1911.							
Jan. 10	Pembina	$0.67	Emerson	$0.42	$0.25	4	$0.30
10	Neche	.66	Gretna	.38	.28	2	.30
10	St. John	.66					

[1] Just across line.

This statement was compiled by Senator McCUMBER, of North Dakota, the figures having been obtained by him from responsible parties at the points designated and indicating the actual cash price paid for wheat on the days mentioned.

I wish particularly to call attention to that portion of the schedule pertaining to Portal and North Portal, showing the comparative prices on both wheat and barley, Portal and North Portal being a village on the border line between Canada and the United States. North Portal is on the Canadian side and Portal on the American side, with only a street dividing them. On December 31, 1910, the price of wheat in Portal was 90 cents per bushel, and on the same day the same wheat in North Portal was 75 cents per bushel, a difference of 15 cents. You will notice that this difference of about 15 cents per bushel exists between all the points mentioned in the schedule. Does Liverpool fix the price?

Mr. Chairman, the message of our President and the bill under discussion was submitted to Congress January 26, 1911. On that date the price of this grade of wheat in Minneapolis was $1.04⅜ per bushel, and in Winnipeg on the same day it was 94¼ cents. Two days after, on January 28, 1911, the price of this grade of wheat in Winnipeg went up 1¼ cents a bushel, and in Minneapolis it went down 5 cents a bushel. The cause assigned for this sudden change was noted in the Minneapolis Journal as due to the possibility of this reciprocity bill being passed. A few days later in these same markets the Minneapolis price went down to 98⅜ cents and the Winnipeg price remained virtually stationary. On February 11, and after about a 10-cent decline in the Minneapolis market, the Minneapolis Journal, which reports the daily proceedings of the market, stated:

> This decline has put the United States nearer an export basis, but still further declines will be necessary to allow this country to enter the European markets with any profit, and many of the local traders of the chamber of commerce predict that domestic prices would continue to decline until this country was put on an export basis.

Mr. Chairman, this is what this form of reciprocity means to the farmers of the Northwest, who are producers of this grade of wheat. All that I have said with reference to wheat applies with equal force, if not greater, to barley.

Mr. Chairman, it is a common statement outside of this Chamber that one of the great blessings which the farmer will receive under the provisions of this pact is free lumber. In my limited time I shall not attempt to fully discuss the provisions in regard to lumber in this bill. In brief, I will say that the duty upon partly finished or finished lumber is somewhat reduced, while rough boards are placed on the free list. This can be of little benefit to the farmer, since unfinished boards are used by him in small quantities only. His house is constructed chiefly of finished lumber. The difference in weight is considerable, the finished product being scarcely more than three-quarters of an inch in thickness, while the rough board is a full inch. Hence the item of freight is so considerable that very little of it would be imported any considerable distance. It might be imported from Canada to the nearest American mill free and there finished by planing and otherwise, and then sold to the American consumer under the tariff schedule of rates prescribed for that grade. I am unable to see how the American consumer can possibly receive any benefit from the removal of the tariff on rough boards.

Mr. Chairman, right here I will digress a moment from the subject I have been attempting to discuss. During the discussion this afternoon a friend of mine on this floor, in a serious but friendly manner, somewhat criticized me as to my ideas on the subject of protection, and particularly called attention to a controversy between myself and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] concerning free lumber. During that controversy the gentleman from North Carolina asked me if I voted for free lumber at the time our recent tariff bill was under discussion. Upon my informing him that I did and that I should do so again if opportunity presented, the gentleman from North Carolina stated that he voted for free lumber and would do so again. Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the vote I cast for free lumber and trust that I may be given the opportunity to do so again, for I firmly believe that the lumbering interests of this country do not at this time need any protection.

In this connection I wish to say that the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin a few years ago had immense quantities of very fine pine and other timber suitable for manufacture of lumber, and there still remains considerable. We have many of the finest and best equipped sawmills in the country, Minneapolis being at one time the great lumbering center of the United States. In my State we have some of the leading lumbermen, and I mention in this connection the names of Mr. Weyerhaeuser, Thomas Shevlin, C. A. Smith, and T. B. Walker. I am informed that these men are among the leading manufacturers of lumber and stumpage owners in the United States. I speak of them for the purpose of showing that by reason of the conditions surrounding them and aided by a high protective tariff they succeeded admirably in their enterprises. I do not know the opinion at this time of any of these gentlemen on the subject of the lumber tariff, whether they all desire its retention or not, yet Mr. Shevlin has expressed himself on the subject recently and has stated that he did not think that any further protection on lumber was needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, believing that Mr. Shevlin is correct, and according to my settled convictions on the subject of a protective tariff, that it should be withdrawn whenever and wherever it is unnecessary, I therefore voted against further protection, and shall continue to do so in the future until conditions change materially from what they are at present.

Mr. Chairman, my people and myself were among the early pioneers in the great State of Minnesota. Aside from a few small cities and villages along the border the great interior was one vast wilderness of timber and prairie land occupied almost solely by the Indians. Our settlement was made near the center of this magnificent area in the timber belt. I know personally the hardships and trials of a pioneer on a timber farm. For more than 50 years these farmers have worked unceasingly from early morn until late at night in order to subdue nature, build up their farms, and make a home for themselves and families. To-day they are enjoying the fruits of their labor.

I will venture the assertion concerning the farmers of the Middle West and the great Northwest who went upon their farms 50 or 75 years ago that if you will estimate their services at 50 cents a day and the services of the housewife and grown sons and daughters at 25 cents per day, their total earnings would greatly exceed the present value of their farms. They own their farms simply and solely because they have worked unceasingly all the day and part of the night, and thus have improved their farm and home, and to-day they are beginning to reap the reward for their labor. The great home market is and ought to remain their market, and not given over without compensation to the stranger across the border.

My friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is in favor of this bill and asserts that the farmers of his State are prosperous and desire its enactment into law. Mr. Chairman, the farmers of Oklahoma have only recently occupied their land and under the most favorable condition. It is only within the past few years that they began the arduous task of developing their farm and building their home. From the very first—and I am glad it is so—they enjoyed this splendid home market which had been provided for them many years before, and they are now reaping the speedy benefit of what their predecessors in adjoining States had worked for generations to build up. It is only within the last few years that the grain and stock raiser in the United States had any competitor. The Canadian competitor had not developed. Until this recent development and enormous production became manifest, the protection accorded the farmer by our tariff laws was of negligible value, yet he was informed, and I believe correctly so, that the building up of the manufacturing industries would ultimately be of great benefit to him, for the reason that it would give him a sure and more profitable market for his grains and live stock. Now the time has come when that condition has arrived. In fact, consumption in the United States about equals production. It is proposed in this bill to strip the farmers of all protection whatever, force him backward, open up this great market to the stranger, while he is compelled to sell his product in the cheapest market and purchase the product of the factory in the highest.

This, my friend, is unjust, inequitable, and to my mind wholly unwarranted. I shall never vote for such a measure.

Some of my political friends have come to me and said, "DAVIS, you have been talking for revision of the tariff downward." I responded, "Yes; and always have been since the day of my election to Congress." They then said, "Why do you propose to vote against this measure, because it certainly is a revision downward, and it is an entering wedge for further revision downward?" True, it is an entering wedge, but is this the proper time and proper place to force an entering wedge? More than 50 years ago the East, the manufacturing section, began its very successful enterprises under a high protective tariff system. It has reaped rich benefits therefrom. Now that the farmers are just beginning to receive a part of this benefit, it is proposed to strike them down and enter the wedge and crush those who have received the least from this system. Yes, my friends, I believe in this entering wedge, but why not begin in such schedules as the woolen, cotton, sugar, steel, and other related ones? Give to the farmer cheaper clothing, cheaper

building materials, cheaper fuel, at the same time you are demanding of him cheaper food products. Thus you will benefit the great mass of the producers and consumers alike. But, say, our Democratic friends, we propose to follow this reciprocity measure by another placing many articles of consumption for the benefit of the consumer on the free list. That sounds well, and if it could be accomplished, in my judgment, it would be well. Yet the discussion thus far has revealed the fact that our Democratic friends and all assert the great improbability of the passage of this other measure. While it may pass this branch of the Congress, yet obstacles apparently unsurmountable probably will defeat it during the life of the Sixty-second Congress. Hence I pause and shall not vote for the bill under discussion or any similar measure until conditions warrant the belief of the passage of the other.

When this trade agreement was presented by the President to the Congress during the last session of the Sixty-first Congress, considerable stress was laid in the message accompanying it upon the necessity of lessening the cost of food products to the consumer. In fact, that was the main consideration assigned for urging the passage of this bill. From the context of the message the President assumes that while the consumer would be much benefited yet the producer of grains and live stock would not be injured.

It is difficult to comprehend how the consumer can be furnished a cheaper food unless some one produces and sells it cheaper. While it is very apparent that the cheap land of Canada can and does produce food products in greater quantity per acre and at less cost than the American farm, yet it has not been shown that the consumer will receive any benefit. The reason for this lies in the fact that while the farmer in the two countries must sell his produce on equal terms in a free-trade market, the manufacturer of flour still retains a high protective duty. The 4½ bushels of wheat which enters into the manufacture of a barrel of flour, after it becomes flour, the miller is protected in at the rate of 50 cents a barrel. While the farmer's fat cattle must be sold in this cheap competitive market, yet the meat therefrom in the hands of the American packer receives the benefit of 1¼ cents per pound when dealing with the consumer. Such is the case with all other products of the farm. In all instances the interest of the manufacturer is highly protected, to the disadvantage of the consumer, while the producer of live stock and grains must sell in the cheapest market, to his loss, which in no way benefits the consumer. Many examples might be given showing that the farmer receives very little benefit, even under existing conditions, from the high price paid by the consumer. For example, at present prices throughout the United States the farmer's wheat nets him about 80 cents a bushel. The flour from this bushel of wheat will make at least 60 loaves of bread, which retails to the consumer at 5 cents a loaf, showing that the consumer has to pay $3 for what the farmer receives but 80 cents. A bushel of oats, for which the farmer receives from 30 to 35 cents, will make 23 packages of Quaker Oats, which retails to the consumer at 10 cents per package, or $2.30.

Mr. J. R. Cahill, an investigator for the labor department of the Board of Trade, London, England, came to this country to investigate cost of living. After visiting several of our large cities and before his departure he stated that he found that the consumers in this country paid 5 cents for a 14-ounce loaf of bread, while in London a 64-ounce loaf retailed for 10 cents, the London loaf being made out of American flour. Thus the fact is apparent that the middlemen, including the miller and retailer and the baker, should not be overlooked in our effort to lessen the cost of food products to the consumer. I might cite many instances as showing that the price paid the farmer is very small compared to that paid by the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this measure for another good reason. Ever since the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862 the Federal Treasury has materially assisted in the establishment of agricultural colleges and experiment stations in every State in the Union. In addition thereto each State has contributed immense sums to educate the agriculturists in scientific farming. Our great Department of Agriculture, with all its ramifications—which, in my judgment, is the greatest department of our Government—employs thousands of scientists and spends millions of money annually to further the science of agriculture. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated by the National and State Governments in furthering agricultural education. While this system was inaugurated by the Federal Government, yet the various States have responded nobly, and are continuing to do so. Increased agricultural production of superior quality is of the greatest consideration. Its benefits are numerous and manifold. The building up of the home in rural communities, dignifying the labor of the farm, so that it becomes a science, adds to the health, wealth, prosperity, and manhood of the yeomanry, aside from generally benefiting our entire population. Again, it is apparent to all that the congested population of our larger cities is an actual menace to the welfare of our country. The best solution of this problem is to keep our agricultural population in the highest possible state of prosperity and happiness. This can not be done by the enactment of the legislation contemplated by this bill. In my judgment this proposed legislation would defeat the very object for which the Department of Agriculture, schools and colleges of agriculture, and experiment stations were established. Should this legislation be enacted, the slogan "Back to the farm" or "Remain on the farm" would lose its force. Depreciate the value of the land and the price of the products therefrom and inevitably the migration from country to city will greatly increase.

Our President in his message has alluded to the sentimental side of this proposed legislation. The Canadian is pictured in glowing terms. It is urged that this proposed agreement should be entered into because of the Canadian's racial affinity to us as well as his proximity to our border. His temperamental and social similarity and kindly feeling toward us is put forward as a further argument for the enactment of this measure.

No standing army need guard our borders against him, no battleships need float the great inland seas that divide us; but, on the contrary, we should welcome and invite him to enter our land and partake of this great home market without price. This, to my mind, is unjust to our own people, and furnishes no reason for the passage of this bill. I assert and believe that while the Canadian is peaceably disposed and one whom we should at all times treat kindly and justly, yet, at the same time, the welfare of our own people should be uppermost in our minds. I do not understand that by this legislation we propose to make him one of us, for he belongs to another nation. His Government is a monarchy. His allegiance is to his King, and not to our Government or its institutions. His allegiance binds him to give preference to the British Crown, and while he will accept our hospitality and the great benefit which he will derive from this proposed legislation, he will be a stranger to us in all things governmental.

I am strongly opposed to this bill and shall vote against it. Yet, if it must become a law—which seems probable—then I trust that a divine Providence who shapes the destinies of nations may so use this so-called reciprocity treaty, this entering wedge, to further amalgamate these two countries and eventually make them one, with but one flag—the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Minnesota proceeds, I desire to suggest that this debate has now been proceeding since last Friday, and I am wondering whether we could not prevail upon the gentlemen who are managing the enterprise to take the committee into their confidence as to when a vote may be expected. It seems to me that that is a proper inquiry to make at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am in hopes that we can take the bill up under the five-minute rule at 3 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. KENDALL. Is it the design of the gentleman to conclude debate to-night?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say candidly to the gentleman that I have had an understanding with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] to close the general debate, except the closing speeches, to-night, and that to-morrow, when the closing speeches are made, we will then take it up under the five-minute rule for consideration.

Mr. KENDALL. What time this evening will the committee rise?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to let the debate go on. I hope we will get through by 6 o'clock.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is proper for me to say to the gentleman that if the committee continues after 6 o'clock a quorum of the committee ought to be present.

Mr. JAMES. I would suggest to the gentleman from Alabama——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the proceedings are by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, by unanimous consent I will say to the gentleman that I have tried to be very liberal with that side of the House. I have not only yielded to the other side of the House, but I have yielded to gentlemen on that side of the House who were in favor of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has had considerably more time than we have had, and I was in hopes, as the debate has run

for many, many hours longer than it was allowed to run when it was before the House at the last session, that the gentleman would allow it to run longer without interruption in order that as many Members may have an opportunity to get in as possible.

Mr. KENDALL. I think no possible complaint can be made against the gentleman from Alabama with respect to time allowed for discussion. The only thing in the matter to me is this, that where the discussion is so general, that a quorum of the committee ought to be present to hear the arguments—that is, after 6 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I regret very much if the gentleman sees proper by reason of no quorum here to cut off any Member's privilege to be heard, but the responsibility will then rest with him and not with me.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, that is not my proposition at all. There is no need of haste with reference to concluding this discussion and limiting men to two, three, or five minutes and from the clamor for opportunity to discuss this bill. I think we ought to take another day.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, the complaint heretofore made by gentlemen on that side of the House was that they had not had time enough to debate questions up for consideration. Now the complaint is because they have too much.

Mr. KENDALL. Not at all. The gentleman, with his usual obtuseness, fails to understand the substance of my complaint. What I am suggesting is that these arguments are of importance to the country and there ought to be a quorum to listen to them.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman, with his usual desire to make complaint when there is nothing to complain about, is pursuing his old course.

Mr. DALZELL. As this matter is proceeding by unanimous consent, I desire to say that, as debates go in this House, the gentleman from Alabama has been exceedingly fair from the beginning to the end of this debate. [Applause.] He has not only been fair, but he has been generous in this respect, that while he believes it to be the wish of his side of the House, which is in the majority, to close this debate substantially to-night, he has permitted the people whom I represent to continue until each of them has had an opportunity to be heard, even though slightly, and if there is any complaint to be made, as I have no doubt there is complaint being made, the complaint is due to me for my distribution of the time on this side, in which I have endeavored to be as fair as circumstances would permit. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire what arrangement has been made with regard to extension of remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. Permission was given in the House to all persons who have spoken to extend their remarks. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because I regard it as a very unjust and unfair bill from the standpoint of the people for whom I especially speak, and it is also unfair and unjust in other particulars as relates to the whole people of the United States. My district is specially interested in this, and we think we know something about the facts embraced in this agreement, or this arrangement, because my district, on the northern boundary, joins Ontario and Manitoba. I have lived within a short distance of that line for more than 30 years, and have observed the difference in the conditions of employment and of production and prices on both sides of the line. I will not take time to go into a discussion of the proposition which has been advanced here by some of the alleged friends of the farmers that the prices of wheat are just as high in Canada as in the United States. I know absolutely from personal knowledge and experience that it is not so. They are mistaken, and there has been a difference on this side to the advantage of the farmers on wheat alone of more than 10 cents a bushel, and sometimes a great deal more, for many, many years.

I do not think we can take the time here to analyze the reasons for this. The principal reason is that the wheat that we raise in the Northwestern and boundary States is spring wheat, is hard wheat, and that is principally consumed in the United States to mix with other kinds of wheat so as to make a more valuable and strong flour for bread making, and it commands a higher price than soft wheat, and, therefore, commands a price that is very much above the price at Liverpool.

I will say, further, that it seems to me that this bill is unfair to the people at large, to the consumer in every occupation of life. It is strange to me that the Democratic Party has not discovered that they are on the wrong track so far as legislation for tariff reform is concerned in this instance. They are, so to speak, trying to reduce the tariff by raising it, for the reason that in this bill you are taking away the duty on the raw material, the price of which was higher by reason of a protected market at home, and you do not remove the manufacturer's differential, or you very slightly change it.

Now, it is self-evident that there are two ways of increasing the protection of the manufacturer by changing customs duties. One is by leaving the duty as it is on the manufactured article and reducing the duty on the imported raw material; the other by raising the duty on the finished article while leaving unchanged the duty on the raw material. When I first came here it was at the beginning of the Fifty-eighth Congress. An extra session was called by the President to ratify the Cuban treaty. And I want to say right here that that was a treaty and not a pact or agreement which has no authority or validity in law. It was a treaty ratified by two-thirds of the Senate and printed in the statute books of the country, and we were called upon to put that into execution by proper revenue laws.

The Democrats were led by Mr. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS and Mr. De Armond. It was my first experience in this House, and I remember it as if it were yesterday. What was the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi? Why, to amend the bill, to carry the treaty into effect. But here you say this "pact" can not be amended. What was the amendment then proposed? It was to wipe out the differential of the Sugar Trust, which amounted to 1⅛ of a mill per pound—12½ cents upon 100 pounds. And they alleged in forcible and eloquent speeches that that 12½ cents on 100 pounds was the cause of the great monopoly, the Sugar Trust, having a strangle hold upon the Republican Party, and if we could wipe out the refiner's differential we would liberate the people of the United States from the grasp of the sugar monopoly. What a change has come over the spirit of our dreams! The leader of the Democratic Party comes up here now and proposes a differential of $1.25 a hundred, or 1¼ cents a pound, on beef and removes the duty entirely upon the raw material. Why, if it had been suggested to the Democratic floor leader at that time that we were to take off this duty on raw sugar entirely, thereby making the entire duty flow into the pockets of the Sugar Trust, he would have justly said that we were candidates for an insane asylum. And yet here is a proposition that is more than ten times as bad, because the differential is increased from 12½ cents per 100 pounds to $1.25 per 100 pounds on raw material absolutely free. Have you ever thought of that? The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] struck the keynote when he said this raised the duties of the Payne bill. Of course it does. It does not do it directly, but indirectly, by removing the duty on raw material all around.

And you do not seem to know it yet. I would like to have somebody debate the merits of this bill and answer this, because I have not heard any discussion of it on the floor so far. The carcass of a steer on the hoof, say, weighs 1,200 pounds, and when dressed it weighs 800 pounds. It costs $1 to slaughter that in the slaughterhouse. You can hire it done for that price. And here is a differential to the manufacturer of $10—1,000 per cent—10 times more than the total cost of production. What are you thinking about?

This bill was never prepared in the Committee on Ways and Means. It must have been prepared by some amateur clerks up in the department. Who can tell how many jokers there are in it? But the thing goes on. It is not meat alone. There is flour, as has been pointed out. There is 50 cents a barrel on flour, and the total tariff on the raw material is wiped off. And so it is with barley. The brewer gets his barley free, as does the maltster, but there is a duty on the beer and the malt. The effect of this is not to reduce duties, but to raise them, and you build a tariff wall around the manufacturers who are organizing trusts a mile high—higher than it has ever been before. It is a reward for combination, monopolistic combination, by the strength of which it is sought to rob the ultimate consumer in every walk of life. Cheap food, cheaper cost of living! Free raw material with duties on the finished product is revision downward, not for the consumer but for the trusts at the expense of the Treasury. You are tying us hand and foot and delivering us over to the meat trust and the flour trust and every other trust in the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, there is one remarkable thing that I have noticed in this debate, and that is that there is a dispute between gentlemen on that side and on this side as to whether this is a Republican or a Democratic measure. Why, bless your soul, it is neither one nor the other. It has all the faults of protection gone mad and of destructive free trade. It is the Democratic donkey, tail end first, and the rear end of the Republican ele-

phant. [Laughter and applause.] That is what it is. It has all the faults of both sides and none of the merits. [Laughter.]

A great deal has been said to the effect that we can not amend or change this bill because, as has been said, it is a pact. There is something sacred about the word "pact." What is this agreement? Has anybody signed it? No. It is a verbal agreement, and the Canadian minister writes, "That is my understanding," and our Secretary of State says, "Yes; that is right; that is my understanding." It is not an instrument in writing, and yet they come in here and say it is so sacred that you can not change it by crossing a "t" or dotting an "i."

It is said in the letter of the Canadian ministers to the Secretary of State, "It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the formal shape of a treaty but that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa." Both the President and the ministers knew that there could be no treaty because the treaty power—the President and two-thirds of the Senate—would not agree to any such proposition. Now while I contend that the action of the President in agreeing to use his "utmost efforts" to secure this legislation was outside and beyond the limitations of the Constitution which vests the legislative power in Congress and requires that all bills raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, yet I admit that the Canadian ministers were differently situated as to their Government, and for this reason: They, like Great Britain, are under the parliamentary system where there is almost complete merger of executive and legislative power in the House of Commons. The premier is a member and leader of the House, and virtually chief executive at the same time. The ministers of the Canadian Government who occupy this dual position might with propriety make this agreement, while on account of our Constitutional limitations the President seems to be without legal authority to do so.

While the President may recommend to our consideration such measures as he shall "judge necessary and expedient," he may not use the appointing power to persuade us, or his power to call or adjourn Congress to secure this or any other proposed legislation.

If he has authority to make such an agreement regarding trade and to carry it out in this manner, he would have the same right as to other subjects—such as the liquor traffic, marriage and divorce, child labor, strikes, and so forth. Would not the inevitable result be that our fundamental law would be so changed as to give the President not only the negative in legislation but the initiative also, and the power of the Presidency increased at the expense of the Congress? Laws would be submitted to us complete in form, and all we would have the right to do would be to say yes or no.

It is a tendency to merge both the legislative and executive power in the President, a tendency directly opposite to the change which has gradually taken place under the British Constitution, where the executive power has been merged in the House of Commons.

The one augments the power of the people, the other leads to autocracy.

The letter of the Canadian ministers speaks of the "Governments of the two countries," just as if it were a treaty, and it is not even preliminary to a treaty. While the ministers may be the "Government" of the Dominion, it is incorrect to speak of the President as the "Government," except when he is executing the treaty-making power, which confessedly was not intended. The object of this agreement was legislation by Congress and Parliament and not a treaty.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. FINLEY. Where does the gentleman think the President stands on this proposition?

Mr. STEENERSON. The President has evidently been misled, and he has succeeded in deluding the Democrats more than they have ever been deluded before, and more than I hope they will ever be deluded again. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Where and how did this bill originate? According to the President's message, it originated when the question of enforcing the maximum and minimum provisions of the Payne law against Canada came up. The first words of the reciprocity message reads as follows:

In my annual message of December 6, 1910, I stated that the policy of broader and closer trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, which was initiated in the adjustment of the maximum and minimum provisions of the tariff act of August 5, 1909, had proved mutually beneficial and that it justified further efforts for the readjustment of the commercial relations of the two countries.

The maximum and minimum provision is one that levies a 25 per cent higher rate of duty on commodities coming from a country that discriminates against our goods and refuses to treat us as fairly as the most favored nations are treated. Apparently, Canada refused to so treat us, but our Government did not enforce the penalty required by the act of Congress in question, but began to negotiate. It was a delicate situation, no doubt, but these Canadian friends of ours persisted in refusing to relieve us from discriminatory treatment in their markets.

Here is what the Canadian minister says of the origin of this matter and what happened.

Referring to his first meeting with Mr. Taft in connection with the operation of the maximum and minimum tariff imposed by the Payne bill, among other things Mr. Fielding stated the following, as given on page 2500 of the official record:

[Extract from speech made by Hon. W. S. Fielding, minister of finance of the Dominion of Canada, before the House of Commons, as reported in the House of Commons Debates, under date of Thursday, January 26, 1911.]

I will frankly say that I do not think Mr. Taft ever desired to impose the maximum tariff upon the products of Canada. The misfortune was that Congress had imposed the tariff. It was not a question of Mr. Taft doing it, as Congress had put that tariff on and declared that on and after a given date the products of all countries not exempted by special action of the President should become subject to the maximum tariff. The maximum tariff existed and was coming into operation in a few days. It was not a question of Mr. Taft putting it on, but of Mr. Taft being induced to take it off, as he had the power to do. * * * As I have already said, it was not a question of putting on the maximum tariff, it was a question of taking it off, and I found that the President of the United States was willing to take it off, if we could give him some decent excuse to do so under the terms of the American tariff law. We made a few changes, a few concessions of no earthly importance, so small and trifling that I am sure hardly any of us in the House could remember to-day what they were. But they served the purpose; they were enough to give Mr. Taft the reason and excuse he desired; and, accordingly, he issued his proclamation that Canada should not be placed under the disadvantage of the maximum tariff, which, if applied, would undoubtedly have done harm on both sides, most certainly to large business interests in Canada. Out of the negotiations at that time have sprung the larger negotiations of a more recent date.

I think by this time the farmers of the United States regret there ever was a maximum and minimum provision in the tariff law. That the opening up free of a market of 92,000,000 people—the greatest and most profitable market in the world—should be the reward of the Canadians for refusing to give us the most-favored-nations treatment will go down as the most remarkable diplomatic achievement in all history. After this, is it any wonder that some people say that the absorption of the United States by the British Empire is far more likely than our annexation of Canada?

We have had experience on the point that it is not every "revision downward" that benefits the people. Did free hides lower the price of shoes? No; not at all. What did it do? It lowered the farm price of hides all over the country, and every farmer in the land can tell you so. What else did it do? It deprived the United States Treasury of the two or three million dollars a year it had theretofore collected on imported cattle hides and turned it into the pockets of the shoe and leather trust, just exactly as this reciprocity arrangement will first reduce the farm price of all that the farmer produces and deprive the Treasury of the five or six million dollars a year heretofore received from duties on Canadian imports and turn it all over to combinations and trusts in this country. Our experience was exactly the same when we had a reciprocity treaty with Hawaii, whereby their sugar was admitted free. The Treasury lost the revenue and the people paid just exactly the same for sugar as they did before.

According to the logic of the advocates of this bill, that man in New York who invented the springs to put in the scales of the customhouse so as to underweigh the sugar imported was really engaged in a meritorious work; he was trying to reduce the cost of living by getting in cheaper sugar. He certainly reduced the duties; he revised the tariff downward—to the Sugar Trust. The trouble was that the trust forgot to pass the reduced price on to the consumer. He was engaged in doing exactly what this bill proposes—increasing the difference between the price at which the manufacturers' raw material and his finished product can be brought in.

The representatives of manufacturing interests in the East are again learnedly arguing that this pact will not injure the farmer, but the farmers think they know their own business as well as anybody. The device of assuming the guise of farmers' friend for an ulterior purpose will not work, for that trick can be played only once in an evening. To show just what the farmers think of reciprocity, I will insert in the RECORD resolutions passed in a mass meeting in Kittson County, right on the boundary line of Canada, and a mass convention

held recently at St. Paul, and also a letter from Justus C. Berg, one of our most prominent and representative farmers.

I say to you as earnestly as I can, that the injurious effects of this law go beyond the comprehension of most of us. It strikes at the industries of 30,000,000 people, and I believe eventually it will increase instead of diminish the cost of living to every man, woman, and child in the United States. How can a Congress elected by the people enact such a law in the exercise of their unbiased judgment? Well might we exclaim—

O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,
And men have lost their reason—

if they will approve so monstrous a proposition as this. [Applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

A BIG MEETING—FARMERS AND BUSINESS MEN HOLD BIG ANTICANADIAN RECIPROCITY MEETING.

HALLOCK, MINN., *April 15, 1911.*

The mass meeting called by President P. H. Konzen, of the Hallock Commercial Club, last Saturday to draft resolutions against the pending Canadian reciprocity and to elect delegates to attend the State meeting at St. Paul, was probably one of the most enthusiastic and well attended public meetings ever brought together in Hallock. Fully 200 representative farmers from different parts of the county were present as delegates, and with the number that attended from town, the courthouse was crowded full. Though nonpolitical, the gathering was made up of men of different political ranks, and for once our Republican friends admitted that the pending Republican Canadian reciprocity pact was one of the most barefaced pieces of class legislation ever attempted upon an intelligent people, and they stood shoulder to shoulder with Democrats in denouncing it as unpatriotic, unjust, and discriminatory—sacrificing the interests of the agricultural masses to the insatiable greed of the capitalistic and manufacturing classes. The only objectionable feature about the whole meeting was that the committee on resolutions, in commending the stand taken by our United States Senators and Congressmen, either willfully or unintentionally left out the name of Congressman W. S. HAMMOND, the only Democratic Member from Minnesota, who worked as hard as any other Minnesotan for the defeat of the bill. P. H. Konzen was chosen presiding officer of the meeting and C. J. Estlund was chosen secretary, and the two were elected delegates to the St. Louis meeting, which met at the old Capitol Building last Tuesday, and, according to the Minneapolis Tribune of the 11th, we note that Mr. Konzen had been chosen by the St. Paul convention a member of the delegation whose duty it will be to carry the convention's protest to Congress at Washington, D. C. Here are the resolutions:

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTIONS.

We, the people of Kittson County, Minn., in mass meeting assembled, believing that Canadian reciprocity, as proposed by the McCall or administration bill now pending before the United States Congress, is unjust and unequal, in that it brings the products of the farm into direct competition with like products of agricultural Canada, while providing no compensatory benefits in any of the articles of manufacture which we buy and consume, do hereby most earnestly protest against the passage of the said reciprocity pact, and unanimously unite in voicing our denunciation of the said act as unpatriotic, unjust, diabolical, and discriminatory, sacrificing the interests of the agricultural masses of the country to the insatiable greed and predatory aggrandizement of the capitalistic and manufacturing classes. And in furtherance of said protest, be it

Resolved, That we regard the said reciprocity treaty as inimical to our best interests and destructive of the only vestige of benefit that the farmer has ever received, or ever expects to receive, from the protective system which he has patriotically helped to maintain for what he conceived to be for the best interests of our common country.

Resolved, That we view, in the passage of the Canadian reciprocity act, a deliberate purpose to discriminate against the farming interests and to sacrifice its rights to the Moloch of corporate greed.

Resolved, That we regard the said act as a direct slap at the rural districts, and therefore shall hold any Member of the United States Congress who supports the same as hostile to our interests and our cause.

Resolved, That we believe that the large cities of our State—St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Duluth—in their strenuous efforts in behalf of the passage of the said reciprocity act, evince a reckless disregard for the rights of the toiling millions upon the broad farming domain of this and those other Western States whose wealth of golden grain and other products, pouring in a torrential stream into their laps, has contributed in no small degree to their prosperity and greatness; and that we view their zeal and activity in that behalf as an exhibition of sheer selfishness and without palliation in rhyme or reason other than that of local benefit at the expense of the rural interests.

Resolved, That we commend the stand taken by our United States Senators, Hon. KNUTE NELSON and Hon. M. E. CLAPP, and by our Representatives, the honorable Messrs. STEENERSON, VOLSTEAD, DAVIS, LINDBERGH, and ANDERSON in opposition to this most unjust and one-sided measure, and we most earnestly urge them to a continuance of such opposition, to the end that the said proposed bill may either be entirely defeated or at least so modified as to yield compensatory benefits to the agricultural interests of the country, for the protection of which they alone, as a class, are sought to be deprived.

Resolved, That the secretary of this meeting be instructed to forward to each of our United States Senators and to each Member of Congress from this State, as well as to the chairman of the mass meeting held at the old capitol building in the city of St. Paul on Tuesday, the 11th day of April, A. D. 1911, a copy of these resolutions.

ELMER C. YETTER.
W. B. FORD.
GEORGE BAKER.

RESOLUTION OF PROTEST.

We, farmers and business men of Minnesota in mass meeting assembled, do most earnestly and sincerely protest against the ratification by Congress of the pending treaty with Canada in its present form.

In doing so we hereby announce and publish the following reasons:

First. That the treaty is unfair, unjust, and discriminating against the agricultural interests of the United States, giving these interests practically nothing in return for what it deprives them of.

Second. That it will inure to the disadvantage, loss, and suffering of our producers without any prospect of cheaper manufactured products to the consumer.

Third. That the removal of the duty on wheat will accrue solely to the benefit of the miller; that of barley to the brewer; that of flaxseed to the linseed mills; and that of live stock, hogs, poultry, and dairy products to the packers and middlemen, and, while not benefiting the consumer, will mean a great loss to the producers.

Fourth. It creates an unfair competition, inasmuch as it will compel our farmers to compete in our own markets with the cheaply produced products of alien competitors. We contend that our home market belongs, in the first instance, to our own citizens.

Fifth. This pact, if agreed to, will retard and set back the progress toward a higher and better standard of farm life which has become so noticeable during the recent prosperous times; it will tend to bring on again that struggle for existence so well remembered by our pioneer farmers, a struggle in which many went under; it will lessen the opportunities for a better education of our farmers' children, and thus encourage them in leaving the farm.

DECLARES PACT WILL CAUSE LOSS.

Sixth. It will lessen the purchasing capacity of our American producers to the extent of millions of dollars annually by depriving them of a legitimate and fair price for their products. All of this will represent a corresponding loss to the commercial interests of our country, as the farmer's profit invariably finds its way into all the channels of trade. Our commercial and manufacturing interests stand to lose as much in this way as they will gain by the expansion of their business.

Seventh. Our American farmers, by their thrift, energy, and frugality, have made this country what it is; they have made it possible for the great commercial interests to become wealthy and powerful. Without the farmer this would have been impossible. In view of this our commercial interests should now stand by the farmer. To do otherwise lays them open to the charge of commercial greed and selfishness.

Eighth. The term "reciprocity" as applied to the Canadian treaty is a misnomer. Reciprocity means an equitable trade or exchange between two countries of products which one country produces and the other does not, or which it produces only in insufficient quantities. We produce everything in this country that is produced in Canada.

Ninth. It constitutes an agreement made secretly and without regard to any settled policies of our tariff laws. It means free trade for the farmer and protection for the manufacturer, and as such is discrimination in its rankest form.

ASSERTS RIGHT TO HOME MARKET.

Tenth. That in trading off our home market of over 90,000,000 people, a market that is and has been abundantly supplied by our own producers, a market that has been built up by American thrift and frugality, and which by every inherent right and heritage belongs to our producers, for that of 8,000,000 Canadians, with its doubtful increased advantages to commercial and manufacturing interests, would not only be unfair and unjust to our own producers, but foolish and reprehensible.

Eleventh. This proposed treaty, when divested of its sentimental features, can and will appeal only to those who are selfishly interested and who expect to gain thereby. As a whole, it will be a damage rather than a benefit to our country. In its present form it should not be ratified.

Twelfth. We repudiate the action of President Taft, large manufacturing concerns, chambers of commerce, and the management of the Great Northern Railway in attempting to force the so-called reciprocity agreement through Congress without giving the people at large an opportunity to give it due consideration or to express their opinions. We regret exceedingly that the city press has failed to give publicity to both sides of this most important question.

BLAMES THE MIDDLEMEN.

Thirteenth. The proposed pact would not reduce the cost of living. It would not benefit the laboring man, the mechanic, or artisan in the great cities, as the exorbitant prices paid by them for produce is not occasioned by the price received by the farmer, but is the result of the excessive charges made by the railroads and middlemen. The farmer only receives 35 per cent of the price paid by the consumer, while the transportation companies and middlemen receive the other 65.

Fourteenth. We hereby express our thanks to all those newspapers of our State who in this controversy have risen above considerations of selfishness and have defended the farming interests against this threatening danger, and we mention expressly the Northwestern Agriculturist, the Farm, Stock, and Home, and the Farmer, and we also thank all members of our legislature and other citizens who have interested themselves in calling this meeting.

Fifteenth. We urge on all our citizens who are in favor of fair play and equality before the law to make continuous and effective agitation against this treaty.

Sixteenth. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress.

HENDRUM, MINN., *April 11, 1911.*

Hon. HALVOR STEENERSON,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I feel moved to address you and thank you for the stand you took last session of Congress in opposition to the Canadian reciprocity agreement, and hope you will do all within your power to prevent its passage this session.

In my capacity as an officer of a farmers' organization covering three of the Northwestern States and other local cooperative concerns I have come in contact with many representative farmers.

I was deeply impressed with the spontaneous opposition the introduction of this Canadian agreement created. This opposition is nearly, if not entirely, unanimous among the farmers of the Northwest. The reasons for this opposition are common and identical. And I can assure you that no mending or changing of the reciprocity bill, even to absolute free trade with Canada, will change the common conviction that this measure is being forced upon the farmers as an excuse for conditions for which they can not justly be held responsible.

The sentiment is so rapidly gaining force that should this bill or any other bill placing agricultural products on the free list pass, the only consistent course for the farmers to take is to stand for absolute free trade with the entire world, and compel, if they can, this country to resort to direct taxation.

It is conceded by all parties that the agricultural sections of the Central and Northwestern States have been the manufacturers' stanchest supporters in building and supporting the policy of high protection. Is this our reward? If so, we have come to the parting of the ways. We have stood for protection in the past, and have been the least benefited. Now that the time has come when we to a limited degree share its benefits, are they to be taken away from us?

Production on land already under cultivation can easily be multiplied by three if farming is sufficiently profitable to warrant the necessary preparation and investment of capital. I believe with others that have studied agricultural conditions carefully that the United States will be self-supporting for generations to come if farming should prove sufficiently profitable to be attractive.

No vocation, or profession either, attains a high degree of efficiency unless its remuneration is commensurate with capital and energy expended. Nor are the American farmers an exception to this rule. To make farming attractive it must have the means to make it comfortable, and that makes for contentment—in other words, share the Nation's prosperity.

Economists and sociologists view with serious apprehension the movement from the farm to the larger cities. The bill in question, or any other legislation adverse to the farmers, can only augment this movement. There may be a few of us so situated that we need not continue in an unprofitable business, but what per cent of the farmers are so situated?

The only excuse offered in introducing or recommending this Canadian reciprocity agreement was that it would reduce the cost of living. But have the consumers of farm products any assurance that their wages will not be correspondingly reduced? If the farmer suffers, will it not sooner or later react on the city laborers? The adjustment will surely follow when the country boys offer themselves on the labor market in competition with others that sell their labor.

These are a few points the farmers would like Congress to consider carefully before they pass a bill that is unpopular to nearly one-third of the country's voters.

If we can assist you in any way, you have but to address us.

Yours, respectfully,

JUSTUS C. BERGH.

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the agreement or informal treaty between the United States and the Dominion of Canada which it is intended to ratify on the part of the United States by this bill proposes to change the economic and commercial relations of the two countries upon the basis of alleged mutual and reciprocal advantage. Stripped of its sentimental considerations, it presents a purely business proposition of whether or not the commissioners have made an intelligent bargain.

Briefly stated, for the purpose of the determination of this question, the bill presents a proposed reciprocal free list, which includes only the raw products of the farm, such as wheat, oats, rye, barley, flax, butter, and cheese, designated as Schedule A, and a proposed reciprocal dutiable list which contains certain specified articles of manufacture, designated as Schedule B.

The proposition is not a new one, and fortunately may, at least in part, be determined by the light that is furnished by the experience of the past, and it is worth while in this connection to consider the trade relations which have heretofore existed between the two countries.

In 1854 the Democratic Party, flushed with victory, as now, presented a proposed reciprocal agreement between the two countries for the assent of Congress which provided for free trade between the two countries in natural products. This treaty was identical with the free list proposed in this agreement, with the exception that it included flour and breadstuffs; fresh, smoked, and salted meats; hides; stone and marble; ores and metals; lumber of all kinds; rice; gypsum; unmanufactured tobacco; and rags, and in this respect offered to the consumer and the farmer some advantages which this treaty does not.

It will be noted that in the treaty of 1854 not an article the value of which had been enhanced by manufacture was included in the agreement.

The contemporaneous statesmanship of that period is unanimous as to the disastrous effects upon the commerce of the United States of the treaty of 1854, and upon its final abrogation in 1866 the resolution providing for its abrogation was supported by such men as John Sherman, of Ohio; Senators Morrill, of Maine; Chandler, of Michigan; Doolittle, of Wisconsin; Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts; and many others. Manufacturing New England was among the first to demand the abrogation of the treaty.

The resolution to abrogate the treaty passed in the Senate by a vote of 38 to 0. In the debate upon the resolution to abrogate the treaty Senator Foote, of Vermont, said:

I believe it to be very generally conceded that while this reciprocity treaty, so denominated, has proved highly beneficial to the interests of the people of the British Provinces, and has contributed very largely to their interest and prosperity, it has at the same time proved injurious and prejudicial to the interest and prosperity of the people of the American States. The very title of the treaty itself is a misnomer. There is nothing reciprocal about it; there is nothing reciprocal in its operation; it produces no reciprocity of benefits between the two Governments. It is beneficial to one only of the contracting parties and injures the other. Such are the practical results of the opinion of the American people, who now, after an experience of its effects for 10 years, demand as with one voice the abrogation of a contract which they regard as partial, unjust, inequitable, and one-sided, as soon as it can be done through the forms prescribed in the treaty itself.

I propose now to consider some of the effects of the treaty of 1854 upon our commerce. In the four years immediately preceding the going into effect of the treaty our importations from Canada, free of duty, amounted to $4,107,392. Those paying duty amounted to $15,002,034, or nearly four times greater. In the four years immediately succeeding the commencement of the treaty our imports from Canada, free of duty, increased to $59,419,926, while those subject to duty decreased to $2,150,394, or 1 in 28, a total importation of $61,570,320, as against $19,110,026 in the four years preceding the treaty. On the other hand, our exports to Canada dwindled from $20,771,691 in 1855 to $15,243,834 in 1866, and in the same period Canada's exports to us increased from $12,000,000 to $46,000,000, of which $25,000,000 was farm products. In this connection Senator Collomer, speaking in favor of the abrogation of the treaty, said:

The amount received by them (Canada) under the treaty free of duty, since it went into operation, was $73,000,000, and the amount received by us from them $115,000,000—

A balance of trade in favor of Canada of $41,000,000—

and yet we had at that time 30,000,000 people to produce, while Canada had but 3,000,000.

When the treaty began, upon all exports and imports between the two countries, we had a balance of trade of $8,000,000, which, at the expiration of the treaty, had turned into a balance of $30,000,000 against us.

Immediately upon the abrogation of the treaty of 1854 the statesmen of Canada began again to knock at our doors for the admission of her farm products, beseeching us for a resumption of reciprocal relations in the products of the farm, but its disastrous effects were still fresh in our memory, and up to the present time we have steadfastly refused to be drawn into any proposition looking to the free admission of the natural products of the Dominion.

President Grant, in his first administration, declined to consider such a proposition, giving as his reason that the advantages of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producers, excepting in the case of a few engaged in transportation. In his second administration he offered to make a new treaty which should include the free admission into Canada of a large number of manufactured products, but the Dominion officials, adhering then as now to the policy of protection of her manufacturing industries, refused to make a treaty upon that basis.

Again, in the administration of President Harrison, the matter of a reciprocal arrangement contemplating the free admission of natural products was considered, and, in a message to the Congress, President Harrison denounced the proposition in the following language:

A reciprocity treaty limited to the exchange of natural products would have been such only in form. The benefits of such a treaty would have inured almost wholly to Canada. Previous experiments on this line had been unsatisfactory to this Government. A treaty to be reciprocal in fact and of mutual advantage must necessarily have embraced an important list of manufactured articles and have secured to the United States a free or favored introduction of those articles into Canada and against the world.

In another message to Congress referring to reciprocity between the two countries, he said:

The conference developed the fact that the Canadian Government was only prepared to offer to the United States in exchange for the concessions asked the admission of natural products. This admission, which was foreseen, necessarily terminated the conference upon this question. The benefits of an exchange of natural products would be almost wholly with the people of Canada.

The Republican platform of 1904 provided:

We have extended widely our foreign markets, and we believe in the adoption of all practicable methods for their future extension, including commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected consistent with the principles of protection and without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or any American industry.

It will be noted from the excerpts which I have read that the policy of the American statesmanship of the past has been to decline the overtures of the Canadian Government looking to reciprocity in natural products, in view of the disastrous results to our commerce and the experiences of the treaty of 1854, unless our concessions in the opening of the American market to the natural products of Canada were met with a reciprocal concession on the part of Canada providing for the free or favored admission of our manufactured products into the Dominion. And that, so far as the Republican Party is concerned, it has never contemplated reciprocity with Canada unless it could be effectuated without injury to any American industry, including agriculture.

The present treaty attempts to anticipate the objection that no reciprocal advantages are offered to our manufacturing industries, by injecting into this agreement what is denominated a reciprocal dutiable list and described as Schedule B. An examination of this schedule, however, discloses the fact that the shadow has been substituted for the substance. It discloses further that no attempt was made to so arrange these schedules of the treaty that it would permit the entry into Canada upon equal terms of any of the manufactured products of this country which compete with the industry of the Dominion or with im-

portations from Great Britain. On the contrary, Schedule B is a compromise between the duty upon specified articles provided by the Payne-Aldrich bill and the duties provided by the general tariff laws of Canada.

But in no case is the reduction in duty sufficient to warrant the assumption that any substantial benefit or increased trade will inure to the American manufacturer. The unquestioned statements of the Canadian statesmen upon this proposition are convincing.

As late as 1903 Sir John Charlton, in an address to the Canadian Parliament, said:

> Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Nothing short of this will do, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than she has already made. We can not afford any more.

How close the pending agreement approximates the Canadian ideal I shall make plain later on in an analysis of the trade relations between the two countries.

In addressing the Canadian House of Commons on March 7 of this year, speaking on the reciprocity agreement, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

> We (Canada) are above all an agricultural people. Our chief wealth is the growth of these products of the Temperate Zone. * * * I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made is simply to get better prices for the products of the Canadian farmer. * * * Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and, therefore, if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise in Great Britain there is a ready market in the United States. * * * It is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than in natural products, but our negotiators would not consent to any reciprocity in manufactured products, but insisted on limiting the agreement simply to such manufactured products as agricultural implements.

To my mind this indicates beyond any question that however the treaty may be regarded on this side of the line, on the Canadian side of the line it is regarded as relating only to natural products and as making no concession whatever to our manufacturing interests. To what extent a free exchange of natural products is reciprocal in its advantages to the United States can be gathered from the tables submitted in connection with the message of the President of the United States, January 21, 1911, in transmitting the treaty to Congress, from which I take the figures which follow:

During the fiscal year 1910 the American tariff upon wheat was 25 cents a bushel. Canada's tariff upon wheat was 12½ cents a bushel. In spite of the fact that our tariff as against the Canadian wheat was twice that of the Canadian duty upon American wheat, Canada imported from us only 55,139 bushels in 1910, while we imported from Canada 2,317,191 bushels, which does not take into consideration the 12,000,000 bushels which were brought into the United States and turned into flour and then shipped back into Canada under the drawback and bond provision of the Payne-Aldrich law, without the payment of any duty, and which, of course, under this treaty would come into competition with the wheat produced in this country.

The tariff upon butter in the United States was 6 cents per pound. The Canadian tariff was 4 cents per pound. Notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian tariff was 2 cents less than ours, we exported to Canada but 61,081 pounds, while Canada exported to the United States, paying a tariff of 6 cents per pound, 980,036 pounds.

Our tariff on cheese was 6 cents per pound. Canada's tariff was 3 cents per pound. We exported to Canada 215,681 pounds. Canada exported to us 163,355 pounds. This, however, tells but a small portion of the story. In the same year Canada exported to Great Britain 164,090,903 pounds of cheese and 5,353,770 pounds of butter. What will be the result when this butter and cheese is diverted to the nearer market of the United States, as it will be when these articles are placed on the free list?

Taking the figures submitted by the President in connection with his message transmitting the treaty to Congress, the articles which are now dutiable but which will be free when exported into Canada from the United States under Schedule A amount to $21,957,605, while the articles now dutiable and which it is proposed to make free under the agreement coming from Canada amount to $39,811,560, a balance of trade in Canada's favor of $17,653,955. This, of course, is applying the terms of the treaty to the trade between the two countries as if it had been in force during the year 1910. When you add to this balance of trade the tremendous amount of natural products of Canada's 800,000,000 acres of farm land which will seek the nearer American market under free trade, it becomes at once apparent that the balance of trade in Canada's favor under the free-trade provisions of Schedule A must reach tremendous proportions and will constantly increase.

Having disposed of the advantage which will inure to Canada by the adoption of this agreement, it becomes necessary to determine what reciprocal advantage, if any, will inure to the benefit of the United States.

The determination of this question involves an inquiry into the effect of the treaty upon our manufacturers, our consumers, and our farmers. It will be remembered from what I have said heretofore that Canada's position in the past has been to decline to consider any proposition looking to the admission into Canada of our manufactured products. I think I shall be able to show that she has adhered strictly to that policy in the pending agreement.

Immediately upon the abrogation of the treaty of 1854, and beginning with 1866, our exports to Canada greatly increased. In that year our exports amounted to $28,794,000; in 1903 they had increased to $137,600,000; in 1910 they reached the enormous total of $239,000,000. Of the latter amount, nearly $100,000,000 consisted of manufactured products. Our exports to Canada are 56 per cent of her total imports from all countries. Our balance of trade against Canada in 1910 amounted to $141,000,000, proving conclusively, to my mind, that Canada is now buying in our market nearly 60 per cent of all that she buys from all foreign countries, including Great Britain, and that she prefers to buy of us. There is no reason to assume that she will buy more under the proposed arrangement; but if this treaty had been in force at the beginning of the fiscal year 1910, out of the $133,000,000 worth of goods subject to duty which we shipped into Canada in 1910 only $25,000,000 worth would have received the benefit of reduced duties provided in the law, and these would have received the benefits of an average reduction of duty of only 17 per cent. While our manufacturers of carpets, clothing, collars and cuffs, cotton print, sheets, telephone and telegraph instruments and fixtures, firearms, furniture, window glass, gloves, knit goods, leather goods, leather beltings, sewing machines, boots and shoes, silk goods, typewriters, ribbons, velvets, woolen blankets, flannels, cloths used in the production of men's clothing, granite, marble, slag, mill machinery, scales, organs, pianos, harness, harness hardware, and a hundred and one of our great lines of production in the United States would still have been obliged, and will still be obliged, should this treaty become operative, to pay the duties which they have heretofore had to pay when these goods were exported to Canada. They not only get no reduction of duty upon their products, but must compete with the products of Great Britain imported into Canada under a preferential tariff of 33⅓ per cent. How much the markets of Canada will be opened by this agreement to the manufactured products of the United States may be imagined when we stop to consider that upon the few articles mentioned in the so-called reciprocal dutiable list in the agreement the average reduction of duty made by Canada on products of American manufacture is 17 per cent, while the average reduction made by the United States upon the manufactures of Canada is 39 per cent.

How small a concession has been made to the manufacturers of the United States may be gleaned from the fact that while the total trade between the two countries amounted to $326,963,231 in 1910, the amount of that trade which would have been affected by the reduction in this bill amounts to $33,391,952, or in fact slightly in excess of 10 per cent of the total trade between the two countries. This so-called concession, it seems to me, hardly justifies us in subjecting our farmers to the competition not only to the constantly increasing production of Canada's 800,000,000 acres, but as well to the competition of the $100,000,000 in value of the surplus farm products of Canada which now seek the markets of England, but which under free trade with the United States must inevitably turn to the free-trade market in this country.

We come now to the consideration of the effect of the treaty upon the consumer of this country. President Taft in his message disposes of that feature of the case in the following language:

> I do not wish to hold out the prospect that the unrestricted interchange of food products will greatly and at once reduce their cost to the people of this country.

Mr. Taft might have gone further than that. He would have stated the truth had he said that with the exception of one or two articles, such as butter and eggs, which are consumed in their natural state, there is not the slightest ground to be found in the treaty for the belief that the consumer would get any benefit whatever from its provisions. He might have said that as far as the consumer is concerned it perpetuates all of the inequalities and injustices of the Payne-Aldrich bill.

While the agreement does remove the duty on wheat it retains a duty upon flour. While it removes the duty upon cattle, hogs, and sheep it still retains a duty of 1¼ cents per pound upon fresh and salted meats, bacon, and ham, and it may be confidently asserted that while the duties upon these manufactured food products have been slightly reduced, taking into consideration the fact that the raw products out of which they are manufactured are upon the free list, the duties imposed by this bill are actually higher, from the standpoint of the consumer, than were the duties of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, and provide a greater rate of protection to the manufacturers.

It must be remembered that duties upon manufactured products are of two kinds—a compensatory duty which is intended to compensate the manufacturer for the duty which he is obliged to pay for the raw products contained in the manufacture when they are imported from a foreign country and a protective duty upon the manufactured articles themselves. The latter is called the differential duty.

Under the Payne-Aldrich law the duty upon wheat was 25 cents per bushel. It takes 4½ bushels of wheat to make 1 barrel of flour. So that in order to compensate the miller for the duty upon the wheat in the flour it is necessary to impose a tariff upon the barrel of flour of four and one-half times 25 cents, or $1.12. So far the miller has had no protection whatever to cover the difference, if any, of the cost of making the flour. The actual tariff imposed by the Payne bill upon the barrel of flour was 25 per cent ad valorem. The average price of the flour imported from Canada to the United States in 1910 was $5 per barrel, making a specific tariff upon a barrel of flour of $1.25. Taking from this $1.25 of actual duty imposed the $1.12 which represents the compensatory duty on the wheat in the flour leaves an actual protection to the miller of 13 cents per barrel.

Now, then, under the proposed reciprocity agreement wheat is on the free list, so that it is unnecessary to compensate the miller for any duty upon wheat, and it becomes at once apparent that the 50 cents per barrel imposed upon flour by the agreement is a purely protective duty and is nearly four times as great as the protection afforded the miller under the Payne law. Indeed, the tariff of 50 cents a barrel is more than twice the total cost of manufacturing a barrel of flour in this country.

This situation is not confined to flour. The same demonstration could be made in the case of meats, bacon, and ham, and all other manufactured products considered in the agreement, which are manufactured in whole or in part from the products of agriculture. It is a fitting monument to the sagacity of the Canadian commissioners that in this agreement they have so arranged the duties that they (Canadians) can ship the cattle, hogs, and sheep raised upon the cheap and fertile lands of that empire of the Northwest into the United States without the payment of any duty whatever, but that when our packers and our millers have manufactured them into beef, hams, bacon, and mutton, they can not sell these manufactured products in Canada except upon paying a duty of 1¼ cents a pound, but in selling to the American consumer they still get the benefit of the duty as against any competition from Canada.

There is no great amount of comfort for the consumer in the placing of the products of agriculture upon the free list, as it has been ages since the human race has been accustomed to eat the raw product of the farm in its natural state. And it is worth notice that the same duty which prevents the American miller and the American packer from shipping his product into Canada prevents the American consumer from getting one cent of reduction in the price of these products.

I come now to the consideration of the effect of the agreement upon the agricultural sections of this country. I do not consider it last because I consider it less important than the others, for I consider it the most important feature of the entire proposition.

I remember when as a boy I heard the great Republicans of State and Nation telling the farmers of the benefits they had derived and would derive from the policy of protection upon farm products. You have been telling them this for 40 years. Now you propose to tell them that they never needed any protection and do not need it now. You expect them to believe you, because, forsooth, you have been lying to them for 40 years. Whatever others may do in this situation, I do not propose to be a party to the deception. I am convinced that the farmer has derived a benefit from protection upon his product in the past, and I am unwilling that these products should be placed upon the free list now without any reciprocal or compensatory advantages whatever. I am opposed to placing the farmers' products upon the free list without any investigation of the effect of placing them there and without any demonstration of the propriety and justice of doing so.

I have always had a great deal of confidence in that saying of the great emancipator, so often and so unctiously displayed in the Republican campaign textbooks of the past:

> I do not know much about the tariff, but I do know that when we buy our goods in foreign countries we get the goods and the foreigner gets the money, but when we buy our goods in this country we keep both the goods and the money.

And I apply that doctrine alike to the farmer and the manufacturer to the country merchant and the jobber. In fact, the experience, not only of this country, but of all countries of long-established prosperity—such countries as France and Germany—demonstrates beyond the power of any present consideration to abrogate it the proposition that protection to be effectual must commence with protection to the farmer.

The last platform of the Republican Party provided:

> The aim and purpose of the Republican policy being not only to preserve, without excessive duties, the security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers, and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-workers of this country—

demonstrating conclusively that up to 1908 we had not abandoned the theory of protecting the products of the farm. That protection to be effectual must so limit the supply and consequently affect the price that the farmer shall be able to maintain a balance of trade in his favor against the world. In other words, it must so regulate the competition of foreign countries that the farmer shall be able to sell his product at such a price and buy what he uses in his business at such a price that he will always have a balance with which he can improve his farm, educate himself and his family, preserve the fertility of his soil, and improve his methods of cultivation. This is the basis of the prosperity of not only the farmer, but the Nation. You may dig deep in the well of memory, you may go back far in the pages of the history of the world, and you will find that the prosperity of nations has been in a large measure the result of the prosperity of the farmer.

You propose to maintain this prosperity by compelling the farmer to sell his product in a free-trade market in competition with one of the greatest agricultural sections in the world and to buy his goods in a highly protected market.

Now, it is claimed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that the benefits which the farmer receives from protection is an indirect benefit, arising from the larger employment and higher wages of the laborer and the larger production of the factory under protection, but I do not understand the philosophy that concludes that the farmer's direct protection should be reduced because he has an indirect protection.

The very process which removes the direct protection decreases the indirect benefit by decreasing the purchasing power of the farmers, and consequently reducing the production and wages of the employees of the factory.

It might be pertinent to inquire in this connection where it is that the prosperity expert gets his facts. Does he go to the factory and inquire what men are employed, and at what wages? No. He goes out to the farm and learns that the crops are well put in, that the weather conditions are good, that there is no prospect of drought, that the chinch bugs have not devastated the crop, and he comes back and makes the report, and the factory owner increases his product, raises the wages of his men 5 per cent, and adds 20 per cent to the price of his goods, because he knows that this year the farmer will have the money to buy a new pair of felt boots, a new overcoat, build a new hog house, and buy his wife a new spring bonnet.

He goes out again next year and he finds that in one section there has been too much rain and that the black rust has attacked the crops, that the grasshopper has devastated the fields, and the prospects are for a lean year in agriculture. He comes back and makes his report. The factory owner curtails his production, shortens the hours of his men, because he knows that this year the farmer will have no felt boots, will use his last year's overcoat, that he will make last year's hog house do still another year, and that the farmer's wife will wear last year's styles.

Canada is preeminently a country of protection.

Under that policy 184 factories with a combined American capital of $233,000,000 have been established. The logic of the situation does not lead me to conclude that she is now relinquishing any part of the policy which has enabled her to bring about a situation which must be so gratifying to her. She is not relinquishing under this agreement one iota of protection which she has afforded to her manufacturers in the past. We

must not forget that the protection afforded by this agreement is ample to protect her industries.

Canada to-day is adopting the identical policy which we adopted 50 years ago, and which we now propose to abandon; a policy under which we attracted to our new and fertile lands the farmers and tradesmen of England, France, Germany, Norway, and Sweden; a policy under which we built up our agriculture and at the same time provided the industries which should make a home market for the farmers' products. During the same period we sold our surplus food products in the markets of free-trade England. To-day under that free-trade policy agricultural land within 10 miles of the world's market, London, is selling for $125 per acre.

Under this agreement Canada is providing herself with a free-trade market in the United States for her surplus farm products. At the same time she is protecting the home market made by her manufacturing industries by an amply high tariff against the competition of the United States.

She will attract to her new and fertile lands the farmers and tradesmen of the States and provide for them both a home market in Canada and a free market in the United States under this agreement. For 30 years, from 1860 to 1890, the agriculture of New England stood still. She was feeling the competition of the cheaper lands in the Mississippi Valley. Under this agreement the agriculture of the United States will stand still.

I want briefly now to consider the effect of Canadian competition in farm products upon the price to the farmer.

It is claimed that the incoming tide of foreign farm products will not affect the prices to the farmer by reason of the fact that in foodstuffs and farm products we are an exporting Nation. It requires no figures to demonstrate the fallacy of that conclusion to any man who is familiar with the facts. However, there is abundant evidence, including the report of the Tariff Board recently submitted in response to a resolution of the Senate (S. Doc. No. 849), that the price of land in Canada is much lower than the price of land in agricultural sections of this country; that the price of farm labor is from 17 to 25 per cent lower in Canada than in the United States; and, taking wheat as an example, that the price of wheat in Winnipeg, as compared with Minneapolis, both of which have the same freight rate to Liverpool, is from 11 to 15 cents lower in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis. A proportional difference in the prices of farm products to the producer in Canada and the United States is found practically in all farm products.

It seems to me inevitable that under these conditions, including the difference in the price of land, of labor, and of greater production—the average production of spring wheat in this country being 11.7 bushels and in Canada 15.33 bushels, and winter wheat in this country 15.8 bushels and in Canada 23.49 bushels (report of Tariff Board, p. 94)—these prices must necessarily seek a common level. But assuming that the price of wheat in this country should be decreased only 1 cent a bushel the loss of purchasing power of the American farmer will aggregate nearly $7,000,000 annually, and if the price in Canada should be increased 1 cent a bushel, which is by no means necessarily true, there would be an increase in the purchasing power of the Canadian of a little over a million and a half dollars. This situation will be found all through the entire schedule of agricultural products, and it should illustrate the absurdity of trading the purchasing power of 90,000,000 people for the purchasing power of 9,000,000 people.

Men will tell you that the competition of Canada will not affect the price. I shall not recite any figures of exports to set aside this conclusion, though a careful examination of our exports in farm products leads me to the contrary conclusion, for the experience of every man will tell him that if he has all of a product that will be consumed within the limits of his own market and considerably more, for that matter, which can be exported to other markets, and some competitor should flood his market with a large quantity of the same product, that the inevitable result must be a depression in the price.

No man can tell, or has attempted to tell, how much Canadian produce will break our markets. But the laws which govern this proposition are as immutable as the laws of nature. Gregory King, the noted political economist and mathematician, lays down the following rule: In a commodity a surplus of one-tenth lowers the price below the common rate three-tenths; two-tenths lowers the price below the common rate eight-tenths; three-tenths lowers the price below the common rate sixteen-tenths; four-tenths lowers the price below the common rate twenty-eight tenths; five-tenths lowers the price below the common rate forty-five tenths. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the application of this principle to our proposed opening of our markets to the products of Canada.

Many men on this floor have deplored the tendency of centralization of population in the large cities, the movement from the farm to the large city; not one of them but would decrease that tendency if it were possible. To my mind there are two ways by which it can be done. One is by increasing the prosperity of the farmer, enabling him to surround himself in so far as it is possible with the conveniences of the city; the other is to make him so poor that he can not move away. The statesmanship that advocates this bill seems to prefer the latter method.

In my own district, one of the oldest and most thickly settled of the agricultural sections of the great agricultural State of Minnesota, the agricultural population in the last 10 years has decreased nearly 15 per cent as a result of the exodus which has taken place in that time to the cheaper and consequently more profitable lands of North and South Dakota and Montana, where profits may be secured with less labor and with less capital. This exodus will not be discontinued. On the contrary, it will be accelerated, but it will be diverted from the lands of the United States to the virgin prairie of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and, to my mind, the greatest asset which Canada will secure by this agreement will be the American farmer. My State is spending thousands of dollars annually to repopulate her abandoned farms—thousands of dollars to make fertile her farms—for she realizes that every farmer that settles upon one of her farms brings an added wealth and added buying capacity of $1,000 annually.

I have been unable to secure definite figures showing to what extent immigration from this country to Canada has taken place in the past, but I think it may be confidently asserted that 400,000 Americans have gone to Canada in the last five years. This immigration can not but be accelerated under the provisions of this agreement which enable the Canadian farmer to raise his product upon the cheap lands of Canada and sell it in competition with the product of the American farmer, in the American market upon an equal basis.

In concluding these remarks let me say that from the consideration which I have laid down I can not come to any other conclusion than that the advantages of this agreement inure wholly to the benefit of Canada; that the progress of the industries of this country will be very greatly retarded; that the prosperity and independence of our farmers will be decreased; that there is an entire and absolute lack of any reciprocal advantage to any of our people or our industries in the agreement.

I would be glad, indeed, if we might obtain a wider market either for the production of our farms or our factories. I think I should be willing even to concede a part of our market if we were offered any share in the Canadian market.

But I can come to no other conclusion than that the prosperity and independence of the American farmer is much too high a price to pay for the concessions which Canada offers in the pending agreement.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from one of the greatest agricultural States in this country, a State that up to the present time has been almost wholly dependent upon agriculture for its success and its prosperity, it is but natural that I should be highly interested in the speeches that have been made on both sides of this great question. I have been particularly interested in the speeches that have been made by the gentlemen who favor this proposition; and were it not because the consequences will be so serious, I should be highly amused, because from those speeches we are led to believe that the farmers of this country are a lot of ignoramuses, who do not know either what they want, or what is for their own good, or what makes for their own welfare.

Now, my friends, I want to say to you that the farmers of to-day are not what they were 50 years ago. At that time there were comparatively few educated farmers, few men who read the daily press, few men who studied the agricultural journals that are now spread abroad over this country, and then it was easy to fool the farmer; but, my friends, to-day you can go out over the broad prairies of the West, and you will find a different class of people; men who have been educated in the high schools, academies, and universities of the country, and tens of thousands of whom have been educated in the agricultural colleges that are standing to-day as a perpetual monument to the wisdom and patriotism of the Republican Party. You can not fool those men as you did before, and they know that this bill that is now before the House will, if it passes, give them the worst end of the bargain. I live in a locality that is only 20 miles from the Canadian line, and I do not have to go to statistics; I do not have to go to the daily

press. I know what the farmer is getting on both sides of the line for farm products. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I know, and any man who has had any experience in the matter knows, that for several years the farmers on this side of the line have been getting an average of from 8 to 12 cents per bushel more for wheat and in the neighborhood of 30 cents per bushel more for barley and about 25 cents per bushel more for flax than the farmers on the Canadian side. In all the speeches that have been made on the floor of this House no man has attempted to deny this fact, and what has troubled them has been to find a plausible reason for the existence of such a difference in the price of the products of the farm in primary markets that are only from 1 to 10 miles apart, outside of the duty that is levied on foreign farm products. This does not trouble the people in our State, for they all know that it is caused by the duty, and the duty alone.

In order to show you the relative value of the three principal crops that are raised in both countries—wheat, barley, and flax—I have here a table showing the prices paid on the various dates mentioned in the table. I will have this table inserted in the RECORD, but I will call your attention now to the fact that for the week ending December 31, 1910, wheat was sold on this side of the line for from 10 to 11 cents more than it was on the other side in towns that were only from 2 to 10 miles apart. On January 10, 1911, the difference in the price was 15 cents in favor of the North Dakota farmer. On January 9, 10, and 11, 1911, the difference in the price of barley in favor of our farmers was from 24 to 29 cents. On the same dates, January 9, 10, and 11, 1911, the difference in the price of flax averaged fully as much as the amount of the duty—25 cents per bushel. As a concrete example, take Portal and North Portal, which are really one town, in which the boundary line between North Dakota and Saskatchewan forms one of the principal streets. Here you will find that there was the same difference in the price of wheat, barley, or flax on the two sides of the street that there was in all the other towns mentioned in the table. Is there any man on either side of this House who is foolish enough to believe that the American miller would pay from 10 to 15 cents per bushel more for wheat, about 30 cents per bushel more for barley, and about 25 cents per bushel more for flax on the south side of a certain street in Portal than they could buy it for on the other side of the same street if the duty was removed? This idea is so absurd that it needs no argument before an audience as intelligent as this.

WHEAT.

Prices paid for week ending Dec. 31, 1910.

UNITED STATES.	Cents.	CANADA.	Cents.
Pembina	89–91	Emerson	79–81
Neche	91	Gretna	81
Hannah	90	Snowflake	77
Walhalla	89–91	Haskett	78–79
Sarles	89½	Crystal City	76
Hansboro	90	Cartwright	77–79
St. John	90	Boissevain	80
Antler	91	Lyleton	78
Portal	86	North Portal	75
Kermit	88	Estevan	74
Souris	93	Waskada	77

Prices paid Jan. 10, 1911.

UNITED STATES.	Cents.	CANADA.	Cents.
Pembina	97	Emerson	82
Neche	96	Gretna	81
Walhalla	97	Haskett	82

BARLEY.

Prices paid Jan. 9, 10, and 11, 1911.

UNITED STATES.	Cents.			CANADA.	Cents.		
Pembina			67	Emerson			42
Neche	68	66	67	Gretna	37	38	38
Hannah			64	Crystal City	38	38	38
Sarles	64	64	64	Cartwright	36	36	36
Hansboro	67	65	66	Boissevain	40	40	40
St. John	68	66	67	Lyleton	40	40	40
Portal	63	63	63	North Portal	35	35	35

Difference, 24 to 29 cents.

FLAX.

Prices paid Jan. 9, 10, and 11, 1911.

UNITED STATES.				CANADA.			
Pembina	$2.32			Emerson	$1.93	$1.93	$1.93
Neche	2.32	$2.26	$2.26	Gretna	2.06	2.06	2.06
Walhalla	2.35	2.25	2.32	Haskett	2.03	2.03	2.08
Hannah	2.42	2.42	2.42	Crystal City	2.10	2.10	2.07
Sarles	2.34	2.31	2.31	Cartwright	2.00	2.00	2.00
Hansboro	2.31	2.24	2.31	Boissevain	2.14	2.12	2.17
Portal	2.33	2.29	2.32	North Portal	1.89	1.89	1.89

The burden of all the eloquent speeches that have been made in favor of this measure has been to prove that if this bill becomes a law it will cheapen the products of the farm to the consumer, but will not reduce the price to the farmer. I am astonished that men as intelligent as those who are occupying seats on the floor of this House should make such an absurd statement or think for one moment that this will be believed by even the most ignorant farmers in the country. "It will not hurt the farmer" is a statement that has been made repeatedly the last few days by those who favor this measure. If this is true, how do you account for the fact that every farmers' organization from Maine to California whose members produce the products that are put upon the free list by this so-called pact are bitterly opposed to the measure and are earnestly pleading for its defeat? You say there is no reason why there should be a duty on farm products between countries whose people are operating on an equal basis in every respect. I deny that they are operating on an equal basis. A great deal has already been said about the cheaper Canadian lands and the smaller investment per acre that this necessitates over there and about the virgin soil and the greater yield that it produces, and I will not now burden you with a repetition of these arguments, but there is another matter to which your attention has not yet been called that I wish to refer to for a moment. Canada has three kinds of tariff rates—general tariff, intermediate tariff, and British preferential tariff. As the greater part of the manufactured good imported into Canada comes from Great Britain, and as the goods imported from other countries must be as low in price as those coming from Great Britain, else they would not be purchased, it is only fair to take the rates of duty on British goods as the standard of comparison with our tariff rates. I will therefore insert in the RECORD a table showing the duties paid by the Canadian farmers on the things that he uses in his everyday life and the duties paid by the American farmer on the same articles:

	Canadian tariff.	United States tariff.
Earthenware	15 per cent	60 per cent.
Tin plate	Free	45 per cent.
Tinware	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Wire:		
Some kinds	Free	
None over	10 per cent	75 cents per 100 pounds.
Hats	20 per cent	55 per cent.
Sugar	35 per cent	80 per cent.
Carpets	17½ per cent	60 per cent.
Oilcloth	25 per cent	45 per cent.
Furniture	20 per cent	35 per cent.
Cotton cloth	25 per cent	50 to 60 per cent.
Soap	65 cents per 100 pounds.	50 per cent.
Gloves and mitts	22½ per cent	60 per cent.
Hose	25 per cent	70 cents per dozen pairs, and 15 per cent, to 85 per dozen pairs and 55 per cent.
Dress goods	15 per cent	60 per cent.
Automobile farm trucks	22 per cent	45 per cent.
Pianos	20 per cent	45 per cent.
Celluloid goods:		
Some kinds	Free	
None over	5 per cent	60 per cent.
Cement	5 per cent	10 per cent.
Underclothing	22½ per cent	45 per cent.
Salt	Free	11 cents per 100 pounds.
Axes	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Shovels	20 per cent	45 per cent.
Scythes	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Stoves	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Chains, iron	5 per cent	45 per cent and up.
Knives and forks	20 per cent	50 to 65 per cent.
Agate ware	22½ per cent	40 per cent.
Sewing machines	20 per cent	30 per cent.
Oranges	Free	1 cent per pound and 20 per cent on the package.
Lemons	Free	1½ cents per pound and 20 per cent on the package.
Window glass	7½ per cent	60 per cent to 75 per cent.
Rice	50 cents per 100 pounds.	$2 per 100 pounds.
Figs	40 cents per 100 pounds.	$1 per 100 pounds and 35 per cent.
Jute bags	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Cotton thread	17½ per cent	45 per cent.
Glassware	15 per cent	60 to 100 per cent.
Lamp chimneys	20 per cent	60 per cent.
Brass goods	20 per cent	45 per cent.
Lamps	20 per cent	45 to 60 per cent.
Baskets	Free	40 to 60 per cent.
Rubber coats	15 per cent	35 per cent.
Rubber boots and shoes	15 per cent	35 per cent.
Books	15 per cent	25 per cent.
Lead	Free	2½ cents per pound.
Clocks and watches	20 per cent	40 to 60 per cent.
Bicycles	20 per cent	45 per cent.

This table shows that on articles generally used the Canadian farmer pays an average duty of from 20 to 35 per cent less than is paid by our farmer. If this measure becomes a law, it will place our farmers in a position where they will have to sell their products in the open markets of the world, Canada being our only real competitor, and purchase what they need from the highly protected industries of the East. I know you Democrats will say that you are going to remedy this by "revising the tariff downward," but you will find yourselves in a position where you will be unable to furnish much relief along this line. True, there are some important schedules that are entirely too high, and these can be revised and adjusted down to a fair and proper basis, and I promise you that I shall vote with you on every proposition of this kind; but you must not forget that under our present constitutional provisions you will be compelled to raise by duties on imports a vast amount of money for the necessary expenses of this Government, and that during 11 months of 1910, 48.7 per cent of our imports came in under the free list and only 51.3 per cent was dutiable. After "revising the tariff downward" to the best of your ability, you will find that, in order to raise the amount of money that must of necessity be raised by a duty on imports, our manufactured products will still be highly protected. And I venture the prophecy that you will not be able to bring our duties down to anywhere near the Canadian preferential duties with which our Canadian neighbors are now favored. The Democratic slogan of "a tariff for revenue only" is a meaningless and misleading phrase, as every intelligent student ought to know. Senator WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, when he was Democratic floor leader in this House, in speaking of this phrase, said, in substance, that, applied to those things which we can produce in our own country, there is no such thing as "a tariff for revenue only," as every duty on such articles is protective to the extent of the duty, whether it be 1 per cent or 100 per cent, and Senator WILLIAMS was absolutely right. I am therefore satisfied that you will not be able by tariff revision to give the American farmer compensation for one-tenth of the amount that you propose to take away from him by placing his products on the free list.

If, then, the Constitution compels you to give protection to our manufacturers, why do you insist on discriminating against our farmers by placing their products on the free list? Is it because you think they are making their money too fast or too easily? If so, I would advise you to read the bulletin just published by the Agricultural Department, in which they say that after thorough investigation they are satisfied it is no longer an easy task to make our American farms pay. Or is it because you think that our farmers are getting more than their just share of the amounts paid by the ultimate consumer? If so, let me read to you the opinion expressed by Secretary of Agriculture, the Hon. James Wilson, before the administration lash induced him to support this measure. In the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1910, pages 19–26, you will find that after a careful investigation of the increase of prices of farm products in their transfer to the consumer Secretary Wilson shows that the difference between the price paid the farmer and the cost to the consumer is in many cases from 40 to 50 per cent. For instance, it was found that poultry growers received only 55.1 per cent of the price paid by the consumer; that the dairyman receives but a scant 50 per cent of the price paid for milk; the apple grower, 55.6 per cent; that beef cost the consumer 38 per cent more than the price paid the great slaughtering houses; and other farm produce from 41 to 50 per cent over the original cost. The conclusion of this section of Secretary Wilson's report is:

> From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.
>
> After consideration of the elements of the matter, it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroad to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment.

No; it is not the tariff on farm products that is responsible for the high cost of food, but the excessive freight charges of the railways and the exorbitant profits of the commission houses and wholesale dealers through whose hands farm products must pass to reach the consumer.

To show you that Secretary Wilson was right when he expressed what I have just quoted, I will insert another table in the RECORD showing the advance in prices on some of the farmer's necessities, and these are only examples showing the general advance in everything the farmers have to buy.

The following statement was prepared by the Department of Labor in Washington. The average wholesale price in New York and in other primary markets of each article for the years 1890 to 1899, inclusive, is taken as the base price, and is represented by 100. The relative price is the average wholesale price for each year from 1898 to 1909, inclusive, compared with the base price. The relative price in March, 1910, is added:

Clothing, 96 to 126; cotton prints, 72 to 145; boots and shoes, 96 to 128; cotton sheetings, 86 to 134; cotton shirtings, 83 to 126; cotton tickings, 84 to 132; wool blankets, 107 to 131; wool flannels, 97 to 124; wool dress goods, 88 to 140; cotton flannels, 81 to 128; cotton hosiery, 83 to 93; miscellaneous, 92 to 132; fuel and lighting, 95 to 130; metals and implements, 86 to 128; lumber and building material, 95 to 151; house furnishing goods, 92 to 109; crude petroleum, 100 to 153; refined petroleum, 99 to 127; wool carpets, 100 to 117; wool horse blankets, 99 to 135; cotton thread, 98 to 126; cotton yarns, 90 to 131; cotton ginghams, 83 to 124; cotton 2-bushel bags, 95 to 143.

If, after you have considered all this, you still insist upon handicapping our agricultural industry, the one industry upon which the success and prosperity of the whole country depends, it must be because reason and logic, justice and fairness do not appeal to you, or because the political game you are now playing for high stakes is tempting you beyond your power to resist.

The gentlemen on the other side of this House have tried to justify a revolution in our economic and industrial world by claiming that this measure, if enacted into law, will help the poor by reducing the cost of living. Now, let us see what there is in this. While the farmer loses millions of dollars every year on barley, no one has attempted to claim that the brewers will sell a glass of beer for less than the regulation price of 5 cents per glass. The farmer is to be subjected to a loss of millions of dollars per year on flax, and no one has tried to show how this will in any way benefit the poor. The whole argument here has been made on wheat, while, as a matter of fact, wheat is by no means an overshadowing factor in the opposition to this agreement. But suppose that American wheat should drop to the Canadian level, or about 10 cents per bushel, and the ultimate consumer would get the whole benefit, what would it amount to? Our statistics show that, as a people, we consume from 5 to 6 bushels per capita. Now, if the consumer could buy this at a reduction of 10 cents per bushel he would save from 50 to 60 cents per year, or about 1 cent per week. For this infinitesimal amount per capita—which the consumer would not get, because this agreement amply protects the millers so they will not need to pass it on to the consumer—the farmer is to be subjected to competition with the world, although he always has and probably always will have to pay tribute to the consumers of his products whenever he has to buy anything that is produced by them. As long as the American people pay each year four times as much for liquor as they do for bread, and four times as much for tobacco as they do for potatoes, there is little need of revolutionizing our political and industrial systems and unsettling farm values and farm profits in order to save 1 cent per week on our bread.

If this measure must become a law, I would like to so amend this agreement that all importations from Canada would be admitted free of duty. But the gentlemen on the other side of the House declare they will not permit the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" for fear Canada might not accept it if we did. Who, let me ask, is legislating for the United States? Is it this House and the Senate at the other end of the Capitol or is it the Canadian Parliament? If Canada will not accept as a free gift the greatest market in the world, she does not have to take it, for we can get along without her better than she can without us. But that is not the reason for refusing to permit amendments.

The real reason is that your Democratic political machine, working in harmony with the interests affected by the admission of manufactured products free of duty—and both have selfish reasons for supporting this measure—are too powerful for the farmers and their friends to overcome.

I know you are trying to cover your tracks by saying you are going to provide for this free list in a separate bill, but the gentleman from New York "let the cat out of the bag" when he said you felt sure your free list would not become a law. If you were sincere you would attach your free list to this agreement as it would then stand ten times the chance of becoming a law that it does as a separate bill.

With the gentlemen on the other side of this House I have no fault to find as they are true to their traditions and consistent in their position, for they have never been friendly to the farmers, but have always looked to the congested cities for their political strength. A striking example of this is New York, where the Democrats nearly always carry the city of New York by about 100,000 majority, and the farmers of the State just as often roll up a Republican majority large enough to more than offset the city vote. The distinguished gentleman from New York, the Hon. FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON, in a

speech on this same subject delivered on the 13th of February last, indicated so plainly where the sympathies of the Democratic Party lie that I shall quote him. He said:

The recent election, bringing about the first overthrow the Republicans have sustained in many years, was freighted with one great demand—the demand by the people of our congested cities to take the taxes off from food and clothing. In response to that mandate we are now taking the first step. From the east side of New York City a million voices are raised in appeal to you that you should make this bill a law. From every city of the East they cry out to you for relief.

If this is not evidence enough of the unfriendliness of the Democratic Party for the farmers of the Northwest, we have but to remember the fact that the Democratic majority, represented by its floor leader, has absolutely refused to grant the farmers a hearing before the final vote is taken. In order to be heard in their own cause, the farmers will have to go to the Republican Senate, where they will be recognized.

Gentlemen, it is a plain case of the cities against the farmers, and with the cities are leagued nearly every trust and monopoly in the country, together with the great financiers that control them. It is a great combination, and it now looks as if it will be a winning one, in this end of the Capitol, at least.

To you, my Republican colleagues who are supporting this measure, I want to sound a note of warning. The Republican platform of 1908 declared for duties equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad and a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. Are you now by your votes going to so interpret this platform that the farmer who invests his all in the farm upon which he lives and where he and his family work, not 8 hours but 16 hours a day, is not to be included in the provision for guaranteed profits that you give to the manufacturer? If so, the Republican Party will never recover from your actions. Applied to the things we can produce in abundance at home, this country can not exist half protection and half free trade; it must be wholly one or the other, and upon your votes on this measure will depend largely what it is to be in the future. You may entertain the fond hope that the farmers, after you have done your utmost to assassinate their industry, will continue to vote for protection for the factories, shops, and mills you represent; but if so, let me disabuse your minds of any such foolish notions. For 50 years it has been the farmer vote that has maintained the principle of protection to American industries, and he has always been promised that he would get the direct benefits that the manufacturers have always had when the consumption of his products would equal the supply. Now, after all these years of loyal support, are you going to break faith with him? If so, can you give me a single reason why the farmers should continue to vote for protection on anything they have to buy?

President Taft has persistently urged the creation of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission, taking the position that no intelligent action can be taken on any subject involving the tariff without a thorough scientific investigation of the subject by a competent commission. In response to his demand, Congress gave him a Tariff Board composed of five men, who are perhaps as competent and impartial as any men in this country. When President Taft went to work on this Canadian tariff agreement, did he first have the Tariff Board investigate the subject for him and advise him as to the probable effect it would have on the farmers of this country? No! He first initiated a tariff agreement that will not only have a tremendous effect on our agricultural industries, but will entirely revolutionize our tariff laws and in all probability entirely wipe out protection as a principle. He then put the Tariff Board to work on the matter, and when they reported and he discovered their findings were against his reciprocity theories he ignored their report.

Are you, my Republican colleagues, going to put your stamp of approval upon such a measure as this? In order to do so, do not forget that you will have to absolutely ignore the findings of the Tariff Board, whose complete report on this subject has finally been published and whose findings are absolutely against the passage of this measure. The Democrats have loudly proclaimed that this is a Democratic measure, and, smarting under this claim, the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Massachusetts and others have tried to show that it is not contrary to Republican doctrine. I think you will concede that ex-Speaker Thomas B. Reed was one of the greatest exponents of protection that ever lived in this country and that his definition of Republican protection principles would be accepted by every Republican protectionist. I therefore want to quote a few lines from an article he wrote shortly before he died, in 1902. He said:

Protection rests upon principle or it does not. If it does not, then it is a mere bestowal of bounty and is no part of the business of government. If it rests upon principle, then that principle must be that the American markets belong to the Americans. You can not maintain your system and sacrifice anything to which it is applicable. * * * If we propose to abandon any industries, we had better not let it be the agricultural industries. Between the Atlantic and Pacific stretch vast regions still untilled. The next victory of protection should be there.

Our system of protection is not for the manufacturers alone. It is for farmers also. Whoever deprives our farmers of all the American market they can occupy is false to their principles and must meet with defeat, or the system must be surrendered which proclaims that American markets are, first of all, for American citizens who are engaged in developing the country we already have.

Blaine was the author of reciprocity, and he crystallized it in a letter he wrote to President Harrison in 1891, in which he said:

It is of the highest possible importance that there be no treaty of reciprocity with Canada. They aim at natural products, to get all the products of the farm on us in exchange for heaven knows what. I would cut the whole thing up by the roots. It would be considered a betrayal of the agricultural interests. The fact is, we do not want any intercourse with Canada except through the medium of a tariff. We are tending to have the great majority of the farmers with us. Let us encourage them by every means we can use and not discourage them by anything. We will break that alliance before six months if we maintain this policy.

The present proposed "betrayal of the farmers" was foreseen by Blaine. He pleaded 20 years ago that we should encourage, not discourage, the farmers.

McKinley learned his lessons in reciprocity from Blaine. He also believed in protecting the farmers. There is not a line to be found in his writings that shows to the contrary. His ideas of reciprocity were placed in the Republican national platform of 1900, on which he made a campaign. In that platform reciprocity reads as follows:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

In his last inaugural McKinley referred to this matter, using the language of the platform on which he was elected. This is what he said:

The end in view must always be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend to increase their employment.

In his Buffalo speech McKinley said:

By sensible trade agreements which will not interrupt home production we shall extend the outlet of our increasing surplus.

And again, in this same speech:

We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

The language and the meaning of the three great advocates of reciprocity in the past is clear and plain. What now passes for reciprocity is not reciprocity. It is not fair exchange. It is simply a sacrificing of our agricultural interests to gain benefits for other interests.

If this is a correct interpretation of the Republican doctrine of protection—and who will dare to say it is not—how can any man claim to be a Republican who works and votes for this measure which violates the principles of protection thus interpreted both in letter and in spirit? I am not pleading for any specific amount of protection on farm products, but I do claim that the great agricultural industry affected by this measure, the greatest and most important industry we have, is entitled to the same consideration and the same benefits under protection that are extended to our manufactured products. No one has denied that the farmers operate our most important industry, and they produce almost wholly raw material, in which the profit is comparatively small.

I agree with John R. Mauff, of the Wisconsin Equity News, who, in speaking of the farmers, says they are the producers of a very large percentage of all the so-called raw material. From these raw materials are developed all of the foodstuffs, including bread, the dairy products, the poultry products, sugars, vegetables, and fruits, all of the grains used in the manufacture of malt and distilled liquors. From these raw materials are also developed the fabrics which the common people use as raiment and for the various household needs, such as cotton, woolen, and linen goods.

These are the people who have cleared the forests, built the highways, erected the schoolhouses, and built the farm residences and splendid barns that dot the landscape. They changed the face of nature and converted the wilderness into a world of peace and plenty, teeming with all the elements of life that enable that other percentage of the Nation's population to live in luxury unknown to the masses in any other country. It is this percentage of farmers that has produced the wealth of the Nation in the main and who feed and clothe the other percentage, including those who consume without producing, as well as other millions who labor in the factories and workshops and in the fields of transportation and commerce. They have filled to overflowing from field and farm and garden, from all over the land, the horn of plenty that pours out so

copiously the richest and sweetest of beef and pork and mutton and bread and butter and fruits into the larder of the housewife in every kitchen in every hamlet and village and city throughout the length and breadth of the land.

I speak of these things to show that a class engaged in an industry of such magnitude and the product of whose toil is so absolutely necessary to producer and nonproducer alike should at least be fairly dealt with in matters of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I will accuse no man of deliberately trying to ruin the farmers of this country, but I think that you fail to understand the importance of the uninterrupted prosperity of our agricultural industry and to realize that anything that tends to reduce the legitimate profits of our farmers will affect in a still greater degree the success and prosperity of the toilers in our factories, shops, and mills, and, in fact, the welfare and prosperity of every industry in this country.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deep interest and marked attention to remarks of the various gentlemen upon this very important question and have yet to observe where it would be of benefit to the great people of the United States to adopt it. No one has undertaken to say how it will be of benefit to the American farmer, and that task, I apprehend, will not be demonstrated upon the floor of this Chamber.

NO BENEFIT TO THE FARMER.

It is not satisfactory to them to say they will not be injured. The question is, How will they be benefited? Do you think that by admitting the farm products free into their market you will benefit them? As well might it be claimed that you benefit the great sheep industry of this country by admitting Australian wool free of duty. How will it benefit the American farmer by admitting hundreds of thousands of tons of hay into his market, by admitting millions of bushels of wheat, barley, beans, and farm products; or the great American laborer by admitting the cheap pauper labor of England, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, and Mexico into this country unrestricted?

FARMERS PROTEST.

I hold in my hand more than 40 telegrams, received yesterday and to-day, all protesting against the enactment of this proposed treaty into law. I admit that there are a few of them sent by merchants, manufacturers, and tradesmen, but the majority are sent by farmers and granges; and I want to admit another thing, lest I forget it, and it might escape your attention, and that is that they are all hot ones. You say that the farmers do not know what they want. You claim the right to give them what they want and not even consult them. Do you claim the right to take away any man's property or his market without giving him anything in return? Do you think the great, intelligent American farmer would trade his birthright for a mess of Canadian porridge? He has endured the hardship of frontier life; he has not only done his part, but he has done more than any other class to clear up and improve and beautify this magnificent Republic; he has paid his taxes willingly to build our churches and schools; he has built the crossroads and the people's highways.

CAN NOT FOOL THE FARMERS.

There are four college centers in my district, Kalamazoo, Albion, Hillsdale, and Olivet. The farmers of my district pay liberally and are taxed handsomely to support the great University of Michigan, represented on the floor of this House by a larger number than any other institution of learning in our land. Within 4 miles from my district and in the very heart of the State is the first and greatest agricultural college in the United States. We have the free rural delivery of our mails, and I will not insult the intelligence of the great American farmer by saying that he does not know what he wants.

One-third of the population of this country are engaged in agriculture. Their eyes are to-day upon this body. We may have our way to-day, we may have our way here, but they will have their way to-morrow if you strike this blow at their material welfare. Their profits are below that of any other branch of industry. Fifteen bushels of wheat to the acre; 80 cents a bushel is the price; $12 the reward; $2 profit for your investment, your days' work from sun to sun, and you are lucky to get that.

PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED TREATY.

It was inspired by a desire to reduce the cost of living, to build up a more friendly relation between the two countries and to extend the market for our manufactured products.

The farmer is now getting low prices for his farm products, barely enough to pay for his toil and leaving very little for his investment. I am not impressed with the low cost of living idea or the low cost propaganda. Labor is more cheerful and better contented when it is well paid; the manufacturer is more prosperous when his prices are fair and he gets a just return for his endeavor. The farmer is no exception and is entitled to a just compensation for his work. It is admitted on all hands that times are better when prices are high and the purpose of the agreement to reduce the cost of living can not be based upon the cost received by the farmer for his products. If so, please put it in on the record. Even the threat of enacting this agreement has cost the farmers already more than a million of dollars. I will place on record the prices of farm products obtained from one of the most reliable sources in this country by a person who has spent 50 years a grain and wool merchant of Charlotte, Mich., and in close touch with the farmers, who writes me under date of April 7, 1911:

	Apr. 7, 1911.	Apr. 7, 1910.
Choice red wheat (60 pounds)	$0.80	$1.10
Oats	.28	.45
Shelled corn	.50	.65
Lambs, live weight (per hundredweight)	5.00- 5.50	8.00- 8.50
Hogs (per hundredweight)	.06	8.00- 8.50
Cattle (per hundredweight)	.04- .05	5.50- 7.00
Potatoes	.30	.60
Eggs	.12	.17
Wool	.17- .18	.23- .25
Butter	.16- .18	.20- .25
Beans (per bushel)	1.60	2.25

And a like reduction for other and similar products.

MORE FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH CANADA.

If it is claimed that it is necessary to pass this reciprocity agreement in order to establish better relations with Canada, upon what ground are you going to refuse a similar treaty with Great Britain, Germany, France, Spain, Japan, Mexico, and the other great sister nations? You propose to tear down the fortress of protection to the farming industry of this country because there is upon the rampart no guns pointed toward our Canadian neighbors. I am for peace, but I am not for peace at any cost, and when you destroy the market of the agriculturists of this country it is at a great sacrifice, which reflects itself not only as to his market but as to his home, his rights, and his independence by allowing this foreign competition.

AM FOR TAFT.

I do not understand that in framing this proposed Canadian reciprocity agreement that the farmer was anywhere consulted. Who had anything to do with the creation and instigation of this proposed treaty who is directly engaged in or concerned with that particular branch of industry? I am in favor of extending to that great class, which is so directly concerned, the right to be heard upon this great question. I am for the President, and I trust he may be elected in spite of himself, and the farmers of this country will have no better place to cast their lot than with the Republican Party. He is a protectionist and not a free trader, and we should nominate and elect him in spite of himself. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I sat here the other day and listened with great interest to my friend [Mr. KITCHIN] from North Carolina. Mr. KITCHIN is always interesting, even when his logic is wholly bad. He declared that reciprocity is a Democratic doctrine and that the Democratic Party stands for a still wider application of that doctrine than that contemplated in the pending bill. This question I shall not discuss.

I wonder at the logic of my friend, however, when he argues for reciprocity and its advantages, and then argues that the price of American products will not be disturbed by the reciprocal agreement and that the price that the American farmer in Minnesota and the Dakotas will receive for his No. 1 wheat will not be less by reason of the dumping into this country of Canadian wheat of the same quality. If this is true, then we are pretending to be giving to Canada something that, as a matter of fact, we are not giving her. We are pretending to give her people a market which, after all, is no better than the Canadian home market, according to his contention. If this is so, why not end the consideration of this question here and now? Why carry it further, for all that it amounts to after all is that we are handing to Canada that which I gather from his own words amounts to a gold brick and in return therefor receive what I believe is a gold brick?

But I do not agree with my friend. I believe we are actually making concessions to Canada, and are not receiving sufficient concessions in return. I wish I could favor this pending bill. I like the word "reciprocity," and believe that a reciprocal treaty could be drawn between the United States and Canada

that would be of benefit to both lands. That is the only kind of reciprocity bill that is worth while; that is the only kind of bill that should be considered.

The pending reciprocity agreement has the support of different Members of this body for various reasons. Republicans support it who, believing in the policy of protection, believe as well in reciprocity, and that the pending measure will perfect our system of protection. Republicans support it who believe the tariff law contains many imperfections, and that the pending measure, imperfect though it may be, is a wedge that will mark the beginning of tariff modification. It has the support of Democrats who announce that they believe in free trade, and of Democrats who believe in wholesale tariff modification and that the present reciprocal proposition will open the way to such modification, and they even stand for a still wider application of the doctrine than is contemplated in the pending bill. All unite in the desire to scale down the cost of living.

As for myself, I frankly confess that I believe that the present tariff law contains provisions that should be modified at the earliest possible time, but I am afraid that the pending reciprocity bill will be a disappointment to all those who believe in the policy of protection and yet believe in tariff modification. I recognize merit in the proposed reciprocal agreement, and yet, since an agreement of this character is in the nature of a bargain or trade, we must look to our part of the bargain and consider how it will affect every person in our country. Looking at the proposed agreement from the standpoint of the beginning of tariff modification, I fear we are not touching the important schedules that need attention, but are laying the lash upon the poor fellow's back who said that imperfections exist in the tariff law. And, again, our proposed modification, as I see it, is so unbalanced as to fail to scale down the cost of living, as I think I can demonstrate.

The pending bill provides for placing upon the free list of each country for the benefit of the other many articles and commodities that are produced in both countries. I shall insert in my speech at this point a list that I have taken from the bill that is now pending:

Live animals: Cattle, horses and mules, swine, sheep, lambs, and all other live animals.
Poultry, dead or alive.
Wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat, dried peas and beans, edible.
Corn, sweet corn, or maize.
Hay, straw, and cowpeas.
Fresh vegetables: Potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables in their natural state.
Fresh fruits: Apples, pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state, except lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, pomelos, and pineapples.
Dried fruits: Apples, peaches, pears, and apricots, dried, desiccated, or evaporated.
Dairy products: Better, cheese, and fresh milk and cream: *Provided*, That cans actually used in the transportation of milk or cream may be passed back and forth between the two countries free of duty, under such regulations as the respective Governments may prescribe.
Eggs of barnyard fowl, in the shell.
Honey.

The bill fails to place on the free list certain other commodities, mention of which I shall make in my printed speech, and which list is closely related to the free list, and yet for some reason is granted the benefit of protection:

Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game, 1¼ cents per pound.
Bacon and hams, not in tins or jars, 1¼ cents per pound.
Meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner, not otherwise herein provided for, 1¼ cents per pound.
Canned meats and canned poultry, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Extract of meat, fluid or not, 20 per cent ad valorem.
Lard and compounds thereof, cottolene and cotton stearin, and animal stearin, 1¼ cents per pound.
Tallow, 40 cents per 100 pounds.
Egg yolk, egg albumen, and blood albumen, 7½ per cent ad valorem.
Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn, in cans or other air-tight packages, and including the weight of the package, 1¼ cents per pound.
Wheat flour and semolina, and rye flour, 50 cents per barrel of 196 pounds.
Oatmeal and rolled oats, including the weight of paper covering, 50 cents per 100 pounds.
Corn meal, 12½ cents per 100 pounds.
Barley malt, 45 cents per 100 pounds. Barley, pot, pearled, or patent, one-half cent per pound.
Buckwheat flour or meal, one-half cent per pound.
Prepared cereal foods, not otherwise provided for herein, 17½ per cent ad valorem.
Bran, middlings, and other offals of grain used for animal food, 12½ cents per 100 pounds.
Pickles, including pickled nuts, sauces of all kinds, and fish paste or sauce, 32½ per cent ad valorem.
Farm wagons and finished parts thereof, 22½ per cent ad valorem.
Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators; thrashing machines, including windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, 15 per cent ad valorem.
Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horsepowers and traction engines for farm purposes; hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, manure spreaders, weeders, and windmills, and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, except shafting, 20 per cent ad valorem.

I have not pretended to give a complete list, but from an examination of the most important items which I have given this fact stands out: That the raw material is not protected, while the manufactured product has practically the same protection that it has when imported from any other country.

Now, let us look this matter over just as we would look over any other business proposition. If it is a good thing, let us avail ourselves of it. If it is bad, let us reject it. There is nothing whatever in the name "reciprocity." It may include everything that is good, or it may include everything that is bad. It may be wholly a giving without a compensation. What of the pending agreement, and how will it affect our country?

Our country has a population of approximately 90,000,000 people. Canada has a population of approximately 8,000,000 people. Our imports from Canada to-day of dutiable goods amount to $47,827,959, and Canada's imports from the United States of dutiable goods amount to $47,333,158. From this Canada's revenue is $7,776,236 annually and our revenue $5,649,826.

The pending bill has to do with commodities that are in very large part produced in both countries, and yet through the demand from year to year and notwithstanding the present duties our country is furnishing a market for many of these products. Last year nearly 1,000,000 bushels of oats were shipped into the United States from Canada and found sale in our markets after paying a duty of 15 cents per bushel. Nearly 100,000 tons of Canadian hay were shipped and sold in our markets after meeting a duty of $4 per ton. Last year nearly 1,000,000 pounds of butter were imported and upon the same a duty of 6 cents per pound was collected, and upon all the commodities that were shipped over the line we collected last year in duties, that we are now asked to surrender, $4,849,933. With the removal of the duties the same commodities would be able to bear down the prices of like commodities in the United States to at least the amount of the duty, and the farmer would lose accordingly. As against this we can not hope for compensating markets in Canada. Nine-tenths of the population of both countries is on the side of the United States, and it takes people to make a market.

But what I have suggested with respect to our imports from Canada upon the theory that if we import the same amount annually in the future our markets would be depressed to that extent is only the small part of this problem. At this time Canada is shipping to us a comparatively small amount of her products of which I am speaking, while she is shipping to England many times this amount, and here lies the difficulty. Between England and Canada there is no tariff, and does anyone doubt that with 3,000 miles cut off from the distance of transportation that Canada would immediately consign the goods that she has to sell to American markets instead of sending them to markets on the other side of the Atlantic? If anyone doubts this he certainly has a wrong conception of business principles.

On this head we need not feel so much disturbed for the present year or for next year. Nor need we feel disturbed on account of the $5,000,000 in revenues that we are surrendering. The imports within the next year or two would necessarily mean something of a loss to our farmers, but it would be scattered over a large population, and thereby would not be so keenly felt. More than this consideration, a consideration appeals to me that has to do with a condition that, as I see it, is just a few years ahead, should this treaty become effective, and the effect that the condition that will exist then will have in preventing the rightful increase in land values within our own country. Our farmers have with care and patience built up their lands, and it is not right that they should now be denied the legitimate value that belongs to such lands by reason of the opening up in competition lands that are now of little value upon the Canadian side of the line.

Within the United States the public lands have been very largely acquired by private individuals through the generous public-land laws of our country. Lands that have a value for agricultural purposes have passed to private ownership. Our great grazing plains are gone. Extensive farming upon the part of the individual must more and more give place to intensive farming in order that values may be produced upon the investment. No one can deny that the extensive areas of unappropriated public lands that the Government has offered free under the homestead laws have played an important part during the last half century in discouraging intensive farming and as well in keeping down the price of lands in the older sections of the United States. Intensive farming means more of cost to

the farmer, just as stall-fed stock mean a greater expense to the stockgrower than the range-fed cattle of 20 years ago.

I am opposed to this bill, because I believe it will spell disaster to the American farmer, for the reason that large areas will be opened to settlement in Canada within the immediate future, and the cost of production in Canada for the next 20 or 30 years will be found to be cheaper than the cost of production within our own country. Canadian land is new, it is virgin, it will produce such an acreage with the minimum amount of labor as will enable the farmers there to flood our markets with their hay, their oats and other grains, their butter and eggs and other farm produce, and the price that will be received will be remunerative to the Canadian, but meager to the farmer of our own land. This is a proposition that is easy of demonstration. Canadian land that is avilable for farm purposes is worth on an average less than one-half what it is worth on this side of the line. A farmer who has $6,000 to invest in land and can buy 100 acres of $60 land in the United States can buy 200 acres of the same quality of land across the Canadian border. A schoolboy can figure out that the producer on the cheap land can sell his products at a remunerative price, and that the same price would net a small margin of gain to the farmer raising the crop on a more expensive land.

But this is not all. The supplies which the Canadian buys he buys at a less cost. In the United States there is a uniform tariff upon the products imported from foreign countries, while in Canada, in addition to the tariffs between Canada and foreign countries, there is a British preferential tariff. This preferential tariff being less than the tariff between Canada and other countries, must necessarily set the price. The tariff on the goods that the American farmer must buy is from 25 per cent to nearly 50 per cent more than this preferential tariff that is available to the Canadian, and the farmer of the United States is compelled to pay that much more for the commodities which he would buy.

On rubber boots and shoes and on rubber coats the Canadian pays 15 per cent duty, the consumer in our country 35 per cent; on jute bags, in which the farmer in my State sells his grain, he pays a duty of 45 per cent, while his Canadian competitor across the line pays 15 per cent; on a sewing machine for his wife our farmer pays a duty of 30 per cent, the Canadian 20 per cent; on a stove for the kitchen our farmer pays 45 per cent, the Canadian 15 per cent; on shovels and axes it is the same; on dress goods our farmer pays 60 per cent, the Canadian 15 per cent; on wire our farmer pays 75 cents per 100 pounds, while the Canadian buys his wire at not to exceed 10 per cent, and much of it is free of duty. Our farmer pays 55 per cent duty on his hat, the Canadian only 20 per cent; our farmer 45 per cent duty on his underwear, the Canadian 22½ per cent, or just one-half that amount; and so I could continue if I had time, and I could show that the farmer on this side of the line is placed at a distinct disadvantage when compared with his Canadian brother because of the preferential duty between Canada and the great manufacturing country of Great Britain. Yet if this treaty shall go into effect, you will expect the American farmer, the farmer of your State and mine, to compete in our own markets in the sale of his hay and his oats, his eggs and his butter, his fruits and his vegetables.

And when it comes to labor it is almost the same. It is true that the wages paid in the part of Canada immediately north of my own State and the State of Washington is about the same as the wages paid to the Canadian laborers across the line, but, taking all the other parts of Canada and comparing them with the United States, the wages paid are nearly 25 per cent higher, on an average, in the United States than the wages paid for similar labor in the parts of Canada of which I speak. Certainly, wages on the farms of the United States must come down to meet the Canadian wage scale or else the American farmer must incur a loss.

I am opposed to this treaty for, as I see it, it is reciprocal in name alone. No one can deny that in revenues we are surrendering approximately twice as much as is Canada. On this point I shall not speak, because I think it is a small consideration. The treaty is reciprocal in name only, because its benefits are not reciprocal. On the one side the Canadian is benefited by being offered a market at home for his products. He is benefited because this will build up his lands, stimulate railroad development, and give him other business enterprises from Halifax to Vancouver. But what is given to the citizens of the United States in return for all this? It is useless to say that the markets of Canada are thrown open to his products. The Canadian markets are already overstocked; there are no extensive markets there for American goods. What other compensation is offered? Why, that the cost of living will be lowered. Now, on this head let us make a little inquiry. It is proposed to place wheat, oats, and other grains upon the free list. But it is also proposed to leave a duty upon flour, prepared cereal foods, and other products of grain. The housekeeper does not buy wheat for her family; she buys flour or bread. She does not buy oats or corn; she buys prepared cereals. If a duty is retained upon the flour and the cereal foods, even though grains are admitted free, do you suppose the consumer will buy his flour or his bread or his cereal food cheaper? Not a bit of it. The consumer will pay just as much, but some one else besides the farmer will receive the benefit. The middle man, the broker, the manufacturer will receive the difference. Let us inquire further. It is proposed to place cattle, hogs, and sheep upon the free list; but the duty is still maintained with slight modification on fresh and cured meats and on the other products of live stock. Can anyone seriously argue that the consumer would pay less for his ham, or his bacon, or his beefsteak, or chops, because the live stock is admitted free? I think not. What would compel the great packing plant to sell its products cheaper? It has no additional competition. On the other hand, it will be able to make a larger profit because, while buying the cattle, hogs, and sheep in a cheaper market, it will sell its manufactured products in the same old market and at the same old price.

Again, I say the housekeeper does not buy beeves, she buys meat; she does not buy hogs, she buys ham or bacon; she does not buy sheep, she buys mutton. And so I conclude that that which the friends of the treaty call a benefit will prove elusive. Elusive to the farmer, because while it offers markets to him, there are small markets in Canada that he wants; and elusive to the consumer, because while the duty is removed from the raw material it is retained in almost its original form upon the manufactured product.

The desire upon the part of the administration to do something that will lower the cost of living is most commendable, yet I believe that whatever may have been the idea when the reciprocity question was first considered, that the working out of the agreement will not attain this end. More than this, even if it should attain this end, it is at the expense of the farmer. Of all those in our country who have stood by the policy of protection, the farmer up to the present has received the smallest returns. Within the last few years the wisdom of the policy is justifying itself to the farmer, and at this time, with the farmer coming into his own as never before, we propose to take from him the benefit that in all justice to him rightfully belongs.

The farmer is not selfish in this fight. More than one of them have said to me that they would be willing to make the sacrifice necessary to bring down the cost of living providing a similar sacrifice be made by our other producers and by the manufacturers. More than this, more than one have said to me that they would stand for the Canadian treaty with all the loss that it means to them providing in that treaty may be incorporated reciprocal agreements touching not the raw products alone, but manufactured products as well. If you are going to throw down the bars on his products, let us throw them all down and let business intercourse and freedom be complete between our own country and the great nation to the north of us.

Yes; but some one says the Democratic Congress proposes to pass a bill placing upon the free list some of the articles mentioned on the protection list with Canada. I am asked if that might make some difference with my vote. In answer I would say that it might, providing the items were included in the present bill. This, however, is impossible. More than this, there is no certainty of the passage of the bill that has been proposed. What is less certain than the outcome of a Congress one branch of which is Democratic and the other Republican? Who is here to promise that the bill will be followed by another that will correct injustices in this one? Who can give assurances that it can pass? Here is a bill that, as I see it, works an injustice upon the farmers of my State and upon our country, and I can not sacrifice their interests upon a promise that no one here is able to fulfill. I must consider the pending bill providing for reciprocity with Canada upon its own merits, and, considering it upon its own merits, I am compelled to be opposed to its passage. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this question of reciprocity there has been every opportunity to make observations concerning the sentiment prevailing throughout the country as reflected in the expression of Members residing in all parts of the Republic. In the face of the President's desire, as expressed in his several messages, there were recorded against this bill when last before us 87 Republican votes, and so uncertain were the managers of the treaty as to its probable fate as a party measure, that a caucus was not called to con-

sider its merits. In fact, I have not learned of a single Senator or Member with whom the Chief Executive counseled before presenting this treaty or trade agreement to Congress. It is evident from the wide divergence of opinion and utter lack of unanimity on the part of the Republican representation here that the objections to this measure are founded on logical and rational reasons, this conclusion being reached, if in no other way, by the fact that 87 Members, or a majority of 9 Republicans, cast their votes against it. Coming directly from the people, as did the Members of the House which convened in December, the vote of that body in February on this measure carries with it the weight of extraordinary significance.

We believe the President to be thoroughly honest and sincere and surely hopeful of the result of the enactment of this legislation; but it is not to be expected that even a President of this great Republic is either infallible, immortal, or immaculate, and error with him is within the range of possibility.

From a political standpoint it may after all result in much good to the Republican Party, for it has been demonstrated during the discussion of this measure that when fundamentals of the Republican Party are assaulted insurgent and stalwart can and do stand together. The kind of insurgents we have in this House I can now regard from a different angle and a different measure of respect than I did when I first came here and witnessed the petty and inconsequential rows over minor and collateral matters. Now, in the time of real trial, when the party has been outvoted and is without power to take the initiative or achieve direct results, they stand like oak and rock, side by side with the stalwarts of the faith of our party's immortal leaders; and in the face of the rising, triumphant shouts of Democracy take their ground when loyalty is best demonstrated and true party pride and patriotism are most needed.

I come from the Republican State of Pennsylvania, a State that is true and certain in her Republican majorities, never wavers, is always stalwart, yields to no State in freedom of suffrage, universal primary law, and triumphs under the unbeaten leadership of the Senate's new head. Notwithstanding my own affiliation during more than a quarter of a century and tendencies toward centralized strength within party council, I am ever ready and willing to recognize what is just and right, and from what I have seen in recent days of the attitude of the so-called insurgents I am impelled to make these passing observations.

The Democratic Speaker long ago claimed this reciprocity treaty to be a real Democratic baby, and I have heard his successor lay like claim, while Mr. KITCHIN on last Saturday made a similar modest challenge.

From a political standpoint, what is the Republican Party to get out of this measure by way of political advantage in case it should be enacted into law?

Observing this Republican minority and recalling last fall's election reverses, it is evident that we not only need to hold the farmer vote, but we must first get him back into the fold if we are to win the presidential election in 1912. I submit that if it is agreed we must have him back, will we accomplish that purpose by removing the tariff from the products of his farm and retaining a tax on what he buys?

We already have 60 per cent of Canada's import trade, while 30 per cent is made up of teas, coffees, spices, champagne, diamonds, and other luxuries which we do not produce, leaving a beggarly 10 per cent of business to compete for. For the mere chance, which we already have, to get part of this remaining 10 per cent we propose removing the tariff from 76 per cent of Canada's exports, with only approximately 17 per cent of our export articles to be admitted free into Canada!

This is truly a one-sided pancake, although the working out of such a policy might be of unusual interest to the Beef Trust, the Harvester Trust, and the Milling Trust. Therefore, if there is only ruin ahead for the Republican Party in abandoning the tenets of the past, of turning from the principles which made the country great and rich and strong, what is there if viewed from the position taken by the President in his message? It is declared, on the one hand, that reciprocity is to give the poor man a better breakfast at lower cost than at present, while, on the other hand, the farmer is told—and we were told right here even yesterday—that reciprocity would not reduce the cost of food products to the ultimate consumer.

There seems to be a contradiction here that thoroughly explodes any theory that will definitely fix the outcome of this trade agreement, excepting that it is certain to give away the world's greatest market with nothing in return, and yet the bill is labeled reciprocity, which is a misnomer and a misconception.

As illustrating the fallacy of this whole breakfast theory and that the farmer is not the man to be pursued because of high prices for food, I bring before you an object lesson which must carry conviction. I hold in my hand a small catalogue issued from the Pennsylvania State College, which contains the names of the students and a few advertisements. State College is located in the heart of Pennsylvania, in a rich agricultural district and farms virtually abutting the campus, and not a cold-storage plant is within 50 miles of the place. There is a free, normal market for agricultural products; in fact, prices should be necessarily a little higher than normal, with 1,800 consuming students creating the demand, and yet I find in this little book an advertisement asking to take boarders at $3 per week. Three dollars per week, or 21 meals at less than 15 cents each, and these meals must necessarily be substantial, as they are served for hungry professors, hungry, growing schoolboys, and football players. In this locality the consumer deals directly with the farmer; in Washington and other cities the consumer deals with the cold-storage baron, and pays 45 cents per pound for calf's liver and 10 cents each for apples.

If you break down this tariff which protects the farmer; if you break down the tariff which protects the manufacturer, then we instantly face in field and in factory competition with Europe's cheapest labor and Asia's worse than slavery. But do not break it down. Keep up protection, not so high that it will be a menace to anybody, but, in any event, if the plan works, keept it up so that it may show the difference of cost of production at home and abroad. But, while protective tariff laws are making the country as a whole mighty with wealth, and it can not be so without protection, let us see to it that the rewards are better divided. Let us see that the great combinations of wealth which have sprung into existence are properly regulated. You can quickly break these mighty combinations of capital called trusts by the ruinous remedy of free trade, but by the application of this method you will at the same time break the country. There must be Federal power great and strong enough, and a power exercised, to meet this trust situation, to bring up with a turn this invisible, insidious power which has been getting most of the reward and the toiling masses so little.

Yes; protection to the farmer, protection to the capitalist, protection to the manufacturer, all in fair and equitable measure; but the place protection is now most needed is around the bending back of labor. The sequel to this suggestion is written against the horizon each day as the great ocean liners emerge from the mists off of Sandy Hook, and from the deck of each great racer of the seas there may be seen from 1,000 to 2,000 hopeful faces peering into the promised land.

Immigrants, immigrants, millions of them, coming to our shores to do what—develop America? No; not the kind who are coming now, for, according to the President's message, the country is overdeveloped already. What then? To help the steamship companies? Yes; that is it; the steamship companies, to make them rich that they may build more ships abroad, fly them under a foreign flag and receive a foreign subsidy, while the millions they bring turn countless thousands of Americans into the streets. Had our great and good President suggested the enactment of some measure that would divert this stream of foreign immigration now coming to this country into Canada, instead of proposing that a stream of Canadian products shall swamp our markets and thereby drive hundreds of thousands of American farmers and their families from under the protecting folds of the American flag to find new homes under the banner of the British Empire, the uplifted hands of not only the agriculturist, but of the American laborer, would have called down from on high a divine blessing.

With the spectacle witnessed on this floor last week of the Democratic majority rejecting real election reform which might have effected the peculiar election system prevailing in the South; with a northern college professor teaching his students to respect the red flag of anarchy instead of the Stars and Stripes; and a Democratic Cabinet member belittling and demeaning the old veterans of the North who hurled back treason and saved the Nation from dissolution, it is indeed high time that Republicans took seriously the issues of the hour and declined to follow misguided leadership.

So far as my constituents are concerned, Pennsylvania, where independence was born, the State which furnished first defenders for all the wars and money without limit, and on whose sacred soil, by the valor of her sons, was determined the fate of independence in Revolutionary days as well as the fate of the Nation from 1861 to 1865, shall not be misunderstood.

My constituents believe in the old nationalism, the old patriotism, the old progressive republicanism. They people the valleys

where Lee's mighty army marched forth to expected triumph and retreated in defeat, where McCausland's marauders applied the torch and exacted tribute, but did not conquer the national spirit of that brave, true people whose humble spokesman I am proud to be to-day.

The Republican Party, if it will stand bravely united against this un-Republican and un-American policy, which is but the forerunner of free trade, and are determined to fuse for that final and ultimate battle for the firesides of the farmer and the workingman, the party will again be triumphant, its messages will be heard to-day and in the long future, and posterity will ever sing its praises.

FARMERS OPPOSE TAFT RECIPROCITY.

To the EDITOR OF THE PRESS:

SIR: Why oppress the American farmer, who has been between the devil and the deep sea for, lo, these many years, prior to the last one or two, and now that consumption of wheat has about overtaken production in the United States, and therefore a glimmer of hope for better times in the future appears to give him heart to struggle on, why, I ask, should his hopes be dashed to the ground by this reciprocity bill? Why should his, of all the industries of the country, be deprived of all protection? Do you think the country can prosper with the basic industry in ruin? Do you think the newspapers will prosper then even with free pulp wood?

My dear sir, mark you, if the farmer is deprived of all protection, will he vote protection to other industries? Or does the Press no longer believe in protection?

The negotiation of this astounding so-called reciprocity by a Republican administration, and supported by Republican newspapers is the most astonishing occurrence within the span of my 70 years of life. Public opinion here—and, I believe, throughout all rural regions—is practically unanimous against the measure, and fiercely against it.

This bill provides for the free dumping of 500,000,000 bushels of wheat into our land in the very near future, besides oats, barley, flax, potatoes, etc. In 1909, the Canadian northwest raised 125,000,000 bushels of wheat. That region is filling up rapidly with settlers, many of them Americans, and it is not a wild prophecy that in five years their wheat yield will be quadrupled. This reciprocity, being enacted into law, means 50-cent wheat for 50 years and correspondingly low prices for the other agricultural products admitted free.

CALVIN M. HAYES.

HARTLETON, PA., *April 15, 1911.*

DENOUNCED BY KNIGHTS OF LABOR—AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AGAINST FREE TRADE WITH CANADA—DO NOT DESTROY A GREAT INDUSTRY.

THE CONGRESS OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR,
New York, April 2, 1911.

To the President and Members of Congress:

The paper industry is one of the greatest single industries in the United States of America. The capital invested exceeds $300,000,000. With an annual business of over $200,000,000, with something like 4,000,000 tons of annual production, the paper industry furnishes to the railroads in the way of freight and raw materials upward of 20,000,000 tons of freight annually. They consume 3,000,000 tons of coal, all from our domestic mines. They sustain a large number of establishments which supply them with machinery and supplies used only in paper mills. They furnish employment directly to over 100,000 men in their plants and probably 40,000 in getting out raw material in the woods and mines, besides indirectly supporting an army of men engaged in supplying them with material which they use in their manufacturing departments.

For every dollar which the consumer pays for paper it is estimated that nearly 70 cents goes to the wage fund of the country.

The whole agitation for Canadian reciprocity is due to a small syndicate of unscrupulous and selfish newspaper and magazine publishers who are desirous of increasing their already enormous profits by $5,000,000 annually through reciprocity at the expense of American labor and industry.

If finished paper is to be imported into this country free of duty, the great paper industry will be crippled, and the man who is a paper maker by trade has got to go to Canada to follow his trade, and take his wife and family into the wilderness to live, where there is no compulsory education law and not one of the comforts of civilization. It means the death blow to many communities clustered about the paper mills and the breaking up of American homes and migration of our skilled labor to Canada, and we are going to have a lot of mills on our hands that won't sell for money enough to pay the bondholders, and the Canadians are going to have our business and our profits.

Any downward revision of the tariff such as the McCall bill proposes would be unjust to both the manufacturer and the farmer of the United States, and would ultimately mean one of two things—the closing of American factories, mills, and workshops, or the American workmen will have to accept a reduction in wages to correspond with the cheaper elements of cost in foreign countries. We would therefore urge that you use your influence to defeat this iniquitous and un-American agreement.

Very respectfully, yours.

THE CONGRESS OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR,
J. R. MANSION, *Secretary and Treasurer.*

NATIONAL GRANGE APPEALS.

NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,
Concord, N. H., March 28, 1911.

To the PRESIDENT:

I would submit that the facts show conclusively that the cost of producing the staple farm crops put on the free list by the Canadian reciprocity arrangement is lower in Canada than in this country. Among these facts, which can not be disputed, are the following:

1. The price of farm lands, as shown by official reports, is much lower in Canada, thus subjecting the Canadian farmer to much smaller fixed charges on his investment.

2. The wages of Canadian farm labor, as shown in an official statement prepared by the Department of Commerce and Labor, are on an average much lower than in this country. This statement gives figures showing that in the Northern and Eastern States the wages paid farm workers are from 20 to 25 per cent higher than in all sections of Canada, with the exception of the Canadian Northwestern Provinces, where wages are practically the same as in our Northwestern States. As against this equality of wages, the value of farm lands in those Provinces is not one-third the value of lands in Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, and other neighboring States.

3. The cost of the manufactured articles which the Canadian farmer buys is much lower than that of similar articles used by our farmers, because of the lower tariff taxes imposed by Canada on foreign goods. An examination of the Canadian tariff laws and preferential trade arrangements shows a difference of at least 20 per cent in favor of the Canadian farmer.

4. Owing to the fact that the farm lands of Canada are chiefly virgin soil the Canadian farmer does not find it necessary to use fertilizers to any extent, while our farmers are forced to use hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of fertilizer each year.

Respectfully,

N. J. BACHELDER,
Chairman Legislative Committee National Grange.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to disagree with my colleague and good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] on this question, but there has been in evidence in the last few days in this House the fact that every man is thinking for himself, regardless of party, and for the best interests of the people of this great country as he conceives them.

We have farmers in Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties, as good farmers as there are in any part of this country. [Applause.] Their fields may not be so fertile or extensive as in some other portions of the country, but they make up largely for this by their industry, energy, and the careful study and intelligent use of soil conditions. And we have a great market there for them. As a result of protection to American industries that market has become so great that the farmers of those two counties, and of all northeastern Pennsylvania, can furnish but a small part of the food necessary for them. [Applause.] Carloads of produce come daily from New York, the West, and South to make up the deficiency.

Now, I want to say to the farmers of this country that where the wheels turn and the furnaces are burning is your market. Originally, as I understand protection, the thought was not so much to protect the farmer against some competitor; it was to give him a market, and the Republican Party has done that. So long as the Republican Party is in power so long will the farmers of this country have a market.

Now, I am an ardent protectionist. No State in the Union has been more steadfast to this principle than the grand old Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But reciprocity with Canada will in no way violate that principle. Wages and the standard of living in that country are practically the same as in this country. This opening of the markets between us and Canada is not going to hurt the American farmer. It is going to increase our opportunities to manufacture, as our lists of exportations there show conclusively, increase our employment, and enlarge our market both at home and in Canada. The farmer in Canada has not any advantage on account of the great area in land up there. He is paying fancy prices for good farm land to-day, and if you go through that wonderful country, as I had the privilege of doing some five years ago, you will see that real estate values are booming. In the little town of Edmonton, with 12,000 people, the most northerly point reached by a railroad, business property sold there five years ago for $1,000 a foot front, and all around that place, for 2 or 3 miles, town lots were staked out; and the secretary of the board of trade told me that they had to go into British Columbia to get the products with which to feed their people.

We are not going to be harmed by this reciprocal arrangement with Canada, but will be greatly benefited. We are selling from the hard-coal lands of Pennsylvania upward of $14,000,000 worth of hard coal and $19,000,000 worth of bituminous coal and coke. We are going to make that country grow. You will see Canada grow faster than it ever grew in any period of its history—so fast that it will astound the world; and the faster it grows, the greater Canada becomes, the greater will be our market. [Applause.]

First, we ought to make this arrangement with them on account of our neighborly relations. It practically means the addition of a new State. Then there is one question that has not been sufficiently dwelt upon, and that is that we will be at peace with that nation; that not one gun or one cannon will be necessary on the boundary line between us, and making unnecessary the expenditure of vast millions in the future for that purpose. It will be a step forward to peace with the nations of the world. I want to commend President Taft for showing that he has the courage of his convictions in presenting this matter to the House with a majority against him, so far as partisan lines are concerned.

I want to commend him on account of his valor, and it will be a ten-strike in the platform on which he will be nominated and elected in 1912. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I want also to commend him for his attitude on the question

of a commission of tariff experts, showing that he is high-minded, farsighted, and nonpartisan, and that he has some faith, at least, in the good judgment of the Democratic Party on that question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And I want to say to Democrats from the Southland, be careful how you move on the tariff question, because if you do what your party did a few years ago, the South, on account of its great recent industrial development, will be hurt more than the North. [Applause on the Republican side.]

From my county millions of dollars have gone into West Virginia, into Texas, Alabama, and other Southern States. I believe, however, much of this money would have been more successfully and usefully invested in Scranton and Lackawanna County, but it is now yours, and if you tinker with the tariff you are going to hurt these and other investors; you are going to deter other millions of northern money from going to your land, and without northern money and northern energy and some northern brains you can not develop the magnificent resources and utilize the splendid opportunities in your great section of country. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

One man in my county, my friends, has $600,000 invested in West Virginia coal lands. If the wheels do not turn and the furnaces do not burn, that coal does not come out of the ground. Another constituent of mine has upward of a million dollars invested in a stretch of railroad in Texas. You must have the mills and furnaces and factories going in order to give employment to the people to make railroads pay, in order to get dividends on anything, and in order to make business worth the while. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NYE. Mr. Chairman, I can not hope, perhaps, to add anything that is substantial to this very remarkable debate, a debate which has been interesting and able. But I may offer a suggestion or two in the 10 minutes that I have.

The barbarians of old looked upon a stranger as an enemy. I think the old Romans had but one word to indicate both "stranger" and "enemy." But as civilization advances and men come nearer together and know each other better the tendency is in spirit always reciprocal. And if we were to trace the march of civilization from the primitive days until to-day we should find that humanity has marched toward reciprocity, at least in spirit.

This is not a perfect bill. I am frank to say that in some respects I consider it far from perfect. But I believe it is in keeping with the spirit of our age and a move in the right direction. I do not believe the subject can be disposed of by splitting hairs or even by a careful analysis of trade balances. I believe the question is ethical as well as economic, and I believe the solution of great economic questions should always be in the light of ethical or moral principles. Sound economic policies must be consistent with sound morals and with just and generous dealings between man and man.

I have been reminded a good deal, while thinking on this subject, of a story I used to tell about a fellow who went West from Maine. I can with propriety locate the story in Maine because I was born there, and I know something of the characteristics and peculiarities of some of the people. This was a case where a man went west and was very fortunate and made lots of money, and 40 years later went back to visit an old neighbor of his, and to visit generally those neighbors whom he knew and with whom he went to school. On one occasion he dropped into a little store and saw an old friend whom he had not seen for 40 years. The home-staying merchant was anxious to know how much his friend was worth and how many millions he had accumulated, and as the two sat and talked together the western man helped himself to an apple that was in a barrel by his side and ate it. Finally, when he had finished his visit, which they both had enjoyed, the western man started to go. "By the way," he said, "I took an apple here. How much are they?" The merchant stopped and hesitated a minute, and then said, "Oh, they are two for a nickel. Take another one." [Laughter.] They had not seen each other for 40 years. They had gone to school together and been boys together.

Now, in the philosophy of the thing there was a genuine sentiment of gladness in the breast of each to meet the other. There was the old-time sentiment of friendship at the bottom, but it finally had to be measured on the basis of "two for a nickel." [Laughter and applause.]

It is no new commentary on human nature. Strive as we may to give freer breath to the social and generous sentiments of our being, we fall back at last to a financial basis of action.

According to the philosophy of many, sentiment is fancy. Only selfishness is fact. With our growth will come a clearer and wider vision of life. Future generations who read the record of this debate will wonder at the fear and alarm of those who to-day picture disaster and ruin because of this well-meant effort of neighboring nations to come into closer and more friendly relations, relations mutually beneficial and healthful to both Nations.

I remember when I was a boy on the farm a couple of neighbors could not agree on a line fence. There was a variance of about 2½ inches between them as to where the line was, and they finally built a narrow lane that people used to call the Devil's Lane. I remember it well. I believe in future years we will look back at this devil's lane that stretches 3,000 miles across this great continent, a continent bearing the impress of an Infinite Father's hand, and wonder that neighbors of one blood and kindred, with one hope, one ambition, and one destiny, could not come to terms of real reciprocity. [Applause.]

But it is the same old story. I guess they are just the same over in Canada as we are here. New Brunswick is afraid of her market for potatoes and Maine is afraid, and both legislatures have passed hostile resolutions concerning this treaty. So it is all along the line, here and there, in spots; some fellow whose experience leads him to believe that he will lose a little stands against this measure. I had just as soon my boy, if he thought his future required it, would go to Alberta or Saskatchewan as to go to the Dakotas or Montana, much as I love my own country and my own flag. But there is a life, a future development of mankind on this continent that human legislation can not control. [Applause.] These great, magnificent countries are going to develop side by side one common people, and they do not need to be under one flag. A neighbor can be a neighbor under his own flag. And I believe that in spirit and principle this is right. It is even worth a sacrifice on both sides. It is a farsighted policy. It is a goal of high statesmanship.

I was born on a farm. I lived and worked on a farm until I was 22 years of age. I would not knowingly or consciously enter upon a new economic policy that would be burdensome to the great agricultural class of this country. I would not do so intentionally. I do not believe this measure will operate to the detriment of any class or any industry. Local and temporary disadvantages may result, but the general welfare will be promoted, and the permanent good of both countries will be advanced.

The social tendency of mankind is toward the cities, and it is destined to be so, for aught I see, for generations to come. There is some attraction about the city. I often wonder what it is. I often wish I could go back onto the farm, and I guess I will when I get through Congress; but the mouths to consume are increasing in proportion to our power of production of agricultural commodities. The farmer is not going to suffer in the future. The best opening and the best destiny, industrially, of any man or of any industry in this country is the future of the sound, honest, thrifty farmer, in my judgment. [Applause.] His prosperity will, I believe, be permanent. Nothing short of famine or pestilence seems likely to impede it, and even these will bring him less suffering than will come to the millions who throng the cities and who depend upon him.

I know that some strictures have been laid upon this measure as un-Republican. My good friend who sits here [Mr. DALZELL], who has led the battle for many years for protection, whose ability and courtesy I have always respected, and whom I admire as a man, seems to fear that this is not good Republican doctrine. I tell him that the Republicanism that has given life to the party is not altogether its industrial policies. It is the party of freedom and progress. The Republicanism that lives, the Republicanism of freedom, does not rest on any mere domestic policy.

I believe that with all our strength of production, with our vigor of diversified industry, we can reduce tariffs substantially and in some industries to the point of a revenue basis, and I do not believe that the future of our country or of our neighbor to the north will be advanced by longer impeding the flow of natural commerce and natural trade between these two great peoples. [Applause.]

Others have presented figures and analyzed tables and dwelt upon statistics. These may be ingeniously employed to the advantage of either side and to some extent have been during this debate. I have neither time nor inclination to dwell upon them. From as fair and impartial a summing up as I am able to make one thing appears. That is, the cost of production in Canada and the United States of the commodities affected by this bill is so nearly identical as to bring the measure within the doctrine of the Republican platform of 1908.

Imperfect though it may be, it is in the main in line with modern thought and with modern and progressive Republicanism. I shall support it in the firm faith that the future will justify it, and that vast and general benefits will flow to all our people and to the generations yet to be.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me I wish to talk on one or two points. I did not intend to take any part in this discussion, because I have stated my views quite freely on other occasions. As preliminary I might say that my friend who just spoke [Mr. NYE] appealed to sentiment, and in his inimitable style ridiculed as sordid those who oppose this treaty. It is true generally that in this discussion there has been an appeal to sentiment rather than sense, ridicule rather than reason. But, gentlemen, it seems to me the question for us to settle can not be solved by such means. Sentiment will not satisfy the man that is robbed nor ridicule deter him from retaliating against unfair treatment. Reciprocity between our people should be our first consideration. This is an act to help special interests at the expense of our farmers and to help the cities at the expense of the country. Yes, but they tell us that the farmers can not be hurt, because it is insisted that the price of farm products are fixed in foreign markets. This assertion, though absolutely ridiculous as to most of the products with which this treaty will place us in competition with Canada, has been repeated over and over again in this discussion.

If the domestic price of wheat is fixed by the export price, then the price at Minneapolis should be the foreign price less the cost of placing it on the foreign market. The Interstate Commerce Commission a day or two ago gave me the export freight rate from Minneapolis to New York at 13.8 cents per bushel by the all-rail route and 11.8 cents by the lake-and-rail route; and the Department of Commerce and Labor says the ocean rate from New York to Liverpool has been from 4 to 5 cents per bushel during 1910. This makes a total freight rate of 18 cents per bushel, rail and ocean, and 16 cents by lake, rail, and ocean routes. This is just about what it has been in the years past. I will print in connection with these remarks tables which I obtained from the Department of Commerce and Labor. These tables give the prices of wheat at Minneapolis, Winnipeg, and Liverpool since September 1, 1909. They show that during 18 out of the 20 months wheat at Minneapolis was too high priced to permit of the export of a single bushel. For three months it was higher than the Liverpool prices. In the face of this fact, can anyone contend that Liverpool fixed the price of our wheat during that time? Like tables can be had for a number of years in the past. Everybody who has lived in my section of the country and paid any attention knows that this is true, as newspapers in their market reports have constantly called attention to it.

In the Minneapolis Journal, one of the leading newspapers of that section, which I received this morning, is a statement that wheat is still too high for foreign export.

Canada exports nearly all the time, and their prices are consequently much lower than the United States.

The President in two different speeches has stated that prices of wheat and other cereals are from 10 to 15 cents higher in Minneapolis than Winnipeg. He might have called attention to the fact that in 1905 the difference in price of wheat was 22 cents and that Minneapolis then imported from Canada more than 3,200,000 bushels, upon which a duty of 25 cents per bushel was paid. Only about half a million bushels of this was afterwards exported. The recent report of the Tariff Board, made upon careful investigation of prices, sustains the statement of the President as to this difference, not only as to wheat but also barley, flax, and other farm products, and no one has seriously attempted to dispute the fact. Some cheap attempts have been made to deceive the farmers by comparing prices of some products in eastern Canada with prices on this side in the Middle West, but such comparisons deceive no one, not even those who engage in that pastime. Some have claimed that the difference in prices only applies to small localities, but this is clearly disproved by the President's statement and by the report of the Tariff Board.

That report shows higher prices than Winnipeg, not only at Minneapolis but also at Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, and other large grain markets of this country. To talk about Minneapolis and Winnipeg, the two greatest primary wheat markets of the world, as local in character, is about as absurd as anything can be. Anyone that knows anything about the wheat trade knows that Minneapolis fixes the price of nearly all our spring wheat and buys large quantities of winter wheat from Kansas and Nebraska. Winnipeg is the gateway for all of western Canada, and dominates that market. Equally ridiculous is the suggestion made by some that the difference between Minneapolis and Winnipeg is due to lack of elevator or transportation facilities. This suggestion is a mere insinuation. The Tariff Board found nothing upon which such a claim could be based. The wheat prices of Winnipeg are for wheat in store at elevators in Fort William or Port Arthur, and not for wheat located at Winnipeg. These great terminal elevators are as able to handle grain as Minneapolis, and they have the same freight rate for foreign export as Minneapolis and Duluth.

But the argument mainly relied upon to show that prices are not affected by the tariff is that we export large quantities. This fallacy has done duty for many years, and I presume we ought to approach it with the reverence due to its age. The vice of the argument is that it entirely ignores actual conditions.

If all the wheat was of one quality, located at the same spot, and had to be sold on the same day the contention would be very persuasive, but that is not the situation. You may overload and depress the market for a month or two until it gets low enough for export and a few bushels may be exported, still during the rest of the year, while more than four-fifths of the crop is being marketed, our prices may be too high for export. This surplus may be in Kansas or Nebraska without affecting the prices at Minneapolis or other large markets. This is the usual situation. Then again you may have a wheat that can not be sold to advantage in this country, because of its character. This is true of the durum wheat; as a consequence it does not compete to any great extent with our other wheat in the domestic market. It is about the only export that has come from the spring-wheat section in years. The Agricultural Department says that for the year ending June 30, 1911, more than 20,000,000 bushels of this wheat either as wheat or flour was exported.

The total export of wheat and wheat flour during the calendar year of 1910 was equal to about 62,000,000 bushels, of this about 24,000,000 bushels was exported as wheat, the balance as flour. The Pacific coast exported last year wheat and wheat flour amounting to approximately 17,000,000 bushels. This wheat does not come in competition with wheat raised east of the Rocky Mountains where you propose to dump Canadian wheat, as the freight rates are too high to make such competition possible.

Now, let us deduct from the 62,000,000 bushels this 17,000,000 bushels. This leaves 45,000,000 bushels. Deduct from this the durum wheat, 20,000,000, and you have left some 25,000,000 bushels. Nearly all of this 25,000,000 bushels goes out as a low-grade flour, for which there is a very poor market in the United States. The reason why the higher grades do not go to foreign countries is well known. Nearly all the wheat that enters the foreign trade, except that from Canada and the durum from the United States, is a soft winter wheat of poor quality. To make a good flour from this it is necessary to mix it with a higher grade. For some years Europe imported high-grade flour for this purpose, but soon found it more profitable to mix the high grades of wheat with the low grades of wheat. This not only gives better results, but is otherwise more advantageous.

When you come to consider that this export comes in small lots, at different times of the year, and is of the character that I have suggested, there is no difficulty in understanding why the tariff affects the price of wheat. The difference in prices between Canada, the United States, and Liverpool is an absolute demonstration of this effect. But let me call your attention to other farm products. Wheat is but one and to many sections not the most important.

No one has contended that any foreign market fixes the price of our barley, flaxseed, rye, buckwheat, oats, hay, potatoes, butter, cheese, eggs, and the like. Barley is in many sections more important than wheat. The United States produced some 162,000,000 bushels last year. Of this an amount no greater than that produced in a single township in my section was exported from the east half of the United States. A small amount was exported from the Pacific coast, but that barley can not come in competition with barley raised in the great agricultural section of our country, as the freight is 50 cents a hundred pounds from the Pacific coast to Minneapolis. The brewers are about the only ones that will profit by Canadian barley. We produced 33,000,000 bushels of rye last year. Of this less than 20,000 bushels went beyond our borders during that time. The distillers of rye whisky smile over the prospects that cheaper Canadian rye will add to their profits. Flaxseed is another important crop. Until last year we produced enough for home consumption, but as prices had not been sufficient to pay for production, the acreage decreased; this in connection with a small crop in North Dakota left the home market short. We exported last year less than $7,000 worth and imported more than $18,000,000 worth. Canada has the soil and situation to put our farmers out of the business of raising flaxseed. Barley and flax usually sell in Winnipeg for about 20 cents per bushel less than in Minneapolis.

Our production of buckwheat, oats, potatoes, hay, butter, cheese, eggs, and the like is just about equal to our home con-

sumption. There is no export of any consequence of any of these. Those who are in favor of this treaty have studiously tried to force wheat to the front as the only article affected. Is not this a trick to divert attention from the real issue? It will not only affect every article that I have enumerated, but every farm product, both North and South. The opening of the Mississippi Valley took from eastern farmers hundreds of millions of dollars. It gave you ruined farms, deserted homes. You propose to open another empire of rich soil, in which plant food has been stored for untold centuries, and let our farmers, who are compelled to fertilize their soil and expend on it very much more labor than is required on new land to produce a crop, compete, and at the same time you expect them to support a system of protection for the factory. You have promised him different treatment. You may have the power to make him submit, but are you sure that it will profit you? If he was getting an undue advantage he might not find fault; but there is no class of our citizens that receive as little reward for toil or privations as does the farmer. The Agricultural Department, in Farmers' Bulletin No. 437, just issued, says that—

In actual practice and for many reasons not foreseen at the outset the average profits in farming, aside from the rise in the value of the land itself, are not large, but on the other hand extremely modest.

This was also the judgment of the Senate committee that recently investigated this subject.

This proposition is not fair and should not pass. [Applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Minneapolis cash wheat quotations of Nos. 1 and 2 northern (track) compared with Winnipeg quotations of No. 1 northern "in store," Fort William or Port Arthur terminal elevators, and Liverpool quotations of No. 2 northern Manitoba.

	Wednesday quotations.			Tuesday quotations.
	Minneapolis.		Winnipeg.	Liverpool—No. 2 northern Manitoba.
	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 1 northern.	
	Cents per bush.	Cents per bush.	Cts. per bu.	Cts. per bu.
1909.				
Sept. 1	98½	96 – 96½	97½	126½
8	97½ – 97¾	95½ – 95¾	97½	129
15	99½ – 100	97½ – 98	98½	130½
22	100½ – 100¾	98½ – 98¾	98	129½
29	101½	99¾	94½	130
Oct. 6	101	99	96½	130½
13	103¾	101¾	98½	131½
20	104½ – 104¾	102½ – 102¾	97	131
27	105½ – 105¾	103½ – 103¾	97½	131
Nov. 3	102 – 102½	100 – 100½	95½	115½
10	104½ – 104¾	102½ – 102¾	97½	115½
17	105½ – 106¼	103½ – 104¼	98¾	.....
24	106½ – 107	104½ – 105	99½	117½
Dec. 1	105½ – 106	103½ – 104	94½	118½
8	109½ – 110	107½ – 108	96½	118½
15	112 – 112½	110 – 110½	99½	119½
22	111½ – 112¼	109½ – 110¼	100½	120½
29	111½ – 112½	109½ – 110½	100½	119½
1910.				
Jan. 5	114 – 115	112 – 113	103½	122½
12	114¾ – 115¾	112¾ – 113¾	103½	122½
19	110½ – 111½	108½ – 109½	101½	120½
26	114 – 114¾	112 – 112¾	103½	120½
Feb. 2	111½	109½	103	121½
9	112	109	102½	119½
16	115¾	113¾	103½	120½
23	113½	111½	102½	119½
Mar. 2	114½	112½	103½	119½
9	114½	112½	104	118½
16	114½	112½	104½	120½
23	116½	114½	105½	120½
30	115½	113½	105½	121½
Apr. 6	110½	108½	104	121½
13	111	109	103½	119½
20	107½	105½	100½	117½
27	109½	107½	99½	117½
May 4	111	109	99½	112½
11	112½	110½	98½	112½
18	110	108	96½	109½
25	109½	107½	92½	104½
June 1	106½	104½	88½	97½
8	107½	105½	90	102½
15	106½	104½	89½	99
22	111½	109½	93½	102½
29	115½	113½	100½	107½
July 6	118	116	105	107½
13	118	116	109½	110½
20	126½	124½	115½	119½
27	124½	122½	110½	121½
Aug. 3	117½	114½	106	117½
10	115½	110	108½	117½
17	113	109½	110	121½
24	110½	107½	107½	121½
31	112½	110½	108½	120½

Liverpool quotations are for the day preceding the date specified in the statement.

Weekly (Tuesday) quotations of wheat in the Minneapolis, Winnipeg, and Liverpool markets, Sept. 6, 1910, to Apr. 18, 1911.

[Data taken from Commercial West, published at Minneapolis, Minn., and Broomhall's Corn Trade News, published at Liverpool.]

	Minneapolis.		Winnipeg.		Liverpool.
	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 2 northern Manitoba.
1910.					
Sept. 6	$1.12⅜	$1.10⅜	$1.05	$1.03⅜	$1.20½
13	1.11⅜	1.09½	1.02½	1.01	1.18½
20	1.11½	1.09	1.01	99	1.18½
27	1.10½	1.08	99	94½	1.16½
Oct. 4	1.10⅜	1.08⅜	98½	94½	1.15½
11	1.09½	1.07¼	97	93½	1.16½
18	1.05	1.03	95½	92½	1.16½
25	1.04½	1.02½	94½	91½	1.15½ 1.08½
Nov. 1	1.02	1.00	89½	86½	[1] 1.05½
8	[2] 1.02	[2] 1.00	90	87	1.03½
15	1.07	1.05½	94	91	1.03½
22	1.05⅜	1.04½	94½	91⅜	1.08
29	1.03	1.01½	90	87	1.05½
Dec. 6	1.04½	1.02½	91½	88½	1.06½
13	1.02⅜	1.01⅜	89½	86½	1.05½
20	1.02½	1.01	90	87½	1.04½
27	1.02⅜	1.00⅜	89½	86½	1.05½
1911.					
Jan. 3	1.06⅞	1.04⅞	92½	89½	1.09½
10	1.08⅜	1.06⅜	95	92	1.09½
17	1.08⅜	1.06⅜	95½	92½	1.10½
24	1.05½	1.02⅝	94	91	1.11½
31	1.04⅜	1.02⅜	92	89	1.11½
Feb. 7	1.01	99	92	89	1.11
14	97⅞	95⅞	90½	88½	1.11
21	98⅜	96⅜	90½	87½	1.09½
28	96⅜	94⅜	88	83½	1.08½
Mar. 7	99½	97½	88½	86	1.08
14	99½	97½	90	87½	1.07½
21	98½	96½	90½	87½	1.07½
28	95½	93½	89½	87	1.07½
Apr. 4	93	91	88	85	1.05½
11	98⅝	96⅝	89½	87	1.07
18	98	96	90½	88	.....

[1] Quotation for new crop.
[2] Quotation is for November 9, November 8 being a holiday in the United States.

Quotations of flaxseed at the Minneapolis, Duluth, and Winnipeg markets from Sept. 26, 1910, to Jan. 23, 1911, as reported by Commercial West.

[Price per bushel.]

Dates.	Minneapolis.	Duluth.	Winnipeg.
1910.			
Sept. 26	$2.70	$2.78	$2.48
Oct. 3	2.54	2.53	2.15
10	2.60½	2.65½	[3] 2.44
17	2.64	2.64	2.40
24	2.57½	2.61	2.39
31	2.60½	2.61½	[3] 2.43
Nov. 7	2.63	2.64	2.45
14	2.70	2.74	2.52
21	2.60½	2.64½	[3] 2.45 / [4] 2.37
28	2.54	2.53	2.26
Dec. 5	2.55	2.54	2.25
12	.....	.....	.....
19	.....	.....	.....
27	2.42	2.37	2.07
1911.			
Jan. 3	2.48¾	2.47¼	2.22
9	2.53	2.53	2.20
16	[5] 2.61	[5] 2.61	2.42
23	2.63½	2.63½	2.25

[1] October 11 quotation.
[2] November 1 quotation.
[3] November bid.
[4] December bid.
[5] January delivery.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, this debate on Canadian reciprocity has had a wide range; it is well that it has, and proper that it should. This is a momentous question, and one affecting for benefit or injury all of our people.

I protest against the attempt to close this debate or the fixing of a date to close until each and every Member on both sides of this Chamber who so desires has had ample time to express his views on this great measure. Neither the Democratic nor the Republican Party can afford to suppress full and free discussion in debating a question of such importance as this. I have no apology to offer for having asked for an hour on this question, even though a new Member. I am as much concerned, and my constituents as much interested, as if I had served here for 30 years. I can not help feeling, as I hear men

asking for time and unable to secure time enough fully to express themselves, that they have the right to demand it.

What is the pressing need for a hurried vote on this question? Will it not stand investigation? Do you think you are currying any favor from the farmer or anybody else by shutting off debate on a question of such vital importance to him as is this?

SOMEWHAT OF A "RUBE" MYSELF.

One of the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber referred to the farmer yesterday as a "Reuben." Well, I am a "Rube" myself.

When this report reaches the Farmers' Cooperative Union and the great grange organization of this country, they will have something to say about the short time given to debating a question of such importance that a special session of Congress was called to consider it. The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, and others here, have given a great array of figures to justify the passage of this measure, covering the relative conditions in the two countries, scale of wages paid, and so forth, attempting to show that there is no discrimination against the farmer, but there was one item they failed to take into consideration. Otherwise I would pay no attention to their glittering array of figures.

They failed to count in the cost of the fertilizer that thousands and thousands of our farmers have to use. The North, East, and the South are full of fertilizer factories. The great packing houses of our country put it out by thousands of tons. The newspaper farmer, the banking farmer, the factory farmer, and, very often, the statistical farmer do not always take this item into account, but the bona fide farmer does.

I venture to say that thousands of our farmers pay out more per acre for fertilizers than it costs thousands of Canadian farmers to put in and harvest their crops per acre. Do you think in cases like that they can compete on a free-trade basis with him?

WHAT PRICES DOES LIVERPOOL FIX?

We have heard much about Liverpool fixing prices. Liverpool does not fix the price on apples in the United States, does it? It does not fix the price of barley, does it? It does not fix the price of hay, does it? Or of potatoes? No; nor of wheat, except to a limited extent, and every intelligent farmer knows it. There are many factors affecting prices all the time, but the farmer does know that 25 cents tariff on the bushel protects him against the competition of Canadian wheat.

I am only a plain farmer, one of that class whom the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber and some of those on this side are trying so hard to convince will not be hurt by the passage of a measure of this kind.

I wish to say to those on this side of the Chamber, who are mostly high protectionists for the manufactured products of their States and communities, and who are now arguing this heresy of the farmer's product going on the free list against the only country he has any need to fear as a competitor in nearly all that he produces, that they are either inconsistent now or else must admit they have for many long years been attempting to flimflam the farmer by word, act, and acquiescence in this protection to his industries.

CAN FARMERS BE BLAMED FOR SUSPICIONS?

Can you blame the farmers of this country for doubting your sincerity? Who constituted you the arbiters of his fortune and the judge of what would be his benefit? And I will say to the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber, who are arguing along the same lines, that as a party they are as inconsistent.

Under your great Wilson bill, when you had the opportunity to carry out these free-trade heresies, did your party improve it? No.

That law carried protection to all farm products, as did the McKinley law. It is true it reduced the rates on those products, as it did in common with other schedules. Did those reductions help anybody or the Government? No.

The effect was exactly the opposite. Why did not your party, when it had the opportunity, put all farm products on the free list, including hemp, cane, cotton, peanuts, with all the products of the South and North? You are very solicitous for the welfare of the farmer, and you also desire to tickle the consumer. It is politics you are playing, and you no more desire free trade as a party than do these proselytes, now your colleagues on this side of the Chamber, and you are attempting to bunco the farmer as well as they are.

Mr. Chairman, some of the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber and the Democratic press of the country have criticized the insurgent Republicans for working hand in hand with the Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON and other so-called standpat Republicans on this great question.

I have no doubt it gives them a pain to find that most of those insurgents who rebelled against so-called usurpation of power by not only Mr. CANNON, but by other Speakers who preceded him, who took different views on methods of procedure and revising the rules of the House that he and other gentlemen did, to find that when it came to great questions like the present one, a proposition that carries with it a vital principle involving not only the financial but the moral interests of the country that these insurgents were still Republicans.

INSURGENTS WOULD CORRECT ABUSES.

The so-called insurgent Republicans are progressive. They want to see the Republican Party correct any abuses that have grown up within the party and the Nation during its long and I will say glorious life. No other political party on earth can point with pride to the achievements along all lines of human endeavor as those that have been written on history's pages during the life of this great party. If the Democrats of this country thought a difference of opinion on some questions was going to cause a split in the Republican Party, that progressives would forsake the party of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley, those three great martyrs, the party of Grant and Sumner, of James G. Blaine, Oliver P. Morton, and other noted statesmen, they must have been grievously disappointed.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Republican Party is to be congratulated that it contains an element of progressiveness, just as I think the Democratic Party should thank God that they have insurgents and progressives in their party, for they are the balance wheels that prevent parties from going to destruction, and it is necessary that we have great political parties.

Mr. Chairman, the South has thousands of farmers, broad-minded, well-informed men, who have within the last few years awakened to the necessity of cooperation. I have met many of them and have the good fortune to belong to the same fraternal and economic unions that many of them do. I have learned to appreciate their sterling qualities, their sense of honor, and their liberality in reciprocal relations between our order in different parts of our common country.

I have traveled to some extent in the Southland, through the Virginias, Carolinas, and through Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky. It is a wonderful land. But much of it shows the effects of one to two hundred years of use. The farmers who are so bravely trying to meet the responsibilities of life, rear their families, and maintain their high moral and social standards under the conditions incident to a depleted soil are worthy of all honor and consideration and the highest respect of their countrymen.

SENTIMENT HOLDS SOUTHERN FARMERS.

As I traveled through parts of the South and contrasted their farms and farm land with that of the boundless West I was prone to say: "God pity them; their condition in life is hard indeed. Why do they stay here when they can do so much better in the West or in Canada?" And then the words of Scott's poem, in his Lay of the Last Minstrel, came into my mind:

> Breathes there the man with soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land!

And the question was answered, this was home—the magic word "home." To-day, as ever, every rightly constituted man and woman, wherever they are and whatever their station, long for home, sweet home. Thousands have left the Southland to make their homes in the North and West, and while they have prospered and grown rich there, they still exclaim of the States of their birth: That "is my own, my native land!"

I have talked with many of them and heard their stories, contrasting the ofttimes struggle for existence on many of the farms of the East and South with their condition of peace and plenty in the West.

Mr. Chairman, being a farmer myself and, I think, understanding farming conditions fairly well in all sections of this Union, I will never knowingly support a measure that discriminates against the farmer or strikes at his welfare as a class, even though I know some of them would be benefited thereby.

NO WHEAT, BUT POLITICIANS.

The gentleman from North Carolina said they did not raise wheat down in his State; and his own lack of knowledge of the industry proves that he at least never raised it, or is in any way informed on the subject. But they do raise wheat, cotton, corn, hemp, sweet potatoes, tobacco, fruit, and many other products, and some of their politicians do raise "h" with a dash and an "l."

I desire to warn the Members from West Virginia, Virginia, and all of those States that are putting out thousands of acres of apples that Canada raises apples, and has hundreds of thou-

sands of acres of as good apple land as there is in the world, and their apples are better keepers than those raised in southern climes. I will give you apple statistics a little later.

I think your southern apple and tobacco raisers, your growers of cane, cotton, and rice, of cattle, sheep, and wool, and all other products are deserving of protection against the products of any foreign country that might come in competition with them. Your country raises some of the products that Canada does. In tobacco and apples she would become a great competitor with Canada under free trade. As far back as the year 1901 Canada produced 11,266,732 pounds of tobacco, as shown by the Canadian Year Book of 1909, and the same authority shows that in 1906 she had 155 tobacco manufactories capitalized at $15,274,923.

WHY NOT FREE-LIST SUGAR?

In this famous compensation bill which you have introduced as a sop to the farmer are you putting tobacco and tobacco products on the free list? Thousands of them use it, as well as do other thousands of our citizens. Canada also has sugar factories and can raise sugar beets in any quantity. You could probably benefit Canada and the American consumer if you would put sugar on the free list. Do you intend to do it in this compensation bill of yours?

Our farmers all use sugar when they have the money to buy it; so does the great mass of the people you call the consumer, though the farmer is the heaviest consumer of any one class because there is more of him. If you want to help those poor consumers in the tenements and factories, do you not think they would get as much benefit from free sugar as from free potatoes?

The farmer is not altogether a hog, although he raises a few. He does not ask for special reductions in his favor. All he asks is a square deal for all the people. You can not fool him with this compensation bill of yours that does not compensate. Quit playing politics and play ball.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina points with pride to this as a Democratic measure. I am very willing they shall father it, and I very much regret that a Republican President has seen fit to champion so unjust and nonmeritorious a measure as this so-called reciprocity fiasco. He is a great lawyer, an eminent jurist, and an authority on government, but doubtless has had but little time to give to economic questions.

His environment and occupation have been such that, evidently, he has given little thought to agricultural questions, and in this case we consider he has been very unfortunate in his advisers.

If we refer to the table of articles on which Canada would have to remit to us on 1910 business under this agreement, we find that United States coal shippers would be benefited to the extent of $455,246, a little more than one-sixth of the money that Canada would have to remit under this act.

GOOD THING FOR MINE OWNERS.

And while this would be a good thing, no doubt, for some of the American mine owners, and so forth, it is no help in the world to that large coalless region lying contiguous to Canada's immense coal fields. Canada has a rate of 53 cents the ton against the United States rate of 45 cents the ton, and Canada did make a rate reciprocal with ours, or 45 cents the ton, but no consumers of coal in the United States are benefited thereby. Still, one-sixth of the business on which Canada remits is coal.

I have heard much said about this measure, but as yet I have never heard one word that shows any crying need for it or any valid reason why it should not be amended and made a just reciprocity measure, or else defeated.

The cry is made that the exactions of the Paper Trust are grievous. Are they more grievous than a great many others whose products are really benefited by this measure? I have not heard any reason assigned for the fisherman's products being placed on the free list. The framers of this measure have tried to justify themselves with the farmer, but not the fisherman. I presume the difference is caused by the farmer's much larger voting number. They need to fool him, but the fisherman politically can not figure very heavily, so it is not necessary even to apologize for placing his products on the free list.

When this measure passed the House last winter, 2,100 Gloucester fishermen placed their flags at half-mast, and well they might. Canada, with its relatively smaller population, has the same fishing possibilities as this country, and our fishermen already feel its competition. According to the statistics we have here, Canada exported of dutiable fish of all kinds to the United States in 1910 more than 73,000,000 pounds, while the United States sent into Canada less than 4,000,000 dutiable product.

SACRIFICES FISHERMEN FOR MANUFACTURER?

Does the sponsor of this bill in the House [Mr. MCCALL] feel that the fishermen of his State are not as worthy of consideration and protection as are its manufacturers?

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the principle of protection to American manufacturers on the basis we have conducted it has been shamefully abused, but as against that abuse and absolute free trade for our country, I think the latter would work to our people far greater calamity than have the abuses under the former.

I believe in tariff revision. I believe in an effective tariff commission that will check the abuses that have long years existed under the system. But while I think absolute free trade would be a calamity, yet from the viewpoint of justice and right, is much more defensible than this attempt to single out three or four of our industries and arbitrarily place them on the free list.

Mr. Chairman, I do not consider it justifiable to try and correct something we regard as a commercial mistake by committing an act of injustice or a moral wrong. I raise my voice here against the attempted rank injustice done to each and every interest being discriminated against under this treaty. As I have said, I am a farmer. I am a member of the Grange and the Farmers' Union, and have been a member of every farmers' organization of any scope we have had in the United States for the last 30 years. I know how they as a class feel about this measure. I am in receipt of petitions that represent the desires of thousands of farmers on this question, and those in favor of this measure are in the proportion of about 1 to 1,000. These petitioners are farmers who represent all political parties.

The Farmers' Union and Grange of the North, East, West, and a part of the South are against this discriminating treaty. Even though in some cases it might benefit some of them, they object to the unjust features of the measure.

Mr. Chairman, the cry of the Members on that side of the House that this is a blow at protection is not borne out by the effect of the Democratic reciprocity measure which was on the statute books of this country from 1854 to 1865.

It had the same free trade provisions, and the only thing it demonstrated to this country was that Canada had vastly the better of the deal, and that at a time when its agricultural production was not a drop in the bucket to what it is now, and when its chance for the better of the treaty was nothing to what it is at the present time, nor is it now a drop in the bucket to what it will be in the future.

On most of the articles Canadians can not raise Canada refused to reciprocate. It puts some fruits and vegetables on the free list, for it, in a greater or less degree, raises most of them, but oranges, lemons, pineapples, and fruits of that kind it refused to let in free. They were entirely too good revenue getters, and it would likewise offend some other nations with which Canada does business if it discriminated in favor of the United States.

CANADA WINS BY TEMPTING SOUTH.

The only wonder is that Canada put cottonseed oil on the free list. Those long-headed Canadian statesmen must have realized that they would have to concede something to our Southland or fail of its support for this measure. Accordingly they put cottonseed oil on the free list and made a very substantial reduction on peanuts. Thus on the basis of 1910 business Canada would remit on those two products $219,223.85, which is between 11½ and 12 per cent of the entire amount Canada would have to remit.

Now, while I have referred to this I do not for one minute think this is influencing the vote of any Member on that side of this Chamber, whatever I may think of other motives, probably not so worthy, influencing some of them.

I am sure of one thing, and that is that it did not influence Senator JOSEPH W. BAILEY, of Texas, when he said on the floor of the Senate last winter that he would never support a measure so unjust to the American farmer as this one.

Mr. Chairman, in looking up the meaning of the word reciprocate, in order to be sure that I was giving to the word its true meaning and not simply what I myself thought it should mean, I found that Webster gives as the logic of reciprocating, "A proposition which asserts subject and predicate to be equal and identical in extent."

Taking Webster as an authority for the meaning of the word, I want to say that the title of this bill is a misnomer; that in few particulars are there any truly reciprocating features in it.

In my judgment it should be entitled "An act of discrimination against certain classes of our people in favor of Canada."

There are several propositions involved in this question, and the one that naturally appeals to us is the financial side, but

in passing laws the Congress of the United States is never justified in passing them purely for financial reasons when there is a moral consideration at stake of vastly more importance to the Nation than is the mere question of dollars and cents.

By what ethics can we justify the singling out of three or four of our industries and putting their products or output on an absolutely free-trade basis, leaving other industries as fully protected as before? Is there any justice in such action?

FEW CLASSES SACRIFICED.

Yet this is what the proposed measure does. By what right do we, as Representatives, take a measure of this kind, negotiated by men, but few if any of us ever heard of until this measure came up—I mean those who represented the Department of State—Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis, who went up to Ottawa and there framed this measure that would depreciate in value the property of part of our people for the benefit of another part of our people and the Canadians and their Government?

Mr. Chairman, a measure of this kind, of such vital importance to our governmental welfare and the welfare of vast numbers of our people, is a thing which should not be entered into hastily, its essential features trusted to untried and uninformed men. Neither should it be passed through Congress by any such hurry-up methods and urging against the amending and correcting of the unjust features of the measure as was practiced and urged at the last session of Congress. I also question the moral right of any political party to go into caucus and agree to pass a drastic and unreasonable measure like this for political expediency, or to make such an attempt.

Mr. Chairman, I found on my desk a few days ago a pamphlet from the Government Printing Office, headed "Canadian reciprocity; extracts from the Daily Congressional Record from January 26, 1911, to March 4, 1911." Among these extracts I find one from the speech of the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, in the House of Representatives, February 14. I desire to read an excerpt from that speech. The gentleman from Alabama says:

> Now as to agricultural machinery and meat. Of course I recognize that this bill is not properly balanced when you put cattle on the free list and leave a prohibitive tax on meat, as you do in this bill. But I want to call your attention to this fact: Suppose you put meat coming from Canada on the free list, would you get any meat to the consumers in this country? Not at all. The Canadians do not produce enough meat for their own people. A little might come over the border here and there, but it would not affect the price of meat in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I have not the pleasure of Mr. UNDERWOOD'S acquaintance. I have no doubt but that he is an honorable, upright gentleman, and I would not for one minute impugn his motives in making this declaration; but I am inclined to think he made that statement from some preconceived ideas in the matter and not from any statistical facts. While, no doubt, he thought he was right, I think, Mr. Chairman, that I hold in my hand a document which will prove to the satisfaction of the gentleman from Alabama that he was wrong. I have here a copy of the Canadian Yearbook for 1909. On page 124 of this book I find, under the heading of "Trade and Commerce, Table XXIX," information regarding the total amount of meat Canada exported to all countries during the years 1905 to 1909, inclusive.

CANADA LARGE MEAT EXPORTER.

According to this table put out by the Canadian Government, the minimum amount of all classes of meat Canada has exported in any one of the years from 1905 to 1909 is 83,909,745 pounds, and the maximum amount exported in any one year 163,481,589 pounds, and a total for five years of 574,427,970 pounds.

We find in the list of meats shipped by the United States to Canada last year that all kinds of meats—fresh, dressed, dried, salted, barreled, and canned, including chicken—only a total of 18,119,642 pounds, less than one-fourth of the amount Canada exported in any year from 1905 to 1909, both years inclusive.

The gentleman from Alabama was under the impression that Canada could not raise enough meat for its own consumption. You can not judge of the possibilities of a country altogether by its exports and imports, and the fact that Canada imported some meat from the United States was no proof that it could not produce enough meat for its own use. Some of the speeches made in the Sixty-first Congress, as well as in the present Congress, in favor of this measure show an amazing lack of information as regards Canada, or else a willful desire to fool the American people, and this is another reason I am against this principle of attempting to decide the fate of a measure like this or any other by a caucus.

A few men generally control these caucuses, fix their policy, and largely destroy the incentive of their members to investigate conditions for themselves. In other words, the caucus destroys their initiative, and they become automatons or pawns on the chessboard. This for the defenders of that system on both sides of this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, in this same pamphlet of extracts, already referred to, I find a speech of Senator Carter, of Montana, delivered in the United States Senate, in which he presented some excerpts from the statements made by Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis as to where the Canadian reciprocity measure benefits the farmer; they tell how many more vegetables the United States ships to Canada than Canada to us, and how this is going to help the farmer. He also refers to shipments of fruits.

WHAT PERSONAL EXPERIENCE SHOWS.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a fruit and vegetable grower for some 14 years, and I have exported by the carload into Canada, and presume I understand Canadian conditions and possibilities as well as Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis do. I will not attempt to say that there will not be some cases where American shippers would benefit under a reciprocal agreement that puts fruits and vegetables on the free list, but on the whole, with my knowledge of Canada's possibilities as to production of those fruits and vegetables that can be raised in that climate, in my judgment the United States producer will lose infinitely more than he will gain by this arrangement.

There is a widespread opinion that Canada can not raise fruit to any extent, and while part of the data I have on this subject is somewhat old, much of it is up to date. This is what Canada produced in fruit from 1871 to 1901, according to the Canadian Yearbook of 1909:

	1871	1881	1891	1901
Apples.....bushels..	6,365,315	13,377,655	7,519,913	18,626,186
Peaches.....do....	.....	.....	43,637	545,415
Pears.....do....	.....	.....	229,240	531,837
Cherries.....do....	.....	.....	192,369	336,751
Plums.....do....	.....	.....	266,350	557,875
Other fruits.....do....	358,963	841,219	320,641	70,396
Grapes.....pounds..	1,126,402	3,896,508	12,252,331	24,302,634
Small fruits.....quarts..	.....	.....	.....	21,701,791

In 1910 Canada shipped 8,126,984 pounds of dried apples, 1,604,477 barrels of apples, which is nearly 5,000,000 bushels.

If Canada has increased in the same proportion in the last 10 years that it did in the other decades referred to, it produces now something more than 30,000,000 bushels of apples, and we suppose other fruits in proportion. While this is not much fruit the possibilities of enormous accessions to this supply are staring the United States producer in the face, and even now the throwing of 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 bushels on the American market would materially decrease the price of apples to the United States producer in the fall of the year when the majority of these fruits are marketed.

He refers to cottonseed oil, and there, Mr. Chairman, I admit there will be a distinct gain to our people. Already Canada is using large quantities, and putting this on the free list should help the cottonseed oil mills, and Canada can not produce it under natural or advantageous conditions, and if the United States could allow some product of Canada that would not interfere with the living or welfare of some of our own people to come in free as an offset, it would be fair and just reciprocity, and carrying out the ideas of reciprocity as advocated by James G. Blaine and William McKinley. Neither of them ever hinted at such reciprocity with Canada as is contemplated by this measure.

Mr. Pepper and Mr. Davis refer to sheep as follows:

> The sheep raisers of the United States would be materially benefited by getting their sheep into Canada free. The Dominion, through its department of agriculture, is now taking means to increase the Canadian supply of sheep. Under the present tariff of 25 per cent sheep to the value of $220,000 imported into Canada from the United States have paid duties in excess of $50,000.

INTERESTING FACTS OVERLOOKED.

These gentlemen failed to tell in this connection that the United States, on sheep imported into this country from Canada, collected duties amounting to $103,519, and that Canada exported to this country about three times as many sheep as we sent there. If this becomes a law the United States sheep man is certainly worsted, as under this act vast herds can be driven down from Canada in the early spring into the United States, for there is no restriction. After shearing time they can be driven back into Canada, thus putting large quantities of Canadian wool on the free list as well as sheep, and becoming equal competitors in wool sales with our American growers.

The statement has been made on the floor of this House that the American negotiators of this measure desired to put meats and meat products, as well as flour, on the free list, but that Canada would not agree to it. The idea that Canada, which is trying to build up its industries and manufactures, would

reject a proposition that would give employment to labor and open up a 92,000,000-people market against their 7,000,000 who have immense quantities of grain in excess of their own needs and have only made a start on their possible production, would refuse to put flour on the free list is too incredible for belief. The same might be said of meat products. If Canada can furnish the United States with the animals, they surely need not fear for their home market, but should jump at the twelvefold greater one.

If Canada did so refuse, our representatives at the drafting of this measure would have been perfectly justified in refusing to indorse the agreement. I maintain, without any fear of successful contradiction, that the admission of their raw products above mentioned into the market of the United States gives the great milling industries of our country, the Meat Trust, and other protected industries a chance to use the Canadian product to hammer down the price of the United States product without any necessity whatever for their giving to the consumer an equal reduction.

ADVOCATES OF MEASURE INCONSISTENT.

These reciprocity disciples say in one breath that our people need all the flour and breadstuffs they can get, and in the next, "We are the largest exporters of wheat in the world."

If this is right, why this crying need? One assertion refutes the other. If it is true, there is only one need we could possibly have for Canada's products, and that is to use as a club to hammer down American prices, which it would naturally do.

Let us be honest with each other and the country. No individual or party can afford to carry a measure by misstatement of facts or by attempting to mislead the class which has all to lose by this arrangement.

Mr. Chairman, the two subordinates of the State Department who negotiated this treaty for our country, these gentlemen to fortune and fame unknown, give us "Wheat values and reciprocity" as follows:

The wheat crop of the United States in recent years has varied from 550,000,000 to 750,000,000 bushels per annum. The present production of Canada is from 100,000,000 to 160,000,000 per annum. Optimists as to Canada's possibilities in wheat raising go so far as to estimate her wheat crop, when the Northwestern Provinces have been more thoroughly settled, at twice and even three times her present production. It is safe to assume that the Canadian surplus of wheat for the immediate future will amount to from 40,000,000 bushels to 100,000,000 bushels per annum. The price of wheat in the United States generally averages as to the northwestern crops fully 10 cents per bushel, and sometimes so much as 15 cents per bushel, higher than in the corresponding sections of Canada. The effect of the removal of the duty on wheat will be advantageous to Canada in that her wheat will be placed substantially on a parity with values in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have given these figures of the negotiators of this treaty as to wheat values in the United States and Canada especially for the benefit of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who so persistently, and I might say so insolently, branded all those asserting this difference in price as falsifiers.

Now, as to their claim regarding Canada's possibilities in wheat raising, I wish to read an excerpt from the report of a Canadian senate committee to their Parliament after scientific examination into Canada's lands and other resources:

Within the scope of the committee's inquiry there is a possible area of 656,000 square miles fitted for the growth of potatoes, 407,000 square miles suitable for barley, and 816,000 square miles suitable for wheat. * * * There is a pastoral area of 860,000 square miles, 26,000 of which is open prairie with occasional groves, the remainder being more or less wooded. Throughout this arable and pastoral land latitude bears no direct relation to summer isotherms, the spring flowers and the buds of deciduous trees appearing as early north of Great Slave Lake as at Winnipeg, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, or Ottawa, and earlier along the Peace River and some minor western affluents of the Great Mackenzie River, where the climate resembles that of western Ontario.

CANADA HAS BOUNDLESS FARMS.

And again:

Three years ago Mr. Conroy, of the department of Indian affairs, reported to a Canadian parliamentary committee that he had found excellent farms in the latitude 62 degrees 3 minutes, which is almost as far north as Iceland, farther north than the southern end of Greenland and some 800 miles north of the upper boundary of Minnesota, where he saw heavy crops of wheat, oats, barley, and peas. Before he started south, on July 28, barley cutting was already under way. He reported all kinds of wild fruits in the country, with the exception of apples, which can not be grown north of Edmonton. But even as far north as Fort Providence he picked with his own hand fine strawberries, raspberries, blueberries, and cranberries. And this is the territory even beyond that territory which Gen. Sherman once contemptuously designated as "the frozen belt."

We find that this 656,000 square miles fitted for the growth of potatoes amounts to 419,840,000 acres, and at 100 bushels to the acre—a low estimate for potatoes—gives a possible 41,984,000,000 bushels of potatoes. Yet there are people already beginning to bemoan the starvation of future generations for the lack of food. We find that the 407,000 square miles suitable to barley production is equivalent to 245,828,000 acres, which at the very low estimate of 10 bushels to the acre gives a production of 2,458,280,000 bushels of barley. Need anybody fear that future generations will run out of that very essential article from which to make beer?

We find that the 816,000 square miles suitable for raising wheat equals 522,240,000 acres, which, at the very low estimate of 12 bushels to the acre, amounts to 6,266,880,000 bushels of wheat; and yet some of our pessimistic economists are already lying awake nights pondering where future generations are going to obtain their white loaf. If but one-half of this territory were used for purposes enumerated, still at Canada's average production per acre, it would not reduce these figures.

We find that their 860,000 square miles pastoral area equals 550,400,000 acres, which, allowing 10 acres to the head, would pasture 55,040,000 head of stock. And it is quite evident that Canada will always be able to furnish its own meat supplies.

The timber, the mineral, including coal, the fisheries, and other natural resources of Canada are probably unequalled by any like-sized territory on the face of the globe, and we want to remember that it has 750,000 square miles more territory than is contained within the boundaries of the United States.

WHEAT RESOURCES OF CANADA ENDLESS.

There is one valley up in Canada that is capable of raising more wheat, or as much wheat, as Mr. Pepper claims optimists estimate for all Canada. This is known as the Peace River Valley, and is made up of 65,000,000 acres of first-class agricultural land. Of the nature of its soil Prof. Tanner, the great English laboratory agriculturist, has reported as follows:

We have hitherto considered the black earth of central Russia the richest soil in the world. That land, however, has now to yield its distinguished position to the rich, deep, black soil of western Canada. The earth here is a rich vegetable humus of from 1 to 4 feet in depth, with a surface deposit rich in nitrogen, phosphoric acid, and potash.

This one valley, which, as compared to the whole of Canada, is as the State of Missouri to the United States, is capable of producing nearly as much wheat as is now produced by the United States. It is this wonderful country, filled with such marvelous future possibilities, that our distinguished friends here who are favoring this bill desire to place in competition with our farmers and their too-often depleted soil.

In return for the privilege of shipping their raw products into the United States free, among other things, Canada has graciously made a reduction of some 14 per cent in her tariff rate on automobiles. The poor manufacturers and the consumers of that luxury will receive the benefit, and this alone should console the fishermen of Gloucester, potato raisers of Maine, dairymen of New York, and apple raisers of Michigan.

The reciprocity treaty which existed between the United States and Canada from 1854 to 1865 has been both lauded and criticized, but whether or not this was a wise or beneficent measure or a weak and discriminating one there is one fact of mathematical accuracy, and that is that the Government of Canada was the financial beneficiary and the Government of the United States the heavy loser.

SUMNER'S VIEW OF OLD TREATY.

Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, in a speech in the United States Senate, January 11, 1864, said:

I come, in the last place, to the influence of the treaty on the revenue of our country; and here the customhouse is our principal witness. The means of determining this question will be found in the authentic tables which have been published from time to time in reports of the Treasury, and especially in the report made to Congress at this session, which I have in my hand.

Looking at these tables we find certain unanswerable points. I begin with an estimate founded on the trade before the treaty. From this it appears that if no treaty had been made, and the trade had increased in the same ratio as before the treaty, Canada would have paid to the United States in the 10 years of the treaty at least $16,373,880, from which she has been relieved. This sum is actually lost to the United States. In return Canada has given up $2,650,890, being the amount it would have collected if no treaty had been made. Here is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

Here is another illustration, derived from the tables: During the 10 years of the treaty the United States have actually paid in duties to Canada alone $16,802,962, while during this same period Canada has paid in duties to the United States the very moderate sum of $930,447. Here again is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

The same inequality may be seen in another way. During the 10 years of the treaty dutiable products of the United States have entered Canada and the other Provinces to the amount of $83,347,019, while during this same period dutiable products of Canada and the other Provinces have entered the United States only to the amount of $7,750,482. During this same period free products of the United States have entered Canada and the other Provinces to the amount of $118,853,972, while free products of Canada and the other Provinces have entered the United States to the amount of $178,500,184. Here again is a vast disproportion, to the detriment of the United States.

Add to these various results the statement in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which has just been laid on our tables, in the following words:

"The treaty has released from duty a total sum of $42,333,257 in value of goods of Canada more than of goods the produce of the United States." (Foreign and Domestic Commerce, 1864, p. 93.)

This conclusion is in substantial harmony with that which I had reached from an independent examination of the tables.

From these various illustrations it is clear that the revenue of the United States has suffered by the treaty in question, and that in this important particular its advantages have not been shared equally by the two countries. Here, at least, it loses all title to its name.

There is an old saying that we can only judge the future by the past, and if such was the result to our Government under that treaty it would be only reasonable to suppose that the same conditions will occur again.

In this case we have only to take the tables prepared by our Government for our guidance in considering this bill to see that a like condition would exist under this treaty. We have statistical data covering all articles exported and imported from and by the two countries from each other for the year 1910 that would be in any way affected by this treaty, together with the present duty rate charged by each country; also giving the proposed reciprocal rate and the amount of money levied by the two countries on articles imported and the amount that would have to be remitted on 1910 business by each country under this agreement.

CANADA DRIVES GOOD BARGAIN.

We find that Canada imported from the United States in 1910 reciprocal products to the amount of $47,827,959, on which she collected tariff duties of $7,776,236. Of this amount Canada would have to remit under this reciprocal agreement $2,560,579. Take this from the duties collected and it leaves Canada a balance of $5,215,657 tariff revenue. We find that the United States imported from Canada during the same year products to the value of $47,333,158, on which we collected customs duties of $5,649,826. Of this amount we would have to remit under this proposed agreement $4,849,933, leaving a balance in favor of the United States of $779,893 tariff duties collected on more than $47,000,000 of business done with Canada, as against Canada's $5,215,657 on practically the same amount of business it did with this Government.

Where is our Government's reciprocal benefit from a measure like this?

We have indisputable proof here that the United States on practically the same amount of business done in Canada that Canada did with us only receives a little more than one-sixth the revenue Canada receives from us under this proposed treaty. Is it wise for our Government to go into any such treaty with these indisputable figures staring us in the face?

This is, in my judgment, not only a great moral wrong we are attempting to do a certain class of our citizens, but from the standpoint of sound business policy it looks to me to be indefensible. Canada puts on the free list all commodities on which it knows it will be able to compete with us, but with few exceptions on those articles which Canada considers are not competitive it retains duties that bring in as much revenue under this treaty as the United States collected from Canada under the old system.

I maintain that from a financial viewpoint this is not fair to our Government as an executor, and from a moral viewpoint it is not fair to our people. This measure is only reciprocity in name. It is a travesty on justice, executed for the benefit of special interests under the guise of a benefit for the masses.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has been quoted as having said that it would check and reduce the cost of living—

that it will not hurt the American farmer, will help the Canadian farmer, and reduce the cost of living to the consumer.

He may be able to fool some American producers with a paradoxical declaration of that kind, but he can not fool all of them.

BOUND TO HURT PRODUCER.

The law of supply and demand, the commercial training of a lifetime, teaches that by no natural conditions can such a thing be possible. How is it going to lower the price of food products to the consumer, yet not hurt the United States producer? There is nothing the producer can buy from Canada that would reduce his cost of living commensurate with his sacrifices. The entire line of commodities that he buys bears the same old tariff rate, with the single possible exception of rough lumber, so he can not help but suffer, the President's assertion to the contrary notwithstanding.

Is it not possible that it is largely other things our people have to buy that are responsible for their burden of high cost of living and not the food supply?

In Secretary Wilson's report for the present year he brings his discussion on the high cost of living to a close as follows:

From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays.

After the consideration of the elements of the matter it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroads to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment.

Note again that this statement is from the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson.

Some great statesmen in their wisdom, in order to get an increased business for certain manufactured articles, have seen fit to put farm products on the free list, thereby depriving the United States producer of protection against the only country he had any reason to fear—this without consulting him or giving him any representation on the supposed commission that framed this agreement.

Now they add insult to injury and belittle his intelligence by telling him that it will not hurt him, but will benefit the consumer.

WHEN FARMER IS HURT COUNTRY IS HURT.

Let us reason together and figure out whether we show good statesmanship and wise policy to treat one class of our citizens in such a high-handed and arbitrary manner. Will it pay even from a financial point of view? Suppose this agreement was entered into, and there is a consequent reduction in the cost of living. There is also bound to be a consequent reduction in the purchasing power of the United States farmer. The United States is dotted over with smiling towns and villages, the prosperity of which is directly influenced by the purchasing power of the farmer.

If this purchasing power is reduced you have immediately struck at the greatest single factor in our American prosperity. The consumer may live cheaper, but he will immediately find that his wage has decreased and his certainty of employment diminished. The trade of the retail stores of all kinds will begin to fall off, consequently it will be felt by the wholesaler in the city. The sales in agricultural machinery and other manufactured products will decrease along with diminished trade in all other lines, and the reduced purchases of home products will greatly offset the increased sale of products in Canada under this reciprocity agreement.

There will be an immediate shrinkage in farm values to keep pace with the decrease in the price of farm products. There will be an increased value of Canadian lands to correspond with the relative value of a 92,000,000-people market opened at their door. We will immediately suffer a great decrease in our circulating medium caused by the influx of American capital into Canada, as well as the loss of a great many of our good citizens who will go over there to reside and partake of their greater prosperity.

The moral effect upon our country will immediately be felt. The farm, becoming unprofitable, will cause an immediate exodus of farmers' sons and daughters to other avenues of life, thus accelerating a condition that has long been causing anxiety and commiseration among our thoughtful scholars and economists. If, in order to benefit a few manufacturers and special interests in the United States, we force this condition on the American producer, what assurances have that class that in a year or two the same interests, desiring to increase their trade with Argentina, will not enter into a similar agreement with that country, with a promised decrease in the cost of living to our consumers and assurance to the American farmer that it will not hurt him?

The American farmer has as much to gain by reciprocity with South America as with Canada, and is bound to lose in either case. The American manufacturer and special interests of all kinds would probably be willing to trade the exchange of the United States agricultural products in return for the admission of their own wares on the same principle that a man is willing to sacrifice all his wife's relatives for the good of his country.

PRIVILEGED CLASSES CRUSH AGRICULTURISTS.

It has been the history of all nations that the wealthy and privileged class controlled the Government and worked their own sweet will on the agricultural classes. This policy was usually carried out until that class became a debased peasantry. When they arrived at that point those countries speedily had their fall. This has been the history of all nationalities, and unless the governments of the present day can profit by the experience of the ages they will follow to the same end.

Some of our European countries are realizing this, and have made vast strides in amending economic laws and changing conditions among their agricultural classes. The most noted of these is Germany.

Great stress has been placed on the benefits that would accrue to the American farmer from the cattle that would be

sent down from Canada to be corn fed in the United States. It is true there might some cattle be brought into this country for that purpose, but, in my judgment, they would be few and far between.

Canada may not be able to raise much corn, although in Ontario they can raise corn equally as well as in New York and Michigan, and better than in Wisconsin or Minnesota. Canada can raise oats, wheat, and barley galore, and can fatten cattle on those grains the beef quality of which is hard to surpass. When the reciprocity bill passed the House last winter cattle immediately took a tumble in price, on account of the increased supply that was going to be obtainable, and an Iowa representative, who was an extensive feeder of cattle, told me that he had ordered his sold at once, at a loss of $1,000. He was of the opinion that he would lose more if he held his cattle and the measure passed the Senate.

Wheat immediately declined some 5 or 6 cents the bushel and never rallied, but the price of flour and beef made no corresponding decline. The consumers of those two commodities received no benefits.

If gentlemen think that the Canadians would allow their cattle to go into the United States as feeders when they have unlimited feed of a splendid quality, they underestimate the shrewdness of our Canadian brother. Some gentlemen arguing on this reciprocity measure allude to the tariff between the United States and Canada as a wall, an unnatural barrier. Why any more unnatural than that between this and other nations with which we have commercial relations?

WHY ONE LINE BARRIER MORE THAN ANOTHER?

There is no more excuse for calling the line between an English colony and us an unnatural barrier than one between us and England herself, though an ocean rolls between. We can do business more expeditiously with England than we can with a large part of Canada. Even though there is only an imaginary line between us, that line is as broad as the Atlantic Ocean when it comes to a question of nationality.

There is nothing in this imaginary line bearing on the justice, injustice, or wisdom of this measure.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if we are going to hammer down the price of our own products with Canadian products, give the woolen industry, the cotton manufacturer, the Sugar and Tobacco Trusts, the United States Steel Trust, and all other protected industries free trade. They are as able to stand it as the American farmer, and there is more justice in this demand than there is in forcing this so-called reciprocity measure on the United States producer. I again reiterate there can be no gain for any part of our people that would compensate for the rank injustice done to another class.

The greatest mistake the United States can make is to start in to trade even the partial prosperity of her agricultural classes for the benefit of any other industry. If justly handled, they will be for all time to come the bulwark of this Nation, her leaders in honor and virtue. They who hold communion with nature and nature's god are apt to be good citizens, and we need the help of that leaven to keep the entire loaf wholesome.

Mr. Chairman, there are sure to be some who would benefit from a measure of this kind, for all could not lose from a financial viewpoint. Reciprocity in most any form is sure to help somebody. The question is whether or not we, as a Nation, can afford to pass a measure like this simply for a financial consideration. The principle of the thing is more to be considered than anything else. The taking away from the United States farmer all protection as against his most dangerous competitor in the manner contemplated by this act is as unjust to him as was King George's acts against the American colonies.

It is natural for all of us to be selfish in our viewpoints on questions like this. If it benefits us financially, it is easy for us to think the other fellow's view is wrong and his loss largely imaginary, while our loss or gain is very real, indeed.

WESTERN FRUIT MAN DECEIVED.

In the far West the fruit man thinks he will gain by an increased demand for his products in the Canadian treeless region. In the fruitless sections of our country it is a matter of indifference. In the East, where United States fruit products have to come into direct competition with Ontario, they are bitterly opposed to it. Anyone who is benefited by this measure considers the contention of the producers of other kinds of products as hardly worthy of consideration. All of our people who own Canadian mines or Canadian lands naturally favor this measure, and it is hard for them to see wherein it could do harm.

The people who buy paper products hope for a benefit from free pulp wood and free paper, and while they think there is concrete argument for their being benefited, it is easy for them to think the other fellow's contentions of damages are weak and unreasonable. There are some who care nothing for the losses of others if they are only sure of benefiting themselves, and there are those who say they expect to suffer a personal loss, but are willing to stand it for the sake of striking a blow at the principle of protection. They admit that this reciprocity agreement is very unjust in its provisions, but are willing to see this wrong committed in order to destroy what they regard as an unwise commercial policy.

This class is little, if any, better than those who look at it solely from the viewpoint of self-interest, for they utterly fail to take the moral effect into consideration. This is not a local question, but a national one, even though it is a question which affects every local community, and its effects should not be considered from the viewpoint of its benefit to the individual, community, or district.

What the effect is going to be upon our entire Nation, not only financially but morally, is more important, and the least thing worthy of consideration is the question of political expediency as affecting political parties or preferment. The actual welfare of the Nation is more worthy of consideration. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I may be pardoned for engaging the attention of this body so early in my legislative experience in this Chamber when I say that, in my judgment, there has not been in the last generation brought before the American Congress so far-reaching and enormously vital a proposition, that so universally affects the whole interests of every class of people I have the honor to represent here as this so-called reciprocity compact.

Not only is it true of my people locally, but to a greater or less degree the whole of the American people elsewhere, and especially is it true of the 30,000,000 of them who are engaged in our agricultural industry and who are producing annually food products to the fabulous value of nearly $9,000,000,000.

Kansas being chiefly and almost exclusively an agricultural region and not lagging in the good work proudly carries the banner above all other States in the production and annual value of her wheat crops, and stands near the head of the column of States in the production of corn, beef, pork, and other foodstuffs. It is not, therefore, strange that her farmers are very deeply and vitally interested in what is going to happen to their great business of stock raising and farm productions, amounting annually in value to $640,000,000, and to their bank deposits, now aggregating $150,000,000 more, when the last anchor of protection they have on their industry shall be swept away by the passage of this bill, bringing them face to face with an unknown and unascertainable competition that will come to them from the incalculable possibilities of a rapidly developing agricultural empire across our northern border, where labor is paid far less, lands one-half or less cheaper, with a fertility much greater than their own. And all this without a reciprocal morsel in return.

It may be wise to remember that we have been delegated and are here solely to legislate for the benefit of our citizens, and not foreigners, which thought should be paramount in every conscience before trying this extremely doubtful experiment that, in the light of the past, will become an additional burdensome yoke upon him who daily goes forth before the rising of the sun and is at this hour tilling the soil, and until the close of the day, for the very necessities of life which all must have—the merchant, the mechanic, the doctor, the lawyer, the preacher, the teacher, and the banker, all wait until in the sweat of his brow he has plowed, sowed, and reaped. He feeds them all.

The farmer's trade is one of worth;
He's partner with the sky and earth,
He's partner with the sun and rain,
And no man loses for his gain.
Men may rise and men may fall,
Yet, the farmer, he feeds them all.

It is of the rights of this great army of American toilers, who are contending with the very elements day by day, in sunshine and rain, in heat and cold, that should be defended from assaults from every source. They are in their fields and are not here. In this they are greatly handicapped for legislative consideration in competition with the well-organized manufacturers, wage earners, and the corporate interests of the country, for the farmers are almost wholly without organization, heretofore depending upon the inexorable law of compensation, which has always met with favor in their sight—receiving an equivalent for what they confer—and content to work out an industrial destiny without special governmental favors.

They are willing at all times to do the square thing, even to conceding some things not to their advantage if in the interests of the city toilers, but if protection is taken off of all their products, as this bill does, they want and are demanding to see it come off of the packers' products and all trust-made goods which they are compelled to buy. If it is protection, they want their share of it; if it is free trade, they want their share of that; and if it is to be reciprocity, they want it to be reciprocity.

The farmers of this country, and especially the western farmers, believe that in trade if you increase the purchasing power of a customer you thereby increase your own prosperity; and therefore they well understand that the more laborers employed and better wages paid in the mills and factories of the East and South the more consumers there will be and better prices will they obtain for their wheat, corn, beef, pork, and other food materials, the finished product of their industry.

Believing thus, they have stood firmly in the past for every measure that would throw a wall of protection around the mills, factories, and workshops in the East and South and the laborers and wage earners employed therein as against all foreign competitors; and they are now willing, if fairly treated by them, that all such industries shall be protected by that reasonable Republican doctrine, namely, the imposition of such tariff duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad with a fair profit to the investor.

Protectionists have always claimed that home competition prevented prices from becoming excessive. In recent years this natural law has been curtailed in its operation, so far as many manufactured articles are concerned, by the action of the trusts in preventing real competition in trust-made articles, and progressive Republicans have demanded not a destruction of the protective principle, but a lowering of the duty until it measured but slightly more than the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. But no one has claimed that there was not real competition in the home market as to agricultural products. The farmers have not combined. The prices of their products are still regulated by the law of supply and demand.

If this be true—and it is true, and no one will deny it—pray tell me then why the protection on the farmers' products should be the first to be destroyed? Pray tell me why it is inconsistent in those who have demanded a reduction of the tariff on trust-made articles to oppose a measure for reduction which carefully—I may say studiously—excepts them from its provisions?

The farmers are not demanding class legislation; they are asking no special favors; they are only contending that the same standard should be applied to the measure of their protection that is applied to others. They contend that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and demand that a no more favorable method be applied to those interests which have stifled competition than to theirs, where home competition is free and unobstructed.

"Equal rights and special privileges to none." Afford the farmers this and they will ask no more.

But, let me warn the gentlemen on this floor representing the manufacturing districts of our country, who are pressing so ardently the passage of this so-called reciprocity measure, which robs the farmers of every line of protection they now enjoy. That they may cease to be liberal to your interests, become impatient under the burden you have laid upon them, forgetting the golden rule, and say unto you, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," and with some Elijah to lead them on, strike back by encompassing your walls of protection, assaulting them so fiercely that there will not be one stone left upon another, and you too will face the avarice and greed of every nation of the earth and then feel the sting of the like burden you have placed upon them.

Gentlemen of the South on this floor, who are so numerously favoring this bill, I ask you where is your fairness or consistency in hugging to your bosoms an ample protection on your sugar, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, of which last year you produced but $150,000,000 worth, and demanding and pressing the passage of this measure that will sweep away the last vestige of protection the farmers elsewhere have, who for the same period produced cereal crops alone of more than $3,000,000,000 in value. With child-like fondness you cling to a tariff on one-twentieth of this great production, and insist that the farmers elsewhere shall lose all on the remaining nineteen-twentieths, and then declare here and upon the stump with vehemence that protection is a robbery, thereby convicting you, not as accessories to the alleged crime, but as principals. Wherein can there be any justice to force the farmer to sell his cereals in a free-trade market and retain an amply protected market in which to sell your cotton, sugar, tobacco, and peanuts?

Pass this bill and you legislate in favor of the corporations, trusts, and combines everywhere by compelling the American farmer to sell his wheat in a free-trade market, so far as Canada is concerned, and when converted into flour, save to the Flour Trust a protected market of 50 cents per barrel in which to sell its products; it will force him to raise and sell his steers, the finished product of his labor, in the same free-trade market, while you give to the packer and the Beef Trust a protected market of $1.25 per hundred pounds in which to sell its meats at exorbitant prices to every family in the land; and it will force the farmer to sell all his other food products in a like free-trade market, and at the same time you carefully give an amply protected market to all manufactured food products now so completely controlled by the numerous other trusts of the country that are daily exploiting the poor of the city, the family on the farm, and everyone, by demanding an unjust tribute from them all.

Charles Sumner once said that reciprocity was a beautiful word and very pleasing to the ear, and then showed how difficult it was to put into practice generally, and condemned the Canadian reciprocity agreement of 1854, which was very similar to the proposed measure, covering like products from each country, as this one does, and which proved so disastrous to and was by the United States abrogated in 1865. Canada has been knocking at our doors ever since for a renewal of the old agreement. She has pressed her claims upon every administration from Lincoln to the present time, without avail until now. If our experiences with a like Canadian reciprocal agreement in the past is of any value, then we should not hesitate, if for no other reason, to set our disapproval upon it. Enact this measure into law and we again reverse the policy of this Government since its foundation, and especially is it true that it will overturn the policy pursued by it in the last 50 years, which has brought to it unbounded prosperity by increasing the property of the Nation from $16,000,000,000 to more than $116,000,000,000, or more than one-fourth of the wealth of the entire world. It will reverse the policy of a great majority of the leading statesmen of our country from the beginning of our Government, as advocated by Washington, Hamilton, Sumner, Morrill, Grant, Sherman, Harrison, Garfield, Blaine, McKinley, and many others who stood for a complete protective policy for the American farmer and reciprocity in such commodities only as were not and could not be produced in this country. In the light, then, of our past teachings, history, and policies, how does the proposed reciprocal agreement square itself, for it requires us to freely open up the greatest market on earth of 92,000,000 of people for an unimportant market of less than 9,000,000 of people, which is unequal, unreciprocal, and unfair?

It puts upon the free list every product of the farmer of the North and West, composing one-third of our great population, to the direct competition of an empire of farm lands as large as our own, with greater fertility, more than one-half cheaper in price per acre than American farms, with labor far lower than our own, and destined at no distant day to be producing an equal amount of farm products to that of the American farmer, if not much more.

George Harcourt, deputy minister of agriculture for Alberta, one of the several Provinces of Canada, in 1909 made this report:

> Of the country which is known the area of producing grain is 220,000,000 acres. The total area in crops last year was 11,257,870 acres, producing a total crop of 240,000,000 bushels. This is not the end. There is a great northern country, the McKenzie Basin, which is capable of producing grain. (Canadian Yearbook.)

It has been estimated that within a comparatively short time, with the encouragement this measure gives, this vast territory will produce bread enough to feed the people of the whole North American Continent. In this connection I invite attention to an address delivered in the House of Commons by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, for 16 years prime minister of Canada, on March 7, 1911:

> We [referring to Canada] are above all an agricultural people. Our chief wealth is the growth of these products of the Temperate Zone. What are they? Fruits, cereals, and vegetables; and it is our boast—not an idle boast, but a boast founded upon actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables, and fruit we can, without exaggeration, beat the world.

This, too, is manifestly unfair to the American farmer, to now bring him up against such conditions, who for many weary years struggled against depression and adversity in building up the vast wealth of the Nation, and after the long-looked-for day of prosperity to him had dawned, when he was just coming into his own and reaping fair and remunerative prices for his patience, labor, and toil, to be thus sorely smitten by him whom he has in the years that are agone defended with his

strong arm, to now be forced to stand with helpless hands while his lands decline in price, see the fruits of his toil sell for less, compelling him to work more and to produce more and sell more for the same amount, in order to keep the home and the farm running. This is not only unjust and unfair to him, but is gross ingratitude. The farm home is an institution and not a factory, and must go on from year to year; the same expenses must be paid from day to day. He therefore can not shut down his farm and close his home, like the mills and factories, when hard times and low prices prevail, and wait for better times as they can do.

The American farmer knows he can not close down and wait, that his industry must go on, and with courage he faces the future and with a loyal devotion to his home, country, and flag, excelled by none, every emotion of his heart pulsating with—

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty—

and realizes he owes a patriotic duty to preserve the home and farm, the hope of the land, without which this country will weaken, fail, and finally perish as nations have done in the past and be known only as they on the historical pages of time.

The American farmer is the chief factor that has created our great American market, built on her soil, in trade and commerce over her rivers and lakes and railroads of which we proudly boast, which exceeds $25,000,000,000 per year, with a production in agricultural and manufactured products four and one-half times greater than all Europe and spending more for education than all the rest of the world combined, the foreigners contributing not one cent in taxes for the maintenance of our schools, churches, roads, bridges, and all other internal improvements that go to make this great market for the use of which he heretofore has had to pay a tariff in order to enjoy the benefits thereof; but this bill, in effect, proposes to compel the American farmer to tax himself to build roads and bridges and highways, so that the Canadian may conveniently travel over them to every American farmer's door as his competitor without money or price. How reciprocal(?).

It has been admitted in debate by friends of this measure that the price of wheat in recent years in the United States has averaged somewhat over 10 cents per bushel more than in Canada, and that this proposed measure, if put into force, would either lower the price of American wheat or raise the price of Canadian wheat. If the former should happen, as intended in the bill, it would have produced a direct loss to the American wheat raiser of $74,000,000, applied to that crop of 1909, and a loss to the Kansas wheat grower last year of the vast sum of $8,500,000. And applying this to the middle and western portion of Kansas, where by skillful farming, the production of wheat, oats, and barley has been developed second to no other portion of our country, driving the arid boundary westward beyond the Colorado line, will work an irreparable injury and perhaps destruction to that industry there.

What loss would come to the American farmer on other products of his can not now be ascertained, but, as affecting one interest alone, again I want your attention to the words of Mr. Laurier when he said, in the aforesaid address:

> Then there is the cattle trade. Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the exchange embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and therefore, if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise, in Great Britain, there is a ready market in the United States.

Great Britain, to whom Canada owes her allegiance, places an embargo on the cattle trade from Canada, and we are here now removing all embargoes as a gracious gift to her Canadian daughter. How generous(?). How reciprocal(?). How fair(?).

A few comparisons will be sufficient to establish the fact that this so-called reciprocal measure is not reciprocal in any respect, but wholly uninteral in spirit and effect:

(1) It gives to Canada a market of 92,000,000 of people, valued annually at $25,000,000,000, for a market of less than 9,000,000 of people, which is far less in proportion to her people than that of our own.

(2) It gives free trade in our great market for all Canadian farm products and refuses free lumber, coal, iron ore, and the like to the American farmer.

(3) It opens our markets freely, but does not require Canada to remove the export duty on her wood and wood pulp that we buy from her.

(4) As to the reciprocal nature of this agreement, the opinion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is worth considering. In the same address above referred to he compliments the Canadian minister of finance, Mr. Fielding, and the Canadian minister of customs, Mr. Patterson, who negotiated the agreement with our Secretary of State, and thanks these two men for having obtained from the United States such an advantageous arrangement and "having obtained it without the sacrifice of any Canadian interest." In other words, he means to say the United States gave all and Canada gave nothing in return.

(5) Pass this bill and we take a step backward among the nations of the earth, for Germany, France, Belgium, and the rest of the world have long since discarded the old reactionary policy of giving free trade in farm products, that even free-trade England is anxious to discard, which will bring dearth and depression to our agricultural industry; our rural population will surely decrease and the slogan "Back to the farm" will become obsolete, and "Go West, young man," will not take him to Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, or the great Middle West, but will be unheeded by him, and he will turn his back on the old home and country and either face toward Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or Alberta, to there swear allegiance to a king and live under another flag, or toward the overcrowded cities, to abide where slums and saloons abound, as breeding places of ignorance, lawlessness, crime, and anarchy. Such is not conducive to, but dangerous to the country's welfare.

It has been urged that this measure will lessen the price of food products and cheapen the cost of living to all; that it will lessen the value of food products of the producer, yes; but to the consumer, no. The consumer does not eat wheat, but the product of the Flour Trust; he does not eat fat cattle, but the products of the Beef Trust. Neither does he eat other raw materials of the producer, but the manufactured food products so completely controlled by the other trusts of our country. It is apparent, therefore, that this measure is not in the interest of the producers nor the consumers of manufactured food products, but in the interest of the conspiracy of organized avarice and greed; and the trusts, combines, and corporations will absorb, as additional profits, all reductions it will force from the producer of farm products long before it reaches the consumer of food products.

The greatest beneficiaries under this measure will undoubtedly be the trusts, combines, and corporatons who buy and sell the food products, both of the producer and consumer, together with the railroads who will transport these products from the Canadian fields to our midst in competition with our own home products. It is perfectly natural, therefore, that the Hills, Rockefellers, Morgans, Vanderbilts, and other captains of high finance are reported as favoring the passage of this measure, which is not only unreciprocal, but class legislation against a large body of our American citizens in favor of a foreign people, and is obnoxiously discriminative in character as against one class of our own people in favor of another, for it gives to the American farmer a free-trade market in which to sell his products and amply protects the trusts and combines of the country in their methods in the handling of the food products of our people. It forces the farmer to compete with free wheat and protects the Flour Trust on its flour at 50 cents per barrel. It gives free competition in barley for the farmer and 45 cents per hundred pounds protection to the brewer on malt barley; free competition in live stock for the farmer and $1.25 per hundred protection to the Beef Trust for its meats; free competition in free flaxseed and other oil seed for the farmer and ample protection on linseed oil and such products for the Oil Trust; free competition in horses and cattle for the farmer and protection at $1.25 per thousand on lumber for the Lumber Trust to house them; free competition in dairy products for the farmer and protection on coal at 45 cents per ton for the Coal Trust. Besides the Sugar Trust, the Steel Trust, and all the other products of the numerous other trusts seemed to be favored as against the American farmer, which is unfair, unjust, un-Republican, and un-American.

In placing myself in opposition to this measure, along with many others of like belief, I am not unmindful of the sensation that awaits our experiences beneath the most powerful machine of the times—the steam roller of the opposition—which is operated so skillfully by the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. Unpleasant for a time it may be, but the conscientiousness of having stood for and defended the rights of the people we represent will be satisfaction everlasting. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY].

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill one would be justified in the assumption that the paper manufacturers and lumbermen of the country would be forced into bankruptcy in the event of the passage of this measure. I am in favor of the Canadian reciprocity bill because the Lumber Trust and all its allied interests are opposing it and because it typifies the most advanced character of pro-

gressive legislation in behalf of the great masses of our people. [Applause.] The activity of the special interests in their endeavor to defeat this measure is a sign of the times.

We find the best thought of the Democratic Party of the Nation favoring this Canadian reciprocity bill, and there seems no question in my mind that its passage will eventually lower the cost of living to our people.

I do not think that God in His wisdom ever intended that an unnatural barrier should rise as a monument to greed, avarice, and the lust of wealth between the people of this country and their neighbors across the Canadian border. [Applause.]

What matters it if the earnings of the Lumber and Paper Trusts and their satellites are reduced if a market for the exportation of our products and the interchange of Canadian goods makes lighter the burden borne by the great masses of our toilers. [Applause.]

But above and beyond all else there is absolutely no question in my mind but what the present high and intolerant cost of living to our people can be lowered materially if we remove the present tariff walls existing between the United States and Canada and allow the wage earners of the land to enjoy the benefits to be derived from Canadian staple products.

To say that there can be no advantage in opening to the widest extent the great market upon our borders is the sheerest folly. Let me present for a moment as a fair and well-drawn illustration the actual conditions in the city of New York that have come about under the present high cost of living.

New York City has a population in round numbers of 4,700,000. It is estimated that these 4,700,000 persons spend about $2,350,000 a day for food. According to the tables of the United States Bureau of Labor the price of beef in 1909 showed an increase of 32 per cent over the average price for the 10 years between 1890 and 1900.

Bread showed an increase of 24 per cent.
Butter showed an increase of 35 per cent.
Eggs showed an increase of 42 per cent.
Flour showed an increase of 54 per cent.
Milk showed an increase of 41 per cent.
Mutton showed an increase of 35 per cent.
Fresh pork showed an increase of 68 per cent.
Salt pork and bacon showed an increase of 80 per cent.
Ham showed an increase of 45 per cent.
Potatoes showed an increase of 20 per cent.
Veal showed an increase of 30 per cent.

This means that the people of the city of New York are paying $180,000 a day more for meat, or $66,000,000 a year, than they would pay under the prices of the previous decade.

They are paying $34,000 a day more for eggs, or $12,000,000 a year.

They are paying $20,000 a day more for milk, or $7,000,000 a year.

They are paying $34,000 a day more for butter, or $12,000,000 a year.

They are paying $7,000 a day more for potatoes, or $2,600,000 a year.

They are paying $267,000 a day more for other articles of food, or $101,000,000 a year.

Thus the people of New York are paying $542,000 more a day for food, or $200,000,000 more a year for food, under the present prices than they would pay under the average prices of 1890–1900.

My friends, let us soberly realize the great problem that confronts us with the people of one American city paying an increase of $200,000,000 on foodstuffs in a single year.

The passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill will realize a double gain for the American people. For we will put raw materials upon the free list which will save our small manufacturers a substantial part of what it now costs them to run their factories, and also let in the food products from the great harvest fields of Canada which will ameliorate the conditions in our cities, such as I have just illustrated, by reducing the cost of living.

I believe also that there is a great and important side of this question that has not as yet been considered in the debate upon this tremendously vital economic issue, and that is the opportunity that lies for moving a new and vastly important commerce of another land through the ports of the United States.

And I beg in connection with this proposed gain in American commerce that you will note how almost entirely dependent Canada is upon her eastern and western terminals for the movement of such commerce, while the United States has so many outlets necessary for this new trade.

No adequate defense can be presented for the trade barriers we have erected against the Canadian Dominion. The trade of our country with Canada should flow as freely as between the States of the Union, for we need the raw materials, the food supply, and the taking advantage of the wonderful natural resources of the Dominion.

To-day all over the land may be noted the demand of hundreds of small manufacturers that they may have the free raw materials of Canada in view of the rapidly increasing competition which they are feeling more and more each year. For the full measure of prosperity will only come to the small manufacturers when they realize an ability to secure the necessary free raw materials for their factories on the fairest and most equitable terms.

The most grievous fact that appears in the trade relations between the United States and Canada is that in the main we have taxed the people of the Dominion on the majority of goods a duty nearly twice as large as that which Canada places upon American goods.

We are establishing a system of continental freedom of trade in the passage of this measure. We are realizing for the first time, as we should have realized years ago, how important—yes, how vitally necessary to us—are the products of the Canadian forests, the earth, the sea, and the mines, and we will allow the American workingman to freely exchange his products with the Canadian lumberman, farmer, fisherman, and miner and pay for them, in reality, with products of our own, for you must bear in mind that the people of Canada are as yet little engaged in manufacturing pursuits and form an ideal people for us to trade with.

The people of Canada, by reason of our greater development in manufacturing, are to-day vitally in need of the things we are most engaged in making, and which we must sell more and more to foreign buyers if we are to continue to grow in prosperity.

With trade flowing as freely between the United States and Canada as between the States of our Union, we shall realize again that great prosperity which followed the trade centers of the East and the great agricultural centers of the West, and find history inevitably repeating itself between the manufacturing centers of the United States and the great and rapidly developing agricultural districts of the Dominion.

Never in the history of this Republic have the conditions of great affluence upon the one hand and extreme poverty upon the other been so strongly paralleled, and the only protest that now rises in the country against the passage of this measure is the voice in behalf of special interest.

The marvelous economic awakening of our people that caused the recent upheaval in politics and gave so wonderful a Democratic victory was the voice of the people crying out for relief from the exactions of a high and intolerant cost of living, and the very presence of many new faces upon the other side of this historic Chamber and a few new ones also at the extreme end of this Chamber, can be considered in no sense as the result of a personal victory, but rather the righteous demand of the people for a new order of things in the economic life of our country.

The result of the recent elections was as pleasing to those Democrats chosen to carry the message of the people as it proved displeasing and disastrous to many men who heard the voice of the people during the days of the Sixty-first Congress and heeded it not.

The tremendous increase in population in this country during the past 20 years and the gradual decrease in the purchasing power of the American dollar has been such that every thinking man realizes that a stronger and better economic policy is vitally necessary to our people.

It is a very narrow line that marks the difference between the purchasing power and the income of the American laborer, and this reciprocity measure, in giving a wider market to our exports, will aid the well-being of those who produce with their brains and hands the wealth of the land.

The American workingman should rejoice to find in the Republican ranks men of the type of McCALL, of Massachusetts, HILL, of Connecticut, CRUMPACKER, of Indiana, and others who are to-day placing loyalty to the people above all else.

When the present governor of Massachusetts voiced the needs of the people in a Republican convention he was advised by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts to leave the party, and in turning his back upon his party and becoming a Democrat and leading the people's cause he was elected by a tremendous majority last year and will be reelected by the largest majority this year ever received by a Democrat in Massachusetts.

There is no turning back from the signs of the times. [Loud applause.]

strong arm, to now be forced to stand with helpless hands while his lands decline in price, see the fruits of his toil sell for less, compelling him to work more and to produce more and sell more for the same amount, in order to keep the home and the farm running. This is not only unjust and unfair to him, but is gross ingratitude. The farm home is an institution and not a factory, and must go on from year to year; the same expenses must be paid from day to day. He therefore can not shut down his farm and close his home, like the mills and factories, when hard times and low prices prevail, and wait for better times as they can do.

The American farmer knows he can not close down and wait, that his industry must go on, and with courage he faces the future and with a loyal devotion to his home, country, and flag, excelled by none, every emotion of his heart pulsating with—

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty—

and realizes he owes a patriotic duty to preserve the home and farm, the hope of the land, without which this country will weaken, fail, and finally perish as nations have done in the past and be known only as they on the historical pages of time.

The American farmer is the chief factor that has created our great American market, built on her soil, in trade and commerce over her rivers and lakes and railroads of which we proudly boast, which exceeds $25,000,000,000 per year, with a production in agricultural and manufactured products four and one-half times greater than all Europe and spending more for education than all the rest of the world combined, the foreigners contributing not one cent in taxes for the maintenance of our schools, churches, roads, bridges, and all other internal improvements that go to make this great market for the use of which he heretofore has had to pay a tariff in order to enjoy the benefits thereof; but this bill, in effect, proposes to compel the American farmer to tax himself to build roads and bridges and highways, so that the Canadian may conveniently travel over them to every American farmer's door as his competitor without money or price. How reciprocal(?).

It has been admitted in debate by friends of this measure that the price of wheat in recent years in the United States has averaged somewhat over 10 cents per bushel more than in Canada, and that this proposed measure, if put into force, would either lower the price of American wheat or raise the price of Canadian wheat. If the former should happen, as intended in the bill, it would have produced a direct loss to the American wheat raiser of $74,000,000, applied to that crop of 1909, and a loss to the Kansas wheat grower last year of the vast sum of $8,500,000. And applying this to the middle and western portion of Kansas, where by skillful farming, the production of wheat, oats, and barley has been developed second to no other portion of our country, driving the arid boundary westward beyond the Colorado line, will work an irreparable injury and perhaps destruction to that industry there.

What loss would come to the American farmer on other products of his can not now be ascertained, but, as affecting one interest alone, again I want your attention to the words of Mr. Laurier when he said, in the aforesaid address:

> Then there is the cattle trade. Years ago we had a cattle trade with Great Britain. We have some yet, but it is not as large as it ought to be, because everybody knows that it has been constantly retarded by the exchange embargo put upon it some 20 years ago or so, and therefore, if we are not able to sell all the cattle we can raise, in Great Britain, there is a ready market in the United States.

Great Britain, to whom Canada owes her allegiance, places an embargo on the cattle trade from Canada, and we are here now removing all embargoes as a gracious gift to her Canadian daughter. How generous(?). How reciprocal(?). How fair(?).

A few comparisons will be sufficient to establish the fact that this so-called reciprocal measure is not reciprocal in any respect, but wholly unilateral in spirit and effect:

(1) It gives to Canada a market of 92,000,000 of people, valued annually at $25,000,000,000, for a market of less than 9,000,000 of people, which is far less in proportion to her people than that of our own.

(2) It gives free trade in our great market for all Canadian farm products and refuses free lumber, coal, iron ore, and the like to the American farmer.

(3) It opens our markets freely, but does not require Canada to remove the export duty on her wood and wood pulp that we buy from her.

(4) As to the reciprocal nature of this agreement, the opinion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is worth considering. In the same address above referred to he compliments the Canadian minister of finance, Mr. Fielding, and the Canadian minister of customs, Mr. Patterson, who negotiated the agreement with our Secretary of State, and thanks these two men for having obtained from the United States such an advantageous arrangement and "having obtained it without the sacrifice of any Canadian interest." In other words, he means to say the United States gave all and Canada gave nothing in return.

(5) Pass this bill and we take a step backward among the nations of the earth, for Germany, France, Belgium, and the rest of the world have long since discarded the old reactionary policy of giving free trade in farm products, that even free-trade England is anxious to discard, which will bring dearth and depression to our agricultural industry; our rural population will surely decrease and the slogan "Back to the farm" will become obsolete, and "Go West, young man," will not take him to Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, or the great Middle West, but will be unheeded by him, and he will turn his back on the old home and country and either face toward Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or Alberta, to there swear allegiance to a king and live under another flag, or toward the overcrowded cities, to abide where slums and saloons abound, as breeding places of ignorance, lawlessness, crime, and anarchy. Such is not conducive to, but dangerous to the country's welfare.

It has been urged that this measure will lessen the price of food products and cheapen the cost of living to all; that it will lessen the value of food products of the producer, yes; but to the consumer, no. The consumer does not eat wheat, but the product of the Flour Trust; he does not eat fat cattle, but the products of the Beef Trust. Neither does he eat other raw materials of the producer, but the manufactured food products so completely controlled by the other trusts of our country. It is apparent, therefore, that this measure is not in the interest of the producers nor the consumers of manufactured food products, but in the interest of the conspiracy of organized avarice and greed; and the trusts, combines, and corporations will absorb, as additional profits, all reductions it will force from the producer of farm products long before it reaches the consumer of food products.

The greatest beneficiaries under this measure will undoubtedly be the trusts, combines, and corporatons who buy and sell the food products, both of the producer and consumer, together with the railroads who will transport these products from the Canadian fields to our midst in competition with our own home products. It is perfectly natural, therefore, that the Hills, Rockefellers, Morgans, Vanderbilts, and other captains of high finance are reported as favoring the passage of this measure, which is not only unreciprocal, but class legislation against a large body of our American citizens in favor of a foreign people, and is obnoxiously discriminative in character as against one class of our own people in favor of another, for it gives to the American farmer a free-trade market in which to sell his products and amply protects the trusts and combines of the country in their methods in the handling of the food products of our people. It forces the farmer to compete with free wheat and protects the Flour Trust on its flour at 50 cents per barrel. It gives free competition in barley for the farmer and 45 cents per hundred pounds protection to the brewer on malt barley; free competition in live stock for the farmer and $1.25 per hundred protection to the Beef Trust for its meats; free competition in free flaxseed and other oil seed for the farmer and ample protection on linseed oil and such products for the Oil Trust; free competition in horses and cattle for the farmer and protection at $1.25 per thousand on lumber for the Lumber Trust to house them; free competition in dairy products for the farmer and protection on coal at 45 cents per ton for the Coal Trust. Besides the Sugar Trust, the Steel Trust, and all the other products of the numerous other trusts seemed to be favored as against the American farmer, which is unfair, unjust, un-Republican, and un-American.

In placing myself in opposition to this measure, along with many others of like belief, I am not unmindful of the sensation that awaits our experiences beneath the most powerful machine of the times—the steam roller of the opposition—which is operated so skillfully by the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber. Unpleasant for a time it may be, but the conscientiousness of having stood for and defended the rights of the people we represent will be satisfaction everlasting. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY].

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill one would be justified in the assumption that the paper manufacturers and lumbermen of the country would be forced into bankruptcy in the event of the passage of this measure. I am in favor of the Canadian reciprocity bill because the Lumber Trust and all its allied interests are opposing it and because it typifies the most advanced character of pro-

gressive legislation in behalf of the great masses of our people. [Applause.] The activity of the special interests in their endeavor to defeat this measure is a sign of the times.

We find the best thought of the Democratic Party of the Nation favoring this Canadian reciprocity bill, and there seems no question in my mind that its passage will eventually lower the cost of living to our people.

I do not think that God in His wisdom ever intended that an unnatural barrier should rise as a monument to greed, avarice, and the lust of wealth between the people of this country and their neighbors across the Canadian border. [Applause.]

What matters it if the earnings of the Lumber and Paper Trusts and their satellites are reduced if a market for the exportation of our products and the interchange of Canadian goods makes lighter the burden borne by the great masses of our toilers. [Applause.]

But above and beyond all else there is absolutely no question in my mind but what the present high and intolerant cost of living to our people can be lowered materially if we remove the present tariff walls existing between the United States and Canada and allow the wage earners of the land to enjoy the benefits to be derived from Canadian staple products.

To say that there can be no advantage in opening to the widest extent the great market upon our borders is the sheerest folly. Let me present for a moment as a fair and well-drawn illustration the actual conditions in the city of New York that have come about under the present high cost of living.

New York City has a population in round numbers of 4,700,000. It is estimated that these 4,700,000 persons spend about $2,350,000 a day for food. According to the tables of the United States Bureau of Labor the price of beef in 1909 showed an increase of 32 per cent over the average price for the 10 years between 1890 and 1900.

Bread showed an increase of 24 per cent.
Butter showed an increase of 35 per cent.
Eggs showed an increase of 42 per cent.
Flour showed an increase of 54 per cent.
Milk showed an increase of 41 per cent.
Mutton showed an increase of 35 per cent.
Fresh pork showed an increase of 68 per cent.
Salt pork and bacon showed an increase of 80 per cent.
Ham showed an increase of 45 per cent.
Potatoes showed an increase of 20 per cent.
Veal showed an increase of 30 per cent.

This means that the people of the city of New York are paying $180,000 a day more for meat, or $66,000,000 a year, than they would pay under the prices of the previous decade.

They are paying $34,000 a day more for eggs, or $12,000,000 a year.

They are paying $20,000 a day more for milk, or $7,000,000 a year.

They are paying $34,000 a day more for butter, or $12,000,000 a year.

They are paying $7,000 a day more for potatoes, or $2,600,000 a year.

They are paying $267,000 a day more for other articles of food, or $101,000,000 a year.

Thus the people of New York are paying $542,000 more a day for food, or $200,000,000 more a year for food, under the present prices than they would pay under the average prices of 1890–1900.

My friends, let us soberly realize the great problem that confronts us with the people of one American city paying an increase of $200,000,000 on foodstuffs in a single year.

The passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill will realize a double gain for the American people. For we will put raw materials upon the free list which will save our small manufacturers a substantial part of what it now costs them to run their factories, and also let in the food products from the great harvest fields of Canada which will ameliorate the conditions in our cities, such as I have just illustrated, by reducing the cost of living.

I believe also that there is a great and important side of this question that has not as yet been considered in the debate upon this tremendously vital economic issue, and that is the opportunity that lies for moving a new and vastly important commerce of another land through the ports of the United States.

And I beg in connection with this proposed gain in American commerce that you will note how almost entirely dependent Canada is upon her eastern and western terminals for the movement of such commerce, while the United States has so many outlets necessary for this new trade.

No adequate defense can be presented for the trade barriers we have erected against the Canadian Dominion. The trade of our country with Canada should flow as freely as between the States of the Union, for we need the raw materials, the food supply, and the taking advantage of the wonderful natural resources of the Dominion.

To-day all over the land may be noted the demand of hundreds of small manufacturers that they may have the free raw materials of Canada in view of the rapidly increasing competition which they are feeling more and more each year. For the full measure of prosperity will only come to the small manufacturers when they realize an ability to secure the necessary free raw materials for their factories on the fairest and most equitable terms.

The most grievous fact that appears in the trade relations between the United States and Canada is that in the main we have taxed the people of the Dominion on the majority of goods a duty nearly twice as large as that which Canada places upon American goods.

We are establishing a system of continental freedom of trade in the passage of this measure. We are realizing for the first time, as we should have realized years ago, how important—yes, how vitally necessary to us—are the products of the Canadian forests, the earth, the sea, and the mines, and we will allow the American workingman to freely exchange his products with the Canadian lumberman, farmer, fisherman, and miner and pay for them, in reality, with products of our own, for you must bear in mind that the people of Canada are as yet little engaged in manufacturing pursuits and form an ideal people for us to trade with.

The people of Canada, by reason of our greater development in manufacturing, are to-day vitally in need of the things we are most engaged in making, and which we must sell more and more to foreign buyers if we are to continue to grow in prosperity.

With trade flowing as freely between the United States and Canada as between the States of our Union, we shall realize again that great prosperity which followed the trade centers of the East and the great agricultural centers of the West, and find history inevitably repeating itself between the manufacturing centers of the United States and the great and rapidly developing agricultural districts of the Dominion.

Never in the history of this Republic have the conditions of great affluence upon the one hand and extreme poverty upon the other been so strongly paralleled, and the only protest that now rises in the country against the passage of this measure is the voice in behalf of special interest.

The marvelous economic awakening of our people that caused the recent upheaval in politics and gave so wonderful a Democratic victory was the voice of the people crying out for relief from the exactions of a high and intolerant cost of living, and the very presence of many new faces upon the other side of this historic Chamber and a few new ones also at the extreme end of this Chamber, can be considered in no sense as the result of a personal victory, but rather the righteous demand of the people for a new order of things in the economic life of our country.

The result of the recent elections was as pleasing to those Democrats chosen to carry the message of the people as it proved displeasing and disastrous to many men who heard the voice of the people during the days of the Sixty-first Congress and heeded it not.

The tremendous increase in population in this country during the past 20 years and the gradual decrease in the purchasing power of the American dollar has been such that every thinking man realizes that a stronger and better economic policy is vitally necessary to our people.

It is a very narrow line that marks the difference between the purchasing power and the income of the American laborer, and this reciprocity measure, in giving a wider market to our exports, will aid the well-being of those who produce with their brains and hands the wealth of the land.

The American workingman should rejoice to find in the Republican ranks men of the type of McCALL, of Massachusetts, HILL, of Connecticut, CRUMPACKER, of Indiana, and others who are to-day placing loyalty to the people above all else.

When the present governor of Massachusetts voiced the needs of the people in a Republican convention he was advised by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts to leave the party, and in turning his back upon his party and becoming a Democrat and leading the people's cause he was elected by a tremendous majority last year and will be reelected by the largest majority this year ever received by a Democrat in Massachusetts.

There is no turning back from the signs of the times. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412 and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. FAISON was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of A. M. Williams, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HENRY of Texas, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

Also to Mr. DRAPER, indefinitely.

CONCLUSION OF GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that after three hours' debate in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to-morrow on the bill H. R. 4412, general debate shall close, and that one hour of that time shall be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], one hour by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and one hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill shall run for three hours to-morrow—one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], one hour by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], and the other hour by himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes), the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, April 21, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a draft of a bill for improvements at Edgemore Lighthouse Depot, Del. (H. Doc. No. 21); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation as to disbursements of appropriations for certain exigency work in connection with the care of public buildings (H. Doc. No. 22); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 6293) to divest intoxicating liquors of their interstate-commerce character in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6294) providing for the allotment of the Camp McDowell Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 6295) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes of 1878 of an act providing for soldiers and sailors acquiring homesteads in public lands of the United States, and deductions of military and naval service from the time required generally to perfect title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6296) to diminish the expense of proceedings on appeal and writ of error or of certiorari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6297) increasing pensions of Indian War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6298) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6299) to provide for the erection of a public building at Naugatuck, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6300) to provide for the erection of a public building at Seymour, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 6301) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station within Cherokee County, in the third congressional district, State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 6302) to remedy in the line of the Army the inequalities in rank due to the past system of regimental promotion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 6303) to repeal section 40 of the act approved August 5, 1909, which authorizes the issuance of certificates of indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6304) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining, and to regulate the expenditures thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) to establish a biological and fish-cultural station in the twenty-third congressional district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) granting pensions to all enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War or the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6307) for the relief of the Kentucky drafted men; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6308) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and to provide for national aid in the improvement of the public roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 6309) to amend section 647, chapter 18, Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 6310) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Choctaw and Chickasaw Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6311) for the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 6312) to repeal an act entitled "An act granting the use of certain lands in the Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas, to the Barry Hospital," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6313) to provide an eight-hour workday for United States penitentiary guards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6314) to provide payment for overtime to United States penitentiary guards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6315) providing for a military highway between Forts Leavenworth and Riley, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6316) authorizing the designation and employment of a medical officer of the Army as director of sanitation of the government of Porto Rico, and prescribing compensation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6317) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6318) to provide for the assignment of certain water rights acquired by the United States under the laws of the different States and Territories; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6319) to amend section 2139 of the Revised Statutes of the United States of 1878; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6320) providing for the allowance of compensation to the members of the United States Land Commission to the Territory of New Mexico, created under the act of Congress of June 21, 1898; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6321) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of land in severalty," etc., approved February 28, 1901; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6322) for the relief of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6323) to regulate and fix the fees of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6324) for the erection of a public building at Winnsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6325) for the erection of a public building at Cheraw, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6326) for the erection of a public building at Yorkville, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6328) to provide for a substitute list of storekeeper-gaugers in the Internal-Revenue Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the Battle of Cowpens on the 17th day of January, 1781; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6330) relating to the removal of civil cases from the State courts to United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6331) to set aside a portion of certain lands in the new State of Arizona now known as the Grand Canyon National Monument and Coconino National Forest as a public park, to be known as the Carnegie National Park, in commemoration of the name of the founder of some of America's greatest institutions and the benefactor of mankind by the promotion of everlasting peace among all nations of the earth without the use of arms; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6332) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6333) to cooperate with the States in encouraging instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics in secondary schools; in preparing teachers for those vocational subjects in State normal schools, and to appropriate money therefor and to regulate its expenditure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 113) calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury for information relative to expenses of the Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 114) amending Rules X and XI; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for an investigation of the undervaluations, frauds, and other malpractices of the persons controlling the American Sugar Co.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMS: Resolution (H. Res. 116) providing for a stenographer to the Committee on War Claims; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LLOYD: Resolution (H. Res. 117) providing for a clerk and messenger to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 118) providing for clerical and messenger service to the several committees on expenditures in the executive departments; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 72) for the appointment of a committee to investigate commerce on the high seas; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 6334) granting an increase of pension to David Whitehead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6335) granting an increase of pension to William J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6336) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Arntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6337) granting an increase of pension to Martin H. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Blackford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6339) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Covell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6341) granting an increase of pension to James Carper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6342) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Chance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6343) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6344) granting an increase of pension to John Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6345) granting an increase of pension to Peter Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6346) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Dale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6347) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Gish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6349) granting an increase of pension to John Gruver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6350) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6351) granting an increase of pension to Frederick K. Hewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6352) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6353) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6354) granting an increase of pension to Erwin M. Harley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6355) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6356) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6357) granting an increase of pension to John P. Lonsway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6358) granting an increase of pension to Helen Longley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6359) granting an increase of pension to John Lutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6360) granting an increase of pension to Ruben V. Lott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6361) granting an increase of pension to Alfred C. McClead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6362) granting an increase of pension to Vinel E. McCreary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6363) granting an increase of pension to John H. Mohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6364) granting an increase of pension to William A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6365) granting an increase of pension to John Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6366) granting an increase of pension to William H. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6367) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6368) granting an increase of pension to William Newson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6369) granting an increase of pension to George P. Ogg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6370) granting an increase of pension to William B. Olds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6371) granting an increase of pension to Erwin A. Ogden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6372) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rokla; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6373) granting an increase of pension to John W. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6374) granting an increase of pension to Edwin F. Spink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to John Shellhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6376) granting an increase of pension to George Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6377) granting an increase of pension to Eli Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6378) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shindorff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6379) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) granting an increase of pension to William Swaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6381) granting an increase of pension to Henry Strouss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6382) granting an increase of pension to Giles J. Titus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6383) granting an increase of pension to William Updegraff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6385) granting an increase of pension to David Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6386) granting an increase of pension to Frederick H. Winiker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6387) granting an increase of pension to Celius W. Worman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6388) granting an increase of pension to David Wertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) granting an increase of pension to James T. Waltemire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6390) granting a pension to Elizabeth Youngblood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6391) granting an increase of pension to George Zabriskie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) granting an increase of pension to William O. Bulger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6393) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Blaine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6394) granting an increase of pension to Everett E. Garner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) granting a pension to Mary A. Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6396) granting a pension to Alice J. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) granting a pension to Desdamona T. Perin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6398) granting a pension to Margaret Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6399) granting an increase of pension to Margarita B. Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6400) for the relief of Emiliano Martinez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6401) for the relief of Jesus Gallegos y Vigil; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6402) for the relief of Pedro Rafael Trujillo; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6403) for the relief of Nicolas Apodaca; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6404) for the relief of Jose Salazar y Ortiz; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6405) for the relief of the estate of Martin Vigil, deceased, and the administrator of said estate, Eslavio Vigil; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 6406) granting a pension to Catharine Crockett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6407) to pay to the city of Leavenworth, Kans., taxes with interest assessed against the lots on which is located the Federal building for street improvements adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6408) to pay the city of Topeka, Kans., taxes, with interest, assessed against the lots on which is located the Federal building for street improvements adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6409) for the relief of James Stanton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6410) for the relief of John T. Glynn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6411) granting an increase of pension to William S. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 6412) granting a pension to Edward Waldo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6413) granting an increase of pension to John Hornbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6414) granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6415) granting an increase of pension to George W. Soules; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6416) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6417) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6418) granting an increase of pension to Pethuel Dorcas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6419) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Gelston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6420) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Whitmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6421) granting a pension to Susan Babcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 6422) granting an increase of pension to David H. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 6423) for the relief of R. H. Davis, administrator of the estate of Enos Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6424) for the relief of the heirs of Gladney, Gardner & Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6425) for the relief of the estate of R. C. Bumpass, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6426) granting an increase of pension to George W. Holdson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6427) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6428) granting an increase of pension to Eric Oleson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 6429) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6430) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Gough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6431) granting an increase of pension to Phillip P. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6432) granting an increase of pension to James W. McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6433) granting an increase of pension to William H. Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6434) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6435) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Luce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6436) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Gustin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6437) granting an increase of pension to David Gough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6438) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6439) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Dunlap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6440) granting an increase of pension to Henry N. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6441) granting an increase of pension to William Frye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6442) granting an increase of pension to George A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6443) granting an increase of pension to John I. Barrows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6444) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6445) granting an increase of pension to William Barrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6446) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6447) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Welshimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6448) granting an increase of pension to David Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6449) granting a pension to Ellen Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6450) for the relief of C. C. Shearer; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 6451) for the relief of Annie McColgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 6452) granting a pension to Henry Langley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6453) granting a pension to William L. Hicklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6454) granting a pension to Theresa J. Sowell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6455) for the relief of St. John's Episcopal Church, at Winnsboro, S. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6456) for the relief of U. G. Des Portes, administrator of the estate of S. S. Wolfe, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6457) for the relief of J. M. Moore; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6458) for the relief of the estate of A. E. Hutchison; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6459) granting an increase of pension to William H. Benthall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6460) granting an increase of pension to J. C. Judy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6461) granting an increase of pension to Recorder M. Mudgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6462) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6463) granting an increase of pension to Spencer C. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6464) granting an increase of pension to Blockmon E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 6465) granting a pension to Albert Truffner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6466) granting a pension to John Zilkie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6467) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Zuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 6468) granting a pension to Laura J. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6469) granting a pension to William Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 6470) granting an increase of pension to Frank Cleaves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 6471) granting an increase of pension to William F. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6472) granting a pension to Albert G. Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6473) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6474) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Lewis M. Maney; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6475) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph H. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6476) for the relief of F. S. McRady; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6477) for the relief of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Tullahoma, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6478) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Henry Pepper and Elizabeth H. Cleveland, heirs of William Pepper, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6479) granting an increase of pension to Ferree Pirtle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6480) granting an increase of pension to William H. Merritt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6481) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Lockwood Coen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6482) granting a pension to Jenkins Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 6483) granting a pension to Frank Doering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 6484) granting an increase of pension to Charles Rutty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6485) granting an increase of pension to Orlando English; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Lucas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6487) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6488) granting an increase of pension to Randolph M. Manley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6489) granting an increase of pension to Minor Hoover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6490) granting an increase of pension to T. Fleming Lent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6491) granting an increase of pension to William F. Merrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6492) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6493) granting an increase of pension to L. W. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6494) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6495) granting an increase of pension to Wilson Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6496) granting an increase of pension to Eldridge G. Van Dyke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6497) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah E. Vansice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6498) granting an increase of pension to Dallas J. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6499) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6500) granting an increase of pension to Berlin F. Myer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6501) granting an increase of pension to William Kintner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6502) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) granting a pension to James H. Sawyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6504) granting a pension to Harvey G. Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6505) granting a pension to Mary Ann Hembury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 6506) granting an increase of pension to Robert Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6507) granting an increase of pension to James R. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6508) granting a pension to Martin M. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6509) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Lively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 6510) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6511) granting a pension to Clarence M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6512) granting an increase of pension to Francis G. French, alias Frank Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6513) granting a pension to Amelia Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 6514) granting an increase of pension to George W. Frazee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 6515) granting an increase of pension to L. Alonzo Dennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6516) granting an increase of pension to John McMahon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6517) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fulks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6518) granting an increase of pension to William H. Van Horn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MITCHELL: A bill (H. R. 6519) granting an increase of pension to McArthur W. Brittingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to Julius E. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6521) granting an increase of pension to Albert Bauswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6522) granting an increase of pension to William McClure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6523) granting a pension to Margaret Dickson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6524) granting a pension to Hugh J. McKane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6525) for the relief of the University of Kansas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Elipha M. Field; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6527) granting an increase of pension to Jane McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6528) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6529) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Lyghton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6530) granting an increase of pension to Margaret T. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6531) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 6532) granting an increase of pension to Christopher U. Rumpf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6533) granting an increase of pension to George Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6534) granting an increase of pension to John F. Staley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6535) granting an increase of pension to James T. Riordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6536) granting an increase of pension to John O'Harrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6537) granting a pension to William H. Lowry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6538) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6539) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cameron, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6540) granting a pension to McCullough Tally; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6541) granting a pension to William Fosler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6542) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel E. Calvert; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6543) granting a pension to Gertie Lee Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6544) for the relief of the heirs of John W. West, deceased; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 6545) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6546) granting a pension to Ophelia McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6547) granting an increase of pension to Benton Braden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 6548) for the relief of the heirs of George S. Thebo; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 6549) granting an increase of pension to Edwin L. Hoopes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6550) for the relief of J. M. Gurley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6551) for the relief of the heirs of J. D. Bellah, sr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6552) for the relief of Samuel E. Howell and James H. Howell, in their own right and as sole heirs of Mary Ann Thomas, deceased, and William T. Howell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6553) granting a pension to Louis H. Dowd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 6554) for the relief of Nicholas C. Buswell; to the Committee on War Calims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6555) for the relief of the Winchester Repeating Arms Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6556) granting a pension to William C. Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6557) granting an increase of pension to John Speers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 6558) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6559) granting an increase of pension to George H. Wirebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6560) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6561) granting an increase of pension to John Bash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6562) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay Corbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6563) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Ketchum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6564) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Heiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6565) granting an increase of pension to Francis Lombard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6566) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan Erdman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Sheets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6568) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Freer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6569) granting an increase of pension to Job Wetmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6570) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6571) granting an increase of pension to John S. McGinness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6572) granting an increase of pension to Eugene B. Guild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6573) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Gurr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, A bill (H. R. 6574) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Robb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6575) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hurst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6576) granting an increase of pension to William F. Stamets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6577) granting an increase of pension to William Cook Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6578) granting an increase of pension to John A. Brimmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6579) granting an increase of pension to Dennis McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6580) granting an increase of pension to William L. Poust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6581) granting an increase of pension to William Willoughby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6582) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Metzgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6583) granting an increase of pension to James Steen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6584) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6585) granting an increase of pension to Horatio P. Keyte; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6586) granting an increase of pension to Percey H. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6587) granting an increase of pension to Peter Dayton, alias William Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6588) granting an increase of pension to Leonard H. Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6589) granting an increase of pension to Peter Schaddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6590) granting an increase of pension to William Bessinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6591) granting an increase of pension to Harriet M. Ritter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6592) granting an increase of pension to James E. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6593) granting an increase of pension to David O'Brien; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6594) granting an increase of pension to Eli Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6595) granting an increase of pension to George W. Musto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6596) granting an increase of pension to Frederick R. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6597) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. McCowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6598) granting an increase of pension to Harry T. Peet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6599) granting an increase of pension to John Maneval; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6600) granting an increase of pension to Jennie K. Noll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6601) granting an increase of pension to William W. Bird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6602) granting a pension to Marie de Planque; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6604) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hoof; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) granting an increase of pension to Israel Osman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6606) granting an increase of pension to John Sweeds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6607) granting an increase of pension to Robert Karstetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6608) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer Mott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6609) granting an increase of pension to Isaac A. Brosius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6610) granting an increase of pension to Ashbell C. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6611) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6612) granting an increase of pension to Elias Merrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6613) granting an increase of pension to John Koch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6614) granting an increase of pension to Abram Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6615) granting an increase of pension to John Brinser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6616) granting an increase of pension to Philip Kohler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6617) granting an increase of pension to Eli K. Peasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6618) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah T. Woodward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6619) granting an increase of pension to Ernest G. Treat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6620) granting an increase of pension to Solomon W. Shadle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6621) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Haneen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6622) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6623) granting an increase of pension to Silas E. Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) granting an increase of pension to James E. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6625) granting an increase of pension to Oren M. Card; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6626) granting an increase of pension to Peter F. Reeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6627) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Shank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6628) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) granting an increase of pension to George Couch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6630) granting an increase of pension to William B. Reece; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to Squire L. Gage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6632) granting an increase of pension to John Lyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 6633) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Shemery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6634) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fessenden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 6635) granting an increase of pension to John Ludwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6636) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Johnstonbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6637) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6638) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Pfoutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6639) granting an increase of pension to William H. Strunk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6640) granting an increase of pension to Charles Chilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6641) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Brimegin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6642) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6643) granting an increase of pension to David Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6644) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Zeller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6645) granting an increase of pension to Howard D. Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6646) granting an increase of pension to Johnston R. Lambright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6647) granting an increase of pension to John Croak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6648) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6649) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Hillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6650) granting an increase of pension to Henry Harer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6651) granting an increase of pension to Cecile O. Hamill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6652) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Douglass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6653) granting an increase of pension to Norman M. Ostrander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6654) granting an increase of pension to John Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) granting an increase of pension to Emer E. Irons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6656) granting an increase of pension to John F. Burkhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6657) granting an increase of pension to John Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6658) granting an increase of pension to Jacob S. Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6659) granting an increase of pension to M. J. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6660) granting an increase of pension to William C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6661) granting an increase of pension to John W. Corle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Holter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) granting an increase of pension to William Coder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6664) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Moon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6665) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Tibbens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6666) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6667) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6668) granting an increase of pension to George J. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6669) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6670) granting an increase of pension to Hurlbutt L. Farnsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer A. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) granting an increase of pension to William Hancock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Eddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) granting an increase of pension to William M. Everhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Fravel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6676) granting an increase of pension to John S. Schuyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6677) granting an increase of pension to James A. Roche; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6678) granting an increase of pension to Hiram L. Yoder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6679) granting an increase of pension to George S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6680) granting an increase of pension to John Shroat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6681) granting an increase of pension to John L. G. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6682) granting an increase of pension to David McClintock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6683) granting an increase of pension to John Bossinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6684) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Smead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6685) granting an increase of pension to William Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6686) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6687) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6688) granting an increase of pension to Josiah W. Harding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6689) granting an increase of pension to James L. Bonnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6690) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Flenker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6691) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Knepp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6692) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Grafius; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6693) granting an increase of pension to Clayton P. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6694) granting an increase of pension to David Rorabaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6695) granting an increase of pension to John Abott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6696) granting an increase of pension to William E. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Casson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6698) granting an increase of pension to John H. W. Lawrance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6699) granting an increase of pension to George W. Buckbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6700) granting an increase of pension to John A. Crissman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) granting a pension to Mary A. Rowland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6702) granting a pension to William Lammerhirt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6703) granting a pension to Martin V. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6704) granting a pension to Charles W. Brace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6705) granting a pension to Paulina L. Klepper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6706) granting a pension to Emma J. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6707) granting a pension to Sara Jane Staddon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6708) granting a pension to Lou Pedigree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) granting a pension to Edward H. Presit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) granting a pension to Katie E. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6711) granting a pension to Chauncey G. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6712) granting a pension to William T. East; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6713) to correct the military record of John H. Smith, alias Henry H. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6714) to correct the military record of George P. Bailey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6715) to correct the military record of John A. O'Dell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6716) to correct the military record of Hiram B. Willson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6717) to correct the military record of Joseph G. Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6718) to correct the military record of George O. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6719) to correct the military record of Dennis Haneen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6720) to correct the military record of C. W. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6721) for the relief of James R. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6722) for the relief of Stephen Campbell and Isaac Overdorf; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6723) for the relief of William S. Rote; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6724) for the relief of John L. O'Mara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

My Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 6725) granting an increase of pension to Apollas W. Moffit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6726) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6727) granting a pension to Fidel Borer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AKIN of New York: Petition of workers in paper mills at Glens Falls, N. Y., against reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension of William J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Cantwell Shoe Co. and 20 other merchants of Coshocton, Ohio, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AYRES: Petitions of Spingarn Bros. and of Washburn, Crosby & Co., both of New York, in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of citizens of the tenth congressional district, State of Indiana, against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of Baptist Church of Penfield, Monroe County, N. Y., favoring the passage of H. R. 1620, to prevent the nullification of State antigambling laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or of racing odds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Fairport Grange, No. 467, Patrons of Husbandry, of Fairport, Monroe County, N. Y., against the passage of the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of citizens of McLeod County, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, earnestly declaring that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton should be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bills for the relief of Joseph W. Adams (H. R. 5359), Beneville De Long (H. R. 5362), Jacob A. Wolfe (H. R. 5364), William H. Bobbs (H. R. 5361), Peter Belcher (H. R. 5360), John R. Leffard (H. R. 5363), and Jackson Taylor Vaun (H. R. 5440); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Petitions of Manufacturers of New York Association and Niagara Falls Local, No. 51, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pratts Patent (Ltd.), against H. R. 4413, putting dog biscuits and other domestic food for animals on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Petition of G. M. Ward and other citizens of Mount Vernon, Ill., against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of American Paper & Pulp Association, against the Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of La Salle, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petitions of Querns Bros., of Philadelphia; G. C. Hetzel & Co., of Chester, Pa.; John Thompson, editor of Farmer and Breeder, Sioux City, Iowa; George F. Tullock, secretary County Grange, Rockford, Ill.; and numerous other citizens, against the Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petitions from 994 residents of Gloucester, Manchester, Beverly Farms, Salem, and Haverhill, Mass., favoring a national department of public health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GOEKE: Resolutions of Holly Start Grange, No. 1718, of Canton, Ohio, and Auglaize Grange, No. 347, Allen County, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Lankin, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. D. Lammle, of Ashley, N. Dak., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Enderlin, N. Dak., favoring increase of salary to the rural free delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of William R. McHaffie and 49 other citizens of San Francisco, Cal., who are dependent upon the pulp and paper industry for their income and support, protesting against the passage of the reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of citizens of Bellingham, State of Washington, for the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of William R. McHaffie and 49 other residents of San Francisco, Cal., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by San Francisco Labor Council, protesting imprisonment without trial in Rostov and Novocherkaska, Russia, of 500 Armenians, for political causes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of the financial board of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, now in session in Washington, D. C., against the Hardwick bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of residents of Omaha, Nebr., asking that lemons be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Herbert F. Hagadorn and others, of Carthage, N. Y., and Martin Nolan and others, of Hainsville, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolution of Carpenters' District Council, Providence, R. I., to repeal the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, which have also been indorsed by their respective divisions in Kansas City, Mo., protesting against a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of board of directors of the produce exchange of Los Angeles, and the members thereof, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 7649, whereby the time of carrying butter, eggs, and poultry in cold storage is to be limited to 90 days; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Spratts Patent, America (Ltd.), of Newark, N. J., protesting against putting dog cakes and other foods for domestic animals on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George C. Edwards, Bridgeport, Conn., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Tioga County Pomona Grange, No. 30; Bert Tuttle and others, of Austenburg; Tioga Valley Grange, No. 918, of Mansfield; and Lookout Grange, No. 1426, Keating Summit, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. G. Graham and others, of Jersey Shore, Pa., and Charles Anderson and others, of Sheffield, Pa., requesting the withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *April 21, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, fountain of wisdom, source of all good, keep us, we beseech Thee, in touch with Thee through the remaining hours of this day that we enter not into temptation, that we do wrong to no man, but with high resolves and noble purposes we may go forward with the work Thou hast given us to do. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HILL was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Kate Maliol, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Jake H. Wackert, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. SWITZER was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of important business.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9066) relating to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property act, and for other purposes, and to amend and revise the same, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY BILL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Chairman, in arising to close the debate in behalf of those Members upon this side of the House who believe in the policy of the present bill, I desire to say that I think the House is to be congratulated upon the illuminating discussion to which it has had an opportunity to listen. The speeches delivered upon both sides of the question and upon both sides of the aisle have been worthy of the subject—a subject which, as was said by the gentleman from Illinois yesterday, is one of the most important ever before the American Congress. The bill has important international aspects and features of an economic character that call for the careful consideration of every Member. It does not make an appeal for the use of the heroics of the hustings, but for the best thought each one of us is capable of giving it.

I listened with great interest to the speech of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS]—the first speech that he has had an opportunity to deliver in this House, of which he has been almost the directing agency for nearly 20 years. It was a speech beautiful in structure, such a speech as is made out of a full mind, and it was entirely worthy of the subject which he discussed. I say that, although I profoundly disbelieve in the conclusions which he maintained. I regretted to notice, however, the pessimistic tone that the gentleman adopted with reference to the American farmer. But it is not strange that, having been in a position where for 20 years he could not escape from listening to the debates, he should have caught the minor key in which the praises of the farmer are usually sung upon this floor. [Applause.]

According to his eulogists here, the American farmer is a very serious-minded individual, with his wife and numerous progeny gathered about him—and I observe that these eulogists usually bless him with a bountiful offspring—desperately and with great solemnity endeavoring to cling to a precarious existence. These orators lament over his rugged qualities, they almost brood over his virtues, and as for his faults, he has none, for he is a being to whom it is impossible to sin.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience with the American farmer. I have seen him in his native lair. It was my great good fortune to live for a number of years in my boyhood upon one of those glorious farms in northwestern Illinois—a $200-an-acre farm, as the gentleman from Indiana called it—one of those prairie farms, not the flat farms that you have farther to the west, but where you have the billows of the prairie tumbling about you. One of those farms which, when they are under cultivation, present a scene of pastoral beauty and of fertility such as can scarcely be found anywhere in the world. I have seen farmers actually burn corn for fuel, as has been so dramatically stated in this debate. Why, it has been presented here, as if it showed the destitution of the American farmer and his straitened circumstances, that he actually burned corn for fuel. I have seen him burn corn. Sometimes he would overcrop with one grain and could not sell it profitably, but he was pretty sure to get even on some other grain; and instead of brooding over the burning of corn, more probably the farmer would sit cheerily smoking his pipe in the light of its blazing fire and his sons would rejoice that they did not have to chop wood. [Laughter and applause.]

The American farmer is not the sad-eyed monstrosity, always staring destiny in the face, that we have had painted here. The farmers, as I knew them, were a prosperous, independent, and happy race of men. I have known many farmers, and I have known some men even on Wall Street, and I have made up my mind that they both belong to the same race, and that there is about as much human nature in the one class as in the other. I have sometimes thought that if the numbers were reversed and that if we had 5,000,000 voters on Wall Street and only a few hundred farmers, our statesmen would sing the homely virtues of J. P. Morgan and his crew and would bestow upon them some of these lugubrious eulogiums of which the American farmer has been so long the patient victim. [Applause and laughter.] And their worst enemy could hardly wish them a harder fate.

Now, it is argued against this bill—and I do not propose to weary the House with a repetition of the statistics we have heard—that just as the opening up of the Western States depressed agriculture in New England so the opening up of our markets to Canadian produce will have the same effect upon the agriculture of the country, and especially upon the agriculture of the West. There is no similarity whatever between the two cases. From 1870 to 1890, you will remember, we built railroads simply for the sake of building railroads. We threw, sometimes in a single year, many thousands of miles of railroad across the most fertile land on the face of the globe, land that was uninhabited. Railroads went in advance of civilization, and in order to get business they sent their agents all over Europe stimulating immigration; and it so happened that the financial and commercial depression from 1873 to 1878 threw hundreds of thousands of men out of employment in the East, and they found places upon the western farms. We had brought under cultivation, and their produce thrown upon our markets almost, as it were, in a day, great and fertile States of this Union, and in order to permit the farmers to live the railroads gave them unnaturally low rates to the markets of the country and to those abroad.

It was said by Prof. Meyer that a bushel of wheat could be carried more cheaply from Chicago to Liverpool than from Budapest to Prague, a distance in a straight line of only 175 miles. A man in Illinois could get into the markets of Boston more cheaply than a man who lived in Worcester County in Massachusetts. The result of this abnormally low rate was practically to transport the prairies of the West into the suburbs of New York and Boston. And, of course, agriculture was depressed in New England, not merely from that circumstance, but because of the conditions there which were adverse to agriculture as it was then conducted.

I saw agriculture not only in the West, but when I was a young boy my father sent me to New England to school, and I had an opportunity there to see how they farmed in New England. In the West a farmer could turn a furrow for a mile, if his farm went that far, without taking his hand from the plow; but in New England the farmer would urge his horses, and more often his oxen, for a few feet and then would have to turn out for a stump or stone. [Laughter.] He would try to select smooth little patches upon the hillside. While a New England hillside, with its alternation of little rye fields and cornfields and pasture and meadow and woodland, presents a very beautiful mosaic to the eye, it certainly is not favorable to agriculture. [Laughter.] And it was inevitable that under the adverse natural conditions and with the antiquated methods which the New England farmers employed they could not compete with the rich and fertile prairie lands of the West.

Now, how is it with Canada? Why, there is, as I have said, no parallel between the two cases. Champlain laid the foundations of Port Royal and Quebec before the Pilgrims landed upon Plymouth Rock. That country is as old as this country.

For 150 years it has been a part of the wealthiest empire in the world, and yet to-day it has less than 8,000,000 people, and instead of capitalists putting in their money, thrusting railroads across the cold fields of Canada, Canada has been compelled largely to build her railroads out of her own treasury, and although she has given enormous land grants and vast sums of money she to-day has only about 25,000 miles of railroads in the whole Dominion.

Canada has not the slightest advantage over the West in fertility or in aptitude for agriculture. The advantage is all the other way. The part of Canada gentlemen fear is a country of a single crop. A single crop will sack the soil. The farms in the Canadian northwest are scarcely habitable for a good many months in the year. Agriculture in our West can be carried on under far better conditions than there.

The lands there are not so cheap as they were in the West when it was settled. Rich prairie land sold in the United States for $5 and less an acre. I happen to know a case where a very intelligent business man of New England desired to buy a half section of unbroken land for each of his two sons. He bought it nearly two years ago, selecting it with great judgment and care, and he was compelled to pay the Canadian Pacific Railroad Co. $25 an acre, and another young man bought some land two weeks afterwards and it had risen to $30 an acre; and that prairie land has since been going up in price. These young gentlemen who started out to build their fortunes found that they had to pay a very high price for their horses, had to hire a man to look after their farms in the winter, began with a drought and a poor crop, and at the present time they still have their fortunes to acquire.

But suppose our young men do go to Canada, and many of them have already gone there. Why, the State of Iowa, that wonderful agricultural State, during the last decade lost in population. Does that mean that it declined in prosperity? Not at all. It is one of the greatest, and is destined to continue to be one of the greatest, and richest agricultural regions in the world. But young men have gone from Iowa because they could get more land in Canada than at home. The land of their own State was all taken up. Suppose they shall found upon the eastern slopes of the Canadian Rockies a newer and a fairer Iowa? Who is there who will not wish them Godspeed? [Applause.] They go there to win their fortunes, just as their fathers made their fortunes, by selling in the open markets of the world; and if they deserve to prosper and if the country is so favorable to agriculture, they will repeat the prosperity of their fathers.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], in the course of his speech, alluded to the agricultural conditions in Germany, and to the fact that Bismarck established agricultural duties there. I fancy that Bismarck did not establish agricultural duties so much for the sake of agriculture as to placate the powerful agrarian element and establish generally in Germany the policy of protection. But they have had, ever since the time of Bismarck, high protection upon agricultural products in Germany.

Let us see what the effect has been. There is this singular law, pointed out by Prof. Fawcett, of Cambridge University, England, that while in a great many articles of common use the demand does not increase the price, yet in the case of agricultural products the demand does increase the price, and he reached that conclusion upon a line of argument something like this:

A man may be producing manufactures of cotton or flax or some other article in which labor is the chief element of production, and if there is a demand for twice as many goods of the kind he makes, he doubles the size of his factory and can manufacture even more cheaply than he could before. But in a country like Germany, which normally supports its population, when you come to increase that population under the stimulus of protection, by building up great manufacturing cities and making a strain upon the resources of the soil, there is a greater demand for agricultural produce than the farmer normally has raised. Now, there are in every country some lands that ordinarily are not cultivated because prices do not make it profitable to cultivate them. They are called valueless, but when you raise the price of farm products it pays to till the best of these lands, and the higher the price the poorer the land it will pay to cultivate. There is an "oscillating margin," upon which you may or may not be able profitably to raise farm produce, according as farm produce is high or low. The man who cultivates must get prices that will warrant him in doing so. These prices enable the man who has fertile land to make still more money, and the increased demand for agricultural produce drives people into the cultivation of lands previously unprofitable, and in order to induce them to do it they must of necessity be paid a higher price for their produce.

Now, let us see what has happened in Germany, which relatively to us has a very large population per square mile and which, with a growing population, has had high protection in agriculture for a great many years. The growing demand for foodstuffs has greatly increased prices. I noticed the other day an address made by the chancellor of the German Empire, who is a rigid and uncompromising protectionist. At a meeting of the National Society of Agriculture he said:

> I am especially grateful to the president—
>
> That is, the president of that society—
>
> for his frank admission that the prices of many farm products have in the past year reached an unhealthy height, burdening in a deplorable manner a great number of people.

That comes from the chancellor of the German Empire with reference to this artificial increase in the price of food. He declares that it burdens in a deplorable manner a great number of people.

Let us look further at the situation in Germany. The agrarian element there, who own the land, are a very powerful element. They not only enjoy high and unnatural prices for the common articles of food, but they have great power in directing the German Empire. As you all know, the State owns the railroads. At a certain time of the year the sugar-bearing lands along the Elbe make special demands for agricultural labor, and so it used to be the custom at that time of the year for laborers living along the Oder to go and help in the harvest of these sugar-bearing lands, where they would get better wages, and then when the harvesting was over to come back again. The German railroads gave them excursion rates. Those agrarians who lived along the Oder made a complaint to the German Government in effect that they had a natural right to employ the labor of their locality, and that for the Government to give these laborers excursion rates made it necessary for the agra-

rians to pay higher wages to their men; and although the minister of finance admitted that it was a good thing for the German laborer, although it gave him more money temporarily, although it enabled an untraveled class to get away from home and to see another part of the Empire and have their outlook broadened, yet the Government yielded to the demand of the agrarian element and refused longer to sell the excursion tickets.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] alluded to the law called the Gregory King law, by which he showed that as the supply of an article of common use increased at an arithmetical ratio, the price decreased at practically a geometrical ratio.

That is, you increase the surplus of a necessary article and you depress the price out of all proportion to the amount by which you increase the surplus. It readily occurred to me that there is a reverse to that law, and the other side is illustrated in the case of Germany. If you decrease below the natural demand the supply of an article of common use in an arithmetical ratio, you increase the price of that article in practically a geometrical ratio. [Applause.] I think there is no escape from that conclusion.

Then about the static equilibrium of which he spoke, in nations between agriculture and manufactures. It is a very good thing if you can secure the equilibrium naturally, but it is a very bad thing to pay too much for it. Suppose there is a nation that has coal mines, iron mines, water powers, great facilities for manufacturing, and a poor soil. Is it wise for her to take her people from the operation of the great natural resources and facilities for manufacturing with which she has been blessed and put them to the cultivation of an infertile soil? Is it not better for them to work the mines, to build up manufactures, and exchange their products with some other nation that does not have these resources but has a fertile soil?

Carry it out to extremes on this theory and every household should maintain an equilibrium, and each should have its own blacksmith, its own shoemaker, and its own spinner. The law of modern trade is for men and nations to do the things they are best fitted to do and to exchange products with each other. [Applause.]

I paid close attention to the argument of the gentleman from Maine, because I have a high respect for him and because I was greatly attracted by his speech. There is one other thing to which I wish to call attention. He referred to the British tariff commission, and quoted them as in favor, practically, of reenacting the corn laws. That would strike an ordinary man as an admission almost from the Cobden Club itself in favor of the policy which the gentleman from Maine was advocating. I thought from its name, as very likely the gentleman from Maine thought, that it must be a royal commission, or if not a royal commission it must be a sort of Government commission. I have looked it up, and in Hazell's Annual, which tells you briefly everything about the Empire, you will find the British Tariff Commission tabulated with other similar organizations. On the one side it frankly states the organizations against Mr. Chamberlain's proposal, which was to tax food coming into England, and there we have the Free Trade League and the Cobden Club and others. In the other column they have catalogued the organizations for Mr. Chamberlain's proposal, and among them is the tariff commission, established by Joseph Chamberlain in the beginning of 1904 in order to push along his particular ideas. That is practically the protective-tariff league of the British Empire, and if you read the names you will find there a collection of gentlemen, some of them very comfortable manufacturers, who are deeply concerned, as are the manufacturers in this country, for the poor farmer. [Laughter and applause.]

I could construct a tariff commission like that here, and it would be a commission of more eminent ability. I would put the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], my distinguished, and I may say my illustrious, friend at the head; I would put the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] upon it; I would give a place upon it to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]; and then I would add to it the secretary of the American Protective Tariff League and of the Home Market Club of Massachusetts. And we should have a fine collection of gentlemen, of great ability and great knowledge; but if I wanted to hold forth anything they said in favor of protection as an admission of an ancient enemy to protection I think some of our narrow-minded partisans on the other side would reserve the right to object. [Laughter and applause.]

This whole discussion has revolved about the price of wheat. But first I wish to say a word about the price of land. I do not think the effect of this legislation is going to be to decrease the price of land, but to keep it from going up too rapidly in value. So far as competition with Canada is concerned, if North Dakota, which has a longer summer and a shorter winter than Canada, can be a part of the same agricultural domain and can compete with Kansas and Iowa and Oklahoma and those wonderfully rich lands toward the South, lands as fertile as those in Campania, where, as Virgil said—

> Summer borrows months beyond her own;
> Twice the teeming flocks are fruitful,
> Twice the laden orchards groan—

if North Dakota can compete with lands like those, what has she to fear from the more frosty Alberta? What has Minnesota to fear from Manitoba when she can prosper side by side with Iowa and Nebraska?

The debate has been chiefly about the farmer, and I have wondered whether he was really so much agitated over this bill as we have been led to believe. I have wondered, since in 1865 patriotism was the pretext which certain great interests employed to terminate the Elgin treaty, whether after all there was not something masked behind the farmer here. People have been industriously sending telegrams to Members. Evidently there has been a great campaign of education, and the suspicion that the farmer was being put where he did not deserve to be has reminded me of that old fort near Panama which was captured from the Spaniards by Morgan and his buccaneers, and it is said the way they captured it was to drive in advance of their charging columns the nuns and the sisters of charity. The Spaniards did not wish to fire upon these good women and so the buccaneers captured the fortress. [Applause and laughter.] I do not wish to say that there have been any other gentlemen behind the American farmer, but I have had just a suspicion that there were some interests behind him pushing him to the front to take the brunt of the fire or to silence it.

But this whole question revolves about wheat, and it seems to me that we can decide it upon wheat alone. I think there is no doubt that in any country which exports a considerable surplus of wheat the price is fixed in the market that takes the surplus. We have been for many years one of the great granaries of the world, selling in the open market, and our wheat has sold on a parity and is selling to-day on a parity, freights being adjusted, with the wheat of Argentina, of Australia, of Canada, of India, and Russia. Although it would seem hardly necessary to quote an authority upon so clear a proposition, I have here Prof. Dondlinger's interesting book on wheat. He has evidently written with great sympathy for the farmer, and he lays down this proposition:

> As soon as a country has a surplus for export and receives more for exported wheat than the home price, plus the exporting, the export will increase, the home price will rise, production will increase, and the price is no longer fixed within the country. The country which buys the export may thus fix the price of wheat for the country which produces it. * * * It is as a consumer of the world surplus that England has held a position of such commanding importance in fixing the price of wheat.

Gentlemen present here some discrepancies in the price of wheat upon one side of the line and the other. I can find similar discrepancies between neighboring towns in South Dakota. It depends upon elevator facilities, it depends upon competition in buying, and you can find those differences in towns in the same State. They are simply little backward whirls and eddies, that you will find in the most rapid onrushing stream. They are simply the exceptions that prove the rule.

The man in North Dakota does not compete with the man across the line in Manitoba directly, but he competes with him 4,000 miles away in the Liverpool market. We have an exportable surplus of something like 100,000,000 bushels a year, and Canada has an exportable surplus of, perhaps, half that amount, and those surpluses are both taken by the Liverpool market. It makes no difference whether the wheat is swept from Canadian or American thrashing floors, when it goes to Liverpool, according to its quality, one kind brings the same price as the other. And so we witness this spectacle on account of the high tariff wall; we see these two broad, golden rivers of wheat flowing in parallel lines upon either side of the boundary and seeking the level of a common market. It seems to me quite beyond our capacity to understand that any other law can operate where we export such an enormous volume of this necessary article, not controlled by a trust, than that the price is fixed in the country which takes the surplus.

Let us take the reverse of that, and we have an illustration to prove the truth of this rule. Take sugar. We do not produce as much sugar as we consume. We consume some 3,500,000 tons every year, and we need to import a great deal from the outside world. Some years ago we had before this House a proposition to give a preferential duty of 20 per cent to Cuban sugar over other sugars. It was alleged here that the Cubans, for whom we designed this arrangement, would get no benefit at all, but that it would go to the Sugar Trust, and what do we

see? We see precisely the result that the advocates of that reciprocity bill pointed out at that time.

The sugar market of the world is Hamburg. The price of sugar in New York is the Hamburg price plus the freight across the ocean plus the full duty into New York. And the Cuban planters, providing they show reasonable intelligence and do not glut the market at a given time, can reckon on the Hamburg price with the freight and full duty added. Since we have to make up our deficiency in the production of sugar by large importations, our home price is the world's—or Hamburg—price with the duty added, and there is a parity in price between Hamburg and Cuba and Sumatra when the differences in duties and freights are considered.

I read this morning in the New York Sun an article upon sugar written, I believe, by Mr. Robinson, one of the most accomplished economic writers upon the American press. He took importations from Sumatra and from some other countries and he carried out the prices into thousandths, and then an importation from Cuba, which had a preferential duty. When they were finally landed in New York they all appeared at precisely the same price, each paying its freight and particular duty. That price is adjusted, although I am not quoting him as an authority upon that, with reference to the Hamburg price.

What is going to happen to wheat if this bill passes? Gentlemen say, if the effect is not to decrease the price of bread, why do we want to pass the bill, and if it is going to decrease the price of bread, it will injure the American farmer, and they repeat this very ancient tariff riddle. I will tell you what I think will happen. We are going to reach just the same condition in regard to wheat as we are in to-day in regard to sugar. When we cease to raise as much as we consume, and when we shall have to bring wheat in from other nations for our own consumption, then we shall see the law I have been talking about illustrated from the reverse side.

Instead of our exporting at the world's price to Liverpool, paying our freight, we shall buy at the world's price at Liverpool and pay in addition the freight and the cost of overcoming any other obstacles in order to get into our own market; and when you reach that point the tariff for the first time—this tariff that has looked so magnificent upon the statute books to the American farmer—will become operative to increase the price of wheat above the world's price. Now, is there any American farmer who would desire to add to the price he is getting in Liverpool 25 cents a bushel of tariff plus the freight rate from Liverpool? He has prospered on wheat growing on the basis of prices in the markets of the world. Do you imagine that when the time of our scarcity comes and when we are not raising as much as we consume that the American farmer will desire to have this price artificially raised in order that he may make more money? He certainly will make as much then if the tariff is not on as he does now.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. McCALL. Just a brief one. I am afraid I shall not have time to conclude.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It is precisely upon this point. All I desire to know is the gentleman's conclusion from his argument. The gentleman argues the price of wheat is fixed at Liverpool, and supposing it will continue to be fixed at Liverpool I desire to know whether in the view of the gentleman the price of wheat in this country will be affected by this Canadian reciprocity agreement?

Mr. McCALL. When I say the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool, of course that is only popularly correct. The price of wheat is fixed compared with the world's demand and the world's supply.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota rose.

Mr. McCALL. Now, just wait a minute. If the effect of this treaty or bill is to increase the world's supply of wheat, then to that extent you will keep down the world's price of wheat; but inasmuch as Canada has access to the same market it has now, it is not probable that the effect of this bill will be to increase her production of wheat. Consequently the passage of the bill will have no effect upon the world's price of wheat.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will it have any effect upon the price of wheat in the United States? I desire to have the gentleman's opinion on that.

Mr. McCALL. Now, I think I reasoned that point out. The gentleman may not have done me the honor of paying attention——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I have paid very close attention.

Mr. McCALL. I think I have suggested that this will become operative and keep the price down at the time when we have to import a surplus, and then it will be more convenient for us to buy from Canada; and—I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It is a very important subject, and I want the gentleman's views upon it.

Mr. McCALL. I know it is a very interesting subject, with many ramifications, but I can hardly be turned from the main course of my argument in the time which I have.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman decline to yield on that point for a question?

Mr. McCALL. The gentleman wants me to appear ungracious by declining to yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. No.

Mr. McCALL. I think I answered the gentleman's question. For that reason I would prefer not to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman think that if ever in the fullness of time we do not produce wheat in the United States sufficient for our own consumption, the future Congresses, 40, 50, or 100 years from now, will not be competent to deal with this question? [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. If the gentleman is here at that time [loud applause and laughter], and the universal hope is manifested in the universal applause [applause], and it appears that the farmer is getting 25 cents a bushel out of this duty on his wheat, and the proposition is made upon this floor to strike off that duty, and therefore to reduce the farmer's price, the gentleman from Illinois will seize the pillars of the temple of protection and will threaten to pull them all down if we touch the farmer's duty upon wheat. [Applause.]

A great deal has been said about the Elgin treaty. It has been argued that it was unfavorable to the United States. Let me call your attention to this circumstance, that in 1850 the trade going both ways between Canada and the United States only amounted to about $5,000,000 a year. This treaty was put in force in 1855 and remained in force for 11 years, and yet in that time it covered nearly a half billion of trade between the two countries. Why, it practically created trade between Canada and the United States, and Canada for a generation after we abrogated that treaty stood in our antechambers asking that we make another reciprocity arrangement with her. She continued to do so for 30 years, until at last Sir Wilfrid Laurier said, "No more pilgrimages to Washington."

Sir John Macdonald made it the fundamental policy of his party to have reciprocity with the United States and, at the same time, incidental protection. And when he came into power, about 1880, for, I think, the second or third time, he established the policy of protection for Canada and attempted to secure a reciprocity treaty. That policy of protection had the effect of stimulating Canadian manufacture, and in 1893 Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the present prime minister, said that "If you give us Liberals power we will destroy protection, which is a sham and a delusion and a robbery," showing that there was complete reciprocity in political rhetoric and that he had gotten that "free of all duty" from the Democratic Party in the United States. [Laughter and applause.]

Sir Wilfrid Laurier three years afterward was intrusted with power. He is a sound and sagacious statesman, and I wish to call the attention of my enthusiastic friends upon the other side of the aisle to the fact that he has done nothing whatever to reduce protective duties in Canada except simply to create the British preferential. And I trust that his sound sense and moderation will be imitated by gentlemen upon the other side if they ever have the responsibility of dealing with the tremendous industries of the United States.

I think it is not necessary to say anything upon the most-favored-nation aspect of this treaty. We heard a great deal about it when the question was discussed in the last Congress, and the fact that that objection has not been urged by gentlemen in the present debate is pretty conclusive evidence that there was no foundation whatever for their former contention. I think, also, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND] has finally disposed of the argument, or, rather, the objection, that we should not have reciprocity in competitive articles.

I am rather surprised to find gentlemen representing border States of the Union opposed to this treaty. A high-tariff wall, however beneficial it may be to a country as a whole, throws a very deep shadow. People can only trade upon one side of the

wall. They are shut out from their neighbors upon the other side. If the men in North Dakota would look at this a little more broadly, they would see that it would be far better for their State, for the farmers there, to trade across the line and acquire farms across the line and not be upon the outer rim of the country where the circulation of the trade current is feeble, as is that of the blood in the extremities of the body. I would suggest that they should not want to continue to be the extremities of the body politic, but that they might more profitably wish to annex Canada industrially, so that they might trade and extend their farms to the north as well as to the south.

Now, it has been denied that the policy of reciprocity, such as this bill presents, is a Republican policy. We have had it shown in this debate that the administration of President Grant, who was a pretty good Republican and did not come from New England, negotiated a reciprocity treaty upon the lines of the Elgin treaty. We have seen that Garfield, afterwards President, was in favor of the Elgin treaty. We had it asserted upon the authority of Mr. Curtis that Mr. McKinley was in favor of the policy. Certainly the amendment proposed by Mr. Blaine tended strongly to show that he was in favor of the policy.

And now I want to quote from a very distinguished man, a man who was governor of a leading State and who has since succeeded a great statesman as the political leader of his State. I refer to ALBERT B. CUMMINS, who was at the time governor of Iowa. I am going to quote from a speech of Gov. CUMMINS, made to the Boston Merchants' Association on December 10, 1903. I will not read all of the extract, because it is somewhat long, but I will read what he says in conclusion:

> Suppose we could to-night add Canada, from ocean to ocean and from her southern line to the North Pole, to the territory of the United States, so that when some courageous American explorer plants the banner of the Republic upon the axis of the world and its beautiful folds fill with the air of the North it will proclaim the eternal sovereignty of the United States. * * * How many are there here or elsewhere who would look upon this accession of power and population upon land and lake and sea as a misfortune to our country or a blow inflicted upon her prosperity?
>
> I go further and eliminate national pride. How many banks would fail on that account? How many factories would close because the Stars and Stripes were flying over this vast domain? What acre would be worth less? What man would be without work or receive less compensation? * * *
>
> Mark you, I am not dreaming of annexation, nor am I advocating free trade with Canada, for the former is more remote than ever before, and the latter is wholly impracticable. I have used the figure only to show that we can safely draw nearer to our neighbor and safely enter upon the negotiation of a reciprocal treaty.

[Applause.]

I commend that to the attention of some of our agricultural friends from the West. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it appears from some of the arguments made in this House, and from some of the arguments that are advanced in Canada, that this bill is to be mutually destructive to the agriculture of both countries, and that the deplorable condition of the American farmer under it is only to be equaled by the wretched squalor which the Canadian farmer will have to face. [Laughter.] As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE] so eloquently said yesterday, this bill presents a great ethical question. It presents an enlightened policy. The President of the United States is simply asking this country to obey the laws of nature, which no great nation can violate with impunity.

Here these two countries lie side by side for over 3,700 miles. The lines of trade naturally run north and south, and we are attempting to force them to run east and west.

And it is the policy of justice. Remember that during the last dozen years our balance of trade against Canada has been nearly $1,000,000,000. She is buying of us this very year more than $250,000,000 in value, and 70 per cent of that trade goes there absolutely free of duty. Her average duty against the goods that we send her is only half as much as the average duty that we impose against her; and of this you may be certain, that after this bill shall pass the average duty of the United States against Canada will still be higher than the average of the duties levied by Canada against the United States.

The President is recognizing the laws of nature. The fact that that country buys from us nearly twice as much as she does from all the other nations of the world shows most powerfully how the ties of nature are drawing us commercially together. It is not wise to try to float upstream. We should permit the laws of nature to work without obstruction, and they will work, for the benefit of both countries. The size of our planet is dwindling every year. The discovery of all of the lands of the world, the wonderful inventions of the last century, the railroad and the telephone and the telegraph make this world to-day as small, compared with the world of the time of Columbus, as one of Jupiter's satellites is as compared with Jupiter. We are rapidly growing smaller, and here is this great neighbor of ours that is industrially a part of the United States. I say it is wise for us to recognize that fact and to pass this bill. It does not go far enough, but it takes a long step in the right direction.

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

Mr. MCCALL. I have about three minutes more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. MCCALL. It is simply a matter of saying a few things in three minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I simply want to ask the gentleman one question. He spoke during the course of his remarks on the question of the most-favored-nation clause. He said that nothing in this bill as it stands would violate the most-favored-nation clause. Suppose, however, an amendment were offered changing a duty in this bill; as, for instance, suppose that an amendment were offered putting Canadian meat on the free list without any reduction on the part of Canada. In his opinion would that violate the most-favored-nation clause?

Mr. MCCALL. I think that would violate the most-favored-nation clause.

I regret that I have only three minutes more. It is argued in effect by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in his very able speech:

> Add this farmers' free list to this bill. Load it to the gunwales with amendments and sink it if you can.

Consider for a moment the sort of a measure this bill would become. Here is a proposition to carry out an international agreement. The first section of the act says that flour shall be admitted at a certain rate of duty from Canada when Canada shall admit flour at the same rate coming from this country, and the same thing with regard to meat and other articles.

The trade is carefully carried out in the first article. Then, in the fourth article, with contemptuous levity we say that all these things, coming from all the rest of the world, for which Canadian statesmen have paid a consideration to get a reduction of duty upon them, shall come into our markets free of duty. Webster said, "Politics should cease at the water's edge"; but this would be playing politics upon an international scale. It would treat with levity the negotiations between the Canadian commissioners and the President of the United States. It would attest, at the same time, their inability to make a bargain and the ability of the President of the United States to drive a hard bargain, because, without any consideration whatever, in a subsequent section, we freely give better terms to the rest of the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may have just two or three minutes more, the boundary line between these two countries stretches, as I have said, for 3,700 miles. There is no modern fort along that line. After the war of 1812, by the Rush-Bagehot treaty, we agreed to have no further armaments upon the Great Lakes, although two of the chief battles of that war had been fought upon them. Great cities, with billions of dollars of property, with fabulous wealth, have grown up along that boundary. They are not defended by a single gun, but there are no cities in all the world that are more safe, because they are fortified and guarded by the good sense, the common interests, and the friendly sentiments of two great nations. [Applause.] We have forts, it is true, and guns along that line, but they are antiquated and the survivals of a time long past. And we have made the dreams of the poets come true, for the boys wage mimic wars in the crumbling embrasures of the forts, the birds build their nests in the lips of the cannon, and little children play upon them and clasp their silent throats. We can just as safely dismantle the tariff forts between the two countries. Canada is one with us in sentiment. She is one with us in all the strongest ties that can draw nations together; and I trust that this side of the House will vie with that side of the House and support the President of the United States in the enlightened and civilized policy proposed by this bill. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. MCCALL] in believing that the question now under discussion in this House is one of vast importance. I quite agree with him also that the debate has been of a high order, quite up to the best traditions of the House of Representatives.

During the last Congress I took occasion to make some observations upon the pending measure, and I shall endeavor so far as I can to avoid any repetition now.

With such knowledge as I was able to gain at that time, of its purposes and probable effects, I felt it my duty to oppose it.

Investigation and reflection have strengthened me in the conviction that the best interests of our people call, and call loudly, for its defeat. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I shall not waste time by way of preliminaries. I ask, in the first place, what necessity was there for the making of this agreement at this time?

Our trade relations with Canada had been adjusted under a tariff law only recently passed. The President had announced that they had been satisfactorily adjusted. The table of exports and imports between the two countries showed that existing conditons were most favorable to our people. Our trade was large and increasing and the balance was in our favor to the extent of many millions annually. It is shown by the schedules accompanying the President's message that under this agreement we will surrender two and one-half millions of revenue yearly in excess of the amount surrendered by Canada. If any necessity therefore existed for new trade conditions, it was on the part of Canada and not of the United States. So far, then, the agreement is undeniably to our disadvantage.

Who suggested the making of such an agreement? We had only recently enacted a new tariff law. Business was gradually adjusting itself to new conditions. True, there was dissatisfaction with the new law, as there always is with a new tariff law. The public press wanted to have free paper, but contained no suggestion of free trade for our farm products. The President and others found fault with the wool schedule, but even so, the President declared the law the best tariff law ever placed on the statute book. He did not intimate any desire for free trade for our agriculture.

What political party outside of Massachusetts suggested reciprocity with Canada? What political convention, in what State of the Union, proposed the opening up anew of our tariff law so as to institute free trade in any form between the United States and Canada?

What national convention suggested it? Where in the platform of the Republican Party upon which the President made his appeal to the people and secured his election do you find, directly or indirectly, that reciprocity with Canada is a party policy?

It would appear, then, that in the absence of any discovered necessity and without any popular demand for it this agreement was made by the President and made in secret, for it is not contended that any party leader was consulted with respect to it.

I approach now a question which is of fundamental importance as bearing upon the constitutional relation of the executive and legislative departments of the Government. I do not need to enlarge on the necessity of compelling each of our coordinate departments to confine itself within its own sphere. Any invasion by one department of the rights and functions of another disarranges the whole scheme and operates to deprive one of the powers granted and to clothe another with powers denied. Too much, I fear, in recent years has there been a concentration of power in the executive department.

Whence comes the constitutional power of the President, let me ask, to make an agreement with a foreign nation which shall revise our revenue laws?

And whence comes the power of the House of Representatives to approve such an agreement, in bulk, without exercising its right of judgment and of amendment, unless it renounces its constitutional prerogative to inaugurate revenue measures?

What is the Canadian pact, as the public press has termed it? The President said in his message recently sent to Congress:

> In my annual message of December 6, 1910, * * * I also informed you *that, by my direction,* the Secretary of State had dispatched two representatives of the Department of State as special commissioners to Ottawa to confer with representatives of the Dominion Government, *that they were authorized to take steps to formulate a reciprocal trade agreement,* and that the Ottawa conferences thus begun had been adjourned to be resumed in Washington.
>
> On the 7th of the present month two cabinet ministers came to Washington as representatives of the Dominion Government, and the conferences were continued between them and the Secretary of State. The result of the negotiations was that on the 21st instant *a reciprocal trade agreement was reached, the text of which is herewith transmitted,* with accompanying correspondence and other data. * * *
>
> *My purpose in making a reciprocal trade agreement* with Canada has been not only to obtain one that would be mutually advantageous to both countries, but one which also would be truly national in its scope. * * *
>
> *I feel I have correctly interpreted the wish of the American people by expressing in the arrangement now submitted to Congress for its approval* their desire for a more intimate and cordial relationship with Canada. I therefore earnestly hope that the *measure* will be promptly *enacted into law.*

That which is now before us is called in the message "a reciprocal trade agreement," on "arrangement," and a "measure." It is said to have been made by authority of the President, and it is submitted to Congress for what? To be debated, deliberated upon, to be amended, to be finally passed upon in such form as Congress may determine? Not at all—*to be approved and enacted into law.*

It is safe to say that the President has no constitutional power to make an "agreement" or "arrangement" with a foreign power to revise our revenue law, especially in terms which preclude the exercise of any judgment upon the part of Congress or either branch thereof.

The President made a carefully prepared speech at Springfield, from which it is apparent that he assumed he had such power.

He said:

> The Constitution provides that the President may make treaties—
>
> *The President may make treaties—*
>
> by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the treaties when thus made shall constitute the law of the land. *It has always been a question, however, whether it was not necessary, in order to carry treaties affecting tariff and revenue measures into effect, to have action by Congress in the form of legislation recognizing and enforcing the treaty.*

Mr. Chairman, that is the law. No treaty can be made relating to our revenues that will be effective until it subsequently be indorsed by the Congress of the United States. At the time when the Cuban treaty was indorsed Congress said:

> *And provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall be treated or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that customs duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress originating in said House.

To continue now the President's speech:

> Because of this doubt it was thought wiser on behalf of both Governments not to make a *formal treaty.*

I do not find in the Constitution of the United States any distinction between a "treaty" and a "formal treaty."

> Not to make a formal treaty, but to make *an agreement between the Executives* by which each, *exercising his constitutional power* in his Government, *should submit the agreement in the form of a statute* to be enacted and go into force on condition that a similar statute was passed by the legislature of the other country.

It is apparent from what the President here says that he assents to the proposition that a treaty relating to tariff changes must receive the indorsement of the House of Representatives before it can go into effect, and it is apparent also that he claims to have a power as Executive, beyond the treaty-making power, to make an agreement with a foreign executive changing our tariff laws in terms which shall not be subject to legislative review or amendment.

It does not require any argument to demonstrate that the President has no such constitutional power.

In both the McKinley law and the Dingley law certain powers were conferred on the President to make tariff changes, but the terms were prescribed by Congress, otherwise the changes would have been held unconstitutional as being a delegation of legislative power that Congress could not make.

There are no provisions in existing law similar to those which were in the McKinley and Dingley laws.

In a subsequent part of his speech the President used these terms:

> In other words, the great benefit of *this treaty* is the profit in mutual exchange, etc.

Further on he says:

> My own view is that no step could be taken more in the interest of a reasonable policy of protection than the *approval of this treaty.*

The President's view of his own powers was shared by the Canadian representatives. In their written stipulation accompanying the agreement they provide:

> 3. It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the *formal shape of a treaty,* but that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost endeavors to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa.
>
> 4. *The Government of the countries having made this agreement*—

And so forth.

From the foregoing it is apparent that both the President and the Canadian representatives entered into what they both recognized as an informal treaty, but what they called an agreement. Whether the Canadian representatives had power to make either a trade agreement or a treaty I do not undertake to say, but I do assert with the utmost confidence that the President had no power to make any agreement changing our revenue laws except such as is conferred on him by the treaty-making clause of the Constitution. And any agreement so made, to be effective, must receive, first, the approval of two-thirds of the Senate and, second, the indorsement of the Congress.

Should the pending bill be passed by a majority of the votes of both Houses, you will have as the result only the unauthorized legislative indorsement of an unauthorized Executive act, and I apprehend that the constitutional powers of the House

and the constitutional power of the Executive are not beyond the power of judicial definition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But you say this is "a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes." But that is not true. *It is a bill to validate a reciprocal trade agreement made by the President with certain Canadian officials so as to make changes in our revenue law.* But the Constitution provides "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." To say that this bill originated in the House of Representatives is merely to juggle with words. The bill, even in form, originated in the Executive department. The form, however, amounts to nothing. It is the President's agreement that you are called upon to ratify. That is the substance; that originated with the Executive.

The power to originate revenue measures comprises the power (1) to choose the subjects of taxation and (2) to name the rate of tax. In this measure, whereby you are asked—to use the language of the President—to put "*the agreement in the form of a statute*," the President and the Canadian commissioners have selected the objects of taxation and also the rates of tax, and you can not dot an "i" or cross a "t." So bound and helpless is the House of Representatives in dealing with this measure that in the last Congress it was jammed through the House under a drastic rule, which not only prohibited amendment but prevented its being read. Now, in this Congress, open proclamation is made by the majority that no amendment will be permitted, because such amendment would jeopardize the agreement.

In all its history the House of Representatives never before knew so humiliating a day as this, called upon, as it is, to renounce its constitutional prerogative and register an Executive decree.

It remains to be seen whether the Senate will renounce its constitutional prerogative as sharer in the treaty-making power.

Of course it is the sheerest sophistry to contend that the *adoption* by Congress of the President's agreement is equivalent in law to its *inception* in Congress. To *adopt* is not to *originate*.

But suppose that both House and Senate renounce their constitutional functions, pass this measure by majority votes, and that it be signed by the President. What then? Ostensibly it becomes a law. The correction of the Members of the House and Senate who have failed in their duty belongs to their constituents. The law, however, will still require the approval of a competent tribunal before it can be effective.

I have challenged an answer to the question, What necessity existed for the making of this agreement at this time? And to the other question, What popular demand was there for it? I proceed further to ask, What do its advocates urge in its behalf? Very little; very little. They have spent all of their time in trying to demonstrate that it will do us no harm. They have been and are strictly on the defensive.

Men on the other side of the Chamber have been loud in its praises as a Democratic free-trade measure, and have enthusiastically supported it as the first step in the destruction of the protective system. Men on this side of the Chamber have devoted their efforts to show that free trade in farm products will not hurt the farmer, and furthermore is in strict accord with the policies and platforms of the Republican Party. All of them have avowed themselves protectionists. All of them have opposed free trade except when it was baptized "reciprocity." Of course the catchword in the mouth of the advocates of this iniquitous measure is the high cost of living—an appeal to the populace—pass this measure and you will get free food. These are the gentlemen who perform the equestrian feat of riding two horses going in different directions at the same time. Free trade with Canada will reduce the price of the farmer's product to the consumer, but it will not reduce the value of the farmer's product to the farmer. Other gentlemen are honest enough to follow the President, who tells us in his message that this measure will not have any perceptible present effect upon prices, that high prices are world-wide, due to many causes, and that any effect thereon must be looked for in the future. If this statement were made to the kind of people whose support of this measure is gained by their belief in it as a relief from high prices, I apprehend there would be a sudden and wholesale desertion.

There is no intelligent man who does not know that there is nothing in the suggestion of relief from high prices by this measure that would justify a revolution in our revenue system, such a revolution as the enactment of this measure would inevitably bring about.

But there is a necessity to increase our foreign trade; hence we must have free trade with Canada in farm products. Here again I find myself in an impenetrable maze of argument, hopelessly groping for the light. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] tells us in one breath that our surplus is rapidly diminishing and that in the future we must draw from Canadian surplus or starve; and then, when he has recovered his breath from that statement, he tells us that we must build up Canada, so as to procure customers for our surplus. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to credit for an original plan for securing foreign trade. Build up the foreigner. "Remove this tariff," says the gentleman, speaking of Canada, "and she will soon gain the strength and stature of a great nation." "You increase the purchasing power of a customer, and you thereby increase your own prosperity," says the gentleman. I recall, in this connection, a quotation from Mr. McKinley's introduction to Mr. Curtis's book, "Protection and Prosperity." He says:

> The people of no nation in the history of the world has ever prospered under a policy which sacrificed home industries to build up and develop the resources and give employment to the labor of foreign states.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

We do not need this measure to secure the Canadian market. That market is already ours. The President tells us in his message that the entire foreign trade of Canada in the fiscal year 1910 was $655,000,000; that her imports were $376,000,000, and of this amount the United States contributed $223,000,000. In point of fact, to be exact, our exports to Canada last year, 1910, were $241,809,233. Our imports from Canada were $103,256,955. The balance of trade in our favor was $138,552,278, or 134.20 per cent of exports over imports. Our exports to all other countries were $1,622,682,411, and our imports were $1,459,667,296, the balance of trade in our favor being $163,015,115, or 11.17 per cent of exports over imports. We already have 60 per cent of Canada's trade. Talk about passing this measure for the purpose of securing foreign trade! That foreign trade we already have.

We do not need this measure to increase our trade with Canada. She is now our best customer. Why? Because she can not help herself. She is our best customer, not as a matter of sentiment, but because she can buy to better advantage in our markets than in any other. Self-interest compels her to deal with us. Why, our exports to Canada have increased from $28,000,000 in 1866, when the former treaty was denounced, to $241,000,000 last year. And they will go on increasing as the demands of the Canadian market increase and the ability of the American producer to supply increases, and nothing can prevent it unless it be some such bungling piece of statesmanship as this proposed treaty. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why antagonize the great farming interests of every State of the Union to pursue a mere will-o'-the-wisp? It is not statesmanship, it is not common sense.

But failing to find any other reason why we should abandon our ancient landmarks, the advocates of this measure rise to the plane of a lofty altruism, beautifully demonstrated by my friend from Massachusetts in his peroration. The Canadians, it is urged, are our neighbors; for 3,000 miles their boundary is our boundary; we are the same race, speak the same tongue, inherit the same traditions, and have similar institutions.

Well, what of it? What is this arrangement—a treaty of peace and amity, an arbitration agreement, or what the gentleman from Connecticut calls it—a plain business proposition, a question of national revenues, of common everyday dollars and cents? Sentiment is not business. Revenue measures are not made on sentiment. The Canadians do not pay our taxes, maintain our schools, our churches, or our charities; they do not build our roads, maintain our Army, or contribute to our Navy. They do not fight our battles. True, living alongside of us, they have been decent enough not to require us to maintain an army to keep them in order. [Applause.] But, true again, living alongside of them, we have not compelled them to maintain an army to keep us in order. True, we are coinheritors of the traditions of English liberty, but only down to the point where our fathers, through blood and sacrifice, extended that liberty to and established it in the United States, while the men of Canada remained still English dependents. Because in common we claim kinship with the great names of English literature, with Shakespeare, and Milton, and Byron, and Tennyson, with the exponents of English statesmanship—Burke and Fox and William Pitt—we may well rejoice. But it is a subject of rejoicing and not of business. It furnishes no reason why we should exchange a good American dollar for a Canadian half dollar. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Sentiment is a grand thing; it rules the world of civilized intercourse, but among cool-headed business men it has no place in the world of trade. It played no part in the long and bitter fisheries disputes with our dear Canadian brethren. It played no part in the settlement of Canada's irritating, arro-

gant, and unfounded claim in connection with the Alaskan boundary line.

If neighborhood and kinship of race and language and history furnish reasons why trade barriers should be removed, they furnish equally good reasons why political barriers should be removed and the two peoples consolidated under one flag. And disavow much as we may any intention in that direction, if we adopt this measure the force of events will ultimately assert itself to that end. This bill itself in its new section proposes another step toward bringing together the two peoples under one flag, and that flag will bear the Stars and Stripes.

O no, my friends, when it comes to a matter of sentiment my heart goes out to my own people; my patriotism is American, not Canadian patriotism; my brotherly love is for my own kin, for the American farmer, not for his Canadian competitor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the absence of any good reason why this bill should pass there are many and potent reasons why it should not.

It is unnecessary, not responsive to the popular demand, disturbing of the business interests of the country.

But more than that, it is unfair to the farmer, whose interests in particular it attacks.

I do not want to weary the committee with a restatement of the argument which has been so well presented by many of those who have preceded me. The history of American agriculture, its gradual extension westward to the possession of new and fertile fields, with the result that older and less fertile fields had to be abandoned, has been vividly portrayed. The similarity of the situation now, if the vast luxuriously fertile fields of Canada are to be brought into competition with our western farms, to the situation as it existed in our earlier years has been pointed out. The same economic law that worked to the disadvantage of eastern agriculture when western farms were established will operate as to Canadian and western farms, and in like manner and with like result.

It is easy to juggle with figures and by a proper selection of them establish almost anything. Doubtless there are some Canadian lands as high in price as some American lands, some places where there is little difference between Canadian wages and Canadian prices and our wages and prices, but they are the exception and not the rule, and anyone who will be honest with himself must agree that as a general proposition Canadian lands are cheaper than American lands, Canadian wages less than American wages, Canadian prices less than American prices; that Canada has a territory of vast proportions, capable of producing almost limitless quantities of grain from a soil fertile beyond any soil on this side of the international boundary line.

It seems to me, discarding special pleas, the conclusion must inevitably be that the possibilities of Canadian agriculture are such as to put American agriculture in competition with it at a great disadvantage. As a consequence, free trade with Canada in farm products must inure to the disadvantage of the American farmer. Taking the agreement as a whole, it can not but inure to the advantage of Canada and to the disadvantage of the United States.

We do not need to rely on theory to establish that proposition. It has already been established in actual experience. I need not enlarge upon this point, because it has been fully discussed both by myself in the last Congress and by various gentlemen in the course of this debate. I then asserted and now assert that the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which was denounced in 1866 and which is similar to the proposed agreement, worked disastrously to the United States and was denounced for that reason.

Gentlemen have denied both propositions. Without adducing any figures by way of proof, they dogmatically assert, first, that it did not operate against our interests, and, second, that it was denounced for political and not for economic reasons, one gentleman asserting that it was denounced on account of our indignation because of Canada's friendship to the Southern Confederacy. But there are two things that have not been and can not be denied: First, that under the operation of that treaty in 12 years our exports to Canada dwindled from nearly $20,000,000 to a little over $15,000,000, while Canada's exports to us grew from $12,000,000 to $46,000,000; that in the last two years of that treaty's life we remitted to Canada duties amounting to over $70,000,000 and lost the balance of trade by over $28,000,000.

These facts have not been and can not be denied. Nor can it be denied, in the second place, that every contemporaneous statesman of note in our history declared the treaty to have been disastrous to the interest of the United States and that it was denounced for that reason.

I recur to this proposition at this time only because in statesmanship, as in everything else, it is wise to take the lessons of experience. And if that treaty, through its 12 years of life under like conditions to those presented now, was disastrous to the interests of the United States, to all the interests of the United States, both her industries and her revenues, we have the right to assume—we would be foolish not to assume—that the enactment of this law now would bring about precisely the same results.

In this connection I ought to refer to the fact stated by the gentleman who preceded me, that ever since the denouncement of the Elgin treaty Canada has been importuning us to enter into a similar treaty, and to call attention to the fact that every administration, from that of Franklin Pierce down to the present administration, has refused to enter into negotiations with Canada for a treaty for the exchange of natural products. Why, so late as the administration of Mr. Harrison, in 1892, Mr. Blaine told the Canadian envoys that we would not entertain any proposition for an agreement looking to the exchange of natural products, because, he said "the benefits of such an exchange would be almost wholly with the people of Canada."

Talk about reciprocal treaties in competitive articles! Why, in the very nature of the case there can be no reciprocal treaty in competitive articles. Exchange of competitive articles means competition. Reciprocity means the trading of the things that we have for the things that we do not have.

But, Mr. Chairman, you may discuss the question of prices, you may discuss the question of agricultural interests, and many other incidental questions, and you will not, after all, have reached the fundamental and dominating issue in this case. Until this bill was introduced it was the universally accepted belief that the protective system, against that of free trade, was the accepted economic policy of the United States. Parties divided on rates of duties. The Republican Party stood for such duties as would furnish protection to American capital and American labor. The Democratic Party stood for rates of duty levied for revenue only. This bill looks neither to protection nor revenue. It deprives us of revenue. It is an open, avowed free-trade measure. It is such upon its face, and it is so declared to be by the Democratic Party.

Its significance lies in the fact—mark me, its significance lies in the fact—that this is the first step in the destruction of the protective system. That system is a complete logical whole, and it admits of no exceptions. It must apply to all industries, or it will not be permitted to apply to any. [Applause on the Republican side.] If the farmer can not have adequate protection for his industry, the manufacturer will not have protection for his. No system of protection is practicable or would be just some of whose schedules are protective and some of which are nonprotective.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who honored me with so much of his attentions, portrayed me as shedding tears for the farmer while I had in mind the manufacturer. The gentleman from North Carolina in part was right. I had both the farmer and the manufacturer in mind. When you direct my attention to the subject of a tariff I always have in mind the great city, dear to my heart, whose interests it is my highest ambition to serve. I recall its pillar of cloud by day, its pillar of fire by night, the roar of its machinery, its myriad workingmen in the receipt of the highest wages paid any workingmen in any place on earth [applause], a city which is a shining exemplar of the beneficent results of the system of protection. And when I have in mind the fact that if the farmer be robbed of his protection my great city will be robbed of its protection I refuse to participate in the robbery. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This measure rises high above mere considerations of temporary profit. It means more than bookkeeping and a balancing of accounts. It involves the integrity of a system whose foundation was laid in the first legislative act of the First Congress, which has received the indorsement of the most distinguished names in our history, and under which we have grown to a height of prosperity unprecedented in the world's annals. The system is essentially a Republican system. From the hour of its birth until this present hour the Republican Party has stood for protection; protection for American capital, for American labor, whether in the field, the factory, or the mine, to the end that there should be established a great home market which should be for Americans, and that the high standard of American civilization should be preserved.

Under its fostering influence cities have been founded, have grown and multiplied. North and South, East and West have been bound together in inseparable brotherhood by bands of steel. Progress has taken its resistless march across the continent, overcoming all the barriers of nature, planting fields and reaping harvests, until even the desert has been made to blossom like the rose. [Applause on the Republican side.] Its

encouraging inspiration has given birth to a hardy race of pioneer sons, whose singleness of purpose, whose energy and aggressiveness and patriotism have given to the world the wonderful story of the winning of the West. [Applause on the Republican side.] Are we going to turn our backs on those hardy pioneer sons and their sons by the abolition of a system to which they owe their success and which is essential to its continuance? Already hundreds of thousands of them, lured by the promises of the luxuriantly fertile fields of Canada, have left their western farms to become a part of our neighbor's population and add to her wealth. Shall we tempt other thousands upon increasing thousands to abandon our fields for Canadian fields, taking with them the virtues that constitute good citizenship? Any policy that takes from us our boys and girls, the good red blood of American manhood and womanhood, that depletes the valley of the Mississippi and the plains of the West and lowers farm values here while increasing them across the border, robs us of our dearest and most valuable possession. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I can not stop to demonstrate at length why no Republican, in my judgment, can consistently vote for this measure. I would like to ask him one or two questions:

First. Do you not believe that the cost of production of farm products is less in Canada than it is in the United States? And if you do, then how can you escape the conclusion that to put farm products on the free list is to violate the pledge of the last Republican platform? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Second. Do you believe the testimony of the Mann committee and of the President's Tariff Board (and neither of these has been contradicted) to the effect that it costs from $2 to $4.14 more to make a ton of paper in the United States than it does in Canada?

If you do, then how can you escape the conclusion that to put paper on the free list is a violation of the pledge of the last Republican platform? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I beg for a conscientious reply to these queries. It is vital. The Republican Party as the party of protection is on trial here to-day. You and I, my Republican brethren, are on trial. As we respond, so shall we and our party, the party of McKinley, be dealt with in the great forum of the American electorate. Sometimes it is swayed by popular clamor, sometimes by the shadow of a great name, but in the end its deliberate judgment is true to righteousness; its last verdict invariably loyal to the loyal. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the enactment into law of this bill, in my judgment, marks the end of an era in the economic policy of our country so far as our customs laws affect the industrial conditions of the Nation.

The period of exclusion has passed; the era of honest competition is here. [Applause.]

For 50 years the Republican Party has maintained the policy of excluding from the home market, as far as it has been able to do so, competitive products from other countries.

In the beginning this policy was inaugurated with the express declaration that it was intended to develop new industries until they were strong enough to stand alone and face in the open markets of the world the rivalry of our productive competitors, but the greed for gain has driven the advocates of this theory far beyond the position they maintained at its inception. To-day there is hardly a great American industry that is not exporting its surplus products to the open markets of the world and selling them in free competition with the manufactured goods and crops of our foreign competitors.

Our agricultural implements supply the farmers' wants beyond the seas. Our boots and shoes are worn by people who speak many foreign languages and who tread the highways of the Occident and the Orient. The looms of our factories clothe the people of distant lands. The freight of our foreign rivals is carried to market on American rails, drawn by American engines, across chasms spanned by American-built bridges. [Applause.] The harvests of our farmers feed the toiling masses of Europe. We would be the unrivaled masters of production and industry in every land where free competition can be obtained if we would but strike off the shackles that bind us to the dead and unnecessary economic system maintained by the Republican Party, that creates false standards and wasteful conditions at home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I recognize that these false standards have been engrafted on our industrial life and that we can not strike them all off in an hour or a day without serious danger. What I contend for is that we turn our faces away from them and gradually and carefully adjust our laws to meet the new conditions that face us, without serious injury to either labor or capital, in order that we may reduce the cost of living at home and be prepared to dispose of more of our surplus products in the markets of the world, to the end that we may give constant employment to labor and maintain stable prices at home.

The Democratic Party does not intend to abandon the custom-houses, but favors a policy of levying customs duties for revenue purposes only, at rates that will not destroy fair and honest competition in the home market. [Applause.] This position will be accomplished by the reduction of tariff taxes provided for in the laws now on the statute books to a point where fair competition will bring about reasonable prices and destroy monopolistic tendencies. [Applause.]

I say that this bill marks the end of an era in the economic life of the Nation. Why? Not that the immediate results will be far-reaching, but because it takes one step in the right direction, a step away from the exclusive protective policy, a step toward an honest competitive policy.

The advocates of the Republican policy of protection have always heretofore insisted that reciprocal trade agreements should only be made to affect noncompeting products. This bill embraces in its terms competitive products of both nations and recognizes the Democratic position that no tariff law is either warranted or just that protects the profits of the producer and destroys honest competition.

The bill under consideration will carry into law a reciprocal agreement negotiated by our Government with the Government of the Dominion of Canada. In the year 1910 the trade of Canada with all the world was $693,211,221; her total imports were $385,835,103; the people of the United States sending her $233,071,155 of this amount, and from the rest of the world she received only $152,763,940.

As the population of Canada is about 7,500,000 it appears that she bought from us about $30 worth of goods for each person living in the Dominion of Canada. This is a remarkable showing considering the fact that our trade is held back by tariff laws that as to the mother country discriminate against us.

Our own import figures show for the same year imports coming into this country from Canada to the amount of $95,128,310, about $1 per capita. They take of us $30 per capita and we take of them $1 per capita. They are a new country and a growing country. Of necessity they will take our products in excess of our taking theirs. Did not the great Eastern States three decades ago live and thrive on the development of the West? Will not the already developed States of the Union grow and prosper on the development of the new Provinces of Canada if you tear down the artificial wall and give us an opportunity for fair trade?

There has been a great deal said in the debate in the House about the farmers in the Northern States being opposed to this pact. It has been contended that the opposition to this pact comes from the agricultural classes of America. My friends, there is no doubt that to-day a number, and possibly a large number, of the farmers of the Northern States are opposed to this pact. Why? Because they have been assiduously campaigned by certain great protected interests that do not dare show their own hands above the surface. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They have been misled by false facts and false statements coming from men who desire to maintain the high protective principles of the Republican party, which protected their profits and made the toiling masses serve them as their masters. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have not had the suggestion made by those who oppose the bill that the real opposition was coming from the great protected lumber interests of this country [applause on the Democratic side], but we know it and you know it. I hold in my hand a circular letter, sent out by the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, of which Edward Hines, of Chicago, is the President—Edward Hines, of recent uncertain fame. Let me read it:

THE NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1911.

To members of affiliated associations:

DEAR SIR: As a member of an association affiliated with the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association you are doubtless interested in the proposed so-called reciprocity agreement with Canada and the action of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association against its adoption in its present form.

Lumber producers of the United States are doubtless interested in different degrees in this subject, but we believe that all feel that the singling out of the sawmills of the country to bear so large a share of the burden of this reciprocity, without any compensating advantages whatever, is in the highest degree unfair, and that we may be justly indignant, regardless of the degree of harm inflicted upon us, by treatment so discriminatory. The protest made to the Senate, a copy of which is sent you, contains a condensed statement of the chief grounds of objection to the agreement.

The agreement which, chiefly because of our efforts, failed to become a law at the last session of Congress, will, of course, be presented at the opening of the extra session, April 4, and we would call for your immediate personal assistance in so presenting the objections to the agreement to your Representatives in Congress and Senators, of whatever party, that this ill-considered and unreciprocal arrangement shall not become law.

Whatever the ultimate effect of the arrangement may be, it is evident that for the time being it will disturb business, upset values of lumber, tend to increase the value of Canadian stumpage at the expense of American, and will affect the credit of American lumber institutions.

We would suggest that you see your banks and discuss the agreement with them along these lines:

First. The credit of lumber concerns in the United States. The past three years have been severe ones in the lumber industry generally, and in some sections almost disastrous. The agreement will make matters worse, rather than better. Should not the banks use all their influence on those in power to prevent a further demoralization of a business which in some sections furnishes so large a portion of their business and revenues? And should not they protest against that which will inevitably tend to depreciate the value of the securities they hold?

Second. The agricultural features of the agreement tend directly to put American and Canadian agricultural land values upon an equality. American farmers have been going by the tens of thousands to Canada within the last few years because they could there get low-priced lands which are as productive or more productive than those at home, unless the latter are to be artificially fertilized at much expense. The extent and character of this movement of American farmers to Canada is sufficient proof of the facts. Our banks, insurance companies, private investors, and other financial interests have immense amounts of capital invested in American farm securities. Do they want the value of these securities depreciated?

Further, great efforts have been made during the last two or three years, with some success, to arouse renewed interest in American land investments, and therefore to check the movement of American farmers and capital to the Canadian Northwest. Great progress has been made in arousing interest in the long-neglected farm lands of the East, the cut-over lands of the South, North, and West, the swamp lands of the East and South, and the irrigated lands of the West. This movement, so promising to all our American interests, will receive a setback which will not be recovered from for years if the reciprocity agreement goes into effect, for with all the tariff barriers removed the cheaper Canadian lands will be as attractive, acre for acre, as those in this country.

American farmers who wish the value of their farm lands as well as of their products maintained should interest themselves in this matter, as indeed they are already doing, and the thousands of protests which came in from farmers and farmers' organizations during the last two weeks of the session did much to prevent the adoption of the reciprocity bill.

Your customers among the retail lumbermen in the agricultural districts of the North should be especially interested in the above arguments, for the passage of the reciprocity bill is certain, because of the feeling and apprehension it will cause among the farmers, with its reflex action upon the banks, to lead to a material curtailment of business and therefore lessen the demands of these customers upon yourself.

We would therefore ask you at once to take up this question with your banks and trust companies, land companies, and farmers (and with your retail yard customers, if you think it wise), and have them reach their Congressmen and Senators before the opening of Congress and continue the work after it convenes.

Your own protest, of course, will be emphatic, and we would suggest that you secure the cooperation of other lumber manufacturers who are not members of your association and so far as possible interest your workmen in the matter, as the adoption of the agreement, which admits Canadian lumber free into the United States, while Canada retains her restrictions on log exports, will necessarily stimulate the construction and operation of mills in Canada at the expense of those in this country.

I should be glad to be advised of how you feel about this matter and what you are doing regarding it. I inclose list of the Representatives from your State and the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee of the new House, which is now at work on tariff revision, including the reciprocity measure.

Respectfully, yours,

THE NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
LEONARD BRONSON, *Manager*.

I call to your attention two paragraphs. He goes on to explain to his brother lumbermen the dangerous straits in which they find themselves, and urges them to call on their bankers and their grocerymen and their farmer friends to come to their rescue and save the downtrodden lumber interests. I read again one of the paragraphs in his letter:

American farmers who wish the value of their farm lands as well as of their products maintained should interest themselves in this matter, as indeed they are already doing, and the thousands of protests which came in from farmers and farmers' organizations during the last two weeks of the session did much to prevent the adoption of the reciprocity bill.

He refers to the last session of Congress. That is, the farmer who is contending for free lumber with which to build his humble home, the farmer for whom the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin says he stands, for whom he is calling for free lumber—this same farmer is appealed to by this Lumber Trust to defeat the legislation that gives him free lumber with which to build his home. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But the trust goes further. Here is one of the concluding clauses of this letter:

We therefore ask you at once to take up this question with your banks and trust companies and land companies and farmers and with your retail yard customers, if you think it wise [laughter], and have them write their Congressmen and Senators before the opening of Congress, and continue the work after it convenes.

My friends, have you ever before heard of the great protected interests of the country, the great monopolistic interests, appealing to the bankers to put the pressure on the poor devil that has a loan to force him to stand for their interests? [Applause on Democratic side.]

Asking the banker! Here it is in black and white, a letter from Mr. Hines, the president of the Lumber Trust, appealing to the bankers of this country to put the screws to the farmers who had borrowed money from them, to appeal to their Representatives in Congress to maintain a high protective tariff for the lumber interests. That is not all.

I wish to read from the New York American a statement which a reporter gathered from Mr. Wakeman, the president of the American Protective Tariff League, the league that stands for prohibitive taxation for protecting profits in the interest of of monopoly. Mr. Wakeman issued a statement, sent out to those who stand with him, and his statement reads as follows:

Will you and your connections kindly wire the following Congressmen at Washington quick, urging them to vote against the Canadian reciprocity agreement?

I shall omit the names. It was an appeal to those protected interests to wire to you gentlemen on that side of the center aisle and to you gentlemen on this side of the House to vote against this bill because it was an attack on the protected interests of this country. When the newspaper reporter asked Mr. Wakeman if that was an official letter and if he stood for it, this was what he said.

That telegram was sent out Monday afternoon, after the executive committee of the league had met and authorized me to send it.

He further said:

We designated the men named because we have reason to believe they have been carried off their Republican faith by President Taft and are about to commit hara-kiri for themselves and the country by joining the Democratic House in indorsing the Taft un-Republican measure of reciprocity with Canada. What we aim at is to ally the Republican majority of the House as solidly as possible against reciprocity and thus make the unpatriotic Democratic majority wholly responsible for its passage. It will then go to the Republican Senate as a distinctly Democratic proposition, and then let the Republican Senate, if it dare, give its sanction to it.

Listen to your masters! [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

The Senate of the United States, the body that in times past has protected the liberties of the American people, are told by the head of this Protective Tariff League that they dare not pass this bill. Afraid of whom? Not the people; afraid of the trusts. Ah, my friends, but it comes nearer home than that. The protected interests of this country know well that this bill will make a break in the dike; that whenever the protective tariff is removed and the northern farmer stands out alone without pretense of protection to his products that he can no longer be counted on to stand in the ranks of the monopolistic interests of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is why they are afraid of it. It is not so much what is in the bill, but they know that the death knell of the protection system will have sounded—that protection that means the protection of enormous profits and the creation of monopolies in this country—when the farmer understands and abandons the Republican Party to those alone who have fattened upon his hard-earned dollars. They are using, my friends, every effort in the districts on that side of the House and in your district, my fellow Democrat and in my district to break the column. I have protected interests in my district, but I do not represent them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I represent the great mass of my constituency who want honest treatment and fair play. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Two years ago, when the proposition came before the House to cut the tariff on iron and steel products, in many cases about half, I favored the proposition because I thought it was just and fair, but some of the protected interests in my district met and passed resolutions, and resolved that they would rebuke me if I voted to reduce the tax on iron and steel. I voted to make the reduction [applause on the Democratic side], but they did not turn me out of Congress [applause on the Democratic side], and they will not turn you out of Congress if you stand true to the people you represent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], when he addressed the House several days ago, stated that the United States Steel Corporation was in favor of this bill and asked if I did not know it, or if that was not the reason why I favored it. As I then stated to the gentleman from Illinois, I was not informed as to the wishes of the United States Steel Corporation. As a matter of fact, I am interested in the iron and steel business myself. Everything I have in the world is in the iron and steel business except my home, but not with the United States Steel Corporation. My people are independent manufacturers. We meet the United States Steel Corporation every day of our existence in a competitive battle on the industrial fields of America. My people have not asked me to vote for a protective tariff on iron and steel.

I stated to the gentleman from Illinois that I did not know the position of the United States Steel Corporation in reference to this bill, and at the time I stated it I did not know, but I will say to him to-day I do know. I know where they stand to-day. I am in receipt of telegrams from my district

to-day stating that the United States Steel Corporation have stopped work on some of the great plants in my district, have turned 3,000 men out of employment, and have given as their reason that I was supporting the Democratic tariff bills that are before the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I regret that this great trust should punish the constituency that I represent because of the position I take here, but I can say this to you: I stand to-day where I stood two years ago—for an honest revision of the tariff schedules. I propose to vote for this bill and the free-list bill without amendment because I believe they are right [applause on the Democratic side], and I care not what may be the effect on my personal fortunes if we can put on the statute books even the first step toward breaking down the system of monopolistic protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If you want to vote for the trusts and the monopolies of this country, vote against this bill. If you wish to take this one step in breaking down the protective wall, there can be no question as to what your duty is to yourselves and your constituencies. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They say that this bill is unfair because it brings the American farmer into competition with the Canadian farmer. Why should he not be brought into competition? Is there any reason? Members on that side of the Chamber may give as the reason that they believe in protecting the producers' profits, favoring special classes, and allowing the Government to guarantee to their favorites the right to tax the people.

They may make that statement, but we have never stood for such a proposition. I have never been able to see why the great manufacturers in my district, or the farmers, or anybody else, should have their profits protected any more than I can see why the grocer, or the mechanic, or the merchant, or the lawyer should have his profits protected by the Government.

Whenever you enter the realm of protection, of necessity you must enter the zone of protecting profits. And whenever you enact a tariff bill high enough to protect a man's profits, you have a tariff levied, not for revenue, but for the sole purpose of protection.

But why should we fear competition from these Canadian farmers? Their standards are the same as our standards. They are our people. There is no difference between us. The Canadian farmer lives in as good a home as the American farmer. His children go to as good a school and wear as good clothes. He has as much meat on the table and he indulges in the same luxuries. He lives up to our standard of life and living. Therefore, when we have him as a competitor we are not tearing down American standards in any way.

But they say he can produce cheaper. The climatic conditions of his country are more rigorous than are ours. Every year that he plants his crops he is in more danger of losing them, because the spring commences later and the fall begins earlier than with us. He must harvest more hay and grain to take care of his cattle in the winter and keep them in the barn longer than our farmers do, because there are nearly two months more of winter that the Canadian farmer has to contend with than does the farmer in the States. Can you say that this does not go into the cost of raising his crops? Is he not at that disadvantage? Why, no man can deny the proposition.

But they say he has cheaper land. The argument has been made repeatedly here that the cheap lands of Kansas and Minnesota 10 years ago did not destroy the high-priced land of Indiana and Illinois. You know that. Instead of the land of Illinois and Indiana being destroyed by the farm products that came from the cheaper lands of the West, the lands doubled in value. There is a greater difference in value in this country between the land in the Dakotas and Minnesota and Illinois and Indiana than there is between the land in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta and the land of Minnesota and the Dakotas. The reason the land is cheap in Canada is because they either can not produce as much per acre or, for the better reason, because they are farther away from the market and it costs more for freight to bring their commodities to the market of ultimate sale and to dispose of them than it does from the higher-priced land near the center of population. That is all there is to it.

There is not a single argument that can be advanced legitimately to show that the Canadian farmer can produce a crop of any kind cheaper than the American farmer can. Then, if that is the case, the sole argument that can be contended for on that side of the House in favor of maintaining this tariff in the interest of the American farmer is that his profits should be protected.

I wish my friend, my insurgent friend, my progressive friend from Wisconsin, were here. I would like to ask him if he stands for protecting the profits of the farmer. He stood with us last year on a great battle field for the rights of this House. But that was merely a parliamentary battle field. He proclaimed himself a progressive, a man that was in advance of his party. He said that he would not vote for the Payne tariff bill because it put unjust taxation upon the American people.

But when the gentleman faces the question of cutting off protection to the profits of his own constituency, he falters at the gate, and is unwilling to make those reductions for his own constituency that he desired to make for the constituency of other men. Ah, my friends, you may call that "progressive," but you only call it "progressive." I say to you that no man can reform the world unless he first be willing to reform himself.

Mr. CULLOP. I notice yesterday wheat in Winnipeg, Canada, was quoted at 92⅜ cents per bushel while in Chicago it was 89 cents a bushel, in St. Louis it was 86 cents and in Kansas City 84 cents per bushel. This seems to be about the difference daily of the Winnipeg market over the Chicago market. Now, if wheat is higher in Canada, as the quotations daily show, will removing the duty on wheat in any manner injure the farmers of the United States?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will not.

Mr. CULLOP. Under the drawback clause of the Payne tariff bill, which provides that all duties on raw material brought into this country for manufacturing products for exportation are relieved of all tariff charges except 1 per cent of the tariff levied, which the Government charges for handling the transaction, is it not true that the miller can import wheat for the manufacture of his export flour, and instead of paying the tariff of 25 cents a bushel it is only 1 per cent of 25 cents a bushel, and he can thereby secure all such wheat from Canada or any other country practically without any tariff at all, so that the tariff on wheat, because of this fact, is practically removed now under the Payne bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct.

Mr. CULLOP. Chicago being the initial wheat market for the Mississippi Valley, does not the difference in price between places like St. Louis, Kansas City, and similar points represent the cost of transportation charges from said points to Chicago and the middleman's profit in handling the grain?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly; that is true.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed the wheat problem so much during the last few days in the House that I hardly feel as though I were justified in saying anything further in reference to that matter, but I want to call attention to this fact, that in the year 1910 the production of wheat in the United States amounted to 695,443,000 bushels. We exported 46,679,876 bushels, or 6.71 per cent. Canada that year produced 149,000,000 bushels of wheat and exported 49,741,350 bushels, or 33 per cent.

Now, I want to ask the other side this question: If the outside world, the markets of Europe, had not absorbed that 49,000,000 bushels of export Canadian wheat, if Canada had sent to this country every bushel of her export wheat, what would have been the result? The European market of necessity would have been 49,741,350 bushels behind the demand. They consumed that 49,741,350 bushels, and if you had taken it away from them and put it into this country, they would have been short that amount. If the European market had been short 49,741,350 bushels, would they not have been ready to consume 49,741,350 bushels of wheat from us at the world's price?

My friends, one strange thing about your party on that side of the House is that you are prepared at any time to deny the economic laws of the universe when it suits your purpose, and to reassert them when you desire to do so. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] Fifteen years ago you denied—your leaders on that side of the House denied—the quantitative theory of money. You said that it did not make any difference how much money you had in circulation; it did not measure your values. And yet last year a distinguished committee of Senators representing your party filed a report on the cost of living in this country and asserted that the cost of living had increased because the amount of money in the country had increased and sent up prices by decreasing the purchasing power of the money.

Fifteen years ago you were on one side of the question and to-day you are on the other. Until this debate commenced, I never heard any man assert the theory that as to the great world crops, like those of wheat and cotton, the surplus crop, where a nation was continually exporting a portion of the crop, did not fix the price. And yet the exigencies of the day, the difficulties of the hour, have driven you to a position where you deny all economic laws and say that the value of your crop is not fixed by the surplus that you send to the markets of Liverpool and London. If they are—and they are, and you know it is true—then what difference does it make whether

you have an artificial tariff barrier between this country and Canada or not, so far as your wheat crop is concerned, because the price of the wheat crop will be fixed by the price you obtain for the wheat that you send to European markets, just as our cotton crop in the Southern States is fixed by the world's supply and the world's demand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. HELGESEN. If the gentleman will answer this one question, I think he can satisfy the farmers of this country that his side is right and that they are wrong on this question. I live in the State of North Dakota. Up there we have a town where half of the town is in North Dakota and the other half in Saskatchewan. One of the principal streets forms the boundary line. How do you account for the fact that the millers for years have been paying from 10 to 12 cents a bushel more for wheat, and the maltsters have been paying from 10 to 25 or 30 cents more for barley, and the merchants have been paying from 20 to 25 cents more for flax on the American side of that street than on the Canadian side? If the Liverpool market or the markets of the world control the price, how do you account for that fact?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is easy enough. I am not talking about local markets or local conditions. I of necessity recognize the fact, for example, that if the District of Columbia were the only market a farmer had in which to sell his produce in this neighborhood, and you put a policeman on the outer border of this District of Columbia and forced the farmer living in Maryland or Virginia to pay a tax for the privilege of bringing his produce into this particular town, it would be true that he could not sell his produce for as high a price outside as he could inside, because in the immediate local neighborhood his market is limited, and for him to take his produce to Baltimore or somewhere else would cost him additional freight charges. What I say does not apply to immediate local conditions. I have no doubt that, if this bill passes, there may be some towns in North Dakota where the price may be affected slightly. On the other hand, I have no doubt there will be some towns in Canada where the price will be affected adversely; but we as a Nation can not limit our legislation to the village from which the gentleman from North Dakota comes [applause on the Democratic side], nor can we fix our theories of the world's commerce from the standpoint of village wisdom. [Laughter and applause].

Mr. LANGLEY. I understood the gentleman to say that the Republican Party had changed its position on the quantitative theory of money from what it was 15 years ago. Is that correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It certainly has.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he and his party have changed their position from what it was 15 years ago on the question of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the theory that we advanced 15 years ago has recently been adopted as correct by a Republican Senate committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say this about these farm products. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], in his carefully prepared and able argument the other day, stated that the cost of living was not governed by a tariff wall, that the farmer did not get the benefit of the prices, but that the price was made by the middleman; and in order to sustain that position he asserted that an onion sometimes sold to the final consumer at a thousand per cent more than the farmer got for the onion when it left the farm. Now, that may be true as to onions. It may be true as to a few commodities, but I want to call your attention to one great commodity that goes on the table of every man, that is necessary to sustain the life of the Nation, and that is meat.

The difference between the wholesale price and the price to the consumer, as shown by the census figures in 50 cities, varies in different localities. In the North Atlantic States the increase above the wholesale price to the consumer is 31.4 per cent. In the South Central States it is as much as 54 per cent, but in 50 cities of the United States the average increased retail price to the consumer over the wholesale price is 38 per cent.

Does that sustain the argument of the gentleman that the wholesale price does not affect the value when it goes to the ultimate consumer? And the same thing is true in many other commodities.

I do not contend for a moment that the value of this treaty is in the fact that we are going to reduce the price of wheat either in this country or in Canada; I believe, though, that we will make a more stable market in both countries. I believe that we will prevent, to a large extent, speculators and manipulators from cornering markets and at times forcing exorbitant prices upon the people of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That may not be a good reason from the standpoint of you gentlemen who believe in protecting profits, but it is certainly a good reason from the standpoint of men on the Democratic side of the House who are opposed to any proposition that leads to monopoly or oppression. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] complains of the fact that the President of the United States sent this pact to Congress. Why, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress are responsible for its being here.

The President called Congress in extraordinary session two years ago to revise the tariff downward, not because he feared the people, but largely because certain large manufacturing interests were demanding changes that had become burdensome to them and the development of their foreign trade. The President was honest and ignorant; the standpatters were informed and cunning; the natural result followed, and they handed the President a "gold brick," that glittered without and was false metal within, when they induced him to sign the Payne-tariff bill.

But the complaining manufacturer was not to be put aside so easily; he knew the rates were still left as prohibitive as they were under the Dingley bill, and he wanted concessions made to advance his trade in foreign markets. They therefore agreed to give the President a "big stick," to be used for the manufacturer's benefit in the nature of the minimum and maximum provision of the Payne tariff law, whereby the rates provided in the bill were made the minimum rates and the maximum rates were an advance of 25 per cent ad valorem over the minimum rate and were to take effect at a later day if foreign nations did not make concessions in the interest of our foreign trade demanded by the President.

The end of the history is a short and sad one. The President went abroad with his "big stick," demanding concessions, and he came back without any material concessions and without the "big stick." Our stand-pat friends were advised that the coercion method would not work before they tried it. They knew France had made a failure of such a plan over two decades ago, but they could not put the tariff any higher than the Payne bill put it; they were unwilling to allow the President a chance to reduce it by making the Payne rates the maximum rate and authorizing the President to reduce it to a minimum rate. If they had done so, this legislation could have been avoided, and he could have probably accomplished his purpose in the main by conceding to Canada the minimum rates.

In the meantime the temper of the American people was such that the President dared not impose the maximum rate on Canadian products. So the President was forced to get out of the difficult position as best he could. The manner in which he did it was best told by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, Canadian minister of finance, when introducing the pending reciprocity agreement at Ottawa:

The President of the United States—

Says Mr. Fielding—

as one evidence of his sincere desire to avoid trouble with Canada, did us the honor of inviting a member of this Government to proceed to Albany to meet him and discuss the matter. * * * It was not a question of putting on the tariff, but a question of taking it off, and I found the President of the United States was willing to take it off if we could give him some decent excuse to do so. * * * We made a few changes, a few concessions of no earthly importance, but they served the purpose and gave Mr. Taft the excuse he desired to refrain from imposing the maximum tariff against Canada. Out of this negotiation grew the larger negotiation of a more recent date. We were invited then to take up the greater question of the reciprocal trade agreement.

Now, is not that pathetic, the straits these bad standpatters placed their President in because they did not know how to arrange a maximum and minimum tariff rate, or were they again deceiving the President? Perish the thought!

Mr. Fielding says:

It was not a question of putting on the tariff, but a question of taking it off, and I found the President of the United States was willing to take it off if he could be given an excuse to do so.

It was an outrage that any political party should put our great country in such a humiliating position in the eyes of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, general debate is now closed, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats, excepting game, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out of lines 11 and 12 the words "1½ cents per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "1½ cents per pound."

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will state frankly to the members of the committee that the purpose of offering this amendment and others which will follow, if they shall receive the support of the committee, is to strike out these products from the tariff list and to offer in their stead, when we reach that portion of the bill, an amendment placing meat and all meat products on the free list.

As I do not desire to speak at different times on this subject when the paragraphs are reached, I want to state my position. If there is one fundamental policy that ought to be adopted by the American Congress at this time, independent of politics, it should be a policy to curtail the power of the trusts, particularly those trusts which are, beyond dispute, in control of many of the common necessaries of life. It is a matter of current history that the chief operations of the great trusts at this time apply to the food products of the people, those things that must enter into the consumption of practically every home.

That the Meat Trust is a combination, an unlawful monopoly, we only need to refer to the records of our own courts where the prominent members and officers of these combinations are at this time under indictment for overworking their opportunities to corner and monopolize the meat products between the time they leave the farm and reach the table of the consumers.

This agreement places the farmer on the free list, and then keeps a liberal protection for the miller, the packer, the tanner, and leather manufacturer, and for everybody that is organized to reap big profits between the farmer and the consumer. It is about as bad as it could be framed to give further advantage to the middleman, who does his business between the producer and the consumer. Those people are doing pretty well now. About the only additional boost we could give them would be a larger free-trade market in which to buy while still protecting them liberally in what they have to sell. This the proposed agreement will do.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will.

Mr. GARRETT. The Payne-Aldrich bill provided for a duty of 1½ cents a pound on meat. Did the gentleman from South Dakota offer an amendment then to put meat on the free list? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I did not; but I will say that if it had been offered, the gentleman on the floor from South Dakota would have supported the amendment, if we had been compelled, as here, to put live cattle on the free list. He will support it here and now, and if you gentlemen will follow and sustain the products of the farm through the intermediate combinations that control prices to the consumer, and place the ultimate products of the farm free from the control of these monopolistic combinations I will support the amendment and support the reciprocity measure. Will the gentleman reciprocate and vote for the amendment that will give free food products to the consumer?

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Within a few days there will be a bill before the House to put upon the free list beef, mutton, veal, lamb, pork, and so forth. I shall vote for it; will the gentleman? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman has answered my question in a manner that would have done credit to a part of the country north of the place where the gentleman resides. He has answered my question by asking another. I asked him whether he would support the amendment in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if various amendments to be offered are to be followed by a discussion of this kind I shall object, if the purpose is to mutilate this bill and ultimately to defeat it in that manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to the gentleman who has just yielded the floor fully answers all that can be said on the subject. The gentleman tries by his amendment to put meat on the free list coming from Canada. We have a bill prepared and reported to this House to put meat on the free list coming from all the world [applause on the Democratic side], and the gentleman will not vote for it when it comes up, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Well, the gentleman may be surprised on that score.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope I will be. I shall welcome the gentleman with open arms.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There are several surprises that may be due the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this. I can say, on the authority of the President of the United States, that the only reason that meat is not on the free list in this bill is because the commissioners of the Dominion of Canada refused to allow it to be placed there. If you adopt the amendment offered, you will defeat the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to have him explain why.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because it has got to go back, if it is changed, to the commissioners for a renegotiation, and that will destroy it at the present time and possibly for all time to come.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the gentleman read the Canadian bill? If he has, he will not make that statement.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have read the Canadian bill, and the gentleman and I evidently differ in our construction of it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he understands that this pact prevents the Government of the United States from declaring free trade in meats between Canada and this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It does at the present time, as far as the agreement goes now. We have a third section added to the bill that I hope will ultimately lead to very much freer trade with Canada than this bill contains now. But I want to say once for all, the purpose of offering amendments to this bill is to defeat it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No man on this side of the House need fear that his vote will be misunderstood when he votes against amendments to this bill, no matter in what form they may come or from what source.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not understand the purport of the inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Possibly not.

Mr. GARRETT. He asked if this treaty would prevent putting meats on the free list from Canada; that is to say, if it would defeat the purpose of the bill that is to come hereafter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, not at all. I did not understand the gentleman's proposition. Of course, the second bill will be passed if it becomes a law after this is signed.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would like to know what obligation we have with Canada in connection with this particular legislation that would deprive us, in honor and comity between nations, from amending this pact or legislation so as to place meat on the free list in this bill, which would not be of like force if on to-morrow we seek to accomplish the same thing by another bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, it is very simple. This is in the reciprocal free list. If we change it here we force Canada to put meat on the free list herself, which she declines to do, and we will destroy the pact; but when this is adopted, if a Republican Senate will adopt and pass a Democratic bill, we will put meat on the free list from all the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on this paragraph be now closed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And all amendments thereto.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Alabama is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT) there were—ayes 125, noes 60.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk began the reading of the next paragraph.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Nebraska had an amendment to offer.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend in line 12, page 1, by striking out the word "pound" and inserting in lieu thereof "100 pounds."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 12, strike out the word "pound" and insert in lieu thereof the words "100 pounds."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I moved to close debate upon the paragraph and all amendment thereto, but I do not wish to cut off the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Alabama to move to cut off debate on the pending amendment, but if the Chair is in error debate is closed on all amendments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may have five minutes in which to discuss his amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I understood the Chairman in stating the motion to state that the motion was to close debate upon the paragraph, and the Chairman, as I understood it, did not say "all amendments thereto."

The CHAIRMAN. To be frank with the gentleman, the Chair's impression was that the motion of the gentleman from Alabama was to close debate on the amendment, but if the action of the House was to close debate on the paragraph and all amendments, why——

Mr. MANN. But the House votes on the motion as stated by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly; but the RECORD will show how the question was put to the committee, and that controls the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not take up the time of the committee——

Mr. KENDALL. It ought not to be done by unanimous consent, but the gentleman ought to have the time as a matter of right.

Mr. NORRIS. I am willing, Mr. Chairman, to take the Chairman's word for it. If he so stated the motion, I did not understand the motion made or hear it stated that way, but I may be mistaken, being so far back in the Hall. If the Chair says that he stated the motion to include all amendments thereto, I will admit that the Chair has the right——

The CHAIRMAN. The RECORD itself will disclose the actual fact, and in the absence of that the Chair, without objection, will recognize the gentleman from Nebraska to discuss the amendment he has just offered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would in effect put the items included in the paragraph here, "Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game" on the free list. It will reduce the tariff to such a low amount that it would practically be free. I want briefly to reply to what the gentleman from Alabama has said in regard to the proposed amendments to this bill. I want to say to the gentleman and that side of the House that if this bill could be amended in certain respects, so as to make it, as I believe it would be then made, just and fair to the men and the classes from whom you take all the protection they now have, I would be willing to support the bill and vote for it. I want to say to the gentleman that he certainly must have misunderstood this bill when he says the adoption of such an amendment would defeat the so-called agreement with Canada. The agreement, or the bill, says we shall charge on the meats mentioned in this paragraph a rate of duty at 1¼ cents per pound. Why can Canada object and why under heaven should she have any reason to object if, instead of charging her 1¼ cents per pound, we said to Canada, "We will not charge you anything; you can bring it in free." There can be no reason given why any item named in the bill that is included in the imports coming from Canada should not be lowered or made absolutely free. There is no objection and there can be none. I know that the gentleman said that he is going to follow this bill by another one that will put these particular articles on the free list, but in order to make that sure and get the relief that he professes he wants to get by this bill—because, as he himself intimated, there is no assurance that the bill in which he intends to put that item will become a law [applause on the Republican side]—then he should favor this amendment. You compel the farmer to sell his product on a free-trade market, but protect the Beef Trust as soon as it gets possession of the farmer's steers. This amendment will put the Beef Trust on the same level, and it may give the consumer of meats some benefit, a thing he does not get as the bill stands.

So, if we run no risk, why not put those items in this bill that everybody admits and understands is going to be placed upon the statute books? I offer the amendment in the best of faith. I would be willing, as I said, if the bill were sufficiently amended along these lines, to support it and to vote for it, as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] said he would. But, if you go on the theory that by caucus action you are going to control a majority of this House on matters of legislation and give to your fellows the simple promise that you are going to give us relief in a different bill which you do not believe yourselves is going to be enacted into law, it seems to me that you are not acting wisely, at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. [Cries of "Vote!"] The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bacon and hams, not in tins or jars, 1¼ cents per pound.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the words "1¼ cents per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "1¼ cents per pound."

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the members of this committee that it is not my habit to take up the time of the House by offering amendments for the purpose of delay, and if I am not interrupted in these five minutes I can say all I desire to say on this subject. It is to my mind so vital if this legislation is to be of any benefit to the people that I think one or two minutes should be given to this particular phase of the question before we pass to a final vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman will assure me that if I have to have a little more time it will not be objected to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course I can not give that assurance. If the amendment that the gentleman is proposing, to put articles on the free list, is adopted, will he vote for this bill?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes; I will, if the gentleman will aid me in putting them on this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not in this bill, but in the other bill.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is there any probability of that bill becoming a law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. From the complexion of the Senate, controlled by the gentleman's party and the way they have acted in the past, I will say no.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this colloquy has disclosed the real purpose of the Democracy in this matter. They are willing to vote to cripple the trusts in a proposition and upon a bill that they themselves know has no chance of passing, but they are not willing to come forward and do it in a bill that may pass. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of this committee to a fact that, so far as I have observed, has not been called to the attention of the committee at all. The Canadian treaty that went into effect in 1854 not only provided that cattle should go on the free list, but that all meat products should go there; not only that wheat should go on the free list, but that all flour and products of grain should go on the free list; not only that hides should go on the free list, but that products of leather should go on the free list. We are here proposing to give to the trusts of this country an advantage which they very much desire but do not need. We are not striking at a single trust in this legislation, except the Print Paper Trust. We are fortifying the powers of the Meat Trust, of the Cereal Trust, of the Leather Trust, of the Flour Trust, and of the Barley Trust by assuring them of a free-trade market in which to buy their products and protecting them by a high-tariff wall against selling their products to the American people. I would like to see the gentleman display a loyalty as great as his frankness and agree with his colleagues to vote for a measure that is

likely to become a law in order that we may give real relief. What will be the operation of this bill? Let us see. It will probably reduce the price of wheat in this country something like 10 cents a bushel, from the best statistics. How many bushels are there in a barrel of flour? Practically four and one-half.

The wheat that goes into a barrel of flour after this bill passes will probably cost the miller about 50 cents less by reason of this agreement—4½ bushels, at a reduction of 10 cents per bushel. And, with remarkable cleverness, exactly 50 cents per barrel of flour is given to protect the millers of Minneapolis when they sell it to the American consumer. No reduction of the price of flour is likely to result, therefore, from this legislation.

It is proposed to put cattle upon the free list, but protect the packer's fresh meat at $1.25 per hundred pounds. The packer will buy the farmer's 1,000-pound steer from Canada free of tariff duty. The steer will make, approximately, 650 pounds of fresh beef, upon which the packer is at once protected to the amount of $8.12½, which is a larger profit than the American farmer has made on a like steer after three years of care and expenditure. This $8.12½ protection to the packer on the meat is but little less than the present tariff duty on the live steer. There is little probability, therefore, that any reduction in the price of cattle will filter through to the ultimate consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. COVINGTON. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the hypocrisy of gentlemen on that side of the House is very apparent. They pretend that they wish to protect the American consumer from the operations of the Beef Trust, and yet they are now engaged in a performance which, even if successful, would bring no relief whatever to the American people from the exactions of the Beef Trust. Canada refuses to put meats on the free list because Canada is afraid that the Canadian consumer would be placed at the mercy of the Beef Trust of this country if American beef was allowed to go free of duty into Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just one moment. The one thing that will bring relief to the American people will be to put on the free list fresh meat coming from every country of the civilized world, so as to permit the importation of meat from Australia, the South American countries, and from every other great meat-producing country in the world, in order to have effective competition with the Beef Trust. But, Mr. Chairman, with an ingenuity for which gentlemen on that side of the House are famous, they pretend to be endeavoring to give relief to the American people by demanding that beef be allowed to come into this country from Canada free when all Canada and everyone else knows that no beef would come here if Canadian beef were put on the free list, but that the Beef Trust would go into Canada and take charge of that industry there, if it had a free market in Canada, and still hold the American market.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will ask the gentleman, Has Canada any objection to the importation of meat from Canada to this country free?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is what I am trying to make very clear. Canada knows that no beef will come into this country, no matter what the tariff rate from Canada is, and inasmuch as this is a reciprocal agreement, the duties and rates are the same, whether articles come from one country or the other.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] both voted against this reciprocity agreement in the last Congress when it was pending in the House. It may be that some gentlemen have heard them raising their voices in favor of free meats when the Payne-Aldrich bill was under consideration here, or under consideration in another body, but my recollection does not bring to mind the figure of the gentleman from South Dakota discussing that question or urging it upon the Members of this House. The attempts to amend this bill are, in my opinion, made for but one purpose, and that is to arouse so much antagonism against this agreement in Canada and to create so much distrust and opposition there against it that, while it will not be beaten in the United States, it will fail to receive the approval of the Canadian Parliament. That, in my opinion, is the purpose of the gentlemen on that side who are endeavoring to amend this measure and attempting to persuade Members of this House that in so doing they are seeking to relieve the American people from the high prices that are exacted for food products.

If the gentleman from South Dakota desires to help in relieving the people of this country from the exactions of the Beef Trust, let him hold his soul in patience and vote for the free-list bill that will be offered here, and which will provide for the free importation of meat, so that the Beef Trust will no longer be in a position to extract money unjustly from the American people.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would say to the gentleman, Yes, I will vote for that bill; but the gentleman may rest assured that it will not pass.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. JAMES. Why will it not pass? Will the gentleman's party defeat it in the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from New York, if the proposed bill does not become a law, will this other proposition become effective?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not expressing my opinion as to whether that measure will become a law in the future, because my experience with the party with which the gentleman has so long been associated leads me to believe that nothing but a supernatural agency would convert certain gentlemen in his party to the policy of serving the interests of the people, and I do not look for that in the immediate future. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the gentleman from New York, Why not permit a vote to be taken on amendments to this measure in order to avoid that very contingency, no matter from what side it may come, whether from my party or from his party? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman's suggestion is plausible, but the applause which he receives comes from those who have been opposing this bill during this debate.

Mr. DALZELL. Does the gentleman not know that there are already two amendments on this bill as it came originally from the State Department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes, I do; and I know that the administration of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a wheel horse for some years assured this side of the House that those amendments will not jeopardize the enactment or approval of this law, either here or in Canada; and the criticism of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] should have been made in the White House and not in the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I shall be glad to be recognized, just to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. CANNON. I rise to oppose the amendment. I have heard the thunders roar before.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is not in order. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. CANNON. Then I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] counsel that no amendment shall be offered to this bill, for the reason that they say the bill covers the pact or agreement made by the President of the United States with the Canadian commissioners, and that this is an effort to vitalize that pact or agreement by legislation, and that it can not be amended without the permission of Canada, that Canada would not consent, and that the agreement would fail. Now, I want to ask the gentleman what assurance he has that, in section 2 of this bill, page 23—

Pulp wood, mechanically ground—

And so forth, which is not according to the pact or agreement, but an amendment to that agreement, will be accepted?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield to allow me to state the assurance we have?

Mr. CANNON. I yield for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My understanding of the history of that amendment is that at the request of the executive department of the Government, either directly or indirectly, that particular

amendment to section 2 was prepared by the distinguished gentleman who now heads the minority of this House, and assurances were received from the Executive, after consultation with the representatives of the Canadian Government, that this amendment would not jeopardize the pact, but would be accepted by Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. When gentlemen get through applauding I will try to take the remainder of my time without interruption. By what grapevine telegraph has that assurance been given? In what public document does it appear? If you can amend the agreement in one respect, why can you not do so in another? It is proposed to amend it in section 2, and if that amendment is adopted the pact is broken, unless Canada accepts the amendment. [Laughter.] I will discuss section 2 when we come to it. I think I know why you amend section 2. You have not stated the reason. I will ask you to state it later; but I think it is a very thin argument to make in the American House of Representatives, which originates revenue bills—except this one [laughter]—that the pending bill can not be amended because Canada will not have it. Great heavens! Let us bring Canada down here and surrender the Hall of the House to her. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will be withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Canned meats and canned poultry, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 6 by striking out "twenty" and inserting "one."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, in line 6, strike out "twenty" and insert "one."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic majority are in desperate straits. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] I say the Democratic majority are in desperate straits indeed when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] feel forced to resort to the arguments they have made upon the preceding amendments. The gentleman from Alabama stated first that if this amendment was adopted the bill would have to go back to the Canadian Parliament. If the gentleman had examined the Canadian bill carefully, as a lawyer, he would never have made that statement, for I have too much confidence in his fairness to this House to believe that he would intentionally have misled it.

Day before yesterday I read a portion of the Canadian bill into the RECORD. I challenged then any lawyer in this Chamber to rise and say that putting a free list of imports into this country would affect that bill in the slightest degree. I renew that challenge now. The gentleman from Alabama next said that if we adopted this amendment that this was reciprocal, and that we would have to make the Canadian side of the bill the same. I want to say that if the gentleman had read his own bill carefully he would not have made that statement, because this does not purport to be reciprocal in any degree, for the proviso is as follows:

Provided, That the duties above enumerated shall take effect whenever the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that on the articles hereinafter enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), when imported therefrom into the Dominion of Canada, duties not in excess of the following are imposed, namely:

We do not propose to touch the Canadian side of the agreement upon these duties. [Applause on the Republican side.] Gentlemen of the majority, you are trying to deceive the country this afternoon in your action of to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no reason, if your are acting in good faith in desiring to lower duties, why you should not vote for these amendments, and the reason you are not is because you do not want to legislate for the country. You propose a little later to support a bill which you believe will be vetoed and not become a law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. THAYER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the same solicitude for the Canadian people which moved him and his associates to offer these amendments is the same solicitude which moves them to vote against this reciprocity treaty with Canada? [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say to the gentleman that I am going to vote for the amendments, every one of them, and I am going to vote for the free list, although without having any confidence that we shall secure the legislation. But if we would adopt these amendments, we would have legislation of some benefit to the consumers of the country, instead of only supposed political issues for you. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, just for a moment I want to engage in a little uncovering of motives. I saw the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to put meat on the free list. When I saw that I began to think of his record in the past. I think I have heard him say that he was for the free admission of nothing into America. He wanted the tariff wall so high that nothing could get over it. What reason has the gentleman for wishing to inject into this reciprocity bill these free-list measures? It must be along these lines that they know that every man who conscientiously will support one of these amendments putting certain items on the free list in this bill will likewise vote for it on the free list introduced by the gentleman from Alabama and now pending here, and they know that every Member who is at heart opposed to this bill will vote to put these items on the free list in this bill and then vote to defeat the bill. If they get these items on this bill here, they will kill this bill in the Senate, or else, if there are enough Members in the House and Senate honestly in favor of the free items now urged by them, then our free-list bill will go through the Senate. You can not be for the free-list items in this bill and against them in the other. And Senators in the other end of the Capitol can not be for free items in this bill and against them in the next bill on the calendar. If this bill will pass the Senate with the free-list items in it, so will the free-list bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama. When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] voted to put meat on the free list in this bill, I looked with suspicion upon the motives of the whole party back of him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] may be honest and sincere, but when he sees the company he is moving with he ought to know he is blind.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of stating my reasons for opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. There seems to be some question as to the exact effect of that amendment, together with the amendments offered by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from South Dakota. These gentlemen say that the effect of the adoption of their amendments would be merely to change the duty imposed by this bill upon Canadian products and not change the duty imposed by Canada upon the American products. Now, if that is true, Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is simply that canned meats and poultry coming from Canada into this country would be received at a duty of 1 per cent ad valorem, and the meats and poultry going from this country to Canada would be charged 20 per cent ad valorem. But the gentleman from Wisconsin says that Canada will not object to this; that Canada would be glad to have her canned poultry come in here at a less duty than she imposes on our product. Of course, that would be for the benefit of Canada. Of course, Canada would not object; but, Mr. Chairman, how about all the other countries of the world with whom we have the most-favored-nation clause in our treaties? The effect of this amendment would be simply this: We would be giving to Canada a preferential of 95 per cent which we accord to no other nation and for which Canada gives us no adequate consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. If it be true that that would be giving Canada something for which we get no consideration, then is it not true that the bill unamended would have the same effect that the gentleman is afraid of, because we are giving to Canada something and getting nothing in return? [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. On the contrary; in my view there is abundant consideration for this agreement on both sides just as it stands. Therefore, we must not by amending this bill give Canada much lower duties than she gives us on the same articles, so that some other foreign nation can say that we are discriminating in favor of Canada in that particular, giving Canada advantages which we do not accord to them.

Mr. NORRIS. The duties are not all the same.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman. It is perfectly apparent that it is just as dangerous to the success of this bill to put Canadian products on the free list where Canada does not reduce her duty against us as to

reduce or raise other duties which we have reason to believe Canada would not accept. That is one other way of beating this bill. There are two ways of defeating the bill. One is to make an amendment which Canada will not agree to, and the other is to make an amendment which will violate the most-favored-nation clause with other nations. I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, as a Republican, and as one who is in favor of this bill as it stands. I propose to vote against any amendment offered for whatever purpose which may result fatally to this bill. I am content in this matter to follow the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against every amendment proposed to this bill, including even the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out the last word, now pending.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will withdraw that pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I am speaking in opposition to it, and the gentleman can not withdraw it. I do not take this view under the mistaken apprehension that it is not within the power of Congress to amend the bill without in any way affecting the agreement entered into by the two countries. [Applause.] I do not disguise from myself the fact that it was wholly within the spirit and the letter of the agreement to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], now pending, or any other amendment which reduces the rate of duty on articles coming from Canada into the United States without in any way affecting the rate of duty on articles coming from the United States into Canada. There are a number of items in this bill that are not at all reciprocal, a number of items in the bill in regard to articles coming from Canada into the United States that are not mentioned in the list of articles going from the United States into Canada. There are a number of articles mentioned in the list going from the United States to Canada that are not mentioned in the list of articles coming from Canada to the United States. For instance, we put a duty of only 10 cents a ton on iron ore coming from Canada into the United States, in consideration of Canada putting a duty of only one-half a cent a pound on unshelled peanuts and 1 cent a pound on shelled peanuts coming from the United States into Canada, because neither of those items is found in the corresponding list of the other country.

It would be quite within our power under the favored-nation clause, in my judgment, to admit meats free of duty coming from Canada into the United States in consideration of Canada admitting meats at a cent and a quarter a pound coming from the United States into Canada. It is quite within the province of the favored-nation clause and the agreement to do this, but it would not be good sense, in my judgment, and I shall vote against that amendment and other amendments. I appreciate the difficulties on the other side of the House in voting down these amendments which are in order, which would not invalidate the agreement, in my opinion.

I am in favor of carrying out the agreement and entering into reciprocal relations with Canada, but I appreciate the fact [applause] that while amendments might be made, they would result in defeat of the bill in the end.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment. My distinguished colleague from Illinois, distinguished in many ways, has stated that section 2 of the bill relating to pulp and paper was not in accordance with the agreement. With what little knowledge I have been able to gain, after partly, if not at least helping in, preparing the amendment or the section in the bill and in part the provision in the agreement, I am prepared to say that section 2 of the bill to the letter carries out the agreement entered into between the two executives and does not depart in the slightest degree from the terms of the agreement. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted; debate is now proceeding by unanimous consent and—— [Cries of "Regular order!"] Regular order is demanded. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lard and compounds thereof, cottolene and cotton stearine, and animal stearine, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, having had no time during general debate, I avail myself of the privilege of offering the pro forma amendment to strike out the last word, for the purpose of reading or having read into the RECORD a poem on reciprocity composed by the poet laureate of the city of Washington, Col. John A. Joyce; and I may be pardoned for suggesting that our poets are not usually inspired by what is bad, but generally by what is good. I ask the Clerk to read it in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECIPROCITY.

Reciprocity is good
In the field and farm and wood
To intertwine our brotherhood.

Reciprocity is best
For each honest, loving guest,
From the East unto the West.

Reciprocity is grand
To tie us to a brother land,
Equality of heart and hand.

Reciprocity is wise,
Without greed or base disguise,
And no secret, liquid lies.

Reciprocity is love,
Gentle as a cooing dove,
Born from glorious climes above.

Reciprocity to feel,
In our woe or in our weal,
That we get a strong, square deal.

Reciprocity, fore and aft,
With all nations, scorning graft,
Through the voice of big Bill Taft!

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. The gentleman states the verses are signed by John A. Joyce. Does that settle the question between John A. Joyce and Ella Wheeler Wilcox as to who is the author of "Laugh and the world laughs with you"? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Egg yolk, egg albumen, and blood albumen, 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game; bacon and hams, not in tins or jars; meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner; canned meats and canned poultry; extract of meat, fluid or not; lard and compounds thereof; cottolene and cotton stearine, and animal stearine; tallow; egg yolk, egg albumen and blood albumen, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be imported therefrom into the United States free of duty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is obnoxious to paragraph 3 of Rule XXI with which, perhaps, the gentleman is not familiar.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont desire to be heard?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I do not if the gentleman insists upon his point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We can not waste time on these frivolous amendments.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment undertakes to put upon the free list certain articles being imported from the Dominion of Canada. The paragraph just read is part of the section relating to the dutiable list of articles imported into the United States from the Dominion of Canada, and the amendment is not germane to it. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barley malt, 45 cents per 100 pounds.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there are two distinctive, fundamental principles of government, upon the one or the other of which all governments are founded and rest. These principles are directly the opposites of each other. In one the theory of concentration of power and authority prevails, and in the other the diffusion of the power and authority of government prevails. In the monarchy the sovereignty of government is concentrated largely in the hands of a few, while in the democracy the sovereignty of government is disseminated among the masses of the people, who exercise the power and control of government. Where power is vested in a few the theory prevails that the few possess and are entitled to have superior privileges and benefits and that the authority of government can rightfully be used to foster and benefit the business and the welfare of the favored few. In the democracy the cherished idea of equal rights and exact justice to all and special privileges

to none pervades and should dominate its institutions of government and the legislation of the country.

There are also two theories of taxation and two distinctive lines of public policy along which the taxing power is exercised. The Democratic Party teaches and boldly asserts that the taxing power of the Government—that power which the Government has and exercises to take the private property of the individual citizen—can only be exercised rightfully for the purpose of raising revenue for governmental purposes to maintain the Government honestly and properly administered, and that when this purpose is accomplished the taxing power of the Government ceases; but the Republican Party disputes this limitation of the taxing power and asserts that the Government has the right and should exercise the taxing power for purposes other than the governmental purpose of raising an adequate revenue to maintain the Government. In keeping with these assertions, for more than 40 years the Republican Party has exercised the taxing power for purposes other than revenue purposes. It boldly asserts that the Government has not only the authority, but that it should exercise the taxing power for the purpose of protection.

Let us clearly understand and illustrate what the doctrine of protection means and how it operates.

For illustration, we will say that in New York, or New Jersey, or Ohio, or Tennessee, or elsewhere in the States of the Union, certain individuals are engaged in business, and the profits realized are not as large as they think they are entitled to, and in order to increase their profits it is proposed, under the theory of protection, to exercise and use the taxing power of the Government so as to require the purchasers and consumers of their goods to pay a larger price and yield a larger profit. For instance, we will say that an importer of hats can buy them abroad at such a price that they can be sold to the consumer at a reasonable profit at $1 each. When he arrives at the port of entry he is met by a customs officer who informs me that before he can enter the goods into this country he must pay a certain duty, and he inquires why and for what purpose. A Democrat tells him that he is to receive the benefits of the markets of our country and that it is just and proper that he should pay a reasonable amount toward raising the revenue necessary to properly maintain the Government; but a Republican says to him that independently of the question of revenue for governmental purposes he must pay a tax for the sake of protecting and fostering the business of the manufacturers of hats in New York or Tennessee, and that these manufacturers desire to sell their hats at a dollar and a half each, and in order to enable them to do so a duty will be levied upon his hats to force him to sell his hats at a dollar and a half each, and thereby enable the home man to exact a larger price and larger profit from his customers. This simple illustration brings out forcefully the difference in principle between the exercise of the taxing power for revenue purposes under the Democratic theory of government and the exercise of the taxing power for the purposes of protection under the Republican theory of government. It will be borne in mind that the increased price of the hat made here does not inure to the benefit of the revenue of the Treasury, but goes wholly into the business of the private manufacturer, and when it is further remembered that for every imported article upon which the Government receives revenue there are at least 10 times as many homemade articles, it is easy to understand how the taxing power of the Government is used to levy tribute under the Republican policy upon the labor and toil and the production of the masses of the people for the purpose of building up the fortunes of a favored few; and when we enlarge this illustration to embrace the vast number of articles used in this country, amounting to billions of dollars each year, we can have some idea of the enormous tribute paid by the masses of the people under this perverted use and exercise of the taxing power, and which goes as tribute into the coffers of the protected classes, and we can get a further insight into the methods by which the colossal fortunes have been piled up in this country.

I wish also to call attention to the fact that when one industry is protected every other industry demands similar protection, and the individuals receiving these benefits bind themselves together and cooperate under a community of interest, not only for the maintenance of their own favored position, but to encourage others to join with them and thereby strengthen and insure the continuance of the policy of protection by which they fatten and grow rich; and thus it is—the political poison spreads, and one artificial condition succeeds another until the natural laws of supply and demand as regulators of trade and commerce are largely destroyed and supplanted by the agreement of combinations formed in restraint of trade; and thus it is that trusts spring up and prosper in every department of business which receives this protection, and the great mass of the people are continually paying tribute to these trusts and combines through the wrongful exercise of the taxing power of the Government. The history of tariff legislation in this country has been that the tariff taxes have continued to grow higher and higher, and the stronger and richer the enterprises become which receive the benefit of tariff protection, the more insistent they become that it shall be perpetually continued and maintained at a higher rate. Right economic laws can not be violated continually with impunity, and we have to-day, and have had for years, many illustrations of wrongs and grievances done to the American people because of these abuses of the taxing power and using the Government as an agency to take the money of some of the citizens for the benefit of others. Conditions became so intolerable and public sentiment became so incensed that the mass of the people at the last election revolted against this policy and in no uncertain terms have demanded a return to a proper and rightful exercise and use of the taxing power of the Government, and have commissioned the Democratic Party to discharge this trust, and the President of the United States, realizing the demand of the people that the tariff tax shall be lowered and the wrongs righted, has submitted for the consideration of the Congress the Canadian reciprocity treaty, and it is my purpose to state my position with reference to the pending legislation. Some of my people have requested me to vote against Canadian reciprocity legislation, and, as I was unable to do so, and desire to place before them and this body some of the reasons why I was unable to do so, I shall use as a part of my remarks my letter in reply to their petition, which letter is as follows:

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th instant inclosing a petition bearing 261 names asking me to work and vote against the passage of the pending Canadian reciprocity treaty legislation.

"In reply I beg to say that I am always glad to have an expression from all of my constituents of their views on pending legislation and always give careful and conscientious consideration to their views and wishes. I fully realize the high character of the signers to the petition, and that very many of them are my warm personal friends.

"I wish to observe that I am now and have all my life been interested in farming and everything I have is invested therein, and my son, just starting in life, has chosen farming as his life work, and I am sure that you will appreciate that from every standpoint I am deeply interested in the welfare and prosperity of the farmers, and that it is my desire to do all I can to promote and advance their interests and success. However, it is my mature judgment, after much consideration, that you and they are unnecessarily agitated over the supposed results of this legislation, and I will give you some of the reasons which move me to pursue the course which I do. And, as it is impossible for me to write personally to each of the signers of the petition, I shall take the liberty of publishing this letter to you as my reply to each of them.

"First. During the last session of Congress the Democrats met in caucus and gave full consideration to this legislation, and by an overwhelming vote adopted it and made it a Democratic measure. During the present session of the newly elected Congress another caucus was held and the matter again considered, and again, by an overwhelming vote, was made and declared to be a Democratic measure. I may add that it has the support and indorsement of all the Democratic leaders of the country. Now, if I should work and vote against the bill I would not in the least change the result of anyone's vote other than my own. But I would, by so doing, subject myself to exclusion from the future caucuses of the party and from participation in its future councils, and I would be placed in a position of political alignment with the high protective tariff wing of the Republican Party. I feel confident that it is not the desire that I should be placed in this position.

"Second. For time out of mind the Democratic Party has declared that the tariff on farm products in this country was of no advantage to the farmers of the country, and did not affect in any way the price of farm products. The Democratic Party has uniformly declared that as this country was a large exporter of farm products which were sold in open market competition of the world that the price of farm products in this country was controlled and governed by the price of the surplus sold abroad. This is a fundamental, economic proposition, which, it appears to me, will not be controverted. For more than 25 years throughout my district and in other places of the State and in other States I have advocated this political doctrine and have declared for these political principles and

policies of tariff legislation, and, so far as I have been able to observe, they have always met the cordial and enthusiastic support and indorsement of the Democrats of all vocations of life. The Democratic Party has repeatedly declared—and so have I—that the tariff on farm products was levied for the purpose of attempting to justify what we consider excessively high duties upon other articles which are affected in price by the tariff. Now, I am asked to reverse this position and, by my vote, assert that the tariff on farm products does affect and control prices, and thereby to approve and indorse the political teachings of the Republican Party. I feel confident that, upon reflection, I will not be asked or expected to do this. When I call your attention to the fact that during the last 10 years we exported and sold abroad 812,239,651 bushels of wheat and, in addition, 144,945,543 barrels of flour, or, if I call your attention to the fact that during the same time we exported and sold abroad $1,975,278,025 worth of breadstuffs, made of farm products, you will at once realize not only the vast magnitude and importance of our foreign trade to the farmers, but you will realize that the prices of these sales abroad fix absolutely the prices of farm products at home.

"Third. But let us deal especially with Canada. During the last five years ending June 30 last, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	$886, 417, 376
Canada sold to us	393, 913, 673
Difference in our favor	492, 503, 703

"These figures show that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys from us more than it sells to us is a good country to trade with. No tariff wall should stand between us and such a country.

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14, 172, 075
Canada sold to us	2, 549, 201
Difference in our favor	11, 622, 874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1, 578, 179
Canada sold to us	1, 193, 796
Difference in our favor	384, 383
Meat and dairy products:	
We sold in Canada	17, 011, 017
Canada sold to us	904, 191
Difference in our favor	16, 106, 826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31, 596, 556
Canada sold to us	6, 679, 884
Difference in our favor	24, 916, 672
Corn:	
We sold in Canada	21, 704, 572
Canada sold to us	14, 350
Difference in our favor	21, 690, 222
Wheat:	
We sold in Canada	4, 442, 307
Canada sold to us	766, 254
Difference in our favor	3, 676, 053

"These official figures of our trade with Canada for the last five years show that she is a pretty good customer of the farmers of the United States, and that she is a country whose trade the farmers should cultivate and seek.

"It has been shown that a mixture of Canadian wheat and American wheat makes a higher and better grade of flour which commands a better price in the markets of the world than the flour made from either alone. Canada ships her surplus wheat to Liverpool and other foreign markets the same as we do, and the only difference is the question of freight rates, elevator facilities, etc. It is claimed by those who are competent to judge that if the United States could control through her own ports the shipment and export of Canadian wheat that it would enable this country to better regulate and control the price of wheat and steady its price and prevent corners and excessive fluctuations.

"Canada raises grass-fed cattle, but is unable to make corn-fed beef. The farmers of the United States have a surplus of corn and other cattle-feeding products, purchase the grass-fed Canadian cattle and corn-feed and sell them to a greater advantage, thereby utilizing their farm products to a better profit.

"Let me illustrate: The farmers of our section likewise raise corn and hay. They go into other States and purchase young mules and feed them and ship them, when grown and fattened, to other States at a nice profit, thereby making their farms more profitable and furnishing use and consumption for their corn and feedstuffs. Would our farmers think it a wise policy to be compelled to pay a tax of $25 or $30 per head on each mule which they bring in from other States for feeding purposes and then when the mule is ready for shipment to be required to pay another $25 or $30 for the privilege of shipping and selling in another State? This forcibly illustrates the truth and correctness of the Democratic theory and policy of government which stands for larger trade and commercial peace and facilities, believing that there is profit both in buying and selling and that the prosperity of the country will be best promoted to all the people when there are few shackles upon trade and artificial conditions are destroyed, and competition and sale and purchase shall be afforded to all the people. I wish to say again that, in my opinion, which is reenforced and supported by the almost unanimous opinion of the Democrats in Congress, that the legislation which we propose will be of immense benefit to the farmers of the country, and I am confident that it will not injure the farmers of our section.

"In your letter you refer to the fact that there has been lately a decline in the price of farm products, and you charge it to the discussion of Canadian reciprocity. It is only necessary to call your attention to the fact that for time out of mind prices have risen and fallen. I might call your attention to the fact that on June 10, 1909, wheat was $1.51; August 26, $1.06; October 14, $1.27;, October 21, $1.21; January 13, 1910, $1.33; June 16, $1.033; November 10, 96 cents. I could call your attention to the same fluctuations in the prices of corn, oats, and other products, showing greater fluctuations, and that Canadian reciprocity has nothing whatever to do with it.

"I may add that the caucus adopted and the House proposes to pass a companion bill placing on the free list all farm and agricultural implements and machinery and vehicles of every kind, leather, saddles and harness, boots and shoes, cotton bagging and ties, and many other articles which enter into the use and consumption of the farmers and the price of which is controlled more or less by the tariff; and I fail to see wherein the farmer has any cause of complaint at the program of legislation proposed by the Democratic Party.

"The doctrine of protection has been talked so long that its political poison has spread much throughout the country and artificial conditions of trade have been created, one artificial condition demanding the creation of another, and so on, until trade conditions have become so artificial and abnormal that trusts and combinations to control prices and restrain trade have infested the land; and the Democratic Party—true to the principles which it has always proclaimed with reference to the tariff—pledged itself to reduce the tariff, and should it not do so it would be false to its promises and betray the trust which the people reposed in it.

"After many years of difference and dispute and quarrels and defeat the Democrats finally united and won a glorious victory in the last congressional election. I believe in Democratic harmony and unity and cooperation. I deplore dissension and strife and division. Now is the time for unity of action and cooperation of purpose, and, all over the country, Democrats everywhere are demanding unity of action and that we shall subordinate our local and personal differences and stand united as a party. This I indorse, and such is my purpose."

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to say that I might have gone further into the details of our trade relations with Canada and reasons why I support this legislation, but it occurs to me that I have said enough to make my position plainly understood. Let the Government return to a rightful and proper use and exercise of the taxing power; let normal trade and commercial conditions be restored; let every man and every industry have a fair chance and unhampered opportunities in the struggles of life; let everyone receive and enjoy the full benefit of the results of his toil, industry, and capacity. Then will the country prosper and the blessings and benefits of labor and trade will be justly and more equitably distributed among the masses of the people and labor will receive and enjoy its reward. Discontent will largely disappear and happiness will bless the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators; thrashing machines, including windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the following substitute. I wish to transfer from page 4 the amendment that I have sent to the Clerk's desk to line 4, on page 16. The paragraph that I offer the amendment to has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY:

Pages 4 and 5, strike out the paragraph beginning on line 21, page 4, and ending with line 2, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in part, including repair parts."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. FORDNEY. I offer this as a substitute for the paragraph just read, and on that I would like to say a few words.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I do not know what the amendment is.

Mr. HARDWICK. I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers a substitute——

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentlemen will permit, I will explain to the committee what I mean by the substitute for that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will suspend for a moment. The Chair will undertake to state the amendment offered by him. It is in lieu of lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, on page 4, and lines 1 and 2, on page 5, to insert the amendment read from the Clerk's desk as a substitute, and as to which a point of order has been reserved by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, in support of the substitute I wish to say that I am offering it for the reason that by the transfer of that paragraph to page 16, line 4, after the word "namely," it places the farm machinery described in that paragraph, or substitute, upon the free list coming from Canada into the United States, without affecting the duty on that class of goods going from his country into Canada.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] stated a while ago that his objection to a certain amendment was because it was not reciprocal. I would call his attention to section 2 of the bill and ask him where there is a word in the entire section or bill that is reciprocal between this country and Canada. Section 2 provides for letting into our market free of duty all print paper and pulp without asking anything in return for it. On the other hand, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said he would vote against all amendments to the bill, and that he would vote for the measure. Now, I want to offset that vote by saying that I will vote for any amendment that will destroy it.

The gentleman from Illinois said that he believed that all articles were reciprocal, for the reason that we were trading a ton of iron ore for peanuts. That is about the size of the measure, gentlemen. This bill is just about the size of trading a ton of iron ore, representing one of the great industries of this country, for peanuts from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, we are taking away from the farmer every vestige of protection on every article produced by him. And no man on that side of the House or this side of the House will contend, if he is fair in his argument, that there is a single thing in the substitute which I have offered that will in any way jeopardize the success of this measure except, my friends, that you are not willing to trade the farmer something for something that you are taking away from him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman's amendment propose to increase the duty found in the bill under consideration at present?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I say, is not the effect of the gentleman's amendment to increase the duty found in the pending bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. If that is the effect, then I do not understand anything that I am talking about. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] But I will say to the gentleman that when I want to reach a conclusion in making up my own judgment I will not go to the gentleman from Brooklyn, or New York. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman would be much more fortunate if he did, rather than rely on himself and his own judgment. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. It is very fortunate for me, perhaps, that I am not a resident of Brooklyn. I have the honor to come from a better district—a district where Republicans grow, and where the farmers raise the products that feed the mouths of the people of Brooklyn. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A MEMBER. Brooklyn no longer exists. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; but it is still on the map, and it belongs to the free-trade element. No man can come to Congress from the district represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] who does not express the sentiment expressed by him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is right. They represent the will of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, well, if my friend wants anything good to eat he will come to Michigan, and there he will get it. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the substitute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan shows how sincerely honest he is in trying to defeat this bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is what I said. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Michigan not only offers an amendment to change the terms of the bill, and so defeat it, but he proposes to raise the duty on the articles mentioned beyond the rates of the reciprocity duty and put those articles back at the old Payne-bill rate, because in offering his amendment he strikes out all rate of duty, and necessarily, as no rate of duty is mentioned, the articles would fall again under the terms on the Payne bill, which are above the rates of duty fixed in this bill, and that would of necessity defeat this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Alabama allow me to reply to that suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. By transferring this paragraph from the protected list to the free list, does the gentleman mean to say that it will increase the duty on that article?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman gives no duty, and that would follow necessarily therefrom.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I will read the language prior to that. Will the gentleman permit me? I would like to set myself right on this. On page 15, line 24, the bill says:

That the articles mentioned in the following paragraphs, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), shall be exempt from duty, namely:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the gentleman transfers it from the free list of this bill to the dutiable list.

Mr. FORDNEY. No. It is just the reverse. I transfer it from the dutiable list to the free list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is the protected list, and the gentleman transfers the item from that without naming any duty, and in consequence the present rate of duty fixed by the Payne law would be effective.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I beg to differ with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Laths, 10 cents per 1,000 pieces.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 24, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, no one in this House can accuse me of lack of good faith in offering this amendment. No one can accuse me of offering this amendment for the purpose of defeating this bill. I voted for the bill before, and whether my amendment carries or not, I will vote for it again. [Applause.] I am offering the amendment in the interest of the people, not alone of my district, but of the entire country; because you have admitted upon the other side that if the amendment does not prevail now it will not be written into the law of this country during this session of Congress. This is your one opportunity to give our people absolute free lumber from Canada, and the question is whether or not you will embrace it. This bill goes far toward free trade in lumber with Canada, but it ought to go all the way.

I am one of the few gentlemen on this side who come from the Middle West who have been earnestly insisting upon a revision downward of the tariff law of this country who are now standing consistently for the same thing in this Congress that they stood for in the Sixty-first Congress.

There is a declaration made in the report of the minority on this bill, filed in the last Congress, signed by the gentleman from

Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], that this bill is an abandonment of the policy of protection. I am not in favor of the abandonment of the policy of protection as William McKinley defined it, as William H. Taft and other great leaders of my party define it, that it is the application of a duty equal to the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad, but I am in favor of abandoning protection as defined by Mr. DALZELL and Mr. FORDNEY, and I will not join with them in maintaining their kind of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am sorry that I must differ with my friends from the Middle West, but in my judgment the consistent thing for us to do is not to rally round these gentlemen whose brand of protection we were so recently repudiating, but that instead we should stand with the President of the United States in this matter; because he is right and I am sure no Republican President ever did, and no Republican President ever will propose a measure to the Congress of the United States that is an abandonment of the policy of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. MADISON. No; I have only five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADISON. Illness prevented me from being here and discussing this bill as I wished and showing as best I could that this bill would not, as has been represented, be detrimental but beneficial to the agricultural classes of the Middle West. I have only five minutes now to discuss my amendment, and can not yield for interruptions. You gentlemen on the other side admit that your so-called "farmers' free-list" bill is not to become a law. You say it will be defeated in the Senate. Why are you passing it? In order that it may go to the Senate and be defeated—in order that you may cry that it was defeated by a Republican Senate? That is playing politics. That is not rising to the high standard to which you as a responsible party ought to rise, and when you are offered the opportunity to give the people of this country free lumber, as you can in this bill, and you refuse to do it, and pass through this House a bill including free lumber that you know will not pass the Senate, you are absolutely convicting yourselves in the eyes of the American people of the fault of inconsistency when you say you want to give them free lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADISON. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Regular order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama renews the request that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADISON. My amendment is only the first of a number that I propose to offer. If you are honest in your desire for complete free lumber I feel sure you will vote this amendment through, and it will be the first one along the line of giving free lumber to the American people from Canada, a country that ranks third among the countries of the world in the quantity of its mature marketable timber.

Gentlemen, this bill is going to the other end of this Capitol, and the Senate of the United States will make the bill. As in the historic summer of 1909 this House will hurry through the bills it is now considering, send them to the Senate, and abdicate the responsibilities and duties placed upon it by the Constitution of the United States. The time will come when the representatives of the people of this country in this House will institute a contest to restore to the House the fundamental rights and privileges of the House. And I say, let it begin now and in the making of this bill. Let us assert our rights under the Constitution to originate bills to raise revenue, and let us make the bill as the gentlemen on the other side would make it, at least as to lumber, if they expressed their own desires. Why, nine out of every ten of you on the other side are in favor of free lumber, and yet you say your free-list bill will not go through, that this bill will go over to the Senate, and that the Senate will do with it as it pleases; and I say to you that, in all human probability, when it comes back here no man will recognize it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a sincere regard for the gentleman from Kansas who has just taken his seat, but through some misapprehension or misconception he has made a statement that I must challenge. He states that we propose to pass a bill through this House with the statement that we do not recognize that it has a chance to become a law. I deny that proposition. I tell you, sir, that the free-list bill that we have introduced in this House and propose to pass will become a law [applause on the Democratic side] or the men who sit in the United States Senate on the Republican side will vacate many a seat, and the President of the United States, if he does not sign it, will never be heard of again in the political history of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side].

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MADISON. Was the gentleman in the House and did he hear the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; but I thought the gentleman's statement was facetious.

Mr. MADISON. Never was the gentleman from New York more serious.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I will say to the gentleman that the bill puts on the free list agricultural implements, fencing wire, and salt and free lumber for your northern farmers. It puts on the free list free cotton bagging and free hides for the southern farmer. It puts on the free list free meat, free bread, and free salt for the people who live in the cities and who are crying for cheaper food products to reduce the cost of living. I say to you that when that bill arrives in the United States Senate if it is not acted upon, there will be a judgment day in the Republican side of the Senate, and if the President does not sign it, there will be a judgment day at the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman says that the farmers' free-list bill puts salt on the free list for the northern farmer. I live in a northern State and I can purchase a ton of salt for 75 cents in my home city.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That does not controvert the statement I made.

Mr. FORDNEY. A ton of salt will last you 100 years. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman probably lives near a salt mine.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman spoke of a judgment day. I want to ask if that side is not a little more anxious for a judgment day than it is for legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all; if there has been a Congress that has met in two decades that has shown itself willing to pass remedial legislation, not partisan legislation but remedial legislation in the interest of the people, this Congress has done so. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman has just said that he is desirous to pass remedial legislation and one of the items is free salt. I agree with him that that is proper, but is that other great necessity, sugar, on the free list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is not.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If not, why not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When we get to the sugar schedule we will legislate as to that matter, but it carries $60,000,000 revenue, or thereabouts, and we can not abandon $60,000,000 to run the Government until we provide something to take its place. [Applause.]

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. Gentlemen of the House, I do not desire to unnecessarily weary you. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on that side of the House will not be so tumultuous as they are now when they are put up against a proposition of voting on the real merits of the questions which are here before us to-day. Having occupied no time in general debate and being in favor of the amendment which my colleague says he intends to offer on the subject of lumber, I want to avail myself of a few minutes to express my views on the amendments to this bill.

Gentlemen of the House, I desire to assure you, and I hope you will believe me in that much, that I do so with the same good faith which has been expressed by my colleague. I believe that if you would avail yourself of your constitutional rights to write this bill here, you would write a bill which would give

justice to every American citizen under the flag, and which would give due credit to President Taft and his administration for negotiating this pact, which would preserve every jot and tittle of it as it was negotiated and would at the same time write into the policy of our Nation true reciprocity with our neighbor upon the north, and extend northward from the Gulf of Mexico to the frozen zones of the Hudson the great zollverein of American trade which now exists in the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, you can not mention reciprocity with Canada in that part of this country west of the Allegheny Mountains unless you bring to mind immediately two things, and they are free lumber and free wheat. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, by insisting on this bill without amendment, give us free wheat but deny us free lumber. They say to us that they propose to put lumber on the free list, but in the same breath tell us they do not believe that bill will become a law. In other words, gentlemen, you say to us you have the courage to assail "the best tariff law ever made"—I believe I quote correctly—in the House of its patron saint and defender and expect to succeed. Not only that, but I doubt whether you will find Brutuses enough, Democratic Brutuses, who will be willing to stab their Cæsar in the halls of the Senate. These are things upon which you will be doubted by the American people, and I say to you that if you are in favor now of free lumber and giving the western farmer a square deal you will vote for the propositions advocated by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. MADISON].

We are urged to vote for reciprocal relations with Canada on the grounds that our neighbors on the north are of the same blood, live under the same system of laws, and have the same industrial and commercial customs we have; but, sir, there can be but one reciprocity, founded on justice between two such peoples, and that is the reciprocity of free trade between those peoples. I am ready to vote for that. But even then it would be necessary to have a readjustment of other rates, tariff rates with which Canada has no concern, in order to do justice to farmers and others who have built up their businesses under the promise of the present tariff duties.

I am one of those who believe the danger which will come to the farmer under this bill has been greatly exaggerated, but this much must be admitted: The new policy, if adopted, means a readjustment of prices and investments, and consequent losses for the farmer. What do you offer as a compensation for these losses? No reduction in the tariff of any consequence from the same country on the things he buys, and free competition with a farmer living under the preferential tariffs granted by England to Canada.

In order to give you a Canadian view of the concessions made by this bill to the farmers on our side of the line, I desire to read a paragraph from Albert R. Carmen, a noted writer, of Montreal, in the National Review of last month. He says, speaking of the Canadian commissioners:

> They were life-long leaders of the "school" which held tenaciously that some sort of a reciprocity between Canada and the United States ought to be possible and profitable without political menace. One of the first doctrines of this "school" has always been that we should strive to get free access for our farm products into the American market, and a companion for this has always been that we should get "free fish" for "free fishing." For the aforesaid free trade in farm products this "school" has usually been willing to grant some concessions on manufactured goods. With these points in their minds our ministers went to Washington; they were offered free trade in farm products without any concessions to speak of on manufactured goods and "free fish" without "free fishing."
>
> We can imagine them—with their eyes solely on the business side of the subject—hardly able to believe their own good fortune.

The duties which these gentlemen insist shall follow the so-called Canadian pact give the American farmer only the same relief which the Canadian commissioners gave to us; they insist that they shall be the same; they amount to nothing to speak of.

If the Senate amends the bill, as I fully expect it to do, giving the West some measure of compensation for what you take away by this bill, or if you will write into it Mr. MADISON'S amendments and treat the Lumber Trust, the Steel Trust, and Harvester Trust as you treat the American farmer, I will vote for the bill, but I will not vote to take all away from the farmer and to take none of the high protective duties away from the trusts.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to elaborate upon this question. To my mind, Members of this House have been so thorough in their investigation and so lucid in their expositions that, after having listened with attention to the debate, I find myself restricted to very narrow limits, lest I annoy you with useless repetition.

Among other things that have impressed me is the nonpartisan manner of the debate, which demonstrates that the gentlemen here present are true to the trust imposed in them by their constituents, that they have the promotion of the best interests of the Nation as a whole at heart, and are here to enact legislation that will prove in their judgment the greatest good to the greatest number. However, it is only natural that some should differ in their conclusions regarding this measure, as it has a peculiar bearing upon the industries of every State of the Nation. Therefore, after weighing the merits of this bill, by which it must necessarily rise or fall, I have, after due study, taken the liberty to anticipate its probable effect upon the Nation at large and inevitably came to the conclusion that the enactment of reciprocity with Canada will prove of inestimable good and benefit.

An argument advanced by those who are opposed, and one upon which they have laid much pressure, may be stated briefly in this manner: That the barrier between Canada and the United States withdrawn, the large yield and extensive production of wheat in western Canada would prove a very formidable competitor with the production of wheat in the United States. Now, if I understand the arguments of the gentlemen from Minnesota correctly, they have maintained that the price of grain at Minneapolis is usually higher than the market prices of the world, transportation charges being considered. Now, usually there is a reason, and when we examine this proposition we find there is a very satisfactory explanation underlying this condition.

Ex-Gov. Lind, of Minnesota, while a Member of this House from that State, who has rendered great service to his State and to the Nation by his usefulness and statesmanship, speaking on tariff revision and Canadian reciprocity, stated on this floor, December 14, 1903, that:

> I speak to my colleagues from the Northwest with full assurance that they will not deny the statement that the one factor that has contributed the most to make Minneapolis great is the development of her milling industries—through the development of that magnificent industry, the greatest in the world, and through the energy and foresight of our earlier business men, Charles Pillsbury and others, living and dead.
>
> Minneapolis has become the greatest primary wheat market in the world. It makes every bushel of wheat raised in Minnesota and the Dakotas worth 2 to 6 cents a bushel more than it would be if our section were dependent upon Chicago or any other eastern point. Some of us know what has made Milwaukee famous. [Laughter.] All of us know what has made Minneapolis famous—"Pillsbury's Best." To maintain the standard of that magnificent bread and of all of our flour our mills must have a certain proportion of hard wheat; and, let me tell you confidentially, that wheat raised in Iowa and southern Minnesota and South Dakota is deteriorating somewhat from year to year, both in quantity and quality.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> What has made Minneapolis flour great? What has given it a world-wide market? Is it not its superior quality and the faithful maintenance of that quality? But to maintain that standard we must have the stronger wheat, that wheat rich in gluten, which comes now only from the prairies of the Dakotas and from the northern part of our State, and in decreasing amount, but which we must obtain from Manitoba and from the other Canadian Provinces in the future.
>
> If for possible present temporary gain you think that our millers should be prohibited from maintaining the quality of their goods and maintaining their world-wide market, where will your farmer neighbors and mine land when "Pillsbury's Best" has ceased to stand for what it now stands? You know, as I know, that our local wheat commands the price that it does only because our mills can as yet obtain enough of the stronger northern wheat to mix with it.

From this it may be inferred that the gentlemen from Minnesota who oppose this bill by reading the speech of the great son of Minnesota would be enlightened regarding the causes which produce the above-mentioned effect. In my own city of Omaha we have been laboring earnestly for several years and have established a great grain market. We have also gone into the milling business. Our winter wheat of Nebraska is rich and splendid in quality, and a large amount is shipped annually to Minneapolis to be mixed with the hard wheats of that vicinity in order that it may be made into a superior selling grade of white flour.

In the daily press of my city this week an important news item states that a large railroad project, on account of the belief that reciprocity with Canada will be enacted, with ample capital, has been formed to construct a railway north and south through Nebraska, the Dakotas, and into Canada. With the completion of this proposed railway the farmers of Nebraska will be enabled to have shipped in from Canada the hard wheats, and thus the milling industries of Nebraska and the Middle West will be benefited and save the producers the necessity of paying the freight charge to the railroads to carry their wheat to Minneapolis, and instead of our farmers paying the freight the Canadians will ship to our mills and pay the freight.

It has been stated here that the prices for wheat are fixed in Liverpool. This is substantially true. However, to be accurate, it must be stated that this rule is subject to the convenience of grain gambling kings of the great cities who drive the prices up and down to suit their purposes. But it is a fact that the price of wheat is fixed by the world's supply. Every day there

is quoted in the grain markets the production or supply of wheat in the Argentine Republic, the supply in Europe, and the Black Sea ports. Therefore excepting in so far as local milling conditions in Minneapolis may have an effect locally the export supply of every wheat-producing nation is ruled by the demand at Liverpool.

At South Omaha, Nebr., there exists the third largest stock market in the world. The cattle feeders of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, and adjoining States come to Omaha to purchase young cattle for their pastures and feed lots. With the barriers between the United States and Canada removed and the anticipated development of the railroad facilities, Canada will ship to our markets in the United States her stock—cattle and feeders—which will be bought by the cattle feeders of the corn-growing States and fattened for food purposes.

Considerable emphasis has been laid on the importations of sheep. The corn-growing States of the Middle West can feed and fatten all the sheep Canada can raise without injuring the cattle-raising industry of the country. Especially so when we know that the total number of sheep imported by Canada in 1909 was only 103,000, while at the South Omaha market as high as 67,000 have been marketed in a single day. This fact establishes to a certainty that the importation of sheep from Canada will not prove disastrous.

Some gentlemen have expressed concern over the effect this bill will have on flax production. As a young man in central and northern Iowa I observed that flax was usually sown on virgin soil; that is, on land just broken by the plow. This was because the roots of the flax rotted the soil and made it fit for wheat the following year. But after the soil became sufficiently adapted no more flax was sown, as it was too severe on the soil. For the same reason, in the developed regions of the Dakotas, flax seeding was used to great advantage, and it is now used in western Canada for the preparation of similar soils for farming purposes. Therefore, reciprocity with Canada will prove beneficial on account of the small amount of flax raised and the great amount needed in the United States.

The illustrious gentleman from Illinois pointed out on the map of Canada in his inimitable way the direction of the heat waves meandering around the southern edges of Hudson Bay and Mackenzie Basin. It seems that he evidently forgot to mention the cold waves that get busy in the neighborhood of Medicine Hat and Swift Current, in the wheat regions of Canada. Why, Mr. Chairman, in Nebraska when we look at the Government weather reports and see that the cold waves commence to do business at Medicine Hat we take it as a signal to drive our cattle and sheep to shelter and prepare ourselves for the coming ordeal. Medicine Hat is reputed as the most likely place from which a cold wave is likely to emanate, and when my friends from the Dakotas who oppose this bill hear that Medicine Hat has begun its deadly frost-biting work they hibernate or seek shelter, and often we do not hear from them for weeks.

Another thing that strikes me as being a principle of equity and justice is that we should be fair to our friends, our neighbors, and our relatives who have, with the courage characteristic of our people, crossed over into Canada to develop that country. And, Mr. Chairman, why should we not lend a helping hand to these large numbers of our brothers by means of this reciprocity with Canada, which without doubt will prove very serviceable in securing their permanent success and prosperity?

In conclusion, I wish to state that I have heard considerable about the effect the passage of this bill would have on different districts. Let me say that I represent one of the greatest manufacturing and agricultural districts of the Middle West, a district in which the cities of Omaha and South Omaha are located, whose census in 1910 totaled 124,096 and 26,000 people, respectively. Since coming to Washington I have not received a single protest from my district against this bill. Not a manufacturer, jobber, or farmer has requested me to vote against it. To show you that my district, which is inhabited by an intelligent and enterprising people, has sufficient manufacturing, agriculture, and so forth, to be interested, and to protest if they so desired, I will quote you a few statistics:

Omaha during 1910 sold $132,262,000 worth of merchandise. The manufacturing products of Omaha and South Omaha amounted to $200,968,541. Our bank clearings were $842,000,000; real estate transfers, $15,273,455; our live stock receipts were 6,132,451, divided into 1,223,533 head of cattle, 1,894,314 hogs, 2,984,870 sheep, and 29,734 horses and mules. In South Omaha we packed 3,746,454 head of live stock, comprising 798,950 cattle, 1,656,246 hogs, and 1,291,258 sheep.

The grain receipts of Omaha were 43,607,400 bushels, representing 9,212,400 bushels of wheat, 23,494,200 bushels of corn, and 10,023,600 bushels of oats.

We also have at Omaha one of the greatest butter markets in the world.

These figures show that with reciprocity with Canada and the proper railroad facilities there is a strong possibility for still greater development of the resources throughout the Middle West. It is only right and just that we should send our surplus products into Canada and receive in exchange commodities which we can use to good advantage. Thus the Great West will become an empire of richness whose greatness can not be estimated.

The farming lands in my district, with these developments, are as fair and as productive as any under the sun. Our schools are of the best. My people are intelligent and are fully able to understand the value of reciprocal trade with their brethren who have gone to Canada to develop that country, and so at the close of this great debate, which has so fully covered all lines of thought, I do not agree, Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Kansas that this is the proper time to place into the treaty any amendments, for reasons fully stated by the friends of the treaty. I am in favor of reciprocity, and I am in favor of this bill, but I am not in favor of defeating it by adding on any amendments here to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer one word that strikes particularly at the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON]. He moves to strike out line 24, which is a provision of 10 cents per thousand on lath. Now, with that section stricken out the old Payne tariff rate attaches of 20 cents a thousand, so the gentleman's amendment is not worth consideration for even a moment.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield. If the gentleman had moved to put lath on the free list, it might at least have been consistent, but as he offers to strike it out he accomplishes nothing and increases the rates from 10 cents, as provided in this pact, to 20 cents, as provided in the Payne bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen upon that side of the House seem to get all their consolation to-day from the misinterpretation of a statement made by me. The doubt as to whether the free-list bill would eventually become a law was not expressed or initiated by myself. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and other gentlemen on that side of the House offered amendments putting upon the free list certain commodities, the products of the Dominion of Canada, because, they assured this side of the House, in that way alone could such articles be placed upon the free list. In the confidence, as they have been in the past and are now, of those directing the Republican Party, both in this House and in another House, they seem to have positive information that a free-list bill can not pass the present Republican Senate. When these gentlemen asked me if, in my opinion, the free-list bill was likely to pass and become a law, in view of the record of the Republican Party and in the face of the statements and the assertions made upon that side of the House, I expressed a doubt, and I said to them that unless some supernatural agency intervened it was very doubtful if the Republican Senate would within the very near future act in any way for the relief of the people or the country.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. However the gentleman arrived at the opinion, whether it comes from this side of the House or not, would not the gentleman advise his side of the House to clinch it by putting it in this bill which is likely to become a law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all; the gentleman and myself are in hearty agreement. We know that those who are proposing such amendments are not friends of the bill, but those who desire its defeat. Let me read from the controversy indulged in between the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and myself:

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would say to the gentleman, Yes, I will vote for that bill—

Referring to the free-list bill—

but the gentleman may rest assured that it will not pass.

And in view of the assertion made by the gentleman from South Dakota and his well-known and generally expressed views in favor of high-tariff rates, I could not withhold an expression of opinion that even at this time another branch of this Legislature had not awakened to the rising indignation of the American people, and that it would perhaps take another storm, the cleaning out of some other places, before the relief demanded by the people would be obtained from the Congress. Whatever lack of legislation there may be here in the interest of the people will not be due to the Democratic Party or to a Democratic House; it will rest upon the Republican

Party and that body which is now controlled by a Republican majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted upon the pending amendment. [Cries of "Regular order!"] The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. MADISON) there were—ayes 48, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shingles, 30 cents per 1,000.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of enunciating this proposition. Frequent and unwarranted reference is being made to the position of this side of the House. No matter what might be the opinion of the gentleman from New York, or any other gentleman on this side, except the majority leader, his expression of opinion is only an expression for himself individually and does not in itself represent the position and attitude of this side. When this side wishes to express an opinion it will do so through the gentleman from Alabama, the majority leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment——

Mr. MANN. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk has no right to read so that nobody can hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was endeavoring to obtain order.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk should cease reading while the Chair is endeavoring to obtain order.

The CHAIRMAN. Order in the committee depends not so much upon the efforts of the Chair as upon the efforts of members of the committee. The Chair is endeavoring to obtain and keep order.

Mr. MANN. We are not criticizing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will not read during disorder.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MALBY. For the purpose of making an inquiry with reference to what the Clerk has just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MALBY. The gentleman from Alabama has stated that we are not to be directed by what the gentleman from New York has said, but the gentleman from Alabama—— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is not in order.

Mr. MALBY. Well, the Chair can not determine whether I am in order until I have made my inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. MALBY. I move to strike out the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, strike out line 25.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I am not so particular how it may read here as how it will read to the country. The gentleman from Alabama suggests we are not following the lead of my colleague from New York, but of his colleague from Alabama.

I am not so particular as to whom we are to follow as to ascertain exactly what we are to follow. I would like to have my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] state——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]?

Mr. MALBY. Not yet. I would like to make an inquiry.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. MALBY. I always proceed in order if I get a chance to proceed. In order that the House may know and that the country may know the position of the majority in Congress——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. MALBY (continuing). I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in reference to this particular paragraph and amendments I proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment. Under the rules pertaining to debate under the five-minute rule debate must be confined to the amendment or proposition before the committee. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. MALBY. I understand that. I am trying to do that, but my friend from Florida [Mr. CLARK] does not seem willing to have me proceed. I was simply trying to ascertain from the authoritative leader of the House of Representatives——

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MALBY. Not until I have completed my interrogatory.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman please state his amendment?

Mr. MALBY. The Clerk will report it again if there is any question about it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I would like a little further time. I suppose this is not being taken out of my time. Now that we have the policy of the House of Representatives fairly well understood, I would like to inquire specifically of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] whether or not the Democratic Party is in favor of placing lumber on the free list. I would just like an answer to that inquiry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the Democratic Party more than two years ago announced its position on that question in its platform, and the Members of Congress representing the Democratic Party are trying to carry out the platform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, that is hardly a specific answer to my inquiry. I want to know——

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It is the best anyone can do with that kind of inquiry.

Mr. MALBY. I want to know specifically, so that we may carry the answer home to the people of the United States who are not——

Mr. CLAYTON. Just swear the witness. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALBY (continuing). In favor of free lumber. I want the Democratic Party through their authority, through the gentleman who represents them on the floor of this House, to state specifically whether they are in favor of free lumber or not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman, in order that I may save time, that we have introduced a bill putting lumber on the free list. I am for it, and I am sure this side of the House is for it, and we expect to pass it within the next few days or weeks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MALBY. I think, Mr. Chairman, that fairly answers my question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will present the gentleman with a copy of the bill if he has not seen it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MALBY. Oh, I have seen the bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am very much pleased, indeed, to receive from such authoritative source the fact that our friends on the other side are in favor of free lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Clerk has not been taking out of my time all of this loose talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair timed the gentleman, and the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for a couple of minutes more.

Mr. ADAIR. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that the Clerk read line 25. Is not that true?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read line 25.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 25. I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman from New York just made that motion to strike out line 25.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the motion of the gentleman from New York, it was to strike out the last two words just read. If so, the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON] is in order.

Mr. MADISON. I desire to move to strike out the paragraph, but do not desire to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. RAINEY. I do, Mr. Chairman. I desire to be heard in opposition, simply for the purpose of putting these lumber experts straight. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I understand these gentlemen from Kansas are making these motions because they stand for free lumber. I understand also that the gentleman from New York made his motion because he stands for free lumber.

Mr. MALBY. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDWICK. He made his motion because he is opposed to it. It seems they are making these motions for opposite reasons. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RAINEY. They make these motions because they do not know anything about the tariff on lumber. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I want to explain the matter to them, so that they can square themselves with their constituents.

Under the Payne-Aldrich bill laths are taxed 20 cents per thousand pieces. Under this bill laths are taxed only 10 cents per thousand pieces. And yet a while ago a gentleman from Kansas got up on the floor and moved to strike out line 24, and if he had succeeded in his motion he would have doubled the tariff on laths and would have restored the 20 per cent rate.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield. The pending motion, for which the gentleman from Kansas also stands, is to strike out line 25. Under the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill shingles were taxed 50 cents per thousand. Under this paragraph, which the gentleman proposes to strike out, they are taxed 30 cents per thousand, so that if the motion which the gentleman stands for prevails he would put back the Dingley rate, 50 cents per thousand, which is 20 cents more than they now are.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, it seems the gentleman did not do me the kindness to listen to my remarks. Everybody else in the House understood what I said distinctly, which was that this is but one of a number of motions which I propose to make leading to the putting of lumber of every kind on the free list, and the RECORD will show it.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman is proceeding in the opposite direction, and when he makes these motions he is increasing, if his motions prevail, the tariff on lumber.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not understand, as I think the House does, that the gentleman from Kansas had in view the striking out of this paragraph here, and when we came to the free list putting it in there?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know what the gentleman had in view.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us be consistent. If we want to get free lumber, let us strike out the duty where the duty is prescribed, and put it in the free list.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's time expired? If so, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MADISON. I want to say this, that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] understood me clearly, and I want the House to understand me. I have this amendment already prepared and will offer it in due time when it is in order:

After the word "wharves," in line 25, page 17, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the words "shingles, laths, fence posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

That is, put on the free list all the lumber that Canada produces. I tried to make myself clear to the House. Of course in order to get all classes and kinds of lumber from Canada on the free list it was necessary to strike out those paragraphs and then offer the amendment I have just read. I propose to offer it, but I shall have nothing further to say on this subject. It has been pretty well discussed, and I do not desire to take up the time of the House. We all understand the situation. The bill as it stands admits rough lumber free and materially reduces the duty on manufactured lumber. That is a great deal, but I would make it absolutely free.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest this to the gentleman, in view of the impossibility of amending this bill, which he himself will admit, which I believe he did admit a while ago——

Mr. MADISON. Oh, I did not.

Mr. RAINEY. If he should succeed in carrying these amendments and then fail to get his free-list amendment in when we get to that, what position will the gentleman then occupy? He will have increased the tariff 100 per cent over the amount which this bill now proposes.

Mr. MADISON. I did not admit for one moment that this bill could not be amended.

Mr. RAINEY. I thought the gentleman had found out by this time that it can not be amended.

Mr. MADISON. I said that this House ought to amend it, and that in all probability it will be amended in important particulars in another body.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MADISON. Yes; if my time has not expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. If it is improbable that the Senate would pass the proposed free list, does not the gentleman think it would be equally unlikely that the Senate would pass this bill if articles on the proposed free list were incorporated in it?

Mr. MADISON. I do not know. I know that when the opportunity is presented to me to do my duty, I ought to do it without regard to what other men may do about it.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is what we are going to do with the free list.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. That is what we are going to do.

Mr. MADISON. That is the privilege of the gentlemen. I have no quarrel with them as to what they are about to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move, on page 7, line 25, to strike out "30 cents" and insert "1 cent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 25, strike out "30 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said back and forth here about what is going to happen to this bill and to the so-called free-list bill after they get through this House. I do not pretend to know what will happen to either one; but every man here knows, from what has been said, that there is considerable doubt about the free-list bill becoming a law. That doubt has been expressed on both sides. It is generally conceded that this so-called reciprocity bill will become a law. Now, if we do not want to play politics, if we want to get results, then let us put onto the bill that everybody knows will become a law the legislation that we want.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. If we put that on, will the bill become a law?

Mr. NORRIS. The amendment will become a law if the bill becomes a law.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is the question. Will it become a law?

Mr. NORRIS. Does the gentleman doubt that this bill will become a law?

Mr. CLAYTON. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Nobody doubts it.

Mr. GARRETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon——

Mr. NORRIS. Does the gentleman doubt that this bill will become a law?

Mr. GARRETT. I think it will if it is not amended.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman wants free lumber. Let us give it on this bill.

Mr. GARRETT. But if we put it into this bill, does the gentleman think this bill will become a law?

Mr. NORRIS. Why, yes. I do not see why it will not become a law if we pass it, for then it will be in the bill, and the bill will become a law.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Nebraska is one of the keenest men in this House. Does he not know that an amendment to the bill will defeat the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. On the other hand, I do not believe any such proposition. In view of the high intelligence and wisdom of the gentlemen who have made that statement here, I can not understand why they should make a statement of that kind.

The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Oklahoma, speaking against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, said that it would increase the rates. I think we understand what the parliamentary procedure would have been had the gentleman's motion prevailed, and had it carried we would have put lumber on the free list. If we pass this amendment I have offered, or in the consideration of it the arguments made by these gentlemen against it do not prevail, it will reduce the tariff on lumber from the country that we want to get it reduced from, practically the only country on earth that would do us any good to get free lumber from.

Now, then, if reducing duty on shingles from the Payne bill to the amount named in this bill—from 50 cents to 30 cents—is good, and we want free lumber and free shingles, let us reduce it from 30 cents to 1 cent. [Applause.] If you want free lumber, for God's sake vote for it instead of trying to make political capital out of the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken the time of the House during this debate, and therefore I ask your indulgence for five minutes. The Democratic Party does not present this bill as its ideal of tariff legislation. It is by no means all that we desire. We present it, though, on account of the political situation in the country, the House being Democratic and the Senate being of the opposite political complexion, and with a Republican President.

If we were playing politics, as some gentlemen have suggested during the progress of this debate that we were, we would present our tariff measure complete and as a whole and let the Republican Senate and President turn it down, so as to bring upon those branches of the Government the same just condemnation of the public that has already been visited upon this branch, which has made so many absent seats on the Republican side of this Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We are giving the people of the United States a half loaf, which is better than none. We are giving them now, so far as we have the power to give them anything, something that can pass both branches of this Legislature and be approved by the President of the United States.

We can not shut our eyes to the fact that there is violent opposition, not only on this floor but at the opposite end of the Capitol, not only in this country but in another country that is affected by this reciprocal agreement, to its passage. Some gentlemen have raised the question that the President had acted beyond his power in this matter. We say in answer to that that it is not a question of power, but a question of policy that is involved in this matter. No man on this side contends that the President of the United States has the power to attempt to originate tariff legislation, and no man on that side or on this side can truthfully say that he has attempted to do it in this case. He has simply suggested to the Congress of the United States that he has been able to secure an agreement with certain executive authorities of the Dominion of Canada by which the parties have agreed to recommend to the legislative branches of both Governments laws to carry out this agreement for reciprocal reduction of tariff duties between the two countries.

If the House passes this bill it will be legislating on its own initiative and in accordance with its own will entirely. So that when the Democratic majority in this Chamber stands by the President in this matter, when we say we will take this proposition as it comes to us from him unamended, we will take this agreement for lower tariff duties as recommended by the executive departments of both countries, we also say we will not load it down with amendments, in this Chamber at least, where we have both the power and the responsibility. We will not give to the Republican Senate an excuse to kill it; we will not give to the opposition party in the Dominion of Canada a pretext to slay it. Therefore, although this legislation is not perfect, although we favor free lumber and many more tariff reductions that can not be carried in this bill, which is intended to carry out a reciprocal agreement already negotiated, yet we will give the people of the United States a chance to get at least these tariff reductions on Canadian products, if it can be accomplished during the present session of Congress, without delay, and we will not play politics with it and load it down with amendments that might give its enemies at the other end of this Capitol an opportunity as well as an excuse to kill it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. NORRIS) there were—ayes 46, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, planed or finished on one side, 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved, or planed or finished on two sides, 75 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed or finished on three sides, or planed and finished on two sides and tongued and grooved, $1.12½ per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed and finished on four sides, $1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, strike out lines 1 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further remarks to make about the matter. I have no desire to delay the House. There has been full expression of opinion in respect to it, and so far as I am concerned I have no further discussion to make.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of opposing this amendment, because of the avowed purpose of its author to ultimately move to place lumber upon the free list. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] stated that we want lumber upon the free list. I do not know to whom he referred when he said "we."

Mr. NORRIS. I did not refer to the gentleman from Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope not, but I beg to inform the gentleman that there are a great many on this side of the House——

Mr. NORRIS. And a great many on the other side, too.

Mr. LANGLEY (continuing). Who are protection Republicans, and who do not want lumber on the free list; and I want to say that I am reliably informed that there are a good many gentlemen upon the other side of the House, too, who do not want lumber upon the free list. [Applause.] I believe that if gentlemen voted untrammeled, voted their real sentiments—the way they actually feel about it—on that side as well as upon this side of the House, there would not be the ghost of a chance of this reciprocity treaty passing the House of Representatives. I claim the same right to stand for the local interests of my district as gentlemen on that side do for the local interests of theirs.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. Not now. The wishes of the people interested in the lumber industry in the mountains of Kentucky appeal to me just as much as do the wishes of those interested in the mica or peanut industries in North Carolina or the fish industry in Massachusetts or in any other industry in any other section of the country that may be affected by this measure. I come from what is generally considered a Democratic district. Three times I have been elected on a platform favoring protection to lumber. I am glad to have the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] state here to the House and to the country that the Democratic Party stands for free lumber now. A good many who opposed me for Congress contended that the Democratic Party did not and would not. I was elected two years ago over a gentleman nominated by the Democratic Party who announced that he was not only in favor of protection to lumber, but that he was in favor of doubling the Republican rate of protection upon it, and the rate then was higher than it is now—the Dingley rate being then in force.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, you ought to have defeated that kind of a man.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, I thought so, too, although he was not as bad as some of you are on this tariff question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY (continuing). And if all of the people in my district had believed what the gentleman from Alabama stated awhile ago, my majority last fall, notwithstanding the Democratic landslide over the country, would have been 4,000 instead of 2,000, as it was.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield——

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield to gentlemen on either side of the House. I do not want to be discourteous to anybody, and especially to my friend from Massachusetts and my friend from New Jersey, but I have not the

time. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that he wants to help me by asking me a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. He did not have anything on me. I wanted to do the same thing. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly obliged to my friend from New Jersey, who is always courteous to this side of the House, and also to my friend from Massachusetts, who seems to desire to help me, but I do not feel that I need any help. [Laughter.] The people of my district have commissioned me, Mr. Chairman, to vote against any proposition looking to the placing of lumber upon the free list, and I propose to carry out their commission and cast my vote accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, the prosperity of the lumber industry involves a living for many a poor man and his family in my district, and I know that it means the same thing in many other States of this Union. It is the second or third greatest industry in the United States, involving millions and millions of dollars and the wages of thousands and thousands of men. If free lumber from Canada will depress the lumber industry, as I believe it will, then I am opposed to it; if it will not have that effect, then it will not help or hurt anybody, and the only result will be the presentation to Canada of that much revenue which would otherwise go into the Treasury of the United States to help bear the expenses of our Government; and all foreigners look alike to me when it comes to injuring our home markets by letting foreign products in. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter inch screen, 45 cents per ton.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Because of the great demand for time on the Republican side of the House, I failed to secure an opportunity to discuss this measure during the general debate; and I shall not attempt any general discussion of the measure now under the five-minute rule. But I feel that it is due myself and due the farmers of my district that I repudiate the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. In closing the general debate in behalf of those Republicans who favor the measure he strongly intimated his belief that the farmers of the country, in opposing reciprocity with Canada, were not acting in good faith, were not expressing their own convictions, but were being made the cat's-paw by the big interests. I hold no brief for the farmers of the country at large; but I can speak for the farmers of my district and for the farmers of Vermont. And so far as they are concerned, the insinuation of the gentleman from Massachusetts is slanderous in the extreme. The farmers of Vermont are opposed to reciprocity because of their conviction that it is an utterly unfair discrimination against them and against the farmers of the country as a class. Let me read to you a letter written on the 20th of last January, before the details of the provisions of the agreement were generally known. The writer is one of the progressive farmers of my district, and the letter voices the convictions of the farmers of Vermont:

ST. ALBANS, VT., *January 30, 1911.*

Hon. D. J. FOSTER, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. FOSTER: I believe that portion of your constituents which is made up of the farmers of Vermont has a genuine cause for alarm in the prospect of the passage of the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada, and I would like to give you my reasons for this belief.

I realize that in the just settlement of this tariff question there should be a patriotic consideration of the greatest good for the greatest number, but from the newspaper reports of this treaty we can see no just distribution of its burdens or its benefits. The Washington correspondent of the Journal of Commerce says that the plan of the commission has been to select the commodities for reciprocity in such a way as to arouse the smallest amount of antagonism on either side of the border. I presume that it was in keeping with this policy that the articles which are on the proposed free list are, with the one exception of fish, made up of products of the farm. I am fully aware that the agricultural interests have the least effective business organization of any industry in the country, and for that reason they are the least prepared to offer effective resistance to any encroachment upon their rights, but we can at least appeal to the sense of justice of the President and Congress of the United States.

As farmers we would not greatly object to free trade with Canada or to a reciprocal agreement which would enable us to benefit by the lower cost of many things which, as consumers, we could purchase in Canada, because we realize that we would have little to fear from a free interchange of commodities with a people having a standard of living and economic resources similar to our own, but we maintain that a treaty like the one proposed, which throws the whole burden upon agriculture and gives no benefits in return, is manifestly unfair.

If the farmers of this country were unduly prosperous and were accumulating large fortunes, we could see some justice in such a course, but I maintain that such is not the case. We invite the fullest investigation into the profits in farming, even where it is conducted in the most careful and scientific manner, with the full knowledge that the profits, after deducting labor, interest, and other fixed charges, would be very small in comparison with the profits in the manufacturing industries which you are asked to favor by this treaty.

I ask you to consider the history of American agriculture for the past century. The inducements offered by the Federal Government for the rapid settlement of the new lands of the West, the invention of machinery to till these lands and to harvest the crops grown upon them, and the building of railroads to transport these crops to market all worked to cause a production of foodstuffs far in excess of the demand. A system of farming based upon soil robbery resulted, and much of the time farm products were produced at a loss if labor and depletion of soil fertility had been taken into account. Farmers became discouraged, boys who could get away left the farms, and the business was considered a good one to get out of. All this time, when the prices of our farm products were determined by the surplus sold in free-trade markets, we were allowed a high protective tariff on foodstuffs. In the past few years a change has taken place. Population has increased so that consumption has overtaken production and prices have increased so that the farmer is able to get a living wage for his work and some interest on his investment. We have passed from the soil-robbery stage of our agriculture to the higher stage, which requires trained men who see the need of maintaining the fertility of the soil.

The past 10 years of higher prices have witnessed the employment of more capital and better methods, and the farms have responded with a larger and surer production to meet the need of the increasing population, but the record so far but points the way to what the farms of this country may do by the employment of yet more capital and generally improved methods.

I maintain that our experiment stations and good farmers in every State have demonstrated that the producing power of our farms may be made several times what it is now and that we can take care of our population for centuries to come. Now, to satisfy the demand of consumers for cheaper food, it is proposed to place upon us the burden of competition with millions of acres of cheap virgin soil. Out of every dollar that the consumer now pays for food we get but 35 cents, the other 65 cents going for transportation and distribution, and this 35 cents is not now giving us more than a fair compensation for our work.

We ask you to consider if it is wise to interrupt the development of our own agricultural resources, which has now been so well begun, while once more the process of soil robbery and profitless agriculture is carried on in a foreign country. We farmers of Vermont have everything to lose and nothing to gain by this treaty, and we are expecting you to protect our interests.

With kindest regards to you in every way, I am,

Very truly, yours, E. L. BINGHAM.

My colleague Mr. PLUMLEY has handed me two letters addressed to him, one of the 25th and one of the 26th of last January, by one of the leading farmers in his district, showing that when the news of the reciprocity agreement with Canada reached the Vermont farmers they did not wait to hear from the "big interests," but promptly sent in their protest. Let me read these letters:

WATERBURY, VT., *January 25, 1911.*

Hon. FRANK PLUMLEY, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I inclose clipping from yesterday's Boston Globe, which leads me to ask you if you are earnestly looking after the interests of the farmers of Vermont in connection with reciprocity with Canada.

This man GARDNER, and all other Massachusetts Representatives in Congress and such representatives outside of Congress, as the notorious Foss, are demanding an open market for Canadian farm products, but all their own interests must be protected. Not for 25 years, until within the last 3 or 4 years, have Vermont farm products returned the cost of production.

No one seems to know what kind of a trade the President has made with the representatives of Canada, but I suppose we shall know after to-morrow, and I hope and believe that you will not fail the Vermont farmer, for he is going to need your best efforts now and in the next Congress as never before.

Very respectfully, yours, GEORGE G. GRANT.

WATERBURY, VT., *January 26, 1911.*

Hon. FRANK PLUMLEY, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: These people are more sensitive in their pockets than in their stomachs where their own pockets are affected, but they will be just as insistent in their demand that they be fed at the expense of the Vermont farmer as they are in their demand for protection at the expense of all the people.

We do not ask for free fish; we are willing they should have all the protection they need. But we do ask for a square deal, and that we shall not be compelled to feed their mill hands on farm products that do not pay the cost of production that they may thereby hire those same mill hands at a lower wage.

Can you send me a copy of the present tariff law?

Respectfully, yours, GEORGE G. GRANT.

The farmers of Vermont do their own thinking. They carry their own convictions under their own hats. They know by reputation the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. They recognize his ability, his scholarship, his high standing in Congress and out of Congress. But they could remind him that two years ago, when we were attempting to revise the tariff, he was one of a small coterie of "elder statesmen" that stood like a stone wall to prevent such a reasonable downward revision of the tariff as the people of the country had reason to expect at the hands of the Republican Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Live animals: Cattle, horses and mules, swine, sheep, lambs, and all other live animals.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5, page 16, strike out the word "sheep," and, in line 6, the word "lambs."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, you will remember, it was contended on the floor of this Chamber that this bill put all the products of the farmer on the free list except wool. I want to call the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that it puts wool to a large extent on the free list. There is nothing to prevent sheepmen in Canada driving any number of sheep over the line before shearing time and after shearing drive them back again into Canada. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] That is all right, gentlemen, you laugh, and you simply laugh because you do not understand the conditions.

A MEMBER. Tell us about them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to say that for 2,000 miles along the border sheep are run in bands from 1,000 to 5,000 head. There is nothing in the world to hinder the sheepman from running the sheep a hundred miles. He can drive down into the United States by slow stages to James Hill's railroad, shear them there, and take his time and drive them back again into Canada. You fellows laugh at this, but it is simply because you do not understand the conditions. That means the marketing of millions of pounds of wool from Canada that loses to the Government of the United States from 11 to 12 cents per pound duty. I simply wanted to call attention to this. You will not pay any attention to it, but the people of the United States will pay attention to it. [Laughter and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "cattle" in line 5, page 16, the following: "Except cattle fattened for slaughter."

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to consume the time of the House in discussing the merits of this amendment. I want to call attention, however, to this fact, that when the convention between the Governments of Canada and France but a few years ago was negotiated by the representatives of their respective countries, the Senate of France refused to concur in it unless an amendment such as this was first incorporated.

And Canada acceded to it. Here is a precedent that we can amend this treaty; here is a precedent, in substance, where Canada has acceded to a similar amendment by another country. And while I do not expect this amendment will prevail here to-day, in view of the caucus action of the majority of this House, I want the RECORD to show, and I want the issue to be clearly presented, whether the people of this country, through their Representatives in this House or through their other responsible officials, are less concerned in the protection of the farming interests of this country than was the Government of France for the farming interests of France. I want the RECORD to show whether you gentlemen upon that side of the Hall are less in sympathy with our farmers than were the representatives of the French people in their Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6, on page 16, after the word "animals," insert the following: "Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats; bacon and ham; meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner; canned meats; extract of meat; lard and compounds thereof; and tallow.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I think the record of this afternoon's proceedings should show that when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] a short time ago made certain objections to placing these articles upon the free list he made one which was applauded upon the other side of the House, which was that to place these articles upon the free list in this bill would conflict with the favored-nation clause in our treaty. And yet, although they approved that sentiment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], they say that in three or four days they are going to pass a bill through this House placing these articles, all of them, upon the free list for the entire world. How do you reconcile that statement? Only in one way—that it is still your hope that that free-list bill that you propose will never become a law, and you are opposed to these amendments to this bill because you know if they are adopted in this bill they will become a law.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] a short time ago said this would mean the defeat of the bill, but gave no reasons for it. How will it mean the defeat of the bill? Where will it be defeated? In the Senate? The Senate will have an opportunity to amend it, striking these out, if they desire to do so. Will it be vetoed by the President? Remember that the President, in his message transmitting this agreement to Congress, stated that in his judgment there was no difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada, either in agricultural products or manufactured products. With that statement upon record, is President Taft going to veto this bill if we place these articles upon the free list, where he has said there is no difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada? No, gentlemen upon the other side of the House, you have got to find some further excuse than you have yet given for defeating these amendments.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, right here and right now I believe that we ought to keep the record straight and to make it right. It is hard for me to believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who last addressed the House, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON] can not see what seems so clear. They talk about sincerity, and they insist so earnestly upon their amendments that I must give them credit for their sincerity, but they certainly know if we inject in this bill items of free imports in favor of Canada, that under our treaties with other nations, the favored-nation clause will make the items we put on the free list in this bill entitled to the free admission from every country, because every other nation will insist, and properly, that under our treaties with them they are entitled to the same rates accorded freely to Canada.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. Not yet. Knowing, then, that anyone who will vote conscientiously and honestly for the admission of one of these items into the free list in this bill will likewise vote for the same item in our free-list bill, and that those who are opposed to our general free-list bill will vote against this bill with these amendments in it——

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HARDY. Not yet. I say, Mr. Chairman, they must know that to load this measure down with these additional items, making this bill, as I have explained, a free-list bill with all the world, under the favored-nation clause of our various treaties, we will give every man who is at heart opposed to this measure in the Senate a club with which to put it to death; and they must know this. Knowing that——

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the Senate will not have an opportunity, if it chooses, to strike out all of these amendments?

Mr. HARDY. Certainly it will; but, on the other hand, the Senate will also have an opportunity to vote on this measure as it comes from the House and, by these very amendments the gentleman is now insisting on, an excuse to kill it.

Now, the gentleman knows that if the Senate should really have a majority in favor of these items that he proposes on the free list, they can put them onto this bill and pass it in the Senate. I believe if they could ever get them onto this bill and pass the bill through the Senate we might vote on it here, and we would vote for it unhesitatingly if you will assure us that your President will not veto it. We will vote for every free item here that comes from the Senate. But we will not load the bill down here so that the Senate will kill it, and we will not give a chance to the President for vetoing it by loading it down at all. We will give the President his bill just as he has asked it and we will make the Republican Senate swallow it or repudiate their own President. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HARDY. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks he has got a better opportunity to get his free list through in a separate bill or on this bill, so far as the action of the President is concerned?

Mr. HARDY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I feel sure we will get what is in this bill if you do not kill it by amendments. I feel sure that if we pass this bill just as it is the Senate will pass it; and, as expressed in the Democratic caucus the other night, I believe if we get this bill through and place it on the statute books and then pass our

general free-list bill in the House and put it up to the Senate, that neither the Republican Senate nor the Republican President will have the nerve to veto it. Pass this bill as it is and I believe we will get both this bill and our free-list bill. Put these amendments on this bill and we will get nothing. [Applause on the Democratic side and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat, dried peas and beans, edible.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all of lines 8 and 9, page 16, providing for placing wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat, dried peas and beans, edible, upon the free list.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, in support of that amendment, I would refer to what I have already said, that we are not granting to the consumer a reduction in the cost of living, because we maintain an almost similar duty under the terms of this bill to that which is placed on the manufactured commodities in the Payne tariff bill. I maintain that it is unjust to the producer to remove the duty from his raw material and to retain the duties upon the manufactured products, and that the argument for cheaper food is delusive to the consumer, because he will need to pay the price of the commodity in its manufactured state, and not as it is when it comes from the farmer. For that reason I offer this amendment. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fresh vegetables: Potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables in their natural state.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 12, strike out the item "potatoes."

Mr. EDWARDS. What kind of potatoes, sweet or otherwise?

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the reason that there are various sections in the Northern States where the only crop of the farmer is potatoes, and I measure my words when I say this; and because of the further fact that northeastern Canada can raise enough potatoes to feed the world. It is a well-known fact to those who have investigated the subject that we can not compete with the Canadian farmers to-day, when they pay 25 cents a bushel on every bushel of potatoes that they bring into this country, and so how can we hope to compete, with potatoes on the free list? I make this motion because I believe that the farmers who are engaged in raising potatoes are entitled to have their interests protected, at least to the extent of some one offering here an amendment in their behalf. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fresh fruits: Apples, pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state, except lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, pomelos, and pineapples.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, strike out the word "except" and strike out lines 17 and 18.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there are several legislative curiosities in this so-called reciprocity agreement. This is one of them. In the provision regarding the admission of fresh fruit from the United States, on page 20, all fresh fruits grown in the United States are admitted free of duty into the Dominion of Canada; but when we come to the subject of the admission of fresh fruit from the Dominion of Canada into the United States, in line 16, page 16, this remarkable exception is made:

Except lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, pomelos, and pineapples.

That was not done by accident, Mr. Chairman. The reciprocity treaty of 1854 was evidently before these commissioners and our so-called agents when this pact was making; yet they deliberately added this exception, giving protection against the Dominion of Canada for the fruits grown in our Southern States. After taking good care of the peanut industry of North Carolina, then, for fear that up on the Mackenzie River or somewhere along the Pacific coast of Canada there might be grown some semitropical fruits like oranges and lemons, they put in this provision. They have taken away from the northern fruit grower all protection against the fruits grown immediately across the line in Canada. They deny to the northern farmer the benefit of whatever southern fruits might be brought in from Canada to insure full protection in the South. It is one of the legislative absurdities of the bill which I commend to our Democratic brethren.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dairy products: Butter, cheese, and fresh milk and cream: *Provided*, That cans actually used in the transportation of milk or cream may be passed back and forth between the two countries free of duty, under such regulations as the respective Governments may prescribe.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, on page 16.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, as the committee knows, these lines have special reference to butter, cheese, fresh milk, and cream. At the present time we have a duty on butter of 6 cents a pound. Notwithstanding that protection we imported butter from Canada last year to the amount, I believe, of something like 1,000,000 pounds, and after it had paid this duty of 6 cents per pound it competed with the butter produced by the American farmer on this side of the line. I shall not prolong this debate, but in justice again to the American farmer, I offer this amendment and trust it may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment prepared similar to that offered by the gentleman from Idaho taking dairy products from the free list. If there is any one branch of the great farming industry that is affected more than all others by this reciprocity agreement, it is the dairy industry. If there is any one thing that the Canadians can do better than anything else, it is to produce butter and cheese. Canada is one of the greatest producers of cheese in all the world. She has been producing it for many, many years, while the dairy industry in this country as we now know it is of comparatively recent origin. Twenty years ago there was no dairying as we speak of it to-day. Of course every farmer made butter and cheese on his farm, but there was no modern dairying as we know it to-day.

Since that time, by virtue of dairy instructions in our State universities and agricultural schools, and the scientific study of soils and grasses, the farmers in the Northwestern States have been able to develop a great industry.

The great dairy countries of the world, Mr. Chairman, are Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Russia. Many years ago expert cheese makers and butter makers from most of these countries settled in Canada, and there they have developed this great industry. Only in recent years have we developed it in this country, and thereby we have added hundreds of millions of dollars to our wealth. We have been enabled to take farms in the rough country where nothing could be produced and by grazing them have developed great dairies.

Now, this last year there was exported by all countries that export cheese a total amount of 485,000,000 pounds, of which Canada exported 172,000,000 pounds, over one-third, while the United States exported but 10,000,000 pounds. Now, Mr. Chairman, the proposition is to throw open our markets to 172,000,000 pounds of Canadian cheese, to say nothing of the 6,000,000 pounds of butter which she also yearly exports, as compared to 9,000,000 pounds exported by us.

A great deal has been said as to the difference in the cost of cheese, or the price of cheese and butter in Canada and here.

In order to remove all doubt I went to the Library yesterday and went through the files of the Toronto Grocer, one of the leading dairy papers in Canada, and took the quotations on the 28th of every month, and took the same prices in Elgin for

butter and Chicago for cheese for that day. I will read you the results. Take butter:

Average price of creamery butter for the year 1909, in Elgin and Toronto.

	Elgin.	Toronto.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
January	30½	25½
February	29½	24
March	29½	21
April	28	24
May	25½	23
June	26	21
July	26	23
August	27½	21½
September	30	22
October	30½	24
November	31½	25
December	34½	25

On cheese the price differed from 2 to 4 cents a pound every single month in the year 1909, which is the last year for which we have the figures. The following shows the prices in detail:

Average price of full cream cheese for the year 1909 in Chicago and Toronto.

	Chicago.	Toronto.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
January	15	13½
February	15½	13½
March	16	14
April	16	13½
May	14	14
June	13½	13
July	14½	12½
August	15½	12½
September	15½	12½
October	15½	12½
November	16	12½
December	16	12½

If this agreement is adopted it will destroy these great industries. It is said that he is a coward who will not turn back when first he discovers that he is wrong. We are likewise cowards if we perpetrate this injustice upon a great industry of our country, an injustice so great that it will paralyze the industry.

When we throw open our markets to the 170,000,000 pounds of cheese and 6,000,000 pounds of butter which Canada annually exports we are saying to our dairymen, "You must make up your minds to take from 5 to 7 cents per pound less for your butter and 2 to 4 cents per pound less for your cheese than heretofore." This will practically ruin these producers. Is this just? Has the Republican Party ceased to be the party of protection? When did you, who are classed as Republicans, cease to believe in the theory of protection as promulgated in our last party platform? We pledged to the American manufacturer and the American farmer a protective tariff equaling the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. We, who are classed as progressives, ask no greater protection than this, but we insist that we are entitled to that amount. Now you propose to throw this doctrine to the winds, and without even attempting to ascertain the cost of production at home and abroad you say to the farmer, "You must meet your competitor in our home markets whether you can produce as cheaply as he or not." In the preliminary report filed by the Tariff Board it is shown conclusively that the American dairyman can not produce a pound of butter or a pound of cheese as cheaply as his Canadian brother, but you ignore this. Whether it wrongs the farmers or not, you pay no attention to the fact that thousands of farms through Wisconsin and Minnesota can be made profitable by dairying when they could not be made profitable in any other way.

In the name of the dairymen of this country I protest against such action. I realize that the Democratic Party is going to put this through, assisted by a few Republicans, and it is folly for me to offer any amendments in behalf of these dairymen. Be that as it may, I should feel derelict in my duty if I did not voice their protests in as positive language as I can command. Again, I wish to protest in behalf of the thousands of firesides in our dairy States against this injustice. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eggs of barnyard fowl, in the shell.

Mr. LANGLEY. On page 17, line 1, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 1, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of putting myself on record in opposition to this provision. The egg industry is an important one in my district, as well as in other agricultural sections of the country. A great many eggs are already imported from Canada under the present tariff rate. It will necessarily follow, if they are placed upon the free list, that a much larger number will be imported, and, according to the law of supply and demand, this will necessarily reduce the egg market in this country; and on behalf of the farmers who will be injured by this provision I have offered this amendment, although I know from what has occurred here this afternoon that it is fruitless for me to offer it, because I already hear the machinery of the steam roller starting up, and the gentleman in charge of it is becoming impatient to roll it over this amendment as he has over all others of a like character that have been offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Seeds: Flaxseed or linseed, cotton seed, and other oil seeds; grass seed, including timothy and clover seed; garden, field, and other seed not herein otherwise provided for, when in packages weighing over 1 pound each (not including flower seed).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17, strike out all of lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, flaxseed is a product of the Northwest. When ground is broken up in a new country that is the first crop that is raised. It is the poor man's crop. This industry has grown in this northwest country and the duty should be left on flaxseed to protect and to help the new settlers. I hope my motion may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fish of all kinds, fresh, frozen, packed in ice, salted, or preserved in any form, except sardines and other fish preserved in oil; and shellfish of all kinds, including oysters, lobsters, and clams in any state, fresh or packed, and coverings of the foregoing.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beginning on line 9, page 17, strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil, including sod oil: *Provided*, That fish oil, whale oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States, shall be admitted into Canada as the product of the United States, and, similarly, that fish oil, whale oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada, shall be admitted into the United States as the product of Canada.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 14, after the word "herring," strike out the word "whale"; and also, on lines 15 and 19, strike out the words "whale oil."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the ships in Canada that are engaged in the whale-oil enterprise are constructed in Norway and cost $23,000 each. The American ships that compete with them are manufactured in American shipyards, by American workmen receiving American wages, and fly the American flag, and cost $80,000 each.

Mr. SISSON. Then buy them in Norway.

Mr. KAHN. The men who man the Canadian ships are Chinese and Japanese. The men who man the American ships are white men. The Chinese and Japanese get $40 a month and feed themselves. The white men on the American ships get $75 a month and are fed by the companies that manufacture the whale oil. If you allow the product of Canada to come in free, as contemplated by the pending measure, you wipe out an American industry and you again drive American ships off the seas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharves.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, strike out lines 24 and 25.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me explain here that I am also going to move to strike out the four succeeding paragraphs on page 18 of this bill. All five of these paragraphs, you will observe, propose to put lumber, in some form or other, upon the free list. I am opposed to all of it. I think we have little enough protection to lumber now. I have already indicated, as fully as I could in five minutes, my views upon this question, and I thought I would explain now that it is my purpose in offering all five of these amendments to take lumber in any form off the free list embodied in this treaty, so that when I offer these four amendments I can do so without explanation. Moreover, it is evident that it is perfectly useless to make an argument in support of all of these amendments, as those favoring the treaty have already demonstrated that they do not proposed to permit an amendment to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "wharves," in line 25, page 17, strike out the period and insert a comma, and add the words "shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, grandilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods."

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say upon this matter. It is simply one of a series of amendments that I stated that I would offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 18.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "not further manufactured than sawed."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this in effect is the same proposition again, and if adopted will give free lumber. I am not going to take up the time to discuss it [applause] except to say—well, Mr. Chairman, since there seems to be such a unanimous expression of delight that I am talking I think I will discuss it. I am in hopes you brethren over there will have by this time been able to solve the proposition properly and have given sufficient consideration to the reasoning that has been poured out here for your benefit that if you really and truly are in favor of free lumber you will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 1 and 2, on page 18.

Mr. LANGLEY. I see the steam roller is operating——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order. The amendment was properly put and acted upon by the committee. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric-light, and telegraph poles of cedar or other woods.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 3 and 4 on page 18.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I said a while ago it is evident the House does not want to hear any further debate——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. LANGLEY. I started to say, I see that the steam roller is oiled and ready to roll over all these amendments, and I do not desire to detain the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wooden staves of all kinds, not further manufactured than listed or jointed, and stave bolts.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 5 and 6 on page 18.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to discuss the amendment for the reasons already stated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the item the gentleman is trying to strike out has been passed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I understood the Clerk had read down to "stave bolts," in line 6, and I moved to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman's amendment is in time. If there is any confusion it was due to the Chair's fault. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman, which is to strike out lines 5 and 6 on page 18.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pickets and palings.

Mr. LANGLEY. I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Kentucky ought to give his reasons—— [Cries of "Oh, no!"]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think there ought to be some display of the intelligence that lies behind such a motion.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee, who is always courteous and amiable, does not mean quite what his language might imply. He will recall that I said to the committee a little while ago that I would offer a motion to strike out all these paragraphs to place any lumber in any form on the free list, because I did not think that we have any too much protection on lumber now. Moreover, out of consideration for gentlemen on that side who have been protesting against debate on all these amendments to the treaty, I have refrained from debating these other motions to strike out the free lumber provision. I could debate them and give an intelligent reason, I think, why the motions should be adopted. But I know the gentleman from Tennessee and the other gentlemen on both sides have made up their minds to vote down all of these amendments, and there is no need of my wasting any more breath upon the subject. I merely wanted to put myself and the majority of the House on record.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plaster rock, or gypsum, crude, not ground.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 8, page 18, the following words, to wit: "Plaster rock, or gypsum, crude, not ground."

[Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Members of this House for only a few moments in order to say a few words which I think I am in duty bound to say in defense of what I think is justice to my congressional district. Under this paragraph of the treaty crude gypsum is placed on the free list. As some of you know, doubtless, gypsum is the substance from which, at the present day, common wall plasters for our houses are made. It exists in abundant quantities in many of the States of this Union. When, at the last session of Congress, the Ways and Means Committee had under consideration what is known as the Payne-Aldrich bill, there were extended hearings on the question of how much duty should be levied upon gypsum. Under the Dingley bill the tariff on crude gypsum was 50 cents per ton. The bill, as it passed the House, reduced it from 50 cents to 40 cents a ton. I thought there was no demand for that, but the bill went to the Senate, and there the duty was reduced to 30 cents a ton. Under this trade agreement crude gypsum is placed on the free list.

I want to say that the State which I have the honor in part to represent is great in many respects. Great in agriculture,

because there is no State in the Union that grows so abundantly such a vast variety of agricultural products. I am opposed to this bill because I believe it does an injustice to the great agricultural interests of my State. But Oklahoma is a great State from the standpoint of its wealth in minerals—coal, oil, gas, iron, asphalt, glass sand, gypsum, and many other minerals. In my congressional district Providence has deposited absolutely unlimited deposits of gypsum. My congressional district has the crude gypsum sufficient to supply not only the United States, but the entire world with gypsum.

Now, then, in 1910, the little tariff of 30 cents per ton upon crude gypsum brought into the Treasury of the United States over $100,000. You gentlemen who believe in a tariff for revenue only ought to support the little tariff of 30 cents per ton upon crude gypsum. The effect of this bill will be to take $100,000 out of the Treasury of the United States and put it in the hands of a few manufacturers of gypsum in the northeastern portion of the United States. People who build houses will not get plaster for their houses any cheaper. This is a discrimination against the gypsum of the West. It appears to me that the men who prepared this so-called treaty, or pact, could not look down into the Southwest a thousand miles away and see the gypsum in the second congressional district of Oklahoma. They did, however, look up north and see the gypsum beds of Nova Scotia, New Breton, and Newfoundland, and placed gypsum on the free list for the benefit of the owners of Canadian gypsum deposits, and the owners of gypsum mills in the northeastern portion of the United States. I enter my solemn protest against this injustice. I believe in the policy of protection. I love my great new State, where I have lived ever since its birth. We have magnificent opportunities for agriculture, and we have magnificent opportunities to become a great manufacturing State. No measure shall have my support that I believe will retard the growth and development of my State or that discriminates against the industries of my people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fluorspar, crude, not ground.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 18, line 13, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, strike out line 13.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Payne tariff law placed a protective duty upon fluorspar. Prior to that time this industry was not protected. The question was fully considered at the last session, and it was found that there are fluorspar mines in Kentucky, Illinois, and a number of other States, but that the ruinous competition of the foreign mineral prevented these mines from being successfully operated. This protective duty was accordingly imposed, justly, I think, and the wisdom of it has been demonstrated by the profitable operation of these mines since then.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Are the gaugers interested in this?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gaugers are probably interested, I will say to the gentleman; they are good Kentuckians and naturally want to see all of Kentucky's industries prosper. This is an important industry in Kentucky. I am satisfied that you are going to vote this amendment down, of course; but I have the right, I think, to offer it and be heard a moment on it, if I desire to be heard. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

It has been only two years since this question was considered by Congress and this duty fixed as a result. I for one am opposed to nullifying by a treaty action so recently taken by Congress, after due deliberation, and therefore I move to strike this paragraph out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rolled round wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, and not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add after line 14, page 19, the following:

"Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

"Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

"Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

"Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight,"——

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that enough has been read already to show that the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order that the amendment is not in order. The Chair will examine the amendment. The gentleman from Connecticut will state his point of order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the amendment is in violation of the rule, in that it is not germane to the question or paragraph——

Mr. BARTLETT. Or to the subject matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], if he desires to be heard on the question.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if there is any point as to its being in violation of that portion of the rule which provides that no amendment shall be in order which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill, or which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed, then, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to change the amendment I have offered by offering it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman did.

Mr. LENROOT. It is substantially that; and as to that, if the point of order is still made, I would like to be heard upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, as I understand the proposition, the gentleman offers an amendment relating to duties between this country and Canada, not the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is one enumerating numerous articles that shall be free of duty when imported from the Dominion of Canada into the United States. The bill before the committee is one arranging reciprocal trade relations between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Had the amendment been one to put the articles enumerated on the free list, no matter from what country imported, it would have been clearly out of order. But in the opinion of the Chair, it being confined to articles imported from the Dominion of Canada, the amendment is in order, and the point of order is therefore overruled. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

"Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

"Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

"Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye, flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

"Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

"Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

"Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages."

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the free-list bill proposed by that side of the House, which it is now proposed to apply to imports from Canada.

I am well aware of the fact that there is no attempt being made this afternoon to legislate upon this very important bill. Every Member on that side of the House, from the hustings all

over this country, has charged that this House has ceased to be a deliberative body. But, gentlemen, with your majority here this afternoon, I say that this House never was less deliberative since I have been here than it is at this moment. [Applause on the Republican side.] Your majority does not dare to consider these amendments upon their merits. You are bound and shackled by a party caucus, and if it was not for that, some of these amendments would be incorporated in this bill.

Now, gentlemen of the majority, if your free-list bill that you propose shall fail of passage, upon you will fall the responsibility before the country of refusing to secure some relief to the consumers of this country in reduction of duties. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say. It is apparent that the free-list bill that we intend to bring before the House next week means in many of its items a reduction of the cost of living to the people of the United States, because we put the articles on the free list as coming from all the world; but, so far as Canada is concerned, it is absurd to claim that agricultural implements or meats or many of the other products named in that bill would ever come from Canada in any considerable quantities if those articles were included in this bill. If the gentleman really desires to enact this free list into law, I hope after this bill has passed the House he will use his influence with the Senators of the United States who agree with him to enable us to send the bill to the President. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. The Senators from his State.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the articles above enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that the following articles, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), are admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty, namely:

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, after the word "*Provided*," in line 15, on page 19, I move to insert the words "That this act shall not become operative before January 1, 1912," and after the word "duty," in line 17, I move to insert the word "only."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "*Provided*," in line 15, on page 19, insert the words: "That this act shall not become operative before January 1, 1912," and after the word "duty," in line 17, on said page, insert the word "only."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment is that this act affects principally the products of the farmer, and that there is now in the hands of the farmer a considerable part of the crops that were grown and produced with no suggestion that there would be any legislation that would materially affect the prices of these commodities, and that under those circumstances, if this bill should become a law, which I hope it will not, unless it is so amended as to equalize its provisions to all industries alike, it is only fair that its operation should not take effect upon the products that were grown while the present law existed, for, even in the prospects of the passage of this bill, there has been a lowering of the prices of the farm products, and the farming industry of this country has been injured to a very appreciable extent without any corresponding advantage to that industry.

If there was a general adjustment of the tariff so as to distribute the general effect, it would be quite a different proposition than that which here confronts us.

If this bill is to be enacted into law, let it be so amended that its provisions do not apply to the products of the last season, but to those only to be produced which have been planted with a knowledge that this bill is likely to become a law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 18, page 19, by inserting, after the word "evidence," the following:

"That the Dominion of Canada has so revised its patent laws as to give to inventors of the United States holding Canadian patents the same privileges as are now given by the United States to inventors of Canada holding United States patents, and shall have satisfactory evidence."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I make the point of order that that amendment is not germane to this bill. It relates to the patent laws, and this is a treaty relating to tariff duties between the two countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, as pointed out two or three days ago, the patent laws of Canada are such that they require an American holding a patent from Canada either to sell his patent or to come to Canada for the purpose of manufacturing the article. Therefore, so long as these laws obtain, the concessions granted under this agreement are absolutely ineffective. It is an idle ceremony for this House to pass an agreement under which Canada proposes to give us concessions so far as access to her markets are concerned when she still retains within her internal legal system the power to render those provisions prohibitive and ineffective. Therefore, it seems to me, it is not only germane but necessary to adopt this amendment if we desire to make this agreement effective so far as Canadian markets are concerned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard briefly on the point of order. While I shall not vote for the amendment if it be placed before the House, it seems to me that it is not subject to a point of order. As I understand the amendment, it is proposed to amend the proviso so that it will read that when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence that—relating to the patent laws—he shall make proclamation that the following articles, and so forth. In other words, to make the dutiable and free list provided in the bill dependent in part upon the duties fixed by Canada and in part upon the revision of her patent laws. Clearly, it seems to me germane, in order to provide that our duties shall be reciprocal, and that we would have a right under this bill to add any provision as a condition precedent to our granting a lower rate of duty or the free list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite get the reading of the amendment in full, but I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper, being the products of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be admitted free of duty, on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee, or otherwise), or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), shall have been imposed upon such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood pulp used in the manufacture of such paper or board.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for section 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news-print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper, being the products of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be admitted free of duty, on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise), or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), shall have been imposed upon paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of paper, board, or wood pulp by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, or any Province or other subdivision of government thereof, where the same was in whole or in part produced (either in the form of wood or pulp or otherwise) or manufactured: *Provided, however*, That the rates of duty as now collected upon the articles in this section mentioned shall in no case be increased.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the only difference between the substitute I have offered and section 2 of the bill as now written is that before Canada can enjoy our markets free of

duty on print paper she must remove from each and every Province in Canada her embargo on pulp wood. I believe that it is only fair that, if we are to take the finished product from Canada or any other country in the world, that country should let free raw material come into our market unrestricted. This section is not as the bill was originally introduced at all. Therefore it is subject to amendment without affecting the bill. Section 2 as now in the bill was prepared by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and presented to the committee and adopted as a substitute for the section that was in the bill when it was first introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], because that section was not properly worded. The only difference between the sections in the bill and the one I offer is that Canada is required to remove her restrictions on pulp wood.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to pulp and paper is a little different in the bill from the situation as to any other article named. There is no prohibition of exportation on the other articles named in the bill. There is no export duty on pulp and paper coming from Canada into the United States. The Dominion of Canada has levied no charge, made no restrictions, fixed no export duty on pulp or paper coming from Canada into the United States. Most of the pulp paper probably will be made in the future at least from pulp wood cut on the public lands known as the Crown lands.

Those Crown lands are not owned by the Dominion of Canada; they are owned by the individual Provinces. Some of those Provinces are very much opposed to permitting any pulp wood to be exported from the Dominion into the United States. The Province of Ontario, for instance, whenever it sells pulp wood upon the Crown lands, puts into the contract the specific provision that that wood shall not be sent out of the Dominion of Canada for manufacture. The result of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], if he states it correctly, would be that any one Province of Canada could absolutely prohibit the taking effect of the provision in the bill and render entirely nugatory all of the legislation in reference to pulp and paper. It would no longer be the action of the Dominion of Canada, but any one Province by putting into a contract for the sale of its pulp wood the provision that that pulp wood should be manufactured in the Dominion of Canada would entirely prevent the operation of the law, if this be enacted into law, and the Province of Ontario or some other Province would take advantage of that power and entirely prohibit all benefits to come from this provision of the law.

In my judgment, it is to the interest not only of the paper consumers in the United States, but of the paper-manufacturing industry in the United States, that the great forests of black spruce in Canada may be utilized by exporting from Canada for the benefit of our paper mills that pulp wood controlled by these Provinces. If the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan should prevail, so far as paper and pulp are concerned, the bill might just as well be thrown into the waste basket, because it would never have any effect.

The proposition contained in section 2 is identically the language of the agreement. The first bill that was presented did not follow out the agreement. Somebody made an error in drawing the bill. While this section 2 has been called the Mann amendment, all I did was to take the language of the agreement, write it out, and present it to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the only thing left out of the agreement in the section as presented with reference to pulp and paper were these words, which were supernumerary:

Provided, That such paper and board, valued at 4 cents per pound or less, and wood pulp.

That was a repetition of language already in the agreement, so in drawing the section that language was left out. In other respects it is in the identical language of the agreement, and carries out not only the intent of the agreement, but makes a law which will be of benefit, in my opinion, both to the consumer and manufacturer.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman will admit that he prepared the amendment that I have offered? It was prepared by the gentleman, and I give him credit for preparing an exceedingly intelligent amendment to that bill. He brought the two amendments to the committee, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] offered the one that is now in the bill, and I offer this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent leave was granted Mr. MANN to proceed for five minutes.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I was not able to be certain that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan was the other provision which I had prepared. I thought it was as it was read, but the gentleman misstated or erroneously stated its effect.

Mr. FORDNEY. Not intentionally.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not intentionally. The provision in the bill will admit, if this becomes a law, at once, free of duty, paper or wood pulp made from pulp wood cut on private lands in Canada, on which there is no restriction of exportation.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would admit paper and pulp from Provinces only as each Province removed all restrictions on the exportation of pulp wood, and would not treat the entire Dominion of Canada as an entity, but treats each Province by itself. There may have been doubt as to which was the better provision. While I think, under the terms of the agreement and under the terms of the bill, it is quite competent for the House, without disturbing the arrangement between the two Executives, to adopt either of those provisions, still, in my judgment, it is better, now that the provision which is in the bill is in the agreement, to follow the language of the agreement and admit the paper made from private-lands pulp wood free of duty without leaving the Provinces the power to control it. If I felt that it was necessary, and if it were not for the lateness of the hour, I would be glad to discuss the matter more at length, but I do not feel at this time at liberty to detain the House further in regard to the proposition. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FORDNEY. Thank you, gentlemen; I will not take more than a minute. Instead of the gentleman's [Mr. MANN] statement being correct that the language in the bill is exactly as agreed upon by our representatives and the representatives of Canada, he is mistaken. I think the gentleman makes a mistake, an honest mistake, of course, because Mr. Fielding, on the floor of the House of Parliament in Canada, stated that the Government of the United States demanded this very same thing, but they were unable to agree to it because they could not bind the Provinces, showing conclusively that the matter had been discussed and that our representatives had aimed to get the very thing that I am asking for, but the Canadian representatives were unable to bind the Provinces. That was his statement and the substance of his (Fielding's) letter to our Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of further readjusting the duties on importations into the United States of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, and of the exportation into the Dominion of Canada of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, the President of the United States is authorized and requested to negotiate trade agreements with the Dominion of Canada wherein mutual concessions are made looking toward freer trade relations and the further reciprocal expansion of trade and commerce: *Provided, however*, That said trade agreements before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, to be added as an additional section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the United States from amending or repealing the same at any time without notice to the Dominion of Canada, nor shall the Dominion of Canada be required to give to the United States any notice before amending or repealing any law responsive to this act.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have just offered authorizes either this country or Canada to withdraw from the reciprocal trade arrangement now proposed at any time without notice to the other. The pending so-called Canadian reciprocity bill occupies a peculiar position. It is not a treaty, as some Members have seemed to suppose it is. It is merely a bill, which, if passed, will become a law of the United States. Then, if Canada passes a similar law, as specified in this act, the President is to issue a proclamation putting our law into effect. We authorize him to do so in the bill. But not one word is said in the bill as to how it is ever to be repealed,

if perchance we should be dissatisfied with it after a few years' trial. Neither is any method provided for its amendment. Manifestly, Canada has some interest in what we shall do in the way of amending or repealing this bill in the future. Our bill admits the products of Canada into this country upon certain terms, provided Canada shall pass a law admitting certain of our products into that country upon certain terms that we have specified.

Now, when the bill we are passing to-day becomes a law, and Canada has passed an act containing exactly the schedules upon our imports into that country that we have stipulated in our bill that she shall pass, it seems to me that a sort of a contract will have been entered into between the two countries. Neither country should arbitrarily withdraw from the agreement after it is entered into without giving some notice to the other, unless it is provided in the bill at the time we pass it that such a thing can be done. This is exactly what I propose by the amendment I have offered.

Reject this amendment and you may have a hard time getting out of the agreement you are now entering into, if you should ever want out. This country will at least desire to change the schedules of this trade arrangement, or some of them, from time to time, and unless this additional section be added no express power will be reserved to do so. Adopt the amendment, and either this country or Canada will be at liberty, without any specified notice to the other, to amend or repeal these reciprocal trade laws at any time. It would certainly be the part of wisdom to do so.

This afternoon I heard the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the leader of the Democratic majority in this House, request his party followers to vote against all amendments that shall be proposed to this bill. Therefore, I can have no hopes that the amendment I have proposed will be accepted. But it is something that has been overlooked, and I feel it is my duty to the country to offer it. Maybe if it is voted down here it will be added to the bill when it reaches the Senate, so that we will not tie our hands for all time to come to what may be a bad bargain.

If the Democrats had not held a caucus in advance of the consideration of this bill and decided on a set program, Members offering amendments at this time could have them fairly considered. For that reason I want to say in passing, that I am unalterably opposed to caucuses. I believe in leaving Members free to exercise their best judgment at all times, otherwise we are reduced from a deliberative body to a mere set of parrots repeating the votes of our so-called leaders.

I am friendly to the Canadian reciprocity bill, and am going to vote for it on the roll call. The amendment is not offered to embarrass those in charge of the bill on the other side of the House; it is offered to cover what appears to be a palpable omission. True, I believe the United States will have the right to repeal or amend this law at any time without having it so expressed in the bill, but it does appear that it would be much better to have that matter made clear and certain by having it stipulated in the bill. That is the sole object of the amendment I have offered in the form of an additional section to the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House without amendment, with a recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had instructed him to report the same to the House without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move the previous question on the bill to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report the same back forthwith amended by placing on the free list lumber of all kinds, whether rough, dressed, planed, or grooved; shingles and lath, the product of the Dominion of Canada, when imported from Canada into the United States; and on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

To recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back forthwith amended by placing on the free list lumber of all kinds, whether rough, dressed, planed, or grooved; shingles and lath, the product of the Dominion of Canada, when imported from Canada into the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska for the previous question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The gentleman is not entitled to make that motion. There is no debate permitted on a motion to recommit.

Mr. NORRIS. The previous question, I think, is proper in order to prevent amendment.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. No amendment can be offered.

The SPEAKER. Without the previous question amendments will be in order. The point of order is overruled. The question is on the previous question on the gentleman's motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. On the motion to recommit I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to recommit, and on that motion the gentleman demands the yeas and nays. All those who are in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fifty gentlemen have arisen—a sufficient number.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty gentlemen have arisen, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The question is on the motion to recommit the bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DALZELL, and several other Members demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill. Those in favor of the passage of the bill will answer "yea"; those opposed "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 268, nays 89, answered "present" 3, not voting 29, as follows:

YEAS—268.

Adair	Covington	Gould	Lewis
Adamson	Cox, Ind.	Graham	Linthicum
Aiken, S. C.	Cox, Ohio	Greene	Littlepage
Alexander	Crago	Gregg, Pa.	Lloyd
Allen	Cravens	Gregg, Tex.	Lobeck
Ames	Crumpacker	Griest	Longworth
Anderson, Ohio	Cullop	Hamill	Loud
Ansberry	Curley	Hamilton, W. Va.	McCall
Anthony	Danforth	Hamlin	McCoy
Ashbrook	Daugherty	Hardwick	McCreary
Austin	Davenport	Hardy	McDermott
Ayers	Davis, W. Va.	Harris	McGillicuddy
Barchfeld	Denver	Harrison, Miss.	McHenry
Barnhart	Dickinson	Harrison, N. Y.	McKinney
Bartholdt	Dies	Hay	Macon
Bartlett	Difenderfer	Heald	Madden
Beall, Tex.	Dixon, Ind.	Heflin	Madison
Bell, Ga.	Donohoe	Helm	Maguire, Nebr.
Berger	Doremus	Higgins	Maher
Bingham	Driscoll, D. A.	Hill	Mann
Blackmon	Dupre	Hobson	Martin, Colo.
Boehne	Dyer	Holland	Matthews
Booher	Edwards	Houston	Miller
Borland	Ellerbe	Howard	Mitchell
Bowman	Estopinal	Howland	Moon, Pa.
Brown	Evans	Hubbard	Moon, Tenn.
Buchanan	Faison	Hughes, N. J.	Moore, Tex.
Bulkley	Farr	Hull	Morrison
Burke, Pa.	Ferris	Humphreys, Miss.	Moss, Ind.
Burke, Wis.	Fields	Jacoway	Murdock
Burleson	Finley	James	Murray
Burnett	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Ky.	Needham
Butler	Flood, Va.	Johnson, S. C.	Nye
Byrnes, S. C.	Floyd, Ark.	Jones	Oldfield
Byrns, Tenn.	Fornes	Kent	Olmsted
Calder	Foss	Kindred	O'Shaunessy
Callaway	Foster, Ill.	Kinkead, N. J.	Padgett
Candler	Francis	Kitchin	Page
Cantrill	Fuller	Knowland	Palmer
Carlin	Gallagher	Konig	Parran
Carter	Garner	Konop	Patten, N. Y.
Cary	Garrett	Korbly	Pepper
Catlin	George	Lafferty	Peters
Clark, Fla.	Gillett	Lamb	Porter
Clayton	Glass	Lawrence	Post
Cline	Godwin, N. C.	Lee, Ga.	Pou
Collier	Goeke	Lee, Pa.	Rainey
Connell	Goldfogle	Legare	Raker
Coury	Goodwin, Ark.	Lever	Randell, Tex.
Cooper	Gordon	Levy	Ransdell, La.

Rauch	Sheppard	Stephens, Tex.	Turnbull
Reilly	Sherley	Stevens, Minn.	Tuttle
Richardson	Sherwood	Stone	Underhill
Roberts, Mass.	Sims	Sulloway	Underwood
Roberts, Nev.	Sisson	Sulzer	Utter
Robinson	Slayden	Sweet	Watkins
Roddenbery	Slemp	Switzer	Weeks
Rothermel	Small	Talbott, Md.	White
Rouse	Smith, N. Y.	Talcott, N. Y.	Wickliffe
Rubey	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.	Wilder
Rucker, Mo.	Sparkman	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Ill.
Russell	Speer	Taylor, Ohio	Wilson, N. Y.
Sabath	Stack	Thayer	Wilson, Pa.
Saunders	Stanley	Thomas	Witherspoon
Scully	Stedman	Tilson	Young, Mich.
Shackleford	Stephens, Cal.	Townsend	Young, Tex.
Sharp	Stephens, Miss.	Tribble	The Speaker.

NAYS—89.

Akin, N. Y.	French	La Follette	Pujo
Anderson, Minn.	Gardner, Mass.	Langley	Rees
Bathrick	Gardner, N. J.	Lenroot	Rodenberg
Bradley	Good	Lindbergh	Rucker, Colo.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Simmons
Campbell	Guernsey	McKinley	Sloan
Cannon	Hamilton, Mich.	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Claypool	Hammond	McMorran	Smith, Saml. W.
Copley	Hanna	Malby	Steenerson
Currier	Hartman	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Dalzell	Haugen	Mondell	Thistlewood
Davis, Minn.	Hawley	Moore, Pa.	Towner
De Forest	Hayes	Morgan	Volstead
Dodds	Helgesen	Mott	Warburton
Doughton	Hinds	Nelson	Webb
Driscoll, M. E.	Howell	Norris	Wedemeyer
Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Esch	Jackson	Pickett	Willis
Fairchild	Kendall	Plumley	Woods, Iowa
Focht	Kennedy	Powers	Young, Kans.
Fordney	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pray	
Foster, Vt.	Kopp	Prince	
Fowler	Lafean	Prouty	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Kahn	Langham	Riordan

NOT VOTING—29.

Andrus	Draper	Latta	Redfield
Bates	Gray	Lindsay	Sells
Brantley	Henry, Conn.	Littleton	Smith, Cal.
Broussard	Henry, Tex.	Loudenslager	Vreeland
Burgess	Hensley	McKenzie	Wood, N. J.
Davidson	Hughes, Ga.	Mays	
Dent	Hughes, W. Va.	Morse, Wis.	
Dickson, Miss.	Kipp	Payne	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

For this session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Until further notice:

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. WOOD of New Jersey.

Mr. HENRY of Texas with Mr. VREELAND.

For to-day:

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. BATES.

For to-day and ending in three weeks:

Mr. LATTA with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

On the reciprocity bill:

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut (in favor of) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Mr. KIPP (in favor of) with Mr. LANGHAM (against).

Mr. SELLS (in favor of) with Mr. DAVIDSON (against).

Mr. LITTLETON (in favor of) with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER (against).

Mr. PAYNE (in favor of) with Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin (against).

Mr. LANGHAM. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. In the negative.

Mr. LANGHAM. I am paired, Mr. Speaker, with Mr. KIPP, and I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LANGHAM, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the result was received with applause.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote just taken was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence until April 26, on account of death in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. YOUNG of Kansas, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Anna F. Shepherd, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet on Monday, April 24, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination of Great Pedee River at Gibson Dam, S. C. (H. Doc. No. 23); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Auditor of the Treasury Department relating to the destruction of certain papers not needed for public business (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination of harbor at Knife River, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination and survey of New Haven Harbor, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 26); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6728) granting pensions to teamsters of the War of the Rebellion, from 1861 to 1865, inclusive; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6729) to provide for the selection and purchase of a site for and erection of a monument or memorial to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6730) to authorize the leasing of the Batan Island Military Reservation for coal-mining purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 6731) to provide for the sale of the surface and mineral deposits of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 6732) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Centralia, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6733) to accept and fund the bequest of Gertrude M. Hubbard; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 6734) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the consular districts of the United States in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 6735) to authorize the exchange with the Coconino Cattle Co. of lands within the Coconino National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6736) to provide for holding terms of United States courts at Hattiesburg, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6737) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6738) to authorize the St. Louis-Kansas City Electric Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the town of St. Charles, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6739) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson forlorn-hope storming party; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 6740) to provide for a survey of the lake front at Fairport, Lake County, Ohio; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 6741) to provide for the erection of a monument to the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6742) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 6743) to provide American registry for the steamer *Minnesota* upon certain conditions; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6744) granting pensions to widows and minor children of deceased soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6745) to remit the duty on pictorial windows to be imported by the Gate of Heaven Church, South Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 6746) to give effect to the fifth article of the treaty between the United States and Canada, signed January 11, 1909; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6747) to authorize the Wisconsin Central Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Croix River between Wisconsin and Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution (H. Res. 119) asking for certain information of the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCOY: Resolution (H. Res. 120) directing the Secretary of War to furnish information in regard to a water supply for Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 121) directing the Department of Justice to furnish information in regard to a water supply for Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAVENS: Resolution (H. Res. 122) authorizing the appointment of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) providing for the termination of the treaty between the United States of America and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg December 18, 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics to collect and compile statistics relating to wars, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 6748) granting an increase of pension to David K. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6749) granting an increase of pension to Morgan M. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6750) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6751) granting a pension to Barbara A. Bauman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6752) granting an increase of pension to Elias Babione; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6753) granting an increase of pension to Melanchton Binkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) granting an increase of pension to Romanes Binkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6755) granting an increase of pension to James W. Beckwith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6756) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6757) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cushman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) granting a pension to James A. Dickinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Diedler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) granting an increase of pension to John Florkowski; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6761) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grundy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6762) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) granting an increase of pension to Henry Homan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) granting an increase of pension to Aaron B. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) granting an increase of pension to John Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6766) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6767) granting an increase of pension to Levi B. Leedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6768) granting an increase of pension to Absalom Mowery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6769) granting an increase of pension to John Z. Macon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6770) granting an increase of pension to James McNary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6771) granting an increase of pension to Tillman McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6772) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Moses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6773) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Overmyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6774) granting an increase of pension to William Poorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6775) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas B. Querrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6776) granting an increase of pension to Burton S. Rathbun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6777) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Reineck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6778) granting an increase of pension to Orrell P. Rarick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6779) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6780) granting an increase of pension to John A. Shively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6781) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Sprout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6782) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Sinclair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6783) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus D. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Markus Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Christina Younkman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6786) granting an increase of pension to Henry Zender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6787) granting a pension to Anna Rose Petty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6788) granting a pension to George Flora; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6789) granting a pension to Juan Bautisto Duran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6790) for the relief of Charles I. Dague; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6791) for the relief of James W. Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6792) for the relief of Phil Sours; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6793) for the relief of Charles A. Bess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6794) for the relief of Lottie Rapp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6795) for the relief of Katherine Ratchford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6796) for the relief of Drs. Langworthy & Langworthy and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6797) to correct the military record of Judson N. Pollard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6798) granting an increase of pension to George S. Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6799) granting an increase of pension to Francis Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6800) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Sally; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6801) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Kyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6802) granting an increase of pension to William Copeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6803) granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Honza; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6804) granting an increase of pension to Henry Keeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6805) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6806) granting a pension to Franklin Barbour; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6807) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Billingslea; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6808) granting a pension to Alice Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6809) granting a pension to Alexander R. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 6810) for the relief of Charles J. Callahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 6811) for the relief of John Moynihan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6812) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Langley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6813) granting an increase of pension to James H. Conklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6814) granting an increase of pension to John L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6815) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 6816) granting an increase of pension to William Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6817) granting a pension to John W. Bolt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6818) granting a pension to Alice A. D. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6819) granting a pension to William F. Patten; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6820) for the relief of James I. Fountain; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6821) to correct the date of discharge of Jerome L. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 6822) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William F. McKimmy, administrator of the estate of John McKimmy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 6823) for the relief of Pedro Fuentes, administrator of the estate of Guadalupe Lujan de Fuentes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 6824) for the relief of John Carr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6825) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6826) granting an increase of pension to John Crew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6827) granting an increase of pension to William L. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6828) granting an increase of pension to Henry Tungate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6829) granting an increase of pension to William H. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6830) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6831) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6832) granting an increase of pension to Anton Ohnesorg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6833) granting an increase of pension to Meredith T. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6834) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6835) granting an increase of pension to John M. Hines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6836) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6837) granting an increase of pension to John P. Jefferries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6838) granting an increase of pension to James C. Rule; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6839) granting an increase of pension to William H. McGary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6840) granting a pension to Elizabeth Farishon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6841) granting a pension to Jerry Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6842) granting a pension to Frances E. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6843) granting a pension to Christina Kraft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6844) granting a pension to John William Willbrandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6845) granting a pension to J. Frank Cornman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6846) granting a pension to Rachel Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6847) for the relief of George P. Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6848) for the relief of Henry Mersch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6849) for the relief of George W. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6850) for the relief of Eli Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6851) for the relief of John Blackston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6852) for the relief of Levant C. Dingman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6853) for the relief of John Ziegler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6854) for the relief of Joseph Rutter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6855) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Warrenton, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6856) for the relief of the treasurer of State Hospital No. 1, at Fulton, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6857) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander Andrae, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6858) to reimburse Marion Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6859) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of John H. Frick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6860) to correct the military record of Philip Sappington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 6861) granting a pension to George P. Cross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 6862) granting a pension to Mary P. Haddaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6863) for the relief of the estate of Capt. Thomas E. Boone, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6864) to equalize the pension of Edwin D. Bates from March, 1883, up to the time of the special act granting him $24 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6865) granting an increase of pension to Lucien E. Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6866) for the relief of John A. Trowbridge; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6867) for the relief of the estate of Larkin H. Penny, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6868) for the relief of Henry C. Emmerke; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6869) granting an increase of pension to John Bonhome; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6870) granting an increase of pension to Riley Liston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6871) granting a pension to Lewis N. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6872) granting an increase of pension to David E. Garey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6873) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6874) for the relief of Everett H. Corson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6875) granting an increase of pension to James Skelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 6876) for the relief of the estate of John Pemberton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6877) for the relief of the estate of Philip Felix Herwig, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6878) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6879) granting a pension to Henry Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 6880) granting an increase of pension to James A. Darrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6881) granting an increase of pension to Dustin W. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6882) granting an increase of pension to Lyman J. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6883) granting an increase of pension to William Borst, alias William Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6884) granting an increase of pension to James H. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6885) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Waring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6886) granting an increase of pension to William C. Oakley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6887) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6888) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Van Horne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6889) granting an increase of pension to Charles Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6890) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6891) granting an increase of pension to John Pogue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6892) granting an increase of pension to John J. De Groff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6893) granting an increase of pension to Lot Smalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6894) granting an increase of pension to Ainer Munson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6895) granting an increase of pension to Delos Sitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6896) granting an increase of pension to Manfield Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6897) granting an increase of pension to David Parris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6898) granting an increase of pension to Richmond White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6899) granting an increase of pension to J. Delos Pruyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to William H. Maxfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6901) granting an increase of pension to John C. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6902) granting an increase of pension to George C. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6903) to correct the military record of Augustus York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAISON: A bill (H. R. 6904) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin C. Smith, deceased, W. W. Smith, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6905) for the relief of the estate of Seth Waters; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6906) for the relief of Samuel J. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6907) for the relief of the estate of Thomas S. Howard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6908) for the relief of W. T. Hawkins; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6909) granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6910) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo F. Stalker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 6912) for the relief of Lewis Myshrall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6913) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6914) for the relief of the estate of J. M. Fortinberry, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6915) for the relief of the estate of Capt. John Bolino; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6916) for the relief of the estate of Harris Barnes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6917) for the relief of Frederick Hughson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6918) for the relief of Thomas Cassidy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 6919) granting an increase of pension to Sherwood C. Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6920) for the relief of Thomas Johnson or his legal representatives; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6921) for the relief of David R. Mister; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6922) for the relief of the heirs of Lemmis J. Spence, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6923) for the relief of Edward S. Salomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6924) authorizing the President to appoint Alexander Shiras Gassaway a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6925) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6926) granting an increase of pension to William McClain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6927) granting an increase of pension to Theodore T. Sperling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6928) granting an increase of pension to George Mudgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6929) granting an increase of pension to William L. Hands; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6930) granting an increase of pension to Stalnaker Marteney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6931) granting a pension to William W. Maroney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 6932) granting an increase of pension to William P. Mayles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6933) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6934) granting an increase of pension to Allen O. Underhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 6935) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6936) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6937) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Roswell W. Gould; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6938) for the relief of Nathan P. Randall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6939) granting an increase of pension to Martin Larvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 6940) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Staples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 6941) for the relief of the heirs at law of Addison C. Fletcher, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 6942) granting an increase of pension to James M. Newland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6943) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Knoop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6944) granting a pension to George R. Pensyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 6945) granting an increase of pension to David W. Dalrymple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 6946) for the correction of the military record of Zephaniah Squires; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6947) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Robert H. Peck a captain in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 6948) to restore to the active list of the Marine Corps the name of Albert Hamilton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6949) granting an increase of pension to James R. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6950) granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. McCown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6951) granting an increase of pension to William R. McNew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6952) granting an increase of pension to John Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) granting an increase of pension to James R. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6954) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Blazer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6955) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Laughters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6956) granting an increase of pension to James White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6957) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6958) granting an increase of pension to P. A. Cobb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6959) granting an increase of pension to John Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6960) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6961) granting an increase of pension to Creed Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6962) granting an increase of pension to W. B. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6963) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6964) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6965) granting an increase of pension to Sarah McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6966) granting an increase of pension to William J. Ingle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6967) granting an increase of pension to John J. Proffitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6968) granting an increase of pension to Edgar H. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6969) granting an increase of pension to Henry Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6970) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Cornett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6971) granting a pension to Ed. G. Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6972) granting a pension to Bascom M. Meyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6973) granting a pension to Elizabeth Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6974) granting a pension to Richard Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6975) granting a pension to Nancy West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6976) granting a pension to James K. Bowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6977) granting a pension to Tide Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6978) granting a pension to Elizabeth L. Bayless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6979) granting a pension to Daniel P. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6980) granting a pension to Manley W. Capps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6981) granting a pension to William H. Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6982) granting a pension to John Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6983) granting a pension to Monroe Trent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6984) granting a pension to Thomas R. Trent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6985) granting a pension to John R. P. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6986) granting a pension to Absalom L. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6987) granting a pension to Lemiel A. Ragan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6988) granting a pension to Isaac A. Wampler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6989) granting a pension to Aaron W. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6990) granting a pension to Ada Hurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6991) granting a pension to Joseph Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6992) granting a pension to Charles A. Bible; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6993) for the relief of James B. Leedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6994) for the relief of Willis M. Kent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6995) for the relief of William Vance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6996) to correct the military record of Thomas Earls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6997) to correct the military record of William B. Jenkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6998) to correct the military record of W. G. McKinzie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6999) to correct the military record of Thomas Ownby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7000) to correct the military record of Isaac G. Osborn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7001) to correct the military record of George Bragg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7002) to remove the charge of desertion against T. N. McKinnis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7003) to remove the charge of desertion against Andrew Potter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7004) for relief of the heirs of William M. Piper; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7005) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William Raines; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7006) granting a pension to certain east Tennesseeans engaged in the Secret Service of the United States during the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 7007) for the relief of Mrs. James M. Jett; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPEER: A bill (H. R. 7008) making an appropriation for defraying losses sustained by lumbermen on the Allegheny River, Allegheny County, Pa., caused by the erection of a dam on said river in said county; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 7009) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7010) granting an increase of pension to Richard S. Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7011) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7012) granting an increase of pension to Perry Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7013) granting an increase of pension to Austin P. Thayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7014) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7015) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7016) for the relief of James B. Jewett; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 7017) for the relief of James R. Evans; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7018) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 7019) granting a pension to Laura Boysen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7020) granting an increase of pension to James Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7021) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7022) granting an increase of pension to Edward Prentice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7023) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Palmer Local Union, Palmer Falls, N. Y., and Thomson Local Union, No. 158, International Paper Makers, of Schuylerville, N. Y., in opposition to the proposed Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERGER: Petition of 63,285 individuals, and by officials of organizations comprising 24,315 members (the individual signatures are of citizens of every State and Territory, except Alaska and Delaware), requesting the recall of the American Army from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers accompanying bill to correct the record of the discharge of Jerome L. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: Resolutions, petitions, letters, etc., from various organizations throughout the country, protesting against the 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine and asking Congress to repeal it; also asking Congress to investigate and endeavor to check spread of disease carried through dairy products, especially to prevent tuberculosis: Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local Union No. 126, Joplin, Mo.; Richmond Typographical Union, No. 90, Charles J. Hughes, sr., secretary-treasurer, 614 Spring Street, Richmond, Va.; Branch No. 14, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, F. W. W. Brennan, secretary, 38 Penn Street, Woodbury, N. J.; Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. C. D. G. Granger, chairman of Industrial Conditions of Women and Children, Atlanta, Ga; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Mayflower Lodge, No. 547, Des Moines, Iowa; District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, Miss Frances Graham French, the Cumberland Apartment, Washington, D. C.; The Woman's Club of Sykeston, N. Dak.; Division No. 154, Order of Railway Conductors, F. E. Tewksbury, secretary and treasurer, Binghampton, N. Y.; Switchmen's Union of North America, Lodge No. 38, M. A. Gooley, 212 Holland Street, Erie, Pa.; Fortnightly Club, Oconomowoc, Wis., Mrs. Celestia L. Edwards, president, Mrs. Charles Cottrell, secretary; Carpenters' District Council, T. F. Kearney, secretary-agent, Room 23, 96 Mathewson Street, Providence, R. I.; Woman's Club, Mrs. Mary J. Ward, corresponding secretary, Charlotte, Mich.; Building Trades' Department, American Federation of Labor, William J. Spencer, secretary-treasurer, Washington, D. C.; Branch 106, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, Columbus, Ohio; Ouakesup Club, Mrs. Hattie A. French, president, and Mrs. Gertrude Sanders, secretary, Hot Springs, Ark.; National Expeller Cotton Seed Crushers' Association, D. G. Dumas, secretary, Fort Worth, Tex.; Journeymen Stonecutters' Association of North America, John Rankin, secretary, 2175 East Thirty-ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio; International Union of Steam Engineers, Local No. 66, E. B. Schenck, recording secretary, 911 Clarissa Street, Pittsburg, Pa.; Cigarmakers' International Union of America, Local No. 457, Amos D. Hill, secretary, 808 Michigan Avenue, St. Joseph, Mich.; Musicians' Protective Union, Local No. 161, C. P. Huestis, recording secretary, 421 B Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Menominee-Marinette Shingle Weavers' Union, Local No. 1, Marinette, Wis., James J. Williams, secretary; Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., Mrs. Jessie Weirich, president, Mrs. Mary L. Lucksinger, acting secretary; Kansas Equal Suffrage Association, Mrs. Catherine Hoffman, president, Enterprise, Kans.; Travel Class of Albert Lea, Mrs. George H. Mueller, corresponding secretary, Albert Lea, Minn.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Resolutions of Local No. 158, Schuylerville, N. Y., and Local No. 7, Palmer, N. Y., International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of St. Louis Stereotypers Union, No. 8, city of St. Louis, Mo., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of Local No. 158, Schuylerville, N. Y., and Local No. 7, Palmer, N. Y., International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORNES: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, against present tariff rates on steel cotton ties and bagging; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of the employees of the Eastern Talc Co., operating in the State of Vermont, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Levi H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of George C. Edwards, of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of N. J. Batchelder, master of National Grange, Cleveland; master of Union Grange; and Clift & Goodrich, of New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Alonzo F. Stalker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Pratts Patent (Ltd.), in opposition to House bill 4413, relative to foods for domestic animals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of 125 residents of Haverhill and Bradford, Mass., favoring a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Resolution of Aroostook County Pomona Grange, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of F. W. Heidel, of Fargo, N. Dak., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Grafton, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Niagara, N. Dak., favoring the increase in salary to rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of citizens of Naugatuck, Conn., against arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany bill authorizing the President to appoint Alexander Shiras Gassaway a second assistant engineer in the United States Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of South Branch Grange, South Branch, Mich., protesting against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. Charles E. Marvin and 30 other residents of Bay City, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 383; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. NYE: Resolutions of Minnesota Millers' Club, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Robert P. Brown, of Providence, R. I., favoring H. R. 26541, relative to trusts and combinations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic, Providence, R. I., favoring building additional battleships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, against closer relations with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution 16 of California Legislature, relating to Deadmans Island; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of William P. McHaffie, of San Francisco, Cal., against the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Legislature of State of California, favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Knight & Lyle and others, of Dunsmuir, Cal., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the L. B. Tibbetts Chapter of American Women's League, composed of 60 members, against suppressing magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William Simpson and others, of California, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. I. Strawn, of Corning, Cal., against raising the postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of the seventh district of Massachusetts, protesting against the establishment of a national board of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolutions of New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, of Boston, in opposition to the proposal to place leather and boots and shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, asking that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petitions of Local No. 158, Thomsons, N. Y., and of Local No. 7, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Palmer, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of tea importers of the city of New York, relative to the duty on tea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Merchants' Association of New York favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, favoring the establishment of a department of public health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolutions of the Carpenters' District Council of Providence, R. I., and vicinity, favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 24, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Assistant Secretary read the following:

OFFICE OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 24, 1911.

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, Senator from Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WM. P. FRYE,
President pro Tempore.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer, and directed that the Journal of the last legislative day should be read.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

SENATORS FROM IOWA AND FLORIDA.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present the certificate of election of WILLIAM S. KENYON as Senator from Iowa for the unexpired term of my late colleague, Jonathan P. Dolliver, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials of WILLIAM S. KENYON, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Iowa a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 4, 1913, caused by the death of Jonathan P. Dolliver, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present the certificate of election of my colleague, Mr. NATHAN P. BRYAN, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials of NATHAN P. BRYAN, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Florida a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1911, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. KENYON is present, and I ask that the oath of his office be now administered to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator elect from Iowa will present himself at the Vice President's desk and the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. FLETCHER. I make the same statement with reference to my colleague [Mr. BRYAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator elect from Florida will present himself at the Vice President's desk.

Mr. KENYON and Mr. BRYAN were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. CUMMINS and Mr. FLETCHER, respectively, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Presiding Officer.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Auditor of the Treasury Department relative to the destruction of certain papers on the files of the department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest. (H. Doc. No. 24.)

The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment of the committee on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation placing appointments and promotions in the Consular Service upon a merit basis, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of the northwest section of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against any further action being taken in the case of the election of a Senator from Illinois, which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Robert Emmet Memorial Association, of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren of Pasadena, Cal., and a petition of the Union Sunday School, of Neutral, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 286, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hillsdale County, Mich., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Brace, Tenn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of Local Union No. 249, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Villa Ridge, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of 98 citizens of Franklin and Berlin, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Takoma Park Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the adoption of a universal transfer system for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. I present a letter in the nature of a petition, signed by the president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, of Boston, Mass. The letter is short. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
BOOT AND SHOE WORKERS' UNION,
Boston, Mass., April 22, 1911.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
1765 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Speaking for the shoe workers who are employed in the principal industry of New England, I venture to solicit your vote and influence against any tariff legislation which would put finished leather and shoes on the free list.

The greater efficiency of labor in the shoe industry in the United States, as against any foreign country, is not sufficient to offset the lower standard of living in all foreign countries, as compared with the United States, notwithstanding the cheaper labor prices which prevail in foreign countries. To put shoes and finished leather on the free list or to in any way reduce the present tariff would compel American shoe manufacturers to meet foreign competition through the only avenue open to them, namely, to attack the wages of the shoe workers and thereby bring about a standard of wages lower than at present exists, which would result in industrial warfare and no doubt eventually establish the lower standard of wages, consequently the lower standard of living.

We therefore trust that your vote and influence will be directed against any legislation which will reduce the tariff on shoes. The shoe workers who would be directly and adversely affected by a reduction of the tariff on shoes number at a very conservative estimate 150,000, who, with those dependent upon them, would make at least three-quarters of a million people who are directly concerned.

We will be glad to have your views upon this question.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN F. TOBIN, *General President.*

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Gaspee Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Providence, R. I., praying for the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 28.

Whereas Congress has provided in the Post Office appropriation bill for an additional railway mail service division headquarters; and

Whereas at present railway mail service division headquarters are located at St. Paul, Chicago, St. Louis, Fort Worth, San Francisco, and Seattle, leaving Denver with railroads radiating in every direction, almost in the very center of the vast territory surrounded by these cities, making it the logical place from a geographical standpoint and also from the standpoint of railway mail service, being the only available important railroad terminal covering service over the following-named roads: Union Pacific, Kansas City, Julesburg, and Cheyenne divisions; Rock Island; Burlington; Rio Grande; Missouri Pacific; Santa Fe; Colorado & Southern; Northern, Southern, Clear Creek, and South Park divisions; Colorado Midland; Denver, Northwestern & Pacific; and Denver, Laramie & Northwestern. Denver is already the division headquarters for the post-office inspection bureau, and when the new building is completed will be the distributing headquarters for supplies, stamped paper, etc., making it the only logical place for the location of the additional railway mail service division headquarters: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Colorado, now in session, urgently requests our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use all honorable means to secure from the honorable Postmaster General the location of the additional division headquarters in the city of Denver.

STEPHEN R. FITZGERALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, April 14, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Colorado on the 14th day of April, A. D. 1911, at 10.30 o'clock a. m. Recorded in book —, page —.

JAMES B. PEARCE, *Secretary of State.*
By THOMAS F. DILLON, Jr., *Deputy.*

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of the Lebanon Farmers' Club, of St. Johns, Mich., and a memorial of the Central Paper Co., of Muskegon, Mich., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presenter a petition of Local Union No. 457, Cigarmakers' Union, of St. Joseph, Mich., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Grant Creamery Co., of Grant, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale and transportation of articles of food held in cold storage, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BRISTOW presented the petition of J. W. Hitchcock and 84 other citizens of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Sulloway old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Centralia, Valley Falls, Denison, Nortonville, Woodstock, Stockton, Woodston, Seneca, Sabethe, Oskalooke, McLorth, Oskaloosa, Effingham, and Morrison, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of Lehigh Division, No. 376, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Lehighton, Pa., and a petition of Local Union No. 370, International Molders' Union of North America, of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of East Lynn Grange, No. 1263, Patrons of Husbandry, of Chester County, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURNHAM presented memorials of George W. Russell, of Atkinson; of 62 citizens of Berlin; and of 35 citizens of Franklin, all in the State of New Hampshire; of Felts Mills Local Union, No. 6, of Felts Mills; of Marble City Local Union, No. 67, of Natural Dam; of Local Union No. 7, of Palmer; and of Thomson Local Union, No. 158, of Schuylerville, all of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, in the State of New York; and of District Assembly No. 30, Knights of Labor, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 90, of Richmond, Va., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of Local Grange of Columbia; Wangumbaug Grange, of Coventry; Local Grange of Suffield; Good Will Grange, of Glastonbury; and of Local Grange of Somers, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Union Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Southington, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Connecticut Peace Society, praying for the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the citizens of the State are interested in the cause of peace and arbitration, now under consideration;

Whereas we are convinced that treaties between nations submitting all questions to a court of arbitration are the most effective agents for the advancement of universal peace and the limitation of armaments; and

Whereas President Taft has already suggested that England and the United States ratify such a treaty; and

Whereas this suggestion has been so favorably received by Earl Grey and the English people generally: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That we formally express our deep interest in the cause of peace and arbitration; and furthermore be it

Resolved, That we especially approve of the action of our President in suggesting the unrestricted arbitration treaty with Great Britain, and that we heartily favor its ratification; and finally be it

Resolved, That these resolutions be sent by the chief clerk to the Hon. Mr. Taft, to Senators NELSON and CLAPP.

Adopted April 19, 1911.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry railway postal clerks in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation granting relief to employees of the post-office service from certain arbitrary orders issued from time to time, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented the petition of Foley Bros. & Kelly, of St. Paul, Minn., praying for a more equitable settlement between the United States and Canada regarding the duty on tea, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of the Connecticut Peace Society, of Hartford; of the Patrick Sarsfield Club, of Waterbury; and of sundry citizens of Danbury and Naugatuck, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Local Grange of Hillstown, of Local Grange of Farmington, and of Eureka Grange, of New Hartford, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of 300 citizens of Hartford, East Hartford, and Bridgeport, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. WARREN. I present a resolution adopted by the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1—Protesting against advance in rates and urging Congress to declare the rates in effect January 1, 1910, to be reasonable maximum rates.

Whereas the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association stands for just, fair, and reasonable treatment of railroad corporations, their stockholders and employees, and at the same time demands fair, just, and reasonable rates to the shippers and the public; and

Whereas the railway companies of the United States, by concerted action, are attempting to make a general advance in their rates; and

Whereas this association believes that, with the increased population and traffic and with the present basis of net earnings, the railroads of

the United States are in a prosperous condition and receiving on an average as much net profit on their investment as farmers, stock raisers, and producers generally are making upon their investment: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, 1. That we protest against the general advance in rates by the railroads of the United States.

2. That we protest against and oppose advances in rates in particular cases, except where the railroads, after full and fair investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission, can show that they do not receive reasonable compensation for the service performed.

3. That we indorse the action taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission in suspending the general advances in rates that have been proposed by the railroads.

4. That we favor the amendment of the present interstate-commerce law which now places the burden of proof on the railroads to justify advances in rates made after January 1, 1910, so that the rates which were in effect on January 1, 1910, shall be declared by law to be reasonable maximum rates, and which shall not be exceeded by the railroads except where the railroads, upon complaint and after hearing, shall show to the Interstate Commerce Commission that it is just and reasonable that they be permitted to advance any of the said rates in effect on January 1, 1910.

Resolution 2—Urging valuation of railroads.

Whereas the railways of the United States are demanding an increase of freight rates in order to raise their earnings to a higher standard of return than the average of the past; and

Whereas the basis of the claim is that their properties have largely increased in value; and

Whereas the question of the value of railway property is made an important factor in all rate litigation; and

Whereas the shippers and the public have no means of showing, and the commission has at present no adequate means of ascertaining, the value of such property: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, That we urge upon Congress the enactment of a law providing for the immediate valuation of railway properties and the ascertainment of all details of cost and investment.

Resolution 3—Relative to furnishing cars to transport live stock and other perishable freight, and to give prompt and efficient service.

Resolved by the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association in convention assembled April 4, 1911, at Cheyenne, Wyo., That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation compelling the railroads to provide sufficient facilities to perform with dispatch their duties as common carriers in furnishing cars and transporting all freight, including live stock, and to promptly transport same, and to exchange loaded and empty cars, and otherwise to provide sufficient facilities, fixing penalties for failure of such duties, and giving to the shipper the right to recover, in any court of any State or Territory having jurisdiction, his damages and attorney's fees; and also empowering the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce penalties for violation of the act, and to make rules and regulations with respect to the time and manner of giving notice for cars, furnishing cars, exchange and interchange of cars, and all needful rules and regulations in the administration of such law, and providing rules applicable to the different classes and kind of freight and the varying circumstances and conditions of shipment.

Resolution 4—Speed limit on live-stock trains.

Resolved by the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association in convention assembled April 4, 1911, at Cheyenne, Wyo., That in order to secure better service from railroads in the transportation of live stock we recommend to Congress the enactment of a law giving the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to prescribe a minimum speed limit for stock trains to suit the conditions in different localities.

Resolution 11—Urging Federal control of the unappropriated semiarid grazing lands.

The Wyoming Stock Growers' Association in convention assembled at Cheyenne, Wyo., April 4, 1911, hereby declares that—

We believe that the prosperity and development of the stock-raising industry on the public grazing lands of the arid and semiarid West is seriously threatened by the present indiscriminate methods of grazing, and we strongly recommend the early passage by Congress of a bill providing for Federal control of these unappropriated public grazing lands and a just and reasonable method of leasing such lands.

We favor a bill to operate either under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior or of Agriculture and along the general lines definitely recommended by this organization at its annual convention in Denver in 1908, and approved at all its conventions since that date. This measure would be of great practical advantage to the stockmen of the West, gives full protection and encouragement to the actual settler and home maker, and, through the distribution of the net revenues received in the construction of schools and good roads in the districts from which the funds are obtained, would be of great public benefit.

Resolution 12—Urging classification of public lands.

To better facilitate the leasing and control of the grazing lands, as outlined in the bill approved by this association, we vigorously urge Congress to provide without delay for the classification of the unappropriated unreserved public lands into grazing and agricultural districts.

Resolution 8.

Whereas there was introduced in the Sixty-first Congress, and to be further legislated upon at the special session now convened, a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada; and

Whereas this agreement proposes to import into the United States from Canada all the products of the farm, such as grains and vegetables and all classes of live stock, free of duty; and

Whereas all the products of the manufacturer, including those articles manufactured from the hides of cattle, sheep, and from wool, are retained on the tax list at their present rates; and

Whereas we believe that if agricultural implements, harness, saddles, boots, shoes, wool, and woolen goods are to remain protected for the benefit of the manufacturer and the skilled laborer, the Government of the United States is asking the farmer and stock raiser to submit to a very unfair agreement by putting our products on the free list to compete with the same products produced at a better advantage in Canada in order that we may induce the Canadians to buy more freely of our protected manufactured articles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, this 4th day of April, 1911, does hereby protest against a policy that is not evenly drawn. We claim an equal protection with manufactured articles or that all be placed on the free list, especially those manufactured from our products: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately sent our Senators and Representative in Congress.

Mr. WARREN presented memorials of Local Union No. 158, of Thomson; of Local Union No. 67, of Natural Dam; of Local Union No. 6, of Felts Mills; and of Local Union No. 7, of Palmer Falls, all of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the memorial of H. H. Heydlauff and 21 other citizens of Day County, S. Dak., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a petition of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gardiner and Burlingham, in the State of Maine, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of Pomona Grange, of South Paris; Perham Grange, of Perham; Cushnoc Grange, No. 204, of Riverside; Belgrade Grange, No. 292, of Belgrade; Chelsea Grange, No. 215, of Chelsea; Amity Grange, of Amity; Pomona Grange, of Excelsior; and Pomona Grange, of Aroostook County, of the Patrons of Husbandry; of the Rumford Light and Water Co., of Rumford, and of sundry citizens of Orono, Webster, Bradley, Livermore Falls, Chisholm, Oldtown, and Bangor, all in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. RAYNER presented a memorial of Taneytown Grange, No. 184, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maryland, remonstrating against the passage of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWN presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 1368) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Barnes, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 48) granting an increase of pension to L. D. Forhand, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 1537) granting an increase of pension to Charles I. Krickbaum;

A bill (S. 1538) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Frank; and

A bill (S. 1539) granting an increase of pension to Warren Caswell (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 1540) granting an increase of pension to Osbern Dillard (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1541) granting a pension to James M. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1542) providing for the purchase of land for the use of the Reform School for Girls of the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper); and

(By request.) A bill (S. 1543) to incorporate the National Christian Congress Association of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

(By request.) A bill (S. 1544) for the relief of the estate of Mary H. S. Robertson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1545) granting a pension to Ellen Kirkpatrick;

A bill (S. 1546) granting an increase of pension to John C. Carpenter;

A bill (S. 1547) granting an increase of pension to William Turner;

A bill (S. 1548) granting an increase of pension to F. M. Keith;

A bill (S. 1549) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Dick; and

A bill (S. 1550) granting an increase of pension to William Stringer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1551) providing for the deposit of the funds of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 1552) granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Sweet (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Christina Murrell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1554) granting an increase of pension to Andrew V. Mitchell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1555) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Gregory (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1556) granting an increase of pension to Allen H. Benton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1557) granting an increase of pension to Simon Ridenour (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1558) granting a pension to Hattie Pearson (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1559) granting an increase of pension to John McDonald (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1560) granting a pension to Isabella J. Loser (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1561) providing for the erection of a monument to Maj. Francis L. Dade and others in Sumter County, State of Florida; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 1562) for the relief of William Walters, alias Joshua Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1563) to apply a part of the proceeds from the sale of public lands to the support and maintenance of farm-life schools for the benefit of agriculture and to increase the knowledge of farming; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1564) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Rockingham, N. C.;

A bill (S. 1565) to provide for the erection of a public building at Burlington, N. C.;

A bill (S. 1566) to provide for the erection of a public building at Rocky Mount, N. C.;

A bill (S. 1567) to provide for the erection of a public building at Shelby, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 1568) fixing the limit of cost for the erection and completion of the United States post office and customhouse building at Wilmington, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1569) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Fisheries.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1570) for the relief of J. E. Bruce (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1571) construing the provisions of section 2 of the pension act of June 27, 1890, and section 1 of the act of February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 1572) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. McCann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1573) for the purchase of a site and the erection of an electrical power plant for irrigation purposes in Deming, N. Mex., or vicinity; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 1574) granting a pension to Joseph Frick;

A bill (S. 1575) granting a pension to Emma A. Poland;

A bill (S. 1576) granting an increase of pension to James J. Hasson;

A bill (S. 1577) granting an increase of pension to Fenton Algard; and

A bill (S. 1578) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1579) to grant an honorable discharge to James Rodgers; and

A bill (S. 1580) to grant an honorable discharge to George W. Hahn (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 1581) granting an increase of pension to Leroy T. Hills; and

A bill (S. 1582) granting an increase of pension to Stephen T. Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 1583) to provide for the disposal of coal and coal lands;

A bill (S. 1584) to provide for the classification of the public lands of the United States;

A bill (S. 1585) relating to the use and occupation of lands of the United States for the development of water power and other purposes;

A bill (S. 1586) to provide for the sale of timber and timber lands; and

A bill (S. 1587) to authorize the disposal of phosphate, oil, asphaltum, or natural gas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 1588) granting an increase of pension to William H. Torrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN.

A bill (S. 1589) to authorize the exchange of conveyances between the Florida East Coast Railway Co. and the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THORNTON (for Mr. FOSTER):

A bill (S. 1590) providing for an increase of salary for the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1591) for the relief of John R. Bisland;

A bill (S. 1592) for the relief of the heirs of Marcelin Tauzin;

A bill (S. 1593) for the relief of Katherine Smith;

A bill (S. 1594) for the relief of the estate of Thomas W. Abney, deceased;

A bill (S. 1595) for the relief of the estate of Leandre Campo & Co.;

A bill (S. 1596) for the relief of the heirs of Felix Dejean;

A bill (S. 1597) for the relief of heirs of J. Casimir Le Blanc;

A bill (S. 1598) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph D. Guidry;

A bill (S. 1599) for the relief of the estate of Eleanor B. Vinson, deceased;

A bill (S. 1600) for the relief of the Stone, Sand & Gravel Co., of New Orleans, La.;

A bill (S. 1601) for the relief of the heirs of Frazine (or Josephine) Delharte;

A bill (S. 1602) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Johnston, deceased;

A bill (S. 1603) for the relief of Leonise Gonzales, administratrix of the estate of Lawrence Montero, deceased;

A bill (S. 1604) for the relief of the heirs of Rudolphe Chachere;

A bill (S. 1605) for the relief of the estate of E. W. Sewell, deceased;

A bill (S. 1606) for the relief of Octave Simoneaux;

A bill (S. 1607) for the relief of Louisa Dornier;

A bill (S. 1608) for the relief of the estates of Gustav Mayronne, Alfred Mayronne, and Fergus Mayronne;

A bill (S. 1609) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. T. H. Maddox, deceased;

A bill (S. 1610) for the relief of John M. Kelly;

A bill (S. 1611) for the relief of the heirs or legal representatives of Eugene Senette, deceased; and

A bill (S. 1612) for the relief of Thomas Kennedy, executor of the estate of Margaret Kennedy, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1613) authorizing the President to appoint Francis Asberry Awl, late a first lieutenant of the Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, as a first lieutenant of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Florinda Butler Evans; and

A bill (S. 1615) granting a pension to Clementine Chapman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 1616) for the relief of the contributors to the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 1617) to pay Maj. Horace P. Williams amount found due him by Court of Claims; and

A bill (S. 1618) for the relief of the Norcross Bros. Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1619) to improve the navigation in the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1620) granting an increase of pension to John E. Dolloff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1621) granting an increase of pension to John A. Wills (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1622) granting an increase of pension to Marquis D. Usher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 1623) authorizing the purchase of additional lands for the Fort Meade Military Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1624) to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in the Crow Creek Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1625) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, to the members of the company of Indian scouts under command of Brig. Gen. Alfred Sully, in 1864 and 1865; and

A bill (S. 1626) extending the provisions of existing pension laws to the officers and privates, their widows, children, and dependent parents, of the "Dakota militia of 1862 and 1863"; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 1627) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across and over the Arkansas River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 1628) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Robbins;

A bill (S. 1629) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Hall;

A bill (S. 1630) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Gaffney;

A bill (S. 1631) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia E. Sawyer; and

A bill (S. 1632) granting an increase of pension to Reuben R. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 1633) granting a pension to Patrick L. Owens;

A bill (S. 1634) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Wright (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1635) granting an increase of pension to George S. Pauer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 1636) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adams (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAYNER:

A bill (S. 1637) to provide for the purchase and distribution of the reports of the court of appeals of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1638) for the relief of the heirs of Charles N. Gregory, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1639) granting an increase of pension to Junius Thomas Turner (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

ALASKA COAL-LAND CASES.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate ordered printed as a document the decision rendered by Judge Hanford, of the United States district court for the western district of Washington, in reference to the coal-land laws of Alaska. A few days after that the United States judge for the eastern district of Washington rendered a decision in a case involving the same state of facts, but taking just the opposite view from that of Judge Hanford. I present a copy of that decision with a view to having it printed as a document. I will not ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have the decision printed at this time, but that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the decision will be referred to the Committee on Printing for recommendation.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in answer to inquiries from various Senators concerning the matter of the committees of the Senate, I desire to say that the probabilities are that the committee on committees will be able to report to the Senate on Thursday next. There is a bare possibility that it may go beyond that a day or two, but I feel pretty safe in making the suggestion I have made.

In view of the fact that a good deal of work is yet to be done by the committee on committees, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the Senator if he means work or pacification? [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, Mr. President, both. [Laughter.]

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can not believe that the Senator means pacification. I do not think he would waste any time in that way.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, before the motion is put I simply desire to say that, so far as the committee assignments of the minority are concerned, the list has been practically completed and is ready for submission to the Senate at any time when it is the pleasure of the majority party to present a list for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 13 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 27, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 24, 1911.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Henry S. Boutell, of Illinois, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Portugal, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland, vice Laurits S. Swenson, nominated to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Norway.

Edwin V. Morgan, of New York, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Paraguay and Uruguay, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal, vice Henry S. Boutell, nominated to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Switzerland.

Laurits S. Swenson, of Minnesota, now envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Switzerland, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway, vice Herbert H. D. Peirce, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 21, 1911.

John Dallas Blake, of Maryland.
John Samuel Fulton, of Maryland.
Nathan Winslow, of Maryland.
St. Clair Spruill, of Maryland.
Roger Sylvester Morris, of Maryland.
Fenton Benedict Turck, of Illinois.
Hewitt Leonard Ballowe, of Louisiana.
Amos Walker Barber, of Wyoming.
John Fletcher Denton, of Georgia.
Edward Dowdle, of New York.
Brayton Earl Failing, of New Jersey.
Louis William Falkner, of New York.
Harlow Grosvenor Farmer, of New York.
Alfred William Haskell, of Maine.
Harris Ayres Houghton, of New York.
Joseph Howard Langworthy, of Kansas.
Frank Rutledge Maura, of Florida.
Joseph Yates Porter, jr., of Florida.
George Douglas Ramsay, of Rhode Island.
William Henry Seemann, of Louisiana.
William Edward Shea, of Montana.
Herbert Alexander Smith, of New York.
Andrew Victor Stephenson, of Nebraska.
Frederick Caesar Augustus Kellam, jr., of the District of Columbia.
Harry Hoagland Blodgett, of Nebraska.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Adolphus E. Watson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1910, upon the completion of six years' service as machinists:

Herbert E. Fish, and
Barnett B. Bowie.

Machinist Bernhard Christensen to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as a machinist.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as carpenters:

Charles J. Kerr, and

Ernest L. Bass.

Maj. Cyrus S. Radford, assistant quartermaster, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant colonel from the 11th day of February, 1911, to correct his rank and title as confirmed on March 2, 1911.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

William R. South to be postmaster at Baypoint, Cal. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

FLORIDA.

A. B. Tull to be postmaster at Titusville, Fla., in place of Fred M. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1911.

IOWA.

H. E. Deater to be postmaster at Shenandoah, Iowa, in place of H. E. Deater. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1909.

O. C. Hill to be postmaster at Clearfield, Iowa, in place of Henry T. Swope, resigned.

Almon C. Steele to be postmaster at Coon Rapids, Iowa, in place of Samuel D. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1910.

LOUISIANA.

B. F. Edwards to be postmaster at Marksville, La., in place of Henry C. Edwards, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Chestina B. Robbins to be postmaster at East Templeton, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

MICHIGAN.

Frank Friedrich to be postmaster at Traverse City, Mich., in place of Oscar P. Carver. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1910.

MINNESOTA.

Cornelius Berghuis to be postmaster at Clara City, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Sarah Dahl to be postmaster at Cottonwood, Minn., in place of Sarah Dahl. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

MISSOURI.

Charles H. Grissom to be postmaster at Dexter, Mo., in place of Thomas J. Ulen, deceased.

George W. Reed to be postmaster at Albany, Mo., in place of George W. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1910.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John B. Powell to be postmaster at Warrenton, N. C., in place of Benjamin C. Green, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Frank Merle Altland to be postmaster at Dillsburg, Pa., in place of George W. Mullen, deceased.

Horace S. Carpenter to be postmaster at East Downington, Pa., in place of Joseph H. Downing, resigned.

Samuel J. Gundry to be postmaster at Lattimer Mines, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

Charles Seger to be postmaster at Emporium, Pa., in place of Charles Seger. Incumbent's commission expired March 27, 1910.

W. A. Terrill to be postmaster at Clairton, Pa., in place of Roscoe C. Keefer, resigned.

RHODE ISLAND.

Robert S. Burlingame to be postmaster at Newport, R. I., in place of Albert C. Landers, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Ernest B. Yule to be postmaster at Alexandria, S. Dak., in place of John H. Dobson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1911.

TENNESSEE.

Allen D. Keller to be postmaster at Union City, Tenn., in place of George T. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

WISCONSIN.

Nicholas A. Lee to be postmaster at Colfax, Wis., in place of Nicholas A. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24, 1911.

AMBASSADORS.

William Woodville Rockhill to be ambassador to Turkey.

Curtis Guild to be ambassador to Russia.

MINISTER.

Henry S. Boutell to be minister to Switzerland.

CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSIONER.

Maj. Sherwood A. Cheney to be a member of the California Débris Commission.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Edward Sinnet Bowman,
Marion Sunsari Lombard,
Ralph Charles Matson,
Warren Pearl Morrill,
Lewis Beers Porter,
Thomas Houston Dow Griffitts,
Charles Loftus Grant Anderson,
Joseph Milton Heller,
John Adam Metzger,
John George Ingold,
Douglas Wiltz McEnery,
William Patrick Joseph Ruddy,
Samuel Jay Turnbull,
Alfred Parker Upshur,
Anton Robert Schier,
Charles John Boehs,
William Culbert Lyon,
Charles Spencer Williamson,
Maurice Rubel,
Albert Hurlbut Roler,
Frank Worthington Lynch,
Philip Pietersen Schuyler Doane,
James Alexander Harvey,
Junius Clarkson Hoag,
Jacob Frank,
Carey Culbertson,
Carl Wagner,
William Cuthbertson,
Rufus Winfield Bishop,
William Louis Baum,
Joseph Grindon,
William Paul Glennon,
Frederick Charles Esselbruegge,
Edward Lee Dorsett,
William Sidney Deutsch,
Russell Daniel Carman,
Holdsworth Wheeler Bond,
Charles Wyche,
Frederick Eno Woodruff,
William Otto Winter,
Carroll Smith,
Nathaniel Meacon Semple,
Henry Joseph Scherck,
Francis Le Sirelle Reder,
Amand Nicholas Ravold,
Harry Morgan Moore,
George Elmer Lyon,
William Henry Luedde,
Clarence Loeb,
Abram Chittenden Leggat,
Frederick Carl Emil Kuhlmann,
Arthur Campbell Kimball,
Walter Charles George Kirchner,
Downey Lamar Harris,
William Augustus Hardaway,
Henry Skillman Atkins,
Frederick Bagby Hall,
Conrad Weil,
Alanson Weeks,
Stanley Stillman,
William Parsons Read,
William Evelyn Hopkins,
Samuel Johns Hunkin,
George Herbert Evans,
James Alexander Black,
John Henry Barbat,
Charles Andrew Powers,
Henry Richardson McGraw,
Clarence Bancroft Ingraham, jr.,
Thomas Edward Carmody,

Alpha John Campbell,
Frederic Wolcott Bancroft,
John William Amesse,
John Edgar Welch,
Prince Albert Morrow,
James Ewing,
John Augustus Hartwell,
Julius Carl Bierwirth,
Edward Quintard,
George Norton Miller,
Max Ballin,
Guy Leartus Connor,
Arthur David Holmes,
Louis Jacob Hirschman,
William Edward Keane,
George Edwin McKean,
William Albert Spitzley,
Henry Rockwell Varney,
John Walter Vaughan,
William Stevenson Baer,
Julius Friedenwald,
Cary Breckinridge Gamble, jr.,
Duncan MacCalman,
Rupert Norton,
Isaac Rosenbaum Pels,
Arthur Marriott Shipley,
Martillus Louis Todd,
Walter Dent Wise,
Randolph Winslow,
Hubert Clement Knapp,
Frank Martin,
Charles Edmund Simon,
Louis Hamman,
Marshall Langton Price,
John Almy Tompkins, jr.,
Joseph Albert Chatard,
Thomas Rodney Chambers,
Charles French Blake,
Harvey Grant Beck,
Standish McCleary,
Charles Woodward Riley,
Alexius McGlannan,
Edgar Bar Friedenwald,
Charles Alfred Dukes,
Arnold Schwyzer,
Anton Shimonek,
Edward Avery Newton,
Joseph Cushman Breitling,
Charles Frye Sanborn,
Walter Franz von Zelinski,
William Holland Wilmer, and
John Edwin Rhodes.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

John S. Coulter,
Frederick H. Foucar,
Paul W. Gibson,
George B. Lake,
Frank N. Chilton,
Horace M. Roberson,
Leo C. Mudd,
Leonard S. Hughes,
Jay D. Whitham,
Henry P. Carter,
James L. Robinson,
Francis X. Strong.
Robert C. McDonald,
Howard Clarke,
Alleyne von Schrader,
Clemens W. McMillan,
Harry G. Ford,
Raymond W. Mills,
James F. Johnston,
Henry C. Maddux,
Samuel S. Creighton,
Bert R. Huntington,
Henry C. Michie, jr.,
Lauren S. Eckels,
Albert P. Clark,
Charles E. McBrayer,
Eugene G. Northington,
Harley J. Hallett,
Josiah H. Holland,
Sanford W. French,
Thomas J. Flynn,
George E. Pariseau,
Robert H. Gantt,
Daniel F. Maguire,
Edward C. Register,
John M. Willis,
Joseph L. Siner,
William Denton,
Joseph O. Walkup,
Fred R. Burnside,
John J. Reddy,
Herbert H. Sharpe,
Lloyd A. Kefauver,
William T. Cade, jr.,
John R. McKnight, and
George G. Divins.

INFANTRY ARM.

William Allison Reed to be second lieutenant.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Capt. Clement C. Whitcomb to be major.
Capt. George H. Crabtree to be major.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Isaac W. Littell to be assistant quartermaster general with the rank of colonel.
Lieut. Col. Gonzalez S. Bingham to be assistant quartermaster general with the rank of colonel.
Maj. Winthrop S. Wood to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel.
Maj. Chauncey B. Baker to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel.
Maj. George McK. Williamson to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel.
Maj. Thomas H. Slavens to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel.
Maj. David S. Stanley to be deputy quartermaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel.
Capt. Harry B. Chamberlin to be quartermaster with the rank of major.
Capt. Louis F. Garrard, jr., to be quartermaster with the rank of major.
Capt. Bertram T. Clayton to be quartermaster with the rank of major.
Capt. Ira L. Fredendall to be quartermaster with the rank of major.
Capt. Harry L. Pettus to be quartermaster with the rank of major.
Capt. Frank A. Grant to be quartermaster with the rank of major.
Capt. Archibald W. Butt to be quartermaster with the rank of major.
Capt. Kensey J. Hampton to be quartermaster with the rank of major.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Colden L'H. Ruggles to be lieutenant colonel.

INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Hornsby Evans to be first lieutenant.

PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

First Lieut. William H. Armstrong to be captain.
Second Lieut. Daniel Rodriguez to be first lieutenant.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. John Magruder to be second lieutenant.
Second Lieut. E. Francis Riggs to be second lieutenant.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Col. Erasmus M. Weaver to be chief of Coast Artillery with the rank of brigadier general.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

First Lieut. Clarence H. Knight, to be captain.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

LIEUTENANTS TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS.

Harry L. Brinser,
Farmer Morrison,
Claude C. Bloch,
Cyrus W. Cole,
John W. Greenslade,
Victor A. Kimberly,
William R. Sayles, jr., and
James H. Tomb.

Carpenter James J. Murphy to be a chief carpenter.
Maj. Cyrus S. Radford, assistant quartermaster, Marine Corps.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

William H. Bloom, Limon.
Frank E. Griffith, Blanca.

IOWA.

Joseph H. Luse, Mystic.
Harry Williams, Sheffield.

MINNESOTA.

Oscar E. Linquist, Dassel.

NEBRASKA.

Will A. Needham, Bloomfield.
Roy E. Thomas, Osmond.

NEW YORK.

George H. E. Aring, Long Beach.
John G. Cole, Waterford.
William L. Connor, New Dorp.
James K. Cowan, White Plains.
Joseph A. Crane, Rochester.
Harrold R. Every, Athens.
Bruce F. Martin, Watertown.
Owen B. Mulholland, Dunkirk.
Jetur R. Rogers, Southampton.
John H. Scofield, Scottsville.
John E. Stevens, Spencerport.
Edith Wallace, Lisbon.
Seneca D. Zek, Hillsdale.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Menzo M. Burt, Roulette.
W. Z. Clay, Emlenton.
William A. McMahan, West Pittsburg.
Henry M. Stetler, Wyomissing.
James H. Wells, Wilcox.

RHODE ISLAND.

R. S. Burlingame, Newport.
Frederick Webley, Greystone.

TEXAS.

Malvina M. Anderson, Roby.
Clara A. Boynton, Anson.
E. N. Browning, Center.
E. G. Crabbe, Corpus Christi.
R. E. Dorsey, McLean.
J. F. Henry, Stratford.
A. D. Hollingshead, Ganado.
Leander Hopkins, Ferris.
Florence F. Kellogg, Carizzo Springs.
Wilson I. Lawler, Deport.
Frank E. Osborn, McAllen.
Benjamin F. Robey, Coleman.
George W. L. Smith, Henderson.
George W. Walker, Blessing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *April 24, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for that broad, generous, godlike spirit which is gradually coming into the world, the fruits of which are righteousness, truth, justice, mercy, peace, good will toward men, and which tend to solidify the peoples of all creeds and of all races into one great family, and which will finally bring the answer to that prayer which falls daily from the lips of thousands: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."

And now, O God our Father, in whom are centered all our longings, hopes, and aspirations, be very near to the Member of this House who has been bereft of the companion who has walked lovingly and sympathetically by his side through many years, sharing his joys and sorrows. Comfort him and the rest of the stricken family by the blessed hope of the gospel, that they may look forward to that realm where neither death nor sorrow ever come; and Thine be the praise, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 21, 1911, was read and approved.

CLERK AND MESSENGER TO COMMITTEE ON DISPOSITION OF USELESS EXECUTIVE PAPERS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 117).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers a resolution, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation, at the rate, respectively, of $6 per day and $60 per month, for the services of a clerk and messenger to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers during the remainder of the present session.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that this resolution and all like it, proposing to pay money out of the contingent fund of the House, must under the rule be considered in Committee of the Whole. I do this for the purpose of establishing a precedent which has hitherto been established in Democratic Houses but not followed in Republican Houses.

Now, if the Chair will hear me a moment, I call attention to Rule XXIII, section 3, of the new rules adopted by this House, which reads as follows:

3. All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money, or bills making appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriations to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, or referring any claim to the Court of Claims, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced.

Referring to the construction that has been placed on this rule of the House by Democratic Speakers, I call the Chair's attention to a line of decisions in volume 4 of Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents, page 1058, beginning with section 4862:

Mr. Hinds says:

Resolutions from the Committee on Accounts authorizing expenditures from the contingent fund do not, according to the later ruling, require consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Now, to sustain the point I make, I quote:

On December 19, 1888, Mr. Walter I. Hayes, of Iowa, from the Committee on Accounts, presented a bill providing clerks for Members, payment of the same to be made out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order that the bill should be considered in Committee of the Whole.

The Speaker [Mr. Carlisle] sustained the point of order.

On July 29, 1892, Mr. W. W. Dickerson, of Kentucky, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted as a privileged report a report on the following resolution, and asked its present consideration:

"Whereas Fred Rice has served as special messenger to the Committee on Agriculture without pay since February 1: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper be instructed to place his name upon the laborers' roll, and that the same Fred Rice be paid out of the contingent fund for services rendered from February 1 to April 1, inclusive, at the rate of $2 per day."

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order that the resolution requiring an expenditure out of an appropriation already made must receive its first consideration in Committee of the Whole.

The Speaker [Mr. Charles F. Crisp, of Georgia] sustained the point of order, holding that propositions reported from the Committees on Printing and on Accounts for the payment of money out of funds already appropriated were, according to the practice, immediately considered in the House. But if the point were made, their first consideration should be in Committee of the Whole, since they are in the express terms of clause 3, Rule XXIII, being proposition "authorizing payment out of appropriations already made."

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. Gentlemen wishing to converse will retire to the cloak room.

Mr. TURNBULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the resolution again reported.

Without objection the resolution was again reported.

Mr. BARTLETT. On March 2, 1893, Mr. Harry W. Rusk, from Maryland, from the Committee on Accounts, submitted a privileged report on the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to John W. Almarade, the father of Ernest Almarade, deceased, late an employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months of the salary being paid to him at the time of his death.

And so forth.

Mr. William S. Holman, of Indiana, made the point of order that the resolution should be considered in Committee of the Whole.

The Speaker, Mr. Crisp, sustained the point of order.

Now, it is true, Mr. Speaker, that during the Fifty-first Congress and at the beginning of the Fifty-fourth Congress there are two instances in which the point of order was not sustained by Speaker Reed. I raise the point of order because it occurs to me that it is in strict compliance with the rule, which provides that a proposition for the payment out of an appropriation already made shall first be considered in Committee of the Whole, and if the Chair follows the precedents that have been made by Speakers Carlisle and Crisp, and in three instances by Speaker Randall, he will sustain the point of order.

I care not particularly about the proposition now before the House, and I am content if the Speaker sustains the point of order and follows the precedents that have been laid down by the different Speakers when presiding in Democratic Houses with reference to this rule, and I will be content as to this kind of a resolution if the House considers it in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

However, we have a rule here which provides that appropriations of money out of the Treasury shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole House. That rule is a salutary one, and I invoke the decisions I have read to the Chair in reference to it in order that as we begin this session, and as resolutions may be offered from time to time for the payment of money out of the contingent fund, or the payment of any of the money of the people out of the Treasury, they shall first be considered in Committee of the Whole, where it has been the practice and the policy of at least the Democratic Houses, time out of mind, to first consider them. This is done to protect the Treasury of the United States, to protect it so that the House may have an opportunity in the Committee of the Whole to consider the matter and to amend it, and not be confined to the strict parliamentary rules that apply to the consideration of questions in the House.

This particular matter may be immaterial. It is not insignificant, it is true, but the amount appropriated is not large, and, so far as I am concerned, I have at present no suggestions to make why it should not pass, but I have objection to considering propositions to pay out of the contingent fund of the House amounts of money, small or large, until they shall have been first considered, if it is so desired to be considered by any Member, in the Committee of the Whole House, and as sustaining that proposition I have read to the Chair a number of decisions made upon this point by the Speakers whose decisions and whose names I have called to the attention of the Chair. It is in direct conformity with the rule, which has been the rule in every House and is the rule in this House, that, although appropriations have already been made, as in this case, for the contingent fund, yet resolutions of this character shall, under the rule, not be paid out of appropriations already made until they are first considered in the Committee of the Whole.

I happen to know that the contingent fund had to be increased a large amount at the last session. I do not think that the appropriation for this was anticipated; it could not be anticipated, because at the time that the deficiency bill was passed there was no certainty—although there might be some expectancy of it—that an extra session of Congress would be called or would be in session now. So that it is likely that all appropriations made out of the contingent fund at this session must necessarily be appropriated for by a deficiency bill to be passed by this Congress. That is all I desire to say at this point. It occurs to me if the Speaker is to follow the precedents I have read of Mr. Carlisle and Mr. Crisp upon the identical proposition of payment out of the contingent fund, the point of order should be sustained.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] would in time past have been decided as well taken. Recent decisions, however, have been to the effect that it was not necessary to go into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of such resolutions as that which is now pending before the House. The money that we seek to provide for in this resolution has already been provided for in an appropriation bill. The contingent fund has been provided for for the current year and also for the year which begins on the 1st day of July, 1911, and all that is sought to be done here is to direct the expenditure of that money which has already been appropriated by this House.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, this is to be a payment out of the appropriations already made.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The rule which I read to the Chair as part of Rule XXIII contains the clause:

> Or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made.

As I understand, the gentleman says the rule does not apply, because this resolution provides for payment out of appropriations already made, although the real rule says:

> Or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new question. The gentleman from Georgia very properly stated, in closing his remarks, that he must rely upon decisions that have been made in years gone by. Recent decisions made by Mr. Speaker Reed and by Mr. Speaker CANNON have been to the effect that it was not necessary to go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman cite decisions made by Mr. Speaker CANNON?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker CANNON has followed the decisions of Mr. Speaker Reed. Mr. Speaker Reed's decisions are several in number.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I stated that.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I read from Hinds' Precedents, on page 1060, section 4867, volume 4:

> On December 18, 1896, Mr. Benjamin B. Odell, jr., of New York, from the Committee on Accounts, reported resolutions authorizing the employment of additional folders at stated compensation, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and also authorizing other payments out of the same fund.
>
> Mr. Nelson Dingley, of Maine, made the point of order that the resolutions should be considered in Committee of the Whole.
>
> The Speaker said:
>
> "The Chair thinks recent rulings have been the other way. This is out of the contingent fund of the House, is a part of its expenditures, and does not affect the United States beyond that."

That has been the decision by which this House has been governed for a number of years past. I have nothing further to say. It is true that there was a time, a number of years ago, when an adverse decision was made.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, does the Chair desire to hear further? I desire simply to state that as far as I am concerned, construing for myself the rule, which in plain language provides for both instances where appropriations have not been made for payment out of appropriations already made, I prefer to follow the precedents set by John G. Carlisle and by Charles F. Crisp in determining parliamentary questions and deciding the construction of rules than to follow that of even so illustrious a Republican as Thomas B. Reed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, the amount involved in the pending matter is small but that fact has no sort of relation to the merits of the proposition of order. I have not heard as yet anyone cite in the course of this discussion advance reason in support of the later ruling that can be relied upon to overthrow the precedents cited by the gentleman from Georgia, and overthrow the point of order which he has raised. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, that anything can be clearer than the language of the rule in regard to a proposition authorizing a payment out of an appropriation already made. It is conceded that in this instance the appropriation has been made. The proposition of the gentleman from Missouri is a proposition to authorize payment out of this appropriation. Upon what conceivable view can it be held that this proposition, which clearly comes within the rule requiring that payment out of an appropriation already made, should be first considered in the Committee of the Whole should not follow the plain requirements of the rule, and be considered in that committee? Sound reason and plain common sense support the former rulings, and no reason has been offered to support the later rulings which are relied upon to overrule the antecedent precedents. When reason supports parliamentary precedents those precedents should be followed as against later precedents not so well supported, or not supported at all, in reason. When a proposition is presented which challenges the later ruling and that proposition is in conformity with the plain language of the rules of this House, that proposition should be sustained, and the erroneous precedent reversed. The language of the rule is so clear that there can be no difference of opinion as to its meaning. Here is the rule: All propositions authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, shall be first considered in Committee of the Whole. See Rule 23, subsection 3. As I have said, the amount involved here is small, but we may have propositions hereafter involving amounts of such magnitude, that we would appropriately desire to consider the questions relating to them in the Committee of the Whole. Therefore at this time, and in this connection the ruling of the Chair on this point of order is a matter of some interest to the House, and I submit anew as I have submitted heretofore, that whatever may be said as to the existence of later rulings by recent Speakers, every consideration of sound reason is with those Speakers who ruled theretofore that such a proposition as has been submitted to-day, should in conformity with the rules, be referred to the Committee of the Whole for consideration, and disposition.

The SPEAKER. This is one of the happy situations in which the Chair can cite great names on both sides of the proposition. If it were an original question, the present occupant of the chair would hold that the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia was well taken, but for the last 10 or 15 years resolutions similar to this one have been considered in

the House with the universal acquiescence of Members on both sides. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before the House is similar to that which has been presented at the beginning of every session of Congress for several years. It provides simply for a clerk to the Committee on Useless Papers at a salary of $6 per day during the session, and also provides a messenger for that committee at a salary of $60 per month. This committee is an exceedingly important committee, and a clerk is a very necessary adjunct to that committee.

The committee is charged with the responsible duty of going to the departments and ascertaining what papers are useless, and the determination of this committee is final as to whether papers are useless or not. The clerk of the committee must necessarily be charged very largely with the work of that committee, because it will devolve upon him to investigate carefully the papers that are presented and to report to the committee whether the papers shall be destroyed or not. In my judgment it requires a very high-class man to perform properly the duties of the clerk of this committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LLOYD. It is a $6 a day place, and it seems to me that $6 a day is not an unreasonable compensation for an expert—and it ought to be an expert—who passes upon the question as to whether papers in the departments shall be destroyed or not.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This committee heretofore has been allotted a clerk out of the nine clerks provided in the legislative bill.

Mr. LLOYD. I beg your pardon. The gentleman from New York is mistaken. There are nine places beside this. There are 10 session clerks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from New York is not mistaken.

Mr. MANN. Not at all. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] is mistaken.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have the record here, and it contains a resolution from the Committee on Accounts distributing the clerks for the session, carried in the legislative bill. I simply wish to say this: If the Committee on Accounts proposes to take care of these committees out of the contingent fund, there will be no reason for the Committee on Appropriations to retain in a bill which will be called up in a little while the nine clerks similar to the nine carried in the legislative bill, and there should be some understanding of what the Committee on Accounts proposes to do.

Mr. LLOYD. If it be true that it is included in your bill, there is no disposition on the part of the Committee on Accounts to press this resolution, because, as I stated to the gentleman privately, we would consider it a personal favor if it were carried in the appropriation bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was not carried as a personal favor I will say to the gentleman from Missouri. It was carried there because it had been carried there for 34 years, and was believed by both the gentleman from Missouri, myself, and the Committee on Appropriations to be required for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Mr. LLOYD. I do not wish to be understood that I asked you to do anything as a personal favor to me.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that, but the statement of the gentleman might be misunderstood. The practice has been for these clerks to be carried in an appropriation bill and to be allotted to the various committees under resolution from the Committee on Accounts, and it seems to me that until the House determines whether it will provide for these nine clerks for the balance of this fiscal year, it would be wise for the gentleman from Missouri to await the action of the House.

Mr. LLOYD. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] intends to follow at once with the appropriation bill, I have no objection at the present time to asking to withhold consideration of this resolution until after the appropriation bill has been considered.

Mr. MANN. Before you do that, I would like to ask the gentleman to yield me five minutes of time.

Mr. LLOYD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] has already suggested that we postpone the consideration of the pending resolution until after another matter has been disposed of. I would suggest to my friend from Missouri that we postpone the consideration of all of these propositions in the House until we have really given them consideration in committee.

The gentleman stated a moment ago that this resolution was the usual one. On that he is mistaken. There never has been such a resolution passed before. It is true that the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers has had a clerk, and that for the last few years it has had a janitor and messenger. Formerly it had a janitor in connection with another committee, but when it was moved out of this building to the other building the chairman of the committee finally got a janitor provided for that committee. And there was a resolution at the last Congress to give a janitor or messenger to this committee, and I do not doubt that the committee needs one. But as to the clerk, what was the situation? The legislative bill for years has carried the provision for nine session committee clerks, and at the beginning of each session the Committee on Accounts has brought in a resolution distributing those session clerks to the nine different committees. What were the committees that had these session clerks in the last Congress? They were the Committee on Manufacturers—which has been abolished—the Committee on Education, and the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers—for which it is now proposed to provide an additional clerk—the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, the Committee on the Militia—which has been abolished—and the Committee on Mines and Mining——

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, which has been abolished, and——

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will wait for a moment; the Committee on Railways and Canals, and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service. Of the nine committees which have these nine legislative clerks heretofore, three have been abolished, and the joint resolution would provide an additional clerk outside of the nine, although this committee has formerly had one.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman certainly has not read this resolution.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but the gentleman has read it.

Mr. LLOYD. There is no attempt whatever, Mr. Speaker, to increase the force of the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers. Heretofore they have had a clerk and they have had a janitor. We ask that they now have a clerk and a janitor. We are asking nothing new.

Mr. MANN. Oh, but the point is this: Formerly they had a clerk out of the nine carried in the legislative bill. Those nine are still carried in the legislative bill. They are carried in the bill reported by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] from the Committee on Appropriations. Now it is proposed to provide for an additional clerk, in addition to the nine carried in the legislative bill, in the bill reported by the gentleman from New York, so as to provide for an additional clerk, although three of the committees which had these clerks before have been abolished. That is economy for you!

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MANN. Now, I read in the resolution——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MANN. Yes; certainly, certainly.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Illinois wants to be accurate.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is accurate.

Mr. LLOYD. I call attention to the resolution which was formerly introduced:

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation at the rate, respectively, of $6 per day and $60 per month for the services of a clerk and messenger to the Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers from the time such clerk and messenger entered upon the discharge of their duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certificate of the chairman of said committee.

Mr. MANN. My friend from Missouri suggests that I should be accurate. I am accurate. I am not reading from a published book; I am examining the records themselves.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more if he desires it.

Mr. MANN. I want only a minute. The resolution which was passed before expressly and only referred to the janitors, and the resolution passed with reference to the clerks was for the assignment of the nine clerks carried in the legislative bill,

payable out of the contingent fund. This is an additional clerk, payable out of the contingent fund. Now, when you have abolished three committees out of those that had the nine clerks, what on earth do you want to provide an additional clerk for in addition to the nine you had before? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I read a moment ago the resolution that was offered at the beginning of the Sixty-first Congress, which is a resolution framed almost in the exact words of the resolution offered now. The gentleman is certainly not fair to this House when he undertakes to convey the idea here that never before had such a resolution been offered to this body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that this resolution be temporarily set aside.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his resolution be temporarily set aside.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman has the right to withdraw it.

Mr. LLOYD. I will withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. That is practically the same thing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the resolution which he offered.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution No. 1. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 1, to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do.

Mr. MANN. Why does not the gentleman move to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and call up all four of his resolutions in that committee without going through a separate procedure to go into Committee of the Whole on each one of them?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask to modify the motion, so as to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills and joint resolutions on the Union Calendar reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The question being taken, the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills and joint resolutions on the Union Calendar, reported by the Committee on Appropriations, with Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland in the chair.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland took the chair amid general applause.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I call up House joint resolution 1, to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, is amended as follows:

So much of said act as appropriates $30,000 for an electric lighting plant, including the enlargement of the power house and one new boiler at the Battle Mountain Sanitarium, Hot Springs, S. Dak., is repealed.

The appropriation made in said act for analysing and testing of the coals, lignites, ores, and other mineral fuel substances belonging to or for the use of the United States is reduced from $135,000 to $100,000.

The appropriation made in said act for protection and improvement of Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., is reduced from $5,400 to $5,000.

So much of the general deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, as appropriates the sum of $500 to reimburse the State board of regents of the University of Idaho for the premium paid on an indemnity bond is repealed.

The Post Office appropriation act, approved March 4, 1911, is amended as follows:

So much of said act as appropriates the sum of $50,000 for expenses of or authorizes the appointment of a commission to inquire and report touching the cost to the Government of the transportation of all classes of second-class mail matter is repealed.

The appropriation made in said act for travel allowance to railway postal clerks is reduced from $1,750,000 to $769,000.

So much of said act as authorizes the Postmaster General to allow railway postal clerks and the employees of the mail-lock and mail-bag repair shops an annual vacation of 30 days with pay is repealed.

The naval appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, is amended as follows:

So much of the paragraph appropriating for "Contingent, Navy," in said act as reads as follows:

"*And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to make partial payments from time to time during the progress of the work under existing contracts and all contracts hereafter made under the Navy Department for public purposes, but not in excess of 90 per cent of the value of work already done; and the contracts hereafter made shall provide for such insurance as the Secretary of the Navy may deem sufficient, and for a lien in favor of the Government, which lien is hereby made paramount to all other liens, upon the articles or thing contracted for on account of all payments so made, provided that partial payments shall not be made under such contracts except where stipulated for, and then only in accordance with contract provisions," is repealed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, during the closing hours of the last session of Congress a condition existed in the enactment of legislation which had been unprecedented in many years. Some of the appropriation bills were not presented to both houses for final enactment until the morning of the 4th of March. As a result of the conditions which existed it was impossible to compare some of the appropriation bills, and in other instances the comparison was made so hastily that errors were made, as a result of which items were enrolled to which the two Houses had not given their assent.

The importance of having the proceedings of the two Houses of Congress beyond any suspicion and the integrity of our proceedings beyond question resulted in the introduction of this joint resolution.

Three errors were made in the sundry civil bill, one in the deficiency bill, three in the Post Office bill, and one in the naval appropriation bill.

Of all the departments affected by this legislation, the Secretary of the Navy alone sent to the Commitee on Appropriations a request that the last item in the bill, which affects particularly the Navy Department, be considered either as having received the assent of both Houses of Congress and having been enacted into law or else be considered upon its merits and amended in certain ways outlined in his communication. It seemed to the committee, however, that it was of so much greater importance that the proceedings of the Congress should be beyond any question and that the integrity of the proceedings be preserved that the most imperative thing for the Congress to do was to repeal these various items which, through error, were enrolled in the appropriation acts.

Unquestionably, these errors were made through inadvertence. It might be at some time, however, that errors of a similar character might be made by design, and in order to prevent any such occurrence at any time it seemed wisest to treat these errors as we have treated them and ask for their repeal.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. What is the history of the item at the bottom of page 2 for travel allowance to railway postal clerks? As shown in the bill, the amount is $1,750,000, and the repeal reduces it to $769,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The item to which the gentleman from Kansas refers was a Senate amendment. In conference the Senate receded from its amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is, the amount, $1,750,000, was a Senate amendment, and there was a recession by the Senate from that amount? Then, how did it become law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Through an error in the enrolling room. Under a misapprehension that that amendment had been agreed to by the two Houses the enrolling clerks included that in the bill. The gentleman from Kansas may recall that the first or second conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill was presented to the House between 3 and 4 o'clock on the morning of the 4th of March. The final conference report, as I recall, was presented to the House about half past 10 or 11 o'clock on the morning of the 4th of March. In the enrolling room—the bill had been set up—the paragraphs which were not agreed to were taken out so as to expedite the enrollment. Through an oversight this particular item and others were inadvertently left in the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the committee made inquiry to find out whether a change in the item at this time in amount will affect any ruling or regulation made by the department since the adjournment of Congress?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I sent a copy of this resolution, which was introduced on the first day of the session, to the heads of the various departments which might be affected by it. I have a letter from the Postmaster General, in which he states:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 6th instant, inclosing copy of House joint resolution No. 1 of the present session of Congress,

which proposes to correct certain errors in the enrollment of appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911. The errors were apparent to this department, and I beg to assure you that no action will be taken tending to defeat the purpose of the resolution.

Very truly, yours,

FRANK HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General.

The same is true of every other department affected except the Navy Department. The Secretary of the Navy requested that the provision in the naval bill be considered on its merits.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have not had an opportunity of looking at the report. Will the gentleman explain the circumstances in regard to the appropriation in reference to Mount Rainier, page 2, line 6?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was an appropriation made by the House, as I recall it, of a little over $3,000. The Senate increased it to $8,000 and the conferees agreed to $5,000. Through an error the amount was fixed at $5,400 in the enrolled bill.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the paragraph relating to the appropriation in regard to second-class mail matter. If I remember correctly, when the conference report was agreed upon it carried an appropriation of $25,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that a joint resolution was introduced and passed creating a commission for this purpose and carrying $25,000, and that the item in the Post Office appropriation bill was eliminated by agreement. This item in this bill merely repeals the provision in the Post Office appropriation act and does not affect the commission created by the joint resolution.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I did not recollect whether the Post Office bill carried this item or not. The statement of the gentleman from New York is that it does not affect the commission or the amount appropriated.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not affect the $25,000 carried in the joint resolution authorizing the joint commission which is now in operation.

Mr. COX of Indiana. But it only affects the appropriation in the Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; under the law at present there are two commissions, for one of which there is appropriated $50,000 and for the other $25,000.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FINLEY. I wish to state my recollection as to the history of this legislation. In the Senate the language such as is carried in the Post Office appropriation bill was inserted by way of amendment. It went to conference and the conferees did not agree, and it came back to the House and we thrashed it out and instructed the conferees, so to speak, to insist on a disagreement. It was stricken out and an independent resolution carrying $25,000 was put through. So that this is clearly duplicate legislation, and I am sure that the department does not wish it.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

The CHAIRMAN, Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I would like to inquire about the paragraph on the top of page 2, with reference to lignites, and so forth.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The House appropriated $100,000 for this purpose and the Senate increased it to $135,000, and in the conference the Senate receded from its amendment, so the amount agreed to by the two Houses was $100,000.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Has the gentleman any opinion as to whether or not the $100,000 is sufficient to do the work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is immaterial at this time. I happened to be a member of the committee which reported the bill, and I think the appropriation is ample. Even if it were not, it is of much more importance that the integrity of the appropriations be beyond question and that the provision should be repealed.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. The Senate receded from its amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from New York the reasons for the repeal of the provision at the top of page 3 of this resolution, regarding the annual vacation with pay of the postal clerks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is for the same reason that all of the others are proposed to be repealed. Congress never assented to that provision. It became a part of the law through the error of a clerk in the enrolling room, and however meritorious any of these propositions may be, it is of more importance that legislation be enacted by Congress than by clerks.

Mr. SULZER. Then, I understand it was never agreed to in conference?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was never agreed to at all.

Mr. SULZER. And it got into the bill through an error?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Through an error due to the conditions that existed in the closing days of the last session.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, after listening to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], that I cordially agree with all that he has said in respect to this resolution, and this, too, without regard to the merit or the demerit to these various propositions. Gentlemen, understand that in the closing days of a short session of Congress which makes, in the aggregate, appropriations of many, many hundreds of millions of dollars, with the great confusion that exists, it is wonderful that more mistakes are not made in the enrolling room than are made, as referred to in this joint resolution. The enrolling room of the House, and perhaps of the Senate also, has been wonderfully efficient. From time to time a mistake has been made. Of course, this is the law, but it is the law through a mistake made by a clerk, and, so far as I recollect, invariably under conditions such mistakes have been corrected by legislation like unto this.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. FRENCH. The report of the committee does not show why the paragraph referring to the amount appropriated for the University of Idaho is repealed, on page 2 of the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was Senate amendment No. 9 to the general deficiency bill, and the Senate receded from its amendment; it was not agreed to by the House. It was included in the general deficiency appropriation bill through an error. There is no reason why it should be paid under such circumstances.

Mr. FRENCH. Of course, I would say that the claim itself is meritorious, but I am willing to let it rest upon its merits, and not try to take advantage of any technicality.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is not taking advantage of any technicality. Those who endeavor to get the benefit of this legislation would be trying to take advantage of a technicality. None of these items has ever received the assent of Congress, and are simply in the statutes as the result of errors.

Mr. FRENCH. That is what I say.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, we tried to hear over here, but we could not, what the gentleman's explanation was of the postal commission to investigate second-class matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the general Post Office appropriation act contained a provision providing for the appointment of a commission and an appropriation of $50,000 to pay its expenses. The conferees on the Post Office appropriation bill reported about 3 or 4 o'clock of the morning of the 4th of March, and an arrangement was made by which it was agreed that that item should go out of the bill or it would have been impossible to pass the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the $50,000 item?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. Later a joint resolution was passed providing for the creation of a commission and appropriating $25,000 for its expenses. That commission is not affected by this bill, but the provision which was erroneously included in the Post Office appropriation act is repealed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, as a matter of fact, the commission was twice created, with two appropriations?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Two appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. And this repeals one of them—the larger?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SMALL] was to be recognized.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be recognized at this time, in view of the explanation which has just been made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, then I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, at the last session the enrolling clerk, Mr. McKenney—and there never was a better enrolling clerk, in my judgment—came to me and other Members of the House on a number of occasions in the closing days of the session and said to us that if we did not hurry along the appropriation bills and the other important bills it would be simply impossible for the enrolling clerks to take the responsibility of properly enrolling the bills. It is not possible for any men, however gifted they may be, to examine everything at once in the course of a few hours' time. It was not anybody's fault, in my judgment, in the House or outside. The instance in reference to the postal commission is a very good instance. It was about half past 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, as I recollect, and not 2 or 3, as stated by the gentleman from New York, when we persuaded the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] not to make a point of no quorum if we would vote down the motion to concur in the conference report. We voted that down and everybody supposed, everybody possibly except the gentleman from Tennessee, that when it came back to the House it would come back precisely in the same condition it was, and it would come back when there was a quorum present. If the point of no quorum had been insisted upon at that time, none of the appropriation bills then not passed could have been passed. The enrolling clerks do this. They enroll bills in advance based upon conference reports, and there is no other way of doing it, relying upon striking out the item that is not agreed to in conference, and they have to be reprinted in the Printing Office hastily, without delay, and in this instance the postal bill was enrolled as the conferees had once agreed to it and in the haste, the final conference report not being agreed to until within an hour or so of the final adjournment of Congress, that item then reported in the final agreement not agreed to was not stricken out by the enrolling clerks in the haste of examining a number of bills.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show it was not agreed to?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; the conference report shows it was not agreed to. The conference report shows that all of these items in this joint resolution were not agreed to. While they stand upon the law books as the laws and can not be attacked collaterally, I am inclined myself to the opinion that an adequate attack could be made to impeach the law as not according to the Journals of the House and the Senate, because these laws are not according to the Journals of the House and Senate. The Journal of the House will show that this item was not agreed to in conference, never agreed to by the House, and has no place in the law. Now, whether these items are just or not is not a question in controversy. The integrity of the proceedings of Congress ought to be beyond all question, and when we have made a mistake by certifying that something was passed that was not passed we ought to remedy it at once in some way, and the simplest way here is to repeal the apparent laws.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the letters received from the heads of the various departments in reference to the communication which I sent them calling attention to the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain letters. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 6, 1911.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your communication of the 5th instant, transmitting copy of "Joint resolution to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911," and requesting suspension of action by this department as to any of the appropriations affected by the resolution until Congress may have had opportunity for the consideration and disposition of the matter.

In reply I have the honor to state that this department will suspend action upon the appropriation measures involved and await legislation by the Congress upon the pending resolution.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN MACVEAGH, *Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 7, 1911.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Your letter of April 6, 1911, has been received, inclosing copy of House joint resolution No. 1, to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911. You direct attention to the portions thereof providing appropriations for analyzing and testing of the coals, lignites, ores, and other mineral fuels of the United States and for the protection and improvement of Mount Rainier National Park, Wash., and request that no action be taken with reference to the apparent increases in the appropriations for these objects from $100,000 to $135,000 and from $5,000 to $5,400, respectively, until Congress shall have had reasonable opportunity to consider and enact the resolution.

In response thereto I have to state that proper instructions have been given to comply with your wishes in the premises.

Very respectfully,

FRANK PIERCE, *Acting Secretary.*

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS,
346 Broadway, New York, N. Y., April 11, 1911.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Upon my return to the office I find your letter of the 6th instant, relating to the proposed repeal of the appropriation of $30,000 made by the last Congress for an electric-light plant at the Battle Mountain Sanitarium, and confirming the information contained in the letter of the general treasurer of the 8th instant, have the honor to advise you that no action in relation to the appropriation will be taken until House joint resolution No. 1 has been disposed of.

Very truly, yours,

J. W. WADSWORTH,
President Board of Managers.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., April 7, 1911.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of the 6th instant, inclosing a copy of House joint resolution No. 1 of the present session of Congress, which proposes to correct certain errors in the enrollment of appropriations acts approved March 4, 1911.

The errors were apparent to this department, and I beg to assure you that no action will be taken tending to defeat the purposes of the resolution.

Very truly, yours,

FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 10, 1911.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, inclosing a copy of House joint resolution No. 1 of the present session of Congress, which provides for the repeal of the provision in the naval appropriation act of March 4, last, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments under public contracts up to 90 per cent of the value of the work already done, and requesting that, so far as possible, no action be taken by this department under said provision in the naval act until Congress shall have had reasonable time to consider and enact the proposed resolution.

It is noted that the purpose of said joint resolution, as stated in the preamble, is to correct errors made in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911, as evidenced by the conference reports submitted to and adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives, and it is realized that at the time of the passage of the naval bill it was intended to omit all provision relating to partial payments under Navy Department contracts.

Owing to the lack of time for deliberation during the closing days of the session it is believed that this matter did not receive the consideration it deserves, and on account of its importance to the public interests the department requests that the provision as it stands in the bill be retained and considered upon its merits as a needful piece of legislation requiring perfection by amendment instead of eliminating it because of its inadvertent enrollment as part of the act.

In connection with this matter the following is submitted for your information:

Section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, which is taken almost verbatim from the act of January 31, 1823 (Stat. 3, p. 723), reads:

"No advance of public money shall be made in any case whatever. And in all cases of contracts for the performance of any service or the delivery of articles of any description for the use of the United States, payment shall not exceed the value of the service rendered or of the articles delivered previously to such payment. * * *"

It has, however, been the practice to provide in the contracts for building naval vessels or the machinery therefor that the price should be paid in installments during the progress of the work, but under such contract provisions delivery to the Government of the work done was not effected as the partial payments were made. This practice is shown by the department's records to have been followed since an early period and is supposed to have prevailed from the beginning, but a statement of the principle upon which it was based and the relation thereof to section 3648 can not now be found.

Originally a reservation of 10 per cent or more was made from each installment and the last installment in entirety was held back until preliminary acceptance and delivery as a protection for the Government against the contingency of having to pay for any minor defects or deficiencies in the vessels or their machinery. Recently, however, owing to the great increase in the cost of the larger vessels, running up above $3,000,000, it was found that the customary reservation from the installments as earned provided a greater sum than was considered necessary for the Government's protection and added an expense to the financing of the work that had to be paid by the Government indirectly as part of the price bid. Therefore the method was adopted for all vessels of dividing the contract price into a larger number of installments to be paid without reservations and securing the necessary protection against defects and deficiencies by withholding the last two or three installments, as the case required, until preliminary acceptance and delivery. Payments are restricted to, though in fact they rarely equal, the value of the work already done, and further protection against failure of the contractor or loss by fire or other accident has been secured by bond with satisfactory surety, insurance, and provision for lien in favor of the Government on the vessel so far as completed and materials on hand, and by giving the Government the right to forfeit the contract and take possession of the work and the contractor's plant.

Inclosed herewith, for your convenient reference, is a typical form of contract for naval vessels—that for battle ship *No. 35*, authorized by the

act of June 24, 1910—which has been marked so as to point out particularly:

First. The eighth clause providing for insurance.

Second. The ninth clause providing for the Government's lien.

Third. The twelfth clause providing for reservations to insure completion in all respects, and the return of all payments made in case of rejection of vessel.

Fourth. The fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth clauses providing that in case the contractors fail the Government may finish the vessel and charge them with any additional expense incurred.

Fifth. The twentieth clause providing for certificate or affidavit from the contractors that the Government's lien is paramount, which certificate or affidavit is, in practice, required with the contractors' application for each and every installment.

The accounting officers of the Treasury have uniformly acquiesced in the making of partial payments under said contracts, and that arrangement has had the support of the Department of Justice, as evidenced by opinions of Attorneys General, wherein it has been at the least indirectly approved. The department had, consequently, entertained no doubts as to the legality of the contract provisions mentioned, but recently the accounting officers of the Treasury decided that, under a contract entered into by the War Department for powder, the making of partial payments before delivery was contrary to the provisions of section 3648 and therefore illegal.

Apprehending that this rule would be applied to the contracts for naval vessels, the department, under date of the 3d of February last, addressed letters to the chairmen of the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives requesting, with a brief statement of the reasons therefor, that the department be given express authority, by a provision as follows, for making partial payments under its contracts, viz:

"That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to make partial payments from time to time during the progress of the work under existing contracts and all contracts hereafter made under the Navy Department for public purposes, but not in excess of the value of work already done; and the contracts hereafter made shall provide for such insurance as the Secretary of the Navy may deem sufficient and for a lien in favor of the Government, which lien is hereby made paramount to all other liens, upon the articles or thing contracted for on account of all payments so made: *Provided*, That partial payments shall not be made under such contracts except where stipulated for, and then only in accordance with contract provisions."

This paragraph is identical with the provision proposed to be repealed by said joint resolution, except the words "90 per cent of," occurring in the twelfth line, page 3, of the resolution.

It is not known by the department why, or at whose suggestion, a restriction of payments to a fixed per cent of the value of the work already done was incorporated in the amendment proposed by it, and after learning that such limitation was contemplated it again requested that payments be authorized not in excess of the value of the work done.

If such limitation be now repealed, the accounting officers would, it is assumed, disallow the payments already stipulated for in existing contracts and inhibit provision for such payments in future contracts.

Should such a situation arise, the Government would be exposed to suits for damages, whether the claims were valid or not, on account of nonpayment, as stipulated in the existing contracts, and it would be obliged to pay under future contracts the cost of financing the undertaking in each case. For the vessels last authorized this item, made up of sums ranging from $3,000 for each $500,000 submarine boat to $50,000 for a $6,000,000 battleship, would amount to approximately a hundred thousand dollars in excess of their cost under the previous plan of making partial payments. For these burdens no compensating advantage would be derived by the Government from the proposed repeal of the provision under discussion.

The department feels warranted in saying that the Government's interests have not been disadvantaged or jeoparded in any respect by making partial payments under the contracts for naval vessels or by withholding a reservation from each of such payments; that the cost of every vessel paid for in installments has been actually less than it would have been otherwise; that competition for the contracts has been enlarged and additional pecuniary advantages thereby gained; and that no useful purpose can be served from other considerations by limiting, as said act does, payment to a sum less than the value of the work already done.

In view of the foregoing it is urgently recommended that the provision in question be not repealed, but that it be retained and amended by striking out the words "90 per centum of," occurring in the 12th line, page 3 of the joint resolution.

Faithfully, yours,

G. v. L. MEYER.

Hon. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, M. C.,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

The bill was read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the bill was laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

EXPENSES INCIDENT TO FIRST SESSION SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I call up House joint resolution 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress.

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the following purposes:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For stationery for Members and Delegates and Resident Commissioners, at $125 each, for the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, $49,750.

For the following employees during the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, but not longer than until and including June 30, 1911, namely:

For 46 pages, including 2 riding pages, 4 telephone pages, 1 press-gallery page, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at $2.50 per day each; 7 messengers in the post office, at the rate of $100 per month each; 3 telephone operators, at the rate of $75 per month each; and 9 clerks to committees, at $6 each per day; in all, $17,554.20, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

On page 2, after line 14, insert:

"For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, to continue available during the fiscal year 1911, $2,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this resolution provides stationery for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners in accordance with the law for the present session of Congress. It also provides for certain session employees. They are the same employees as are provided in the legislative appropriation act which was enacted in the session of Congress just closed for the next regular session. There is nothing further to add, unless some gentleman desires information as to some of the items.

Mr. MANN. I would like a little time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time?

Mr. MANN. Oh, five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice, if I may have the attention of the gentleman, that the bill carries an item for nine clerks to committees at $6 per day each, which is the same number of clerks carried in the legislative bill for the regular session of Congress. As I recall it, this is the first time that there has been a bill carrying these committee clerks at a special tariff session of Congress. There was no such resolution or bill passed two years ago, and there was no such resolution passed at the time the Dingley tariff bill was passed, as I recall it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not a fact that in neither of those two sessions of Congress the committees of the House were appointed until just before adjournment?

Mr. MANN. It is a fact that the committees were not appointed at that Congress, and it is a fact that at this Congress the caucus of the gentleman's party determined that the committees should not work——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. Oh, let us find out whether I am mistaken or not. Time will tell. They have decided, in effect, that these committees shall not work. There is no intention that they shall work. Now, what is the fact? These nine clerks heretofore were apportioned to the Committee on Manufactures, the Committee on Education, the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Documents, the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, the Committee on the Militia, the Committee on Mines and Mining, the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, the Committee on Railways and Canals, and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service. Three of those committees have been abolished and the other six will make no report at this session of Congress, unless it be that the gentleman now happily occupying the chair, who is chairman of the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Documents—and it is proposed to give him another extra clerk, not out of this fund at all——

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is there anything in this resolution which says that these clerks shall be assigned to the committees the gentleman has named?

Mr. MANN. Certainly not.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why does the gentleman state they are going to be so assigned?

Mr. MANN. I did not say they were going to be. They could not be so assigned, because three of the committees have been abolished.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the gentleman draws the inference that we are appointing new clerks for six committees.

Mr. MANN. I did not draw any inference at all. I stated a fact.

Mr. SHERLEY. I say to the gentleman that he is absolutely mistaken.

Mr. MANN. I am not mistaken as to the fact.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. Three committees to which clerks in the past have been assigned have been abolished.

Mr. SHERLEY. As to the future he is quite wrong.

Mr. MANN. What do they propose to do? Do they propose to assign these $6-a-day clerks to committees that have not had these clerks in the past? That is economy for you. I am perfectly willing for that side of the House to have all the clerks it wants. I believe in the committees having clerks and messengers, but I have very little regard for the hurrah about

economy and the abolition of committees to save expenses, and then provide the same employees for some other purpose.

The last Democratic caucus adopted a resolution providing for the abolition of these six committees, and if I am not correct in this statement—I was not present at the caucus—I would be glad to have some gentleman on that side of the House correct me. But I have what purports to be a resolution which, as I am informed, passed the Democratic caucus, and I think I shall insert it in the RECORD as a resolution of economy. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I hope the gentleman will insert it, because it is a good resolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I say I will insert it in the RECORD as a resolution of economy, so that hereafter I may be able to call the attention of Members on that side of the House to the fact that they are not living up to the terms of the resolution.

Here is one instance: They say they propose to save $12,000 by the abolition of these six committees. The only expenses these six committees had were these three clerks and the clerks of these committees and the two janitors. Now, they have not reduced any of the clerks. They propose to appropriate for the same number of clerks that were appropriated for before. They may assign them to some other committees.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is not the gentleman presuming that the Committee on Accounts will report sufficient bills to take up the nine positions?

Mr. MANN. I am.

Mr. GARNER. Is the gentleman justified in drawing that presumption?

Mr. MANN. I think I am justified in drawing that inference when the Committee on Accounts has reported a resolution this morning to provide an extra clerk in addition to the nine.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment. If it is not intended to assign these nine clerks to committees, why do you want to appropriate for them?

Mr. GARNER. I will say to the gentleman that when an opportune time comes I propose to offer an amendment to this bill, not only cutting down the number of clerks but placing their salaries at $125 a month instead of $6 a day.

Mr. MANN. I am with the gentleman as to that. I hope that side of the House will be with him.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not further misrepresent me on the floor of this House as before.

Mr. MANN. Certainly not. I do not think I did misrepresent the gentleman, and I certainly do not wish to misrepresent him.

Mr. LLOYD. I said before, Mr. Chairman, and I say now, that we do not want to provide two places for the gentleman who at the present time occupies the position of chairman of that committee.

Mr. MANN. I understand that. I would like a little more time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Missouri is here, I want to say that a few moments ago he said this was the same resolution that had heretofore passed, and——

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I said it was a resolution passed in 1909, and I read the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. The gentleman from Missouri will have time enough of his own.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, all that I ask is that the gentleman will read the resolution which I read.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that I will read it and give the gentleman some information about it, which I do not blame him for not having. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

What was the fact? The gentleman read a resolution passed at the last extra session, two years ago, when the committees were not appointed, when there was no appropriation for these nine committee clerks, when there was no provision for the nine clerks such as is carried in this bill, which has been pending in the House since the first day and was reported before the gentleman's resolution came in; and at that extra session of Congress, when no committees were appointed, but when there was a standing committee created by law for the disposition of useless documents, there was a resolution passed giving to that committee a clerk and a janitor for that session. But as soon as the other session came, when the nine committee clerks were appropriated for, one of them was assigned to this committee. The gentleman proposes to have the nine clerks created and assign another clerk to this committee. If I am not correct, I will be glad to have the gentleman correct me.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I have repeatedly said that there was no purpose on the part of anybody to provide two clerks for the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

Mr. MANN. Everybody knows the gentleman from Missouri too well to believe that he would want to provide two clerks for one committee unless there was need of it. I am not criticizing the gentleman for endeavoring to provide a clerk for this committee. I think the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers ought to have a good clerk and a messenger. It has a good chairman. It ought to have the accompaniments that go with the chairman. [Applause.]

Mr. LLOYD. Then there is no difference between us.

Mr. MANN. Not in the slightest degree about that; but what I object to is the cry of economy on the one hand, and then an appropriation for all that has been appropriated for before, and then some in addition, on the other hand.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois assumes, because in the past Republican Congresses have maintained useless committees and provided clerks for them, that that is the purpose of this Democratic House. Of course, in that he is very greatly mistaken.

In the legislative appropriation act passed in the last session of Congress, when the Republicans were in control, provision was made for nine session clerks for committees. These nine session clerks have been carried since 1877 for various committees of the House. They have not always been allotted to the same committees in every Congress, but provision has been made for them in the appropriation acts, and the Committee on Accounts have submitted their resolutions distributing the clerks among the committees to whom, after investigation, it was deemed advisable to allot clerks.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. At the beginning of this session it was announced that the majority proposed to save about $180,000 from the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; it did not make any such statement.

Mr. MONDELL. In a reduction of the employees of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I assume that there was included in this sum of $180,000 the compensation of the clerks to the committees that were abolished. Now, is it not rather early in the session to begin to restore the clerks that were stricken out, or who were not to be provided for, who were included in the reduction of $180,000?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is that the gentleman's question, or is the gentleman simply getting rid of something that was troubling him, as to what the Democratic House was going to do?

Mr. MONDELL. I simply ask that question. It was announced that the majority reduced the expenses of the House about $180,000 by dispensing with the services of certain employees. Now, I assume that included in that $180,000 were the employees of the committees that were abolished. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is quite true.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, the gentleman in his resolution proposes to provide for the clerks whose services were supposed to have been dispensed with in that economy program. I simply ask if it is not rather early in the session to begin to increase the employees?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has not read the resolution or he would not have made such an absurd statement.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] stated that these committees were not intended to do any work, and he asserted that a Democratic caucus had decided that the committees should do no work. The gentleman is very much mistaken. If he had read the resolution adopted by the caucus, he would have known that no such resolution was adopted and that no such inference could be drawn.

In order to concentrate the attention of the country upon this Congress and to place the responsibility for the failure to

enact the legislation that the country demands, the Democratic caucus determined not that the committees of the House should do no work, but that they should not report legislation to this House until after the important legislation upon which the attention of the country was concentrated had been disposed of and until further action by the Democratic caucus; but it was not supposed that these committees would be organized, have bills referred to them, receive communications from the various departments of the Government, have resolutions of inquiry sent to them requiring attention, and then sit idly by doing nothing, instead of preparing their legislation to be reported to the House at the earliest moment when it was deemed advisable to present the legislation to the House. So the Committee on Appropriations provided for nine session clerks for committees. It will be time enough for the gentleman from Illinois to criticize these clerks and their assignments when the attempt is made to assign them to the respective committees.

This bill provides for these clerks until the 30th day of June. When the resolution was under consideration a conference was held with the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. I have no hesitation in stating all the facts in connection with these items. Prior to this time various committees on expenditures in the different departments have been useless and idle committees. I do not recall any very effective work that has been done by them since the Belknap impeachment back in 1876; but they have been carried along in this House and session clerks for them appointed at $125 a month. They have done no useful work for the benefit of the House or useful service to the country. It was stated by the chairman of the Committee on Accounts that in view of the resolution adopted by the Democratic caucus and the determination of the Democratic House to make a thorough and searching investigation of all the departments of the Government it would be necessary to supply competent help to these committees, and it was stated that if the clerks were carried in this resolution the Committee on Accounts would probably allot them to the committees which would undertake the work of investigating the various departments of the Government.

So far as I am concerned, I desire these committees to be thoroughly and properly equipped for the important work devolved upon them. Not in a great many years have these departments been overhauled as they should be. I have already supplied some of the committees with information which has come to me in connection with my work on the Committee on Appropriations, and which leads me to believe that valuable results will come from the investigations to be made by these committees.

If these clerks are not to be allotted to these committees, or some other committee requiring them, they should be eliminated from this resolution; but if these committees are to do efficient work, if they are to make the searching investigations that it is proposed they should make, they should be equipped with clerks who will be competent to render the assistance that the committees will require.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. If I understood the gentleman, the object in including the nine clerks was to give each of the committees on expenditures in the departments a clerk?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; the chairman of the Committee on Accounts stated that they could be utilized in that way, and that they desired to give these committees clerks at a compensation of $6 a day.

Mr. GARNER. In order that the gentleman from New York may understand the situation in reference to the Committee on Accounts I will say that they provided in the last Congress a session clerk for each committee on expenditures at a salary of $125 a month.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that.

Mr. GARNER. There were session clerks for nine other committees at $6 a day. If the gentleman is undertaking to provide committee clerks for expenditures in the departments, he is giving them $6 a day in this Congress when they only received $125 a month in the last Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But they did not have any work to do at the last Congress. It is proposed to make the committees now important and useful, and the chairman of the Committee on Accounts stated that if these nine clerks were carried they would be allowed to the committees which were to do this important and useful work.

Mr. GARNER. I did not understand it that way.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understood it that way, because I particularly inquired of the chairman of the Committee on Accounts as to the advisability and propriety of carrying the nine clerks, and called his attention to the fact that some committees heretofore which had clerks assigned to them had been abolished, and the chairmen of others had made the statement that these clerks would not be necessary for their committees during the present session.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from New York yield so that the House may understand the situation? Is it the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate the money for the use of the different committees on expenditures in the departments—10 in number?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nine.

Mr. MANN. Nine departments and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We have only had 9 heretofore, but we will have 10 hereafter.

Mr. GARNER. I say, was it the intention of the Committee on Appropriations that the Committee on Accounts should not give, for instance, the Committee on Education, the Committee on Disposition of Useless Documents, the Committee on Mines and Mining, the Committee on Railways and Canals, the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic any session clerks at this time? I asked this question so that the House might understand the situation, so that the Committee on Accounts will not be put in the attitude of refusing to assign these committee session clerks, but let it be settled to-day as to whether or not these committees are to have session clerks.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. GRAHAM. The information I want is from the gentleman from Texas as to the comparative cost of a session clerk at $6 a day and a regular clerk at $125 a month. As I understand it, those who got the $125 a month are on the pay roll all the year round.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, no.

Mr. FITZGZERALD. No.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is in error. They were session clerks at $125 a month each, and I propose at the opportune time to offer an amendment to pay these clerks at the rate of $125 a month, rather than $6 a day.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that on last Thursday this House by a unanimous vote instructed each one of these nine committees to inaugurate an efficient and complete investigation of each of the nine executive departments of the Government, and that if those committees carry out the instructions of the House they will have to have not only clerical help of the kind suggested by the gentleman, but, perhaps, even additional help.

Mr. GARNER. There is no question about that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. One of the reasons I requested the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], this morning to defer pressing the resolution which he offered was for the reason I have already stated. After these nine committee clerks have been allotted, if they are authorized by the House, and it be then decided to give a clerk to some of the committees which hitherto had session clerks at $6 a day, and they were not included in the resolution allotting the nine carried in this resolution, it would more easily have been possible for the gentleman from Missouri to have explained the action of his committee and to satisfy the House about it; but I repeat, now that the gentleman is here, that in a conference with him the statement was made that if these clerks be carried, in view of the work to be done by these Committees on Expenditures, the Committee on Accounts would allot the clerks to those committees instead of the clerks heretofore allotted, and if there were one or two other committees which needed clerks at this particular time they would then be authorized in addition by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the statement that has been made by the gentleman from New York about the conference which we had. I think it is the disposition of this side of the House, and, as far as I have knowledge, the disposition of the other side of the House, to investigate these various departments, and if it is done, it is very necessary to have assistance in doing it. I have heard no objection from any source to providing the necessary help for that kind of work. I believe that every man on this floor will with pleasure vote for a proposition that provides the necessary clerks for the chairman of any committee on expenditures. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] and myself, both anxious for economy, agree to that, and every member of the Committee on Accounts is in sympathy with that view. We want to provide these expenditure committees with every clerk that is necessary, and if one clerk is not enough, we have the courage to

come on this floor and ask for more clerks to assist in investigation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I have only one additional statement to make. In 1877 there were 21 session clerks to committees at $6 a day. Five of the committees of the House had annual clerks. Since that time as committees have been created or as their usefulness has departed the number of session clerks has either increased or diminished; and, in addition, annual clerks have been substituted for session clerks for a great many of the committees of the House. In the fiscal year 1909 the number of session clerks was reduced from 11 to 10, and 2 additional annual clerks were provided for committees. In 1910, while there were 10 session clerks, they were reduced in the legislative bill for the next fiscal year to 9, and an annual clerk was provided for another committee. So far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, it has no desire to provide these clerks if they be not needed for committees. They were included in this resolution upon my statement to the committee of what was clearly and distinctly stated by the chairman of the Committee on Accounts to be the intention of that committee in allotting these clerks. No provision is made for these clerks now until the regular session, which commences the first Monday of December next. This resolution provides the money which can be utilized until the end of this fiscal year, June 30. If the clerks be not allotted, then the money will not be utilized.

Mr. HAMLIN. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he has any other resolution that carries an appropriation to provide for this expenditure for clerks specifically.

Mr. FITZGERALD. None whatever. Unless it is provided for here, it would have to be provided for out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. HAMLIN. I understand the gentleman's idea was that these nine clerks that the gentleman does provide for here will be assigned to these expenditure committees. Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. If some of these other committees which had these session clerks require them at this session of Congress, provision could be made for them out of the contingent fund.

Mr. HAMLIN. I would like to say, if the gentleman will yield me about two or three minutes, right in this connection, perhaps a couple of minutes——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HAMLIN. I simply want to say, as chairman of one of these committees, I am more concerned about the time the clerk will be employed than about what the clerk is paid. Now, it is the intention under the direction of the caucus that these committees shall get busy. They have never been busy heretofore, and it seems to me it illy becomes the other side of the House to criticize the employment of the clerks, because I have been a member of one of these committees for four years, and that committee has had only three meetings in the four years, and yet they have had a session clerk at $125 per month. Now, I am chairman of the committee to which I refer, and we propose to get busy and to stay busy until we have completed our work. This House only a few days ago adopted unanimously a resolution providing for this very thing and giving these expenditure committees the right to sit during the recess of Congress. Now, it seems to me that there ought to be some provision made at some time, so that, in case this work is not completed by the 30th of June, this work can go on and these committees may not be without a clerk; because, of course, his services will be indispensable when these committees are at work. I am not specially concerned whether the compensation is $125 per month or $6 per day. It seems to me these clerks will be the busiest of all the session clerks and ought to be placed on an equality with all the other clerks and their compensation either raised to $6 a day or the others brought to $125 per month.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware that these clerks for the expenditure committees have been entirely provided for since the gentleman's services in Congress commenced?

Mr. HAMLIN. When I was first placed on the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department they had a clerk.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken. They had a clerk at that session of Congress, provided after the gentleman was placed on that committee. These provisions for clerks for these expenditure committees have been only in the last three or four years.

Mr. HAMLIN. I said four years; I have been a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department for four years.

Mr. MANN. For three or four years, or some such matter. It was done on a statement following an investigation made by Mr. Littlefield of Maine, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department. The statement was made here by nearly every chairman of one of the expenditure committees that they were going to do, oh, a lot of work in that Congress, and we finally gave them a session clerk. Now, I suppose it will be an annual clerk.

Mr. HAMLIN. No; not the gentleman who now has the floor. We do not want an annual clerk, because I do not think we need one.

Mr. MANN. I am glad the gentleman says that, because I apprehended they might want annual clerks for those committees.

Mr. HAMLIN. In reply to what the gentleman has just said I will relate a little instance which occurred when I was first put on the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department. I went in search of the committee room. I found it on the gallery floor in the center of this building. When I was seeking to meet the chairman, whom I had never met, I was greeted by a gentleman who said that he was the clerk to that committee, and I told him I had been assigned to that committee and I wanted to know when the committee would meet.

He looked at me commiseratingly, and laughed and said, "This committee is a dead committee and never has any meetings;" and he further vouchsafed the information that it had not had a meeting for 30 years. But he informed me that he was clerk of the committee, and I have in my possession now the records that contain the minutes of three meetings. I think I have attended all of the meetings of that committee, but have only attended three meetings in four years.

This committee has made preparations to get busy now, and is going to be busy, if I can keep it busy, during this session of Congress, or until we complete our work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, all the criticism which has been directed against the action of the Committee on Appropriations is much ado about nothing. There is no purpose on the part of the Appropriations Committee to provide two clerks for any one committee, and such will not be the effect of the passage of the pending resolution. The criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] might be well taken, should we pass the resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri, and then enact the pending bill. In that even there might be duplication. But there is no purpose to pass both of these measures. Had we adopted the resolution offered this morning by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] such action on our part would merely have rendered it necessary for us to amend the present proposition by striking out "nine" and inserting "eight." This amendment would have put both the Lloyd resolution and the pending one in perfect harmony. As a matter of fact, the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] is not before this body, and if we enact the pending proposition it is not likely that it will be returned to us. So I say this criticism is a matter of moonshine.

Mr. MANN. If it had not been for the criticism, they would have been both before the House and both have been passed.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Not at all. If we had acted upon and adopted the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri, then when this bill came up in order, it would be simply necessary for us to reduce the number of clerks provided for, from nine, to eight, and then both propositions would be completely accordant.

Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of the Democratic Party, as it has illustrated already, to abolish whatever positions are unnecessary. It is also its purpose to provide whatever positions may be necessary, for the effective conduct of our work.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. If I am correctly informed——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. MANN. The Democratic caucus provided for the abolition of a large number of policemen—34 privates. Can the gentleman inform us whether they have been abolished or not?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am informed that this abolition is dependent on the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, but is it not a fact that the official of the House who has the power to appoint these officers can dismiss them?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I am not apprised as to that.

Mr. MANN. I can apprise the gentleman that it is wholly within his power to dismiss them, in which case they could not draw their salary.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will say to the gentleman that if this authority exists, it will be exercised. There is too much of the work of your party for us to undo, to expect it all to be undone at once. In due season it will be overhauled, and the gentleman need not be exercised in mind. It will be done, and effectively done—you may be assured on that point.

But I simply wish to conclude what I have to say in respect to the action of the Appropriations Committee. We reported this resolution, because it was suggested to us, and I will say in this connection that our report was the unanimous action of the Appropriations Committee, that the work of the investigating committees for the different departments would be a matter, not only requiring time, but requiring on the part of those charged with the work, something in the way of skill, and in the way of technical knowledge. For that reason we desired to aid these committees by providing them with clerks that would be of service to them in the progress of these inquiries. Therefore, we agreed on the salaries that are included in the recommendation of the committee, in the pending proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I understand we have abolished three committees that had these session clerks and janitors and messengers, and that at the Democratic caucus the Democratic Members took credit to themselves for reducing the expenses of the House $12,000 by that action. Now, if you simply assign these clerks to other committees—and this resolution provides for the same number of clerks—how will the "demnition total" of expenses of this House be reduced?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. OLMSTED. Yes. That is the question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is a proposition that the gentleman may offer in the way of an amendment to the pending resolution if he thinks it is a workable proposition.

Mr. OLMSTED. That is the question.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It seems to me it is a proposition in the way of an amendment. I do not understand, I will say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the situation is at all such as he says it is.

Mr. OLMSTED. The situation is this: That this pending resolution provides for just the same number of session clerks as were provided in the last Republican Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will say to the gentleman, yes; but it will obviate the employment of the same number of session clerks payable out of the contingent fund.

Mr. OLMSTED. I have no doubt there will be plenty of room found for a whole lot of extra clerks before you get through this session. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] has already indicated that by his resolutions.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman from Virginia think it would be an appropriate question to ask of gentlemen on that side, why they object so strenuously to the departments being investigated and the committees being equipped with the proper help to investigate them?

Mr. MANN. Nobody has objected.

Mr. OLMSTED. No; nobody has objected. What we object to is the insincerity of the cry of reducing expenses. Nobody has objected.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to the fact that the resolution to investigate the departments went through by unanimous consent. There was no objection whatever to it on this side. So far as I am concerned, I do not care how much investigating there is. It can not do any harm and may do some good.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania states that the resolution provides for the same number of clerks as were provided for when the Republicans were in charge in the last Congress.

Mr. OLMSTED. That is what I understand.

Mr. GARNER. I want to state to the gentleman that he is in error as to that. The last Congress carried an appropriation for 12 session clerks at $6 a day and 9 clerks at $125 a month. This provision provides for only 9 clerks at $6 a day. It provides for 3 clerks less at $6 a day and 9 clerks at $125 a month.

Mr. OLMSTED. If there is any reduction involved in a change from $125 a month to $6 a day, I am not good enough in arithmetic to find it. I think it is an increase.

Mr. GARNER. There is a reduction of all the $125 clerks and a reduction of three at $6 a day. For instance, there was at the last Congress a session clerk, at $6 a day, on the Committee on Manufactures. There was a session clerk on the Committee on Education at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Documents at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on Militia at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on Mines and Mining at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on Railways and Canals at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on Pacific Railroads at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on Private Land Claims at $6 a day. There was a session clerk to the Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic at $6 a day, and there was a session clerk to each of the nine committees on expenditures in the different departments at $125 a month, in addition to those I have mentioned——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. One hundred and twenty-five dollars a month each.

Mr. GARNER. Yes. Now this appropriation bill provides for only 9 clerks at $6 a day, in lieu of the 12 clerks at $6 a day, and the 9 clerks at $125 a month, as provided at the last session.

Mr. OLMSTED. This appropriation bill provides for just the same number of session clerks as were provided for in the appropriation bill the enrollment of which it strives to correct, without any change in that respect.

Mr. GARNER. There may be the same number appropriated for in the legislative bill; but, as a matter of fact, there were carried on the roll, whether paid under the appropriation bill or out of the contingent fund, the number of clerks that I have mentioned—21 instead of 9, as here provided.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, may I say once for all, in response to all that has been said on that side, that every committee that has been abolished will remain abolished, and that every clerk heretofore carried for one of those abolished committees, will be abolished. The appropriation for the clerks in this bill has no relation whatever to the clerks for the committees that have been wiped out. I hope I make myself sufficiently clear in that connection. This appropriation, as has been pointed out, is simply to enable us to give the committees expert clerks, for the purpose of enabling them to do the work of the character that is to be done. That is the whole purpose of the resolution.

Mr. OLMSTED. I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Whether it is not a fact that in the extra session of Congress which passed the Dingley tariff bill, and in the extra session of Congress which passed the Payne tariff bill, there were no session clerks appointed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a fact, and it is also a fact that there were no committees appointed until a day or two before the adjournment of each of those sessions of Congress, a fact which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has probably overlooked.

Mr. OLMSTED. I am quite aware of that fact.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They were do-nothing sessions, and so far as the country was concerned the only thing they did was to pass two infamous tariff bills, and it was because of the passage of the last one that the country sent the present Democratic majority to this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OLMSTED. The country has prospered under those two bills as it never prospered before. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The country did not seem to have that opinion last fall. In this Congress all of the committees have been appointed, and they are all going to do effective and useful work. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OLMSTED. They are not, not one of them, permitted by the Democratic caucus to make a report.

Mr. JAMES. It would have been a heap better if your committees had been under the same rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can not even state accurately what the Democratic caucus has determined, although it has been twice stated by myself on the floor.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Whether, in the gentleman's opinion, it is expected that these nine clerks are necessary to be assigned to the Expenditure Committees at this session?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the information which has been given to me.

Mr. MANN. I suppose, then, there will be no other assignments out of the contingent fund?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no authority to make any such statement as that.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman has no authority to speak for the contingent fund, and yet the gentleman is, in the main, in charge of matters of appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will state again, so there will be no misunderstanding: The chairman of the Committee on Accounts [Mr. LLOYD] made this statement, that if these nine clerks were carried in this bill and the money was made available until the 30th of June, the Committee on Accounts would allot these clerks to the nine Committees on Expenditures in the Departments, and if any of the committees which heretofore had had clerks of this character could show the necessity for having clerks during this session they would be taken care of out of the contingent fund.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Committee on Accounts, as I understand it, has ordered reported a resolution to provide committee clerks for the expenditure committees, payable out of the contingent fund?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what the committee has authorized unless it has actually made a report.

Mr. LLOYD. The misfortune in connection with all this matter is the fact that there has been very great confusion in the minds of all of us about the salaries of these various session clerks. I confess at the time I had the conference with the gentleman from New York that I had the impression that the clerks on the Committees on Expenditures had previously been receiving $6 a day. I find on investigation that heretofore they have received $125 a month, and, just like the gentleman from New York, I believe they received $125 a month too much, because I do not believe that they rendered any service.

Now, this bill proposes that there shall be nine session clerks, and that they shall receive $6 a day. I do not suppose that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had in mind just what committees these clerks were to be assigned to, and I do not suppose that this side of the House to-day cares what committees shall receive the benefit of this appropriation, as long as the committee that receives a session clerk does the service which will be of benefit to this House and to the country.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate is closed, and the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the following employees during the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, but not longer than until and including June 30, 1911, namely:

For 46 pages, including 2 riding pages, 4 telephone pages, 1 press gallery page, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at $2.50 per day each; 7 messengers in the post office, at the rate of $100 per month each; 3 telephone operators, at the rate of $75 per month each; and 9 clerks to committees, at $6 each per day; in all, $17,554.20, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, line 11, strike out the words "9 clerks to committees at $6 per day" and insert in lieu thereof the words "15 clerks to committees at $125 per month."

Mr. MANN. Let us have the amendment reported.

The Clerks read as follows:

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "9 clerks to committees at $6 each per day" and insert in lieu thereof the words "15 clerks to committees at $125 each per month."

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's amendment is not complete.

Mr. GARNER. The total is a matter of very easy calculation. Now, Mr. Chairman, under the present statute I want to call the attention of the committee to the committees of the House under the last Congress that had session clerks. I may say in this connection that nearly every chairman of these committees have already called the attention of the Committee on Accounts to the fact that they need a session clerk. I may say that I violate no confidence when I say that the committee on organization of this House has taken into consideration the fact that they will have session clerks.

Now, then, if we are going to give these other committees session clerks in addition to giving the expenditures committees session clerks, the appropriation ought to be made in this bill. If the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, of which my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is chairman, is to have a session clerk, then it ought to be included in this bill. If the Committee on Education, of which the distinguished gentleman on my left [Mr. LEVER] is chairman, is to have a clerk, it ought to be included in this bill. If the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Documents in the Executive Departments, of which the distinguished Chairman of the Committee of the Whole at present is chairman, and for which we considered a resolution this morning, is to have a clerk for his committee, it ought to be included in this bill. If the Committee on Mines and Mining, of which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is chairman, is to have a sessison clerk, it ought to be included in this bill. If the Committees on Railways and Canals and Reform in the Civil Service are to have session clerks, they ought to be included in this bill. If the Committee on Election of President and Vice President and Representatives in Congress is to have a session clerk, it ought to be included in this bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It ought to have a regular clerk, an annual clerk.

Mr. GARNER. That will have to be considered later. I admit that the gentleman from Missouri and his committee have brought in sufficient legislation to justify him in having an annual clerk. [Applause.] I want to call the attention of the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to what my amendment will do in the way of a saving. My amendment, if adopted, will give each of these committees the clerks they ask for, and will save in this Congress fourteen hundred and ten dollars a month from what it was in the last Congress. In other words, if you give these clerks I propose to these committees at $125 a month, you will save each month the sum of $1,410. At the last session of Congress there were 12 session clerks at $180 a month, amounting to $2,160 per month. There were 9 session clerks at $125 each a month, making $1,125 per month, making a total of each month's expenditure for session clerks of $3,285. My amendment would provide for 15 clerks at $125 each, which makes a total of $1,875 per month. I make this statement so that our Republican friends may see that we are keeping good faith in our proposition to cut down the expenses of the Government.

We do not propose to have a sessision clerk for the Committee on Manufactures, which has been discontinued; we do not propose to have a committee clerk for the Committee on Militia, which has been abolished, or the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, which has been abolished, or the Committee on Pacific Railroads, or the Committee on Private Land Claims, which have also been abolished. These committees each had a clerk at the last session of Congress at $6 per day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the proposition presented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], if it were adopted, would have the effect of making the salaries uniform, but I doubt the propriety at this time of undertaking to amend this bill in this way. The Appropriations Committee has pursued the course that has usually been pursued in these matters. It has provided for these session clerks, and I am perfectly willing that the resolution shall remain as it now stands, providing for the clerks at $6 per day. Then whatever other session clerks are necessary can be provided for in the usual way by resolution from the Committee on Accounts, providing that the sum shall be taken out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What does the gentleman say as to this proposition: Will the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas cripple the service of the House in any way?

Mr. LLOYD. I do not know whether there is any difference in the effectiveness of a clerk that may be employed at $125 a month and one that may be paid $6 a day.

Mr. COX of Indiana. If there is not any difference in efficiency of a clerk employed at $6 a day and a clerk at $125 a month, then, in the interest of economy, does not the gentleman feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas ought to be adopted?

Mr. LLOYD. I have not said it will secure the same degree of efficiency. It may be that you could secure a very much better clerk at $6 a day than at $125 a month. I do not know, but there is this one thing about it that I am interested in, and that is we shall have effective service. I am not concerned as to whether the clerk shall receive $6 a day or $125 a month for this short session. What I do want is that these committees, when they shall receive their clerks, shall use them and make them effective and useful to this House and to the country.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate is exhausted on the amendment.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then I move to strike out the last word. Briefly, I want to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I have listened to this debate carefully and attentively for the last hour and a half, and it strikes me the gentleman from Texas has solved the problem. I have no doubt, nor do I have any question in my mind, but that all of these small committees can get good and efficient clerks at the rate of $125 per month. There seems to be some question on both sides of the House as to whether or not these small committees—and I designate them as such for lack of a better word—will do their duty. That is up to the committee, and if we can save fourteen hundred dollars per month, as the gentleman from Texas figures out, without crippling the efficiency, without crippling the service of any of these various committees, it is in line with the policy our party has started out to pursue, and I am at a loss to understand how any tangible, sound argument can be made against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I believe it ought to become a law, and right now is the time to do it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think the situation in the House illustrates a couplet of poety, which, if I remember rightly, runs something like this:

Oh, what a tangled web we weave
When first we practice to deceive.

Now, the gentlemen on the other side find themselves all tangled up and at cross purposes in the consideration of a very simple resolution relative to some clerks to certain committees of the House.

There is not a gentleman on either side who is at all disposed to deny to any committee of the House all the clerks that it needs for the transaction of its business; and, therefore, ordinarily there would not have been a word of discussion on this resolution, but it so happened that on the opening day of the session the triumphant majority temporarily occupying the other side announced that they were going to begin in the exercise of their new-found temporary authority to give the country a splendid example of economy, and by reducing the expenditures of the House $180,000. Now, I do not know who the bookkeeper of the economy book of the gentlemen on the other side is, but whoever he is, when this resolution passes, he should strike $12,000 off the $180,000, as that is the amount of this first item against the credit of the proposed saving of $180,000. The truth is the gentlemen understood that the announcement of the saving of $180,000 per annum would go broadcast over the country, and they would be applauded for beginning their administration of affairs by such a splendid example of economy, and they did not think that when they came in with these resolutions one after another to restore all of the places they had proposed to abolish that anybody would pay any attention to them, and so in the course of time, while having the credit for economy, they would have not only all the places that we had when we controlled the House, but a few more. Strange as it may seem, the gentleman from Missouri this early in the session has not only proposed to restore several places which were to have been abolished, but he brought in a resolution to provide for a brand new place that we never had before.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman from Wyoming permit?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman from Wyoming has heard that statement contradicted often enough, and there is no excuse for him here making the statement that he has just made because I have offered one simple resolution which provided that the clerk who has charge of the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers shall receive a salary of $6 a day. Now——

Mr. MONDELL. But the gentleman is making a speech in my limited time.

Mr. LLOYD (continuing). And now he charges that the gentleman from Missouri not only wipes out the whole $180,000, but in addition to that he is asking that there shall be a new clerk who never has been provided for by law.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, the trouble is the gentleman from Missouri is trying to differentiate between the intent and the fact. We have all heard the old saw about the road to a certain locality we all hope to escape having been paved with good intentions. The gentleman's intentions were all right. I do not think that he intended to provide for a second clerk for the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, but the fact is that had the gentleman's resolution passed, and had the resolution of the gentleman from New York passed, there would have been two clerks instead of one for that committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman did not intend to do it. They will create enough places, heaven knows, by intent, but this is one created through inadvertence.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, in order to be fair, the gentleman must correct that statement, because if the resolution passes which the gentleman presents it does not necessarily follow that one of these committee clerks will be for the committee presided over by the present Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. GARNER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact we reported to the country and, as he says, we proposed to save $12,000 by abolishing five committees——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARNER. I ask that his time be extended five minutes, Mr. Chairman, if he desires it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARNER. That we intended to save the expense of $12,000 a year by abolishing those committees. Now we propose——

Mr. MONDELL. Now, if the gentleman will allow me, I did not say that, that perhaps was part of the widely advertised cut of $180,000 to which I referred. I did not refer to the saving with regard to those particular committees.

Mr. GARNER. If I may be permitted, then, I will suggest that one item in that was $12,000, which was saved by virtue of the discontinuance of these six committees.

Now, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the figures——

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman was very kind about securing me five minutes. Does the gentleman intend to use it all?

Mr. GARNER. Under my amendment you will save $1,410 a month instead of $12,000 a year.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, the question of whether the gentleman's amendment saves a penny or not depends upon how long the gentlemen on the other side propose to keep us here. If Congress is in session eight months out of the year, there is no difference between a clerk at $6 a day and an annual clerk at $125 a month; and Congress has been in session for years on an average of about seven months in the year. So, as a matter of fact, on the record we have been making for years past the saving in the proposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], instead of being $1,400 a month, would amount to, for 15 places, to about $3,000 a year. Of course, it is well to economize, gentlemen, but we will not reduce the billion-dollar appropriations of Congress very fast at the rate of $3,000 per annum.

Now, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, if I understand it aright, because I think you get better work and more efficient work out of a clerk who is paid the same sum by the month for the year than you do out of a clerk who is paid by the day and who feels under no obligation to do any work for the committee during the vacation. But the proposition that the gentleman's amendment is going to save any amount of money worth considering I do not think is borne out by the facts. And if the gentlemen on the other side propose to amend the tariff to the extent that they say they are going to amend it, we will not only be in session 8 months this year, but we will be in session the entire 12 months. In that event the pay of an annual clerk at $125 per month would be considerably less than a session clerk at $6 per day.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] complains because he suggested that some one was criticizing the provision for these clerks. Why, there is no one in the House criticizing a resolution for the necessary clerks for

the committees. No one has any disposition to do that, and no one has done it. The gentleman said that his party proposed to reduce the expenditures of the House, and were now giving an illustration of it. They are, but it is this sort of an illustration, namely, that whereas they have abolished three committees, they do not propose to reduce any of the expenditures of the House in abolishing those three committees——

Mr. SAUNDERS. If the gentleman will pardon me——

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). Because the proposition of both the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is to provide just as many clerks as you had before the committees were abolished. Now, how there is going to be any saving by simply abolishing committees and striking them from the RECORD, except the saving in printer's ink necessary to print the committee list, I can not see.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I made no complaint or criticism of that. What I said was this: That you were misapprehending the situation, and taking advantage of that misapprehension to create a false impression.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not misapprehending the situation at all. The situation is just this: The gentlemen on the other side, in order to give the country the impression that they were going to be economical, that they were going to save a lot of money, gave it out that in the expenditures in the House itself there was to be a saving of $180,000. Now, we know that no such saving can be effected and efficient work performed, and so we are well aware of the fact that as the days pass we will have one resolution in here after another, so that at the close of the present Congress the expenditures made by the gentlemen on that side will at least equal the expenditures which were made in the last Congress, when the control was on this side.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman from Wyoming is a prophet, but if he is no more accurate as a prophet than he is in giving his reasons in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] his prophecy will not be realized. He stated he would support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas because a session clerk at $125 a month will do more work than a session clerk receiving $6 a day, because the per diem clerk will not do any work during the vacation. I do not expect that a $125 session clerk will do any work during a vacation, either; so that if all the gentleman's predictions are as accurate as that statement, they will not give him much satisfaction when he has finished.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman to say——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just one moment. The gentleman has unintentionally misstated some matters in connection with this resolution. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] stated that if the resolution reported by the gentleman from New York were to pass and if the resolution reported by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] were to pass, then the Committee on Useless Documents in the Executive Departments would thereby have two clerks. I called his attention to the fact that such was not the fact, and it is not a fact.

The resolution reported by myself and now under consideration does not allot to any particular committee any clerk whatever. Gentlemen should inform themselves of the contents of resolutions before they attempt to criticize Members in the House or say what the resolutions purport to do.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Did not the gentleman from New York expect that, if his resolution passed, the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers would be one of the committees provided for, as it has heretofore been provided for?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have stated three or four times already during the discussion that these nine clerks were provided in this resolution because of the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Accounts that that committee desired to allot these nine clerks to the respective Commitees on Expenditures in the various departments, and I stated these matters in such a manner that there could not be much misunderstanding about what I said. Now, if that is not the purpose of the Committee on Accounts, not only should the amendment of the gentleman from Texas be defeated, but these nine clerks should be stricken from this resolution. There should be no misunderstanding whatever as to what is proposed here. This resolution provides, up to the close of this present fiscal year, the 30th of this coming June, for the nine session clerks carried in the legislative bill for the next regular session. Inasmuch as the Committee on Accounts, since the conference between its chairman and myself, has decided that these Committees on Expenditures shall not have clerks at $6 a day, the nine clerks should be eliminated from this resolution, and the Committee on Accounts should bring in resolutions providing for session clerks to the various committees in the manner they have always been provided. This House can then judge for itself whether this side of the House proposes to make improper and unnecessary and wasteful expenditures.

The gentleman speaks as though these 9 clerks would necessarily be allotted to the same committees as were supplied with clerks in the last Republican House. I have taken the time and endeavored to point out that it was not the intention in reporting this resolution to provide clerks at $6 a day for any of the committees that had them heretofore under allotments made by the House, and I wish to say to the House now that whether the amendment of the gentleman from Texas be adopted or not I shall move to strike out either the 9 clerks provided for in the resolution or the 15 clerks at $125 a month, if the amendment be adopted. The adoption of that amendment would have the effect of permanently increasing the number of session clerks from 9 to 15. Before that be done, I believe that the Committee on Accounts should be compelled to justify the authorization of clerks to any additional committees that it proposes to authorize. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] presses his amendment, I am indifferent whether it be adopted; but whether it be inserted, or whether the 9 clerks remain, so long as the Committee on Accounts has determined that these expenditure committees will not require clerks at $6 a day for the balance of this fiscal year I shall ask that they be stricken out.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman accept an amendment substituting $125 a month for $6 a day, and not providing for 15?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I think they should all go out. This resolution provides the same number of clerks provided in the legislative bill for the next session of Congress, and if the Committee on Accounts does not propose to allot these nine clerks for the balance of this fiscal year they should not be appropriated for at this time. Clerks can very readily be provided out of the contingent fund as they are needed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman evidently did not understand my question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did understand it. The gentleman asked to provide nine clerks at $125 a month.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Instead of the nine clerks at $6 a day; in other words, a simple change of compensation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it would be much better under all the circumstances to have them all go out and be provided in the regular way.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] seems to misunderstand me.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I do not misunderstand the gentleman.

Mr. LLOYD. I had the conversation that he says I had with him, but I find upon investigation that I was mistaken about the amount that these Expenditures Committee clerks received. I thought they received $6 a day. It turns out, on investigation, that heretofore they have received $125 per month. Now, in order to avoid this tangle I would be very glad if the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who now understands that I was mistaken, would accept an amendment making this $125 a month for these nine clerks, and then there would be no misunderstanding about it anywhere. It is no reflection on the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to suggest to the gentleman that this session of Congress will probably run beyond the 30th of June, and no provision will be made during the period from the 1st of July until the first Monday in December, and if it is proposed to give these clerks $125 a month it would be much better to do so out of the contingent fund. It would be much better for the gentleman and his committee to bring in their resolution apportioning the various clerks to the committees when provision is made for their payment, so that they can be subjected to whatever criticism it may be the desire of the House to indulge in.

Mr. LLOYD. May I call the gentleman's attention to another fact which is exceedingly embarrassing at this time? The contingent fund of the House is very low. There is not enough in that fund to meet the current expenses, even without adding any expenses to it. There is at this time less than $10,000 in that fund, and the demands on it, according to the statement made by the disbursing clerk, will amount to about $18,000,

leaving somewhere near $8,000 of a deficiency, and I am very anxious that this contingent fund shall be protected in every way possible to protect it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not unusual during an extra session of Congress, not contemplated when the appropriation was made, to provide a deficiency appropriation for the contingent fund; and all that would be necessary would be to provide whatever money would be necessary to carry this fund until the end of the fiscal year, but if these nine clerks are not to be allotted in the manner in which it was understood they would be when this resolution was reported by the Committee on Appropriations, then in justice to the committee they should be eliminated from this resolution. Regardless of what happens to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I shall offer such a motion. If the gentleman's amendment be adopted, I shall move to strike out the 15, so that all these matters can be determined in the proper way.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the gentleman also that he proposes now to strike out the 9?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall make a motion to strike out the 9 clerks, or the 15, if the 15 be adopted as an amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. You propose to strike out the 9 whether the 15 are adopted or not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has moved to amend by inserting 15, at $125 a month, instead of 9, at $6 a day; and whichever proposition is adopted I shall move to strike out. If the amendment is not adopted, I shall move to strike out the 9; and if the amendment is adopted, I shall move to strike out the 15.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Under what parliamentary procedure will the gentleman from New York move to strike out an amendment after it is adopted?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the procedure of Jefferson's Manual, section 464. When a motion is made to amend by striking out certain words and inserting others in their place, a motion to strike out the words is in order.

Mr. MANN. Not at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I believe it is, although I may be mistaken.

Mr. MANN. The motion is not in order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, we will discuss that when the time comes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am personally inclined at present to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, although I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that his amendment only provides for 15 clerks where, under my count, it should be 17 clerks. I do not know what committees the gentleman means to discriminate against.

Mr. GARNER. I do not intend to discriminate against any committee. I will say to the gentleman that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice has suggested to the Committee on Accounts that he believes that when his committee in the course of time has had an opportunity to investigate the situation it might be advisable to get the services of a good lawyer.

Mr. MANN. I think it is very certain that the House will never give the gentleman from Missouri a lump sum to expend for clerk hire.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say that it was not the intention of the chairman to appropriate a lump sum, but to provide for a clerk at a better salary than $125 a month, but for a less number of months, not to exceed the amount that might be required for the session clerk, and that he would get more efficient service.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman knows that that is impracticable. Now, let us be square about the clerks for these committees.

Mr. SABATH. We always are.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Illinois, who says "We always are," knows nothing about it. He never has been the chairman of a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this amendment has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have been chairman of a committee of this House for a number of years. The last two years I was chairman of a committee and we had three or four clerks busily engaged all the time. Before that I was chairman of Committee on Elections No. 1 for four years. Probably the committee did a few days' work during that four years; yes, it did more than a few days' work, but the committee had a clerk at $2,000 a year and a messenger at $1,000. It was well worth the Government's while to give us those officials. When gentlemen have served here for long years and acquired knowledge and information and influence in the House it is well worth the while for the Government to give them some additional help. The only way it can be done is by making them chairmen of committees and giving the committee a clerk. It would be a wise provision if the Government could give to the Committee on Appropriations more clerk hire than the average Member has. Some of these gentlemen who have acquired through experience positions as chairmen of these committees are entitled to some additional help, not because the committees will use the clerks, not because the committees have much work to do, but because the Members have the work outside of committee work which is of value to the House and to the country. The Committee on Education is a great committee.

Formerly, at one time since I have been here, it was presided over by Galusha A. Grow, of Pennsylvania, Speaker of this House more than half a century ago. I do not think it has had a meeting in that half century; and yet I would be glad to give to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], chairman of that committee, a clerk for the committee, knowing that it would be profitable to the House and to the Government for him to have that extra help, not for committee work, but for work which comes to him as a Member of the House.

There are other Members in the same condition. Here is the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining. They meet occasionally, and it is a valuable committee, but regardless of that I would give to the chairman of that committee a committee clerk. The Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic never had a clerk until out of the fullness of our hearts we gave to that committee a clerk because Mr. Sperry, the oldest Member of the House, over 80 years of age, was its chairman.

It was not because the committee had any use for the clerk, but because we thought we could profitably give to Mr. Sperry an additional clerk, and we gave it in the form of a committee clerk. The expenditure committees propose to work. I hope they will. I have heard that song ever since I have been here, but whether they work or not, I am glad to give to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri a committee clerk, which I know will be of value to the country. If I had my way about it, I would have kept the six committees that you have abolished and give to the chairman of each of them a committee clerk, to work, not for the committee, but in the interest of the country. Why, gentlemen here who receive a salary and allowance of fifteen hundred dollars a year for clerk hire, each one of them on the same basis, know that various Members of the House require more assistance than the average Member does, and this is the only way that assistance can be given. In the body at the other end of the Capitol nearly every Member of it is the chairman of a committee, including the members of the minority, and why? Because it is a method of providing help that is needed and is of value. When you gentlemen take credit for having abolished six committees you do not exhibit a great knowledge of economy, but a lack of legislative wisdom.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the substitute by striking out the word "fifteen" and substituting the word "nine."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "fifteen" and inserting the word "nine."

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do that for the purpose of enabling the committee to properly express its wishes. The substitute, being a substitute, would not be divisible, and yet it presents two affirmative propositions, one being the change from $6 per day as compensation to the clerk to $125 per month, and the other being an increase from the number 9 to the number 15. By the amendment that I have offered the committee will be able to pass upon both of these questions. Believing that the questions are such that each member of the committee can for himself determine, I will not waste the time of the committee in discussing the merit of the amendments themselves.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, just one word before the vote is taken. I want to call the attention of the committee to the effect of this amendment, at least upon one member of the Committee on Accounts. If the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky is adopted, I will take it as the voice of this committee that it does not believe that these various committees ought to have session clerks, and I for one member of the Committee on Accounts shall oppose any resolution to give these various committees a session clerk. Now, I do believe—in fact, I know—that there are some of these committees that ought to have session clerks. The Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers ought to have a session clerk, but if you

adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], taking into consideration the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, it must be convincing that it is the judgment of this committee that only nine committee clerkships should be provided, and that those should go to the committees on expenditure in the departments. Let us not misunderstand each other, but let us know exactly what the effect of the adoption of this amendment is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of committees provided with session clerks never carried in one of these resolutions, but always paid from the contingent fund.

Mr. GARNER. Just so, Mr. Chairman, and there can be no reason why the appropriation should not be carried here, if you should have these clerks.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They should not be carried here unless it is the intention of the Committee on Accounts to allot the clerks already provided, and which have been provided for a number of years, in this session of Congress to some other committee.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I want to call attention to the fact that I called attention to a moment ago. It is no secret, as I understand, that the committee on organization of this House has taken into consideration the fact that these committees that have session clerks now will be provided with session clerks at this session of Congress.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I heard the gentleman use the term "committee on organization."

Mr. GARNER. I did.

Mr. MANN. I read the rules carefully, and I did not catch it. What is that committee?

Mr. GARNER. That is a committee the gentleman had no part in creating.

Mr. MANN. I had no part in creating any of them; but what is it?

Mr. GARNER. And I imagine the gentleman from Illinois will have no occasion to interview that committee or bring anything before it; but, if he will note, I was addressing myself particularly to this side of the House, that they may know the effect of failing to provide these committees with their proper session clerks; and let us not be misunderstood in regard to the effect of this amendment. Now, it does seem to me, gentlemen, that we ought to give these various committees session clerks. If they are so insignificant and have no work to do, it would be our duty to do in this instance like we did in the others and discontinue the entire committee. What is the object of having a committee of this House if it has no power to do work? If it has no work to do, then it ought to be abolished.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why can not we appropriate for these session clerks out of the contingent fund of the House just as we have been doing?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, we can do that. Certainly, we can strike out this entire section and come in and appropriate for them; but the chairman of the committee——

Mr. HARDWICK. I used the word "appropriate"; I meant provide for them.

Mr. GARNER. Yes; and in providing for them we appropriate for them.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Can we pay them out of the contingent fund?

Mr. GARNER. I was just going to remark, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] has already advised this committee that the contingent fund of the House is at its lowest ebb. It is something like the Treasury of the United States, it is barely able to go from day to day, and there is no telling when they will have to come to this House and ask for an additional amount.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Very likely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. SHERLEY) there were were—ayes 87, noes 11.

So the amendment was adopted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, commencing in line 11, page 2, from the word "and" down to and including the word "day," in line 12, and strike out, in lines 12 and 13, the words "seventeen thousand five hundred and fifty-four dollars and twenty cents" and insert in lieu thereof the words "twelve thousand eight hundred and fifty-six dollars and twenty cents."

Mr. MANN. I would like to have that amendment reported.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Chair that the substitute as amended is the order of the committee.

Mr. MANN. We do not know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will be taken on the substitute as amended. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, may we have it again reported?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York offered an amendment which we are entitled to have reported.

The CHAIRMAN. But it is not before the House yet. The vote will be taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas as amended by the committee by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment as amended was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 33, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to amend, page 2, line 11, beginning with the word "and," down to the word "day," in line 12, included. Also, in lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "seventeen thousand five hundred and fifty-four dollars and twenty cents" and insert "$12,856.20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "and nine clerks to committees at $6 each per day," and in lines 12 and 13 strike out "$17,554.20" and insert "$12,856.20."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. LLOYD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 80, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "necessary," insert "That the charwomen be paid out of said contingent fund the sum of 75 cents per day each in addition to the amount they are at present receiving, during this session only, for the extra services they are required to render."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to say a word to my brother Congressmen in reference to this measure.

A few days ago I came out of my office in the House Office Building late in the evening. There were a number of women there going around on their hands and knees, scrubbing the floor. I asked them what they received, and they said they received 75 cents a day. They informed me that they were required to clean up eight rooms each, and nine, if they could, each day. In addition to that they were required to do the scrubbing, for all of which they only received 75 cents each per day.

Mr. Chairman, I am a Democrat and in favor of retrenchment, but I am not willing to go upon record in this Congress or elsewhere as doing such an injustice to that class of people, as they are not, in my judgment, receiving fair and just compensation in proportion to work faithfully done, and I hope this committee will adopt the amendment which I have offered. Let us help the poor, needy, and deserving and go after the bad trusts which are playing havoc with our country and people. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the charwomen in the House Office Building receive $20 a month. A large number of them are also employed as charwomen in the Congressional

Library. It is an unfortunate thing that women are compelled to work in order to earn money in such a manner in order to support themselves, but this compensation is very gladly accepted by them and, unfortunately, there are great numbers of them who are only too glad to get this employment. In the place of these charwomen we might substitute political janitors, who would not keep the building clean and who could not be located when they were wanted. It seems that the compensation for this service was fixed after investigation as to what would be considered reasonable and proper compensation for the class of work done; and, as a member of the House Office Building Commission, I have never heard complaint from anybody engaged in this work because of the compensation. I do know that a number of women in the District are very anxious and glad to obtain the employment at the compensation offered. I insist upon the point of order that the amendment is not in order, as it provides for payments out of the contingent fund and is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill and committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

MILEAGE.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I call up House joint resolution 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York calls up House joint resolution 3, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 3—making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives.

Resolved, etc., That the appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories, and expenses of Resident Commissioners, made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912, approved March 4, 1911, be, and the same are hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from the Territories, and Resident Commissioners for attendance on the first session of the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the mileage of the Sixty-second Congress is carried in the legislative appropriation bill. Under a decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury, made July 22, 1893, mileage is not available at an extra session of Congress convened before the first regular session unless specific authority is made for its payment by Congress. This resolution is in conformity with resolutions heretofore adopted by Congress in extra session, and makes available the money already appropriated, so that it may be paid to the Members who have been called here to an extra session prior to the regular session of Congress.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will not be in order until the debate is closed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the appropriations for mileage of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories, and expenses of Resident Commissioners, made in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1912, approved March 4, 1911, be, and the same are hereby, made immediately available and authorized to be paid to Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from the Territories, and Resident Commissioners for attendance on the first session of the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. The amendment is not in order yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after the word "Congress," line 3, page 2, the following: "*Provided*, That hereafter Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and Delegates from the Territories, and Resident Commissioners from Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands shall receive mileage at the rate of 10 cents per mile in going from their homes to Washington City and 5 cents per mile for returning to their homes, to be computed by the usual route of travel.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I would prefer that the gentleman make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that this is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this joint resolution provides that the appropriation made for a specific purpose shall be made available for payment at the present time. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] proposes as a substitute for that resolution a provision which attempts to fix the rate or amount of compensation for mileage to be paid to Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners in place of the one making the appropriation available.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, is not this amendment in order under the rules that we recently adopted?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. The so-called Holman rule applies to general appropriation bills. This is not a general appropriation bill. And besides that, I do not know whether the amount of compensation provided by the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana would be fair and just. This money has already been appropriated.

On a previous occasion I advocated an amendment to the law allowing mileage which would change the rate of mileage. I can speak frankly on this question, Mr. Chairman, because I am less interested, perhaps, than most other Members of the House. The amount of money paid to me as mileage at each session of Congress is not as much as $100, so that the amount that I shall personally receive is not sufficiently large to justify anybody in harboring the belief that I favor the expenditure of $145,000 in order to be personally benefited to the extent of my mileage.

The question of mileage was well thrashed out in the early sessions of Congress at the very beginning of the Government, and mileage was paid to Members, and the rate of mileage was fixed so that Members would be given different amounts, in the belief that the compensation of Members of Congress should be the same, and that they should also be paid the expenses they incurred in coming and going between their homes and the seat of Government. Eight cents a mile, as I recall, is the compensation or amount allowed to officers of the Army and Navy as mileage when traveling on official business. The amount allowed to Members of Congress is supposed not merely to cover the personal expenses of the Members in traveling to and from the seat of Government, but it is supposed to cover all the expenses incident to the Members bringing their families to Washington for the session of Congress. Where, in some instances, because of the very great distance at which some Members reside from the Capital, the amount allotted to them may be somewhat in excess of their actual expenditures, yet so far as I have been able to ascertain, a Member of Congress with an average family who moves from his residence to Washington for the session of Congress and brings his family and such household utensils, as many of them are required to bring, is not compensated more, or very little more, than his actual expenses. Until some committee of the House shall make an investigation to ascertain by proper inquiry whether the amount now paid is excessive, or what would be a proper allowance under existing conditions, it seems to me that what should now be done is to make available for Members who are assembled here the mileage already appropriated. If at the next session of Congress it is determined that the amount should be changed, then when the appropriation is to be made the amount can very readily be fixed at such sum as may be proper under all the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. This only makes available money already appropriated.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that it is a very difficult matter to change the opinion of a court when he has once made up his mind, and that it is much harder to convince the court, when he has once made a ruling, that his ruling is erroneous.

With all due deference to the ruling of the Chairman, I do not believe that the amendment which I have offered to this resolution applies to the appropriation that is sought to be made available for the present session of Congress.

The resolution which I have offered, and which has been read by the Clerk, provides that hereafter Members of Congress

shall be allowed mileage at the rate of 5 cents per mile in going to and returning from their homes. I can not understand how that can possibly apply to the appropriation made at the last session of Congress, which appropriation the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] undertakes to make immediately available. The word used in the amendment is "hereafter." It is not for the present at all, but it is something to occur hereafter. It does not apply to the appropriation made at the last session of Congress, but for the mileage to be paid to Members of Congress at the next session. Therefore, I do not believe that the ruling is correct.

The gentleman from New York spoke about the mileage allowed to Army officers and to Naval officers at the rate of 8 cents per mile while traveling on official business. I think the gentleman from New York and every Member upon the floor of this House will agree with me that that mileage is too much, and if I am not mistaken in the membership of the Committees on Expenditures in the War Department and Expenditures in the Navy Department we will have a chance, before the adjournment of Congress next spring, to vote on a proposition to cut down that mileage. It was not my purpose to speak to the merits of this resolution, but to confine myself to the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. One of my colleagues from the State of Washington pays about $500 a year more to bring his family down here than he receives in mileage. Does the gentleman think he is getting too much?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The family of the gentleman's colleague are not Members of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman think, then, because a man resides far from Washington City he ought to be punished by having a portion of his salary taken from him every year in that way?

Mr. COX of Indiana. It may be unfortunate that the gentleman lives in the State of Washington.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman advocate leaving Members' families at home?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman think a Member of Congress living in the State of Washington should leave his family at home?

Mr. COX of Indiana. No; I do not. I think the gentleman ought to bring his family here.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Does the gentleman want me to pay that out of my salary?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I do; absolutely.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then if the gentleman is so patriotic and wants to cut down the expenses of the Government, why does not the gentleman be fair about it and offer an amendment or a bill to reduce the salary, so as to put himself on an equality with the other Members of the House?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I do not know that I am getting anything extra over the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think the gentleman's patriotism is measured very largely by his distance from Washington City.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, on the question as to whether or not this amendment which I have offered is in order, I want to call the attention of the Chairman to clause 2 of Rule XXI, which provides as follows:

> 2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

And so forth.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that under this rule, recently adopted by this House, this amendment which I have offered is germane, and is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That rule relates to general appropriation bills. This is not a general appropriation bill.

Mr. COX of Indiana. In effect it is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is not a general appropriation bill; the rules specifically define general appropriation bills.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The point is made, Mr. Chairman, that this is not an appropriation bill. In effect it is because it carries forward an appropriation made at the last session of Congress and proposes to make that appropriation immediately available.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But it is not a general appropriation bill.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Now, Mr. Chairman, as to its being germane to the subject matter of the bill, the question recurs whether the amendment I have offered is germane to the resolution. If it is germane, it is in order under this rule.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman tell us whether this mileage question was brought up and considered in the Democratic caucus, and whether it was passed upon there or not? [Laughter.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can not give away the secrets of the caucus. [Laughter.] I will say to the gentleman, however, and I am justified in saying, that it was not. Now, on the question of whether it is germane, whether or not it can come under this rule, I call the Chairman's attention to section 17 of the United States Statutes at Large, Twenty-ninth Congress, volume 14, which provides that the compensation of Senators and Members of the House shall be $5,000 a year and that they shall be allowed 20 cents a mile going and returning home. What does that rule mean? If it means anything, it means that anything is in order that will save expense. If it is germane, it is in order, and it is germane because it seeks to reduce the expenditures of this House and to reduce the expenditures of the National Treasury.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. As I understand, the only effect of the resolution before the House is to make available now the appropriation for mileage which would be available next December if no special session was held. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. COX of Indiana. That is my understanding.

Mr. GARRETT. Is not the gentleman willing that we may go on and have it now when we need it [laughter] and then take up the question and deal with it when it comes to be appropriated for next December, when we do not need it?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The difference between the gentleman's construction and the resolution is that I do not believe the amendment I have offered will in any way touch the resolution of the gentleman from New York so far as making the appropriation immediately available is concerned.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I arise to a point of order, or, rather, to two points of order. First, the Chair said he would hear the gentleman from Indiana briefly, which he has already more than done, and, secondly, the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], but he is addressing the people of the third Indiana district. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of the gentleman from Kentucky is well taken that the gentleman from Indiana is not talking to the point of order.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then I will speak to the point of order. To sum the matter up, Mr. Chairman, the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York seeks to make immediately available an appropriation made at the last session of Congress. I contend that the amendment I have offered does not in any way affect that resolution.

In other words, if the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York, together with my amendment, both become a law, the amount appropriated at the last session of Congress to pay the mileage for the next session would be immediately available. But after that the rate of mileage will be only 5 cents a mile. I realize, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty a man is laboring under when he is trying to convince the Chair after he has already ruled.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I was unable to hear all that the gentleman has said. Do I understand that the gentleman from Indiana claims that his amendment is in order because of the adoption of the Holman amendment to the rule?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes; I think so; that is my construction of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not been convinced by the argument of the gentleman from Indiana, and he sustains the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the various resolutions to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House resolutions Nos. 1, 2, and 3, and had directed him to report reso-

lutions Nos. 1 and 3 back without amendment, and No. 2 with amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the resolutions do pass.

CORRECTING ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution No. 1, to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911, without amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

SUNDRY EXPENSES, FIRST SESSION SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution No. 2, making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, with sundry amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] If not, the vote will be taken on the amendments en grosse.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

MILEAGE.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution No. 3, making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The question was taken, and the House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations, to report forthwith with the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Indiana opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I am as it is now.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the same forthwith with the following amendment:

"*Provided*, That hereafter Senators and Members of the House of Representatives and Delegates from the Territories and the Resident Commissioners from Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands shall receive mileage at the rate of 10 cents per mile in going from their homes to Washington City and 5 cents per mile for returning to their homes, to be computed by the usual routes of travel."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion to recommit as submitted by the gentleman from Indiana is not in order. It is not germane to the resolution and would not be in order if offered as an amendment, and under the well-settled practice of the House it is not in order as a motion to recommit if not in order as an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. The question is on the passage of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, motions to reconsider the votes by which the last three several resolutions were passed were laid on the table.

AMERICAN RED CROSS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I call up House joint resolution 38, to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C., which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 38.

Be it enacted, etc., That authority be, and is hereby, given to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to grant permission, under such conditions and restrictions as he may deem necessary, to the executive committee of the American Red Cross to erect for exhibition purposes at the meeting of the International Red Cross in 1912 temporary structures in Potomac Park or other public ground in the city of Washington, on a site to be approved by the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That the United States shall be put to no extra expense of any kind thereby and that the structures shall be promptly removed by the American Red Cross at the close of the meeting and the site cleared of all debris and put in as good condition as before the erection of the structures.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman able to say where it is expected that these buildings will be placed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The statement is made by the secretary of the Red Cross that they will probably be placed in the vicinity of the Daughters of the American Revolution Building, where, I believe, the convention is to be held. Miss Boardman, the secretary of the Red Cross, after a conference with Col. Cosby, indicated that the buildings would be erected at a point probably in the vicinity of the place where the convention is to be held, or if that were not suitable, or, if it were deemed to be advisable to have it and the Army hospital exhibit building together, it might be necessary to put the buildings in some part of Potomac Park.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will remember that a few years ago we passed a resolution giving to the Railway Supplies Association, or whatever the title was, authority to construct exhibition buildings on the park down by the Washington Monument.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I made an error; it is in the vicinity of the Pan American Building.

Mr. MANN. It is about the same place; the Daughters of the American Revolution and Pan American Buildings are together.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I made the statement the convention was to be held in the Daughters of the American Revolution Building; it is the Pan American Building. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion by Mr. FITZGERALD to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was, on his motion, laid on the table.

SETS OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 126.

Resolved, That the superintendent of documents, Government Printing Office, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue to the library of the House, for use in said library, 10 complete sets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, including indices, of the Fifty-third Congress, first and third sessions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. FINLEY. The purpose of the resolution is this, that the supply of RECORDS of that Congress in the House library is very small, and during the present session there is great demand for them; in fact, the demand is greater than can be filled.

Mr. MANN. And has the Public Printer got them in bound form?

Mr. FINLEY. He has over 50 sets of each. If the gentleman will recall, the resolution only says for the first and third sessions. Of course we would like to have those of the second session, which was the tariff session, but he has none of them to furnish, but he has over 50 sets of the first and third sessions. It will cost nothing, and there can be no objection that I can see to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING, COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 125.

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House and to have such printing and binding done as shall be necessary in the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. EDWARDS, indefinitely, on account of illness of father.
To Mr. CRAGO, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.
To Mr. THAYER, for eight days, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GALLAGHER was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William H. Mayo, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

By unanimous consent, Mr. NORRIS was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers submitted in support of H. R. 16298, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. CANNON, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of J. T. Kirkman (H. R. 25844), Sixty-first Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRINTING INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces the following appointments to the Printing Investigation Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINLEY, Mr. BARNHART, and Mr. FOCHT.

TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I intended to call up the bill H. R. 4413 for debate to-day, but on account of the lateness of the hour I do not intend to ask the House to go into debate to-day. However, I desire to arrange the disposition of time and dispense with the first reading of the bill this evening before we adjourn, so we can go promptly into debate to-morrow. For that reason I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place on the free list agricultural implements and other articles.

Pending that motion, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the debate on this bill be divided equally between the two sides of the House, and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] be allowed to control the time in opposition to the bill and that I be allowed to control the time in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] control the time against the bill, and that he, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], control the time in favor of the bill, and that the time be equally divided.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. CANNON. Is there any disposition at this time to limit general debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is not, on my part.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to know if the gentleman can tell at this time whether he has any idea as to the length of time that will be consumed in general debate on the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can only state that from the requests I have had on this side of the House, and assuming that there will be as much time consumed on the other side of the House, it is likely to take four or five days.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman this question, further: Will there be any disposition to confine general debate to the bill itself?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is a matter of the ruling of the Chair. Any gentleman——

Mr. NORRIS. Heretofore the ruling has always been that you did not have to talk about the bill.

Mr. MANN. You do not have to do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will be determined by the Chairman when we get to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas will state his point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Rule XXXV gives the Speaker control over the official reporters of debates. Now, in the printing of speeches in the RECORD, speeches printed separately are annotated in two different ways by the editors of the RECORD. I call the Speaker's attention to page 448. In that case a speech is printed with this annotation:

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes—

Mr. So-and-so said:

Now, I call the Speaker's attention to page 450, where a speech is printed with this editorial annotation, a briefer one than the former:

On the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes—

Mr. So-and-so said:

Now, I desire to ask the Speaker if it is the practice of the official reporters of debates to use the longer annotation on speeches actually delivered on the floor of the House and the shorter annotation on those which are printed under general leave to print and are not delivered on the floor of the House at all?

Mr. MANN. It is not.

The SPEAKER. In the first place, the Chair hardly thinks it is a parliamentary inquiry, but will answer it. The Clerk informs the Chair that the headings on these speeches were put on at the Government Printing Office and the reporters had nothing to do with them. And the Chair is absolutely certain that the Chair is not going into the business of writing headnotes for other people's speeches. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. We have no other source of inquiry except the Speaker in this matter. Then the House is to understand that this difference in annotation does not really denote whether the speech was delivered in fact or merely printed?

The SPEAKER. It does not, and the Chair understands from the uniform practice of the last 18 years, and to the certain knowledge of the present occupant of the chair, there is no sort of way of finding out from reading the RECORD itself whether a speech is delivered here or not, except where it is cut up with debate. That is generally the test.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then parenthetical applause or laughter does not denote it?

Mr. MANN. I saw a speech printed during the last session of Congress, where permission was obtained to insert it while I was in the chair, prepared so as to read that the "Clerk read so-and-so" and the gentleman's time "was extended so-and-so" and filled with applause. Not a word of it had been uttered on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4413.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. ALEXANDER took the chair amid general applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4413. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 4413. A bill to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, etc., and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Tuesday, April 25, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DALZELL, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4413) to place upon the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, submitted a minority report (No. 4, pt. 2), which said views were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6823) for the relief of Pedro Fuentes, administrator of the estate of Guadalupe Lujan de Fuentes, deceased, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 7024) granting pensions to widows and minors of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7025) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 7026) for a public building at Two Harbors, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7027) granting the public lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Arkansas to the State of Arkansas for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 7028) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint certain persons in the Regular Army and place them upon the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 7029) for the erection at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., of a monument to the memory of Col. Alexander William Doniphan; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7030) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARBURTON: A bill (H. R. 7031) to place on the free list sugar, other than maple sugar, rice, lemons, oranges, pineapples, almonds (unshelled), filberts (unshelled), walnuts (unshelled), and peanuts or ground beans (unshelled); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 7032) to authorize the exchange of conveyances between the Florida East Coast Railway Co. and the United States to adjust the boundary line between Key West Barracks Reservation and the land filled by said railway company in front of same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORNES: A bill (H. R. 7033) providing for the establishment of the United States National Bank of America, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 7034) to check the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7035) increasing the cost of erecting a public building at Hinton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 7036) to establish a fish-cultural station at Mobile, in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLERBE: A bill (H. R. 7037) to provide for the erection of a monument to Brig. Gen. Francis Marion; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 7038) authorizing desert-land entrymen who have complied with the provisions of the acts of Congress approved June 27, 1906, and June 17, 1902, to assign the same or any part thereof in tracts of not less than 5 acres; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 7039) providing for the deposit of the funds of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7040) to increase the compensation of carriers on rural free-delivery mail routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7041) to limit the effect of the regulation of commerce between the several States and Territories as to certain commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7042) to provide for refunding to lawful claimants the proceeds of the cotton tax unlawfully collected; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7043) to amend section 15 of an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 7044) to repeal the several acts authorizing an internal tax on cotton and relating to the same and providing for the payment to the treasurers of the respective States wherein said tax was levied and collected the amounts so collected for the use and benefit of the common-school fund of said respective States and for purposes of general education; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7045) providing for the adjustment of the claims of the Wisconsin band of Pottawatomie Indians for annuities and other moneys under treaty stipulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolution (H. Res. 123) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish information relative to the new building authorized for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARTER: Resolution (H. Res. 124) authorizing the Committee on Indian Affairs to investigate the administration of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes by the different departments of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7046) granting an increase of pension to James West; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7047) granting an increase of pension to David Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7048) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7049) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7050) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Steible; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7051) granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7052) granting an increase of pension to Henry Roeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7053) granting an increase of pension to William A. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7054) granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7055) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Marka; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7056) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Magill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7057) granting an increase of pension to Hosea H. Meek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7058) granting an increase of pension to Henry Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7059) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Kobel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7060) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7061) granting an increase of pension to Elisha E. Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7062) granting an increase of pension to William Frederick Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7063) granting an increase of pension to Fred Groch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7064) granting an increase of pension to Romeo W. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7065) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Furman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7066) granting an increase of pension to William L. Frisbey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7067) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7068) granting an increase of pension to Joshua B. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7069) granting an increase of pension to Albert B. Cavalier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7070) granting an increase of pension to Daniel T. Cockerill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7071) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7072) granting an increase of pension to Sherman A. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7073) granting an increase of pension to Arthur L. Bird; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7074) granting a pension to Daniel Burkey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7075) granting a pension to Emogene Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7076) granting a pension to Margaret Metzgar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7077) granting a pension to Rollin King; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7078) granting a pension to Charles H. Heimlich, alias Charles H. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7079) granting an increase of pension to Simon Fockle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 7080) granting an increase of pension to Guy Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7081) to remove the charge of desertion against Wesley Appleton, alias Nelson Myers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7082) granting an increase of pension to George A. Whalen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 7083) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Herbert W. George; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7084) to reimburse Matthew J. Munster; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 7085) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7086) granting an increase of pension to John W. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7087) granting a pension to James Saulpaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7088) granting an increase of pension to Asa Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 7089) for the relief of Margaret Tucker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7090) for the relief of Sallie E. Barnes, administratrix of the estate of Joseph Barnes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7091) for the relief of Joseph B. Tucker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 7092) granting an increase of pension to Philip Shay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7093) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7094) granting an increase of pension to John M. Hines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7095) granting an increase of pension to James K. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7096) granting an increase of pension to Edgar J. Kempinsky; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Thomas Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 7098) retiring Thomas Harrison, a clerk in the Naval Observatory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7099) granting an increase of pension to James H. Colvill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7100) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ohr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7101) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7102) granting an increase of pension to William J. Wotring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7103) granting an increase of pension to Edward Cottingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7104) granting an increase of pension to Louis A. Kellar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7105) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gigantet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7106) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7107) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Oxley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7108) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus D. Coulson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7109) granting an increase of pension to William S. May; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7110) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7111) granting an increase of pension to Selleck K. Tylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7112) granting an increase of pension to Wesley B. Hedding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7113) granting an increase of pension to David Shank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7114) granting an increase of pension to John G. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to Charles J. Keesee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7116) granting a pension to James E. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7117) granting a pension to Alice V. Lutes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7118) granting a pension to George Brant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 7119) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Baer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7120) to correct the military record of Francis M. Helm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 7121) granting an increase of pension to Frederick L. Killion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7122) granting a pension to Pernetta J. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 7123) for the relief of Ella M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 7124) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 7125) referring to the Court of Claims for adjudication and determination the claims of the widow and family of Marcus P. Norton and the heirs at law of others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 7126) for the relief of Antonio Hook; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7127) for the relief of Alice R. Anderson, administratrix of the estate of Albert Bell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FAISON: A bill (H. R. 7128) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Beaufort, N. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 7129) granting a pension to Frederick Kahler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7130) granting a pension to Sylvester Fobar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7131) granting a pension to Thomas Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7132) granting a pension to John Levingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7133) granting a pension to John Ripperdan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7134) granting a pension to John Rayles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7135) granting a pension to William F. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7136) granting a pension to Job Utley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7137) granting a pension to Edmond Dunahoo; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7138) granting a pension to Martin E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7139) granting a pension to Frederick Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7140) granting a pension to Lewis S. Skiles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7141) granting a pension to William M. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 7142) authorizing the President to nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Lloyd L. R. Krebs, late a captain in the Medical Corps of the United States Army, a major in the Medical Corps on the retired list, and increasing the retired list by one for the purposes of this act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7143) granting an increase of pension to Peter Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7144) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weekley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 7145) granting an increase of pension to Richard Dearborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 7146) granting an increase of pension to James F. Vernon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7147) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Basil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 7148) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Doughty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7149) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bachman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7150) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Hemings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7151) for the relief of the estate of John B. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 7152) granting a pension to Joshua B. Hartzog; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 7153) granting a pension to Charles H. H. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7154) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Edward Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 7155) granting a pension to May Phillips Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 7156) granting an increase of pension of Edmond S. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7157) granting an increase of pension to Rufus Buxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7158) granting a pension to John F. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7159) granting a pension to Margaret D. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 7160) to correct the military record of Maj. Robert G. Smither, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 7161) granting an increase of pension to John W. Kinnison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7162) granting an increase of pension to George Ditzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 7163) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7164) granting an increase of pension to Clara Boyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7165) granting an increase of pension to Flora A. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7166) granting an increase of pension to William Kelrnan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 7167) granting an increase of pension to James Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 7168) granting an increase of pension to John A. Vermeulen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7169) granting a pension to Frank E. Lyman, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 7170) granting an increase of pension to John Gilley, with accompanying papers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 7171) for the relief of Harlow L. Street; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 7172) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Reams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7173) granting an increase of pension to Hiram W. Shroyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7174) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Truitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7175) granting an increase of pension to Norman Stygles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7176) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Personett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7177) granting a pension to Edward Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 7178) granting an increase of pension to Charles Muehlbach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7179) granting an increase of pension to John M. Fields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7180) granting an increase of pension to James P. McClellan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7181) granting an increase of pension to Landon Sherrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7182) granting a pension to Henrietta M. Majors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7183) granting a pension to Sarah J. Boone; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7184) granting a pension to John Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: A bill (H. R. 7185) for the relief of M. R. Flynn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 7186) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Arbuckle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7187) granting an increase of pension to John A. Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7188) granting an increase of pension to John G. Tally; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7189) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7190) granting an increase of pension to Celesten Deleat; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7191) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Faith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7192) granting an increase of pension to W. E. Warthen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7193) granting a pension to Joseph Erit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7194) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7195) granting an increase of pension to Charles I. Krickbaum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7196) granting an increase of pension to James Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7197) granting an increase of pension to William P. Metcalfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7198) granting an increase of pension to Francis Westerfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7199) granting an increase of pension to James V. Morrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7200) granting an increase of pension to William M. Coop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7201) granting an increase of pension to James H. Dorance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7202) granting an increase of pension to Philander G. Woodworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7203) granting a pension to Ruth Walston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7204) granting a pension to William Kral; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7205) to correct the military record of Joseph Gannon, alias Joseph Post; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 7206) granting an increase of pension to John Southard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7207) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7208) granting an increase of pension to William McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 7209) granting an increase of pension to James C. Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7210) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Strassheim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7211) granting an increase of pension to Walter J. Hardin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7212) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McFadden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7213) granting an increase of pension to Irvin Metcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 7214) granting an increase of pension to George W. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7215) granting an increase of pension to Curtice C. Whittier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7216) granting an increase of pension to Levi W. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7217) granting an increase of pension to William H. Richmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7218) granting an increase of pension to Oscar J. Piper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7219) granting an increase of pension to Orville C. Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7220) granting an increase of pension to William H. Colcord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7221) granting an increase of pension to Peter Bower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7222) granting a pension to Mary J. Bedell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7223) granting a pension to Mary Highland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7224) for the relief of Rose B. Armour; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7225) granting an increase of pension to Louise A. Coe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARBURTON: A bill (H. R. 7226) granting an increase of pension to Thompson McL. Chambers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7227) granting an increase of pension to George Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7228) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Laws; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7229) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bracken; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7230) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Haptonstall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 7231) granting an increase of pension to Shepherd M. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7232) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7233) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Wildasinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7234) granting an increase of pension to James Ormsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7235) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7236) granting a pension to Joseph P. Dawes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7237) granting a pension to Ezriah Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7238) granting a pension to John Meehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 7239) granting an increase of pension to Julia Weber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7240) for the relief of Mrs. Antonio Pfister, administratrix of the estate of Antonio Pfister; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7241) for the relief of the heirs of the estate of Charles and Palmyra Barre, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7242) for the relief of Leonise Gonzales, administratrix of the estate of Lawrence Montero, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 7243) granting an increase of pension to Show Hinebaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7244) granting an increase of pension to Wilson S. Maize; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 7245) granting a pension to Albert V. Lawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7246) granting an increase of pension to Williston W. Goodrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7247) granting an increase of pension to Jesse P. Boone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 7248) for the relief of the estate of John Carr, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7249) for the relief of Louisa Dornier, administratrix of the estate of Jules Dornier, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7250) for the relief of Mrs. John W. Austin; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petitions of Colmore H. Weldon, James B. Gorsuch, Thomas R. Shaw, T. B. Yates, W. C. Gillihan, and 35 others, veterans of the Civil War, residing at Gallatin, Mo.; William Overton, James R. Brown, William Collier, and 20 other veterans of the Civil War, of Mercer, Mo.; and Ellsworth Post, No. 12, Grand Army of the Republic, of Grant City, Mo., favoring the Sulloway pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Papers of Hewson L. Peeke, supporting H. R. 6128; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of Mark Compton and others, of Potter, Kans., against limiting the cold storage of butter, eggs, etc., to a period less than one year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Oak Grove Grange, Coshocton, Ohio, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of Joseph McCurdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLESON: Letters, petitions, resolutions, etc., from various organizations throughout the country, protesting against the 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine and asking Congress to repeal it: Child Study Club, Mrs. Eva Downing, president, and Mrs. Ella Tinker, secretary, Mason City, Iowa; Menominee Woman's Club, Mrs. J. D. Crawford, president, 1530 State Street, Menominee, Mich.; Metal Polishers' Union, Local No. 1, George H. Harris, president, and A. L. Bernard, secretary, Detroit, Mich.; Cigar Makers' Union, Local No. 314, Frank Barthel, secretary, Jackson, Mich.; United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters, etc., Local Union No. 161, Karl Luthin, recording secretary, Quincy, Ill.; Cigar Makers' Union No. 129, Charles Hornburg, president, and J. W. Sanford, secretary, 201 Railroad Building, Denver, Colo.; International Molders' Union of North America, Local No. 270, Valentine Barie, corresponding representative, Pittsburg, Pa.; Cleveland Conference Board of International Molders' Union, Fred L. Baumgartner, secretary, 226 Columbia Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Division 421, F. W. Stone, secretary, 1801 Bailey Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.; Hyperion Club, Mrs. Julius Fischer, corresponding secretary, Nelsonville, Ohio; American Federation of Labor, Lodge No. 12868, Frank Williams, corresponding secretary, Bedford, Ind.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Division No. 376, Granville F. Rehrig, chief engineer, Box 530, Lehighton, Carbon County, Pa.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Resolution of Marble City Local, No. 67, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Natural Dam, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of State Pilots' Association of the State of Florida, opposing antipilotage; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Felts Mills Local, No. 6, of Felts Mills; Thomsons Local No. 158, of Schuylerville; and Palmer Local, No. 7, of Palmer Falls, all in the State of New York, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. Ellison & Sons, Minot, N. Dak., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, favoring House bill 26791, known as the Hanna bill, providing for additional compensation to the rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of Local No. 158, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Schuylerville, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Local No. 6, Felt Mills, N. Y., and Local No. 67, of Natural Dam, N. Y., International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Agency and Colfax, Iowa, against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAMB: Resolutions of Lehigh (Pa.) Division, No. 376, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring an amendment to the oleomargarine law by reducing tax thereon and providing for its sale in original packages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of citizens of State of Michigan, favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Guy L. Tromble and 7 other residents of Aloha, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Omaha, Nebr., asking that lemons be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of Mrs. Florida Theriault and 56 others, favoring a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of citizens of the second congressional district, State of Oklahoma, protesting against the mobilization of United States troops on the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the imprisonment of 500 Armenians in Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of San Francisco, Cal., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER: Resolutions of Lehigh Division, No. 376, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Lehighton, Pa., favoring the repeal of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUJO: Petition of Sonia Cotton Oil Co. (Ltd.), that camels hair or woolen press cloth, and the material from which it is made, be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers in the case of John Gilly, for increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Resolutions of Central Council, Irish Clubs, of Boston, Mass., against arbitration with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Spratts Patent, America (Ltd.), against removing the tariff from dog biscuits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Resolutions of Vicksburg Post, No. 61, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, indorsing the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Resolutions of Orient Council, of Newton; Gilman Marston Council, of Atkinson; Prospect Council, of Plymouth; Franklin Pierce Council, of Concord; North River Council, of Northwood; John P. Hale Council, of Barrington; Paul Revere Council, of Epping; Washington Council, of Salem Depot; and Bunker Hill Council, of Stratham, Junior Order of American Mechanics, all in the State of New Hampshire, favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of John Adams, of New Haven, Conn., and 2,500 others, in favor of a department of public health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolutions of the citizens of Naugatuck, Conn., against the enactment of a new arbitration treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of Nathan Dustin and 25 other citizens, of Galena, Ohio, against the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petitions of Thomson Local, No. 158, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity, and of George W. Lane Co. and others, of New York, against duty on tea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *April 25, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Coaden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, when we consider the works of Thy hand, the vast and stupendous universe, and the wonderful adaptation of means to ends everywhere apparent, we are moved to wonder and awe; but when we feel the thrill of that everlasting fatherly love revealed in the heart of the Christ and poured out in agony in Gethsemane and on the cross of Calvary we are moved to admiration, thanksgiving, praise, gratitude, and love. But, oh, how soon we wrap the mantle of selfishness about us and forget our duty to Thee and to our fellow men! Forgive us, we beseech Thee, and help us to be true followers of the Jesus of Nazareth, in thought, word, and deed, for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRINTING OF SPEECHES IN THE RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a few remarks about a matter relating to the printing of the RECORD. This is the only time in the proceedings of the House when a Member is in order in saying anything regarding the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to make a few remarks about the printing of the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. How long will it take?

Mr. MURDOCK. Not over five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for five minutes to make some remarks about the printing of the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. JAMES. I regret to have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If a Member of this House desires to reach a matter relating to the manner of the printing of the RECORD, is there any other time when he is in order, when he can obtain recognition for the purpose?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order if he rises for the purpose of correcting the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. I must confess that I do not rise for the purpose of correcting the RECORD in any specific thing.

The SPEAKER. Then the objection of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] shuts the gentleman from Kansas off.

Mr. JAMES. If the gentleman wants to correct the RECORD, I do not object.

The SPEAKER. He says he does not want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. No specific thing, but just the manner of printing certain things in the RECORD.

Mr. JAMES. I will withdraw my objection. Let the gentleman go ahead.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I pointed out to the Speaker that there were two ways of heading set speeches when printed in the RECORD, one by the inclusion at the beginning of the speech of an editorial annotation in one instance reading as follows: "The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and having under consideration such and such a bill," and in the second instance, another briefer editorial annotation, which reads as follows: "On the bill No. 4412, to promote reciprocal trade relations," and so forth.

Now, I asked the Speaker yesterday if it were not a fact that when the longer annotation appeared at the beginning of a speech it did not indicate that that speech was actually made on the floor of the House, and if, on the other hand, when the shorter annotation appeared, it was not clearly an indication that the speech was not made on the floor of the House, but printed under leave to print. The Speaker said that in his opinion it did not denote any such distinction.

I want to say that I have since learned that it does denote such distinction, that the Style Book of the Government Printing Office sets forth that when a speech is printed under the general leave to print it carries the shorter annotation, and when actually delivered on the floor of the House then it carries the longer annotation. So, if the printers in the Government Printing Office carry out the regulations in their style book, which is as binding on them as the rules are upon the House, the country and the House should understand that when the shorter annotation appears the speech was never delivered in the House.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does the gentleman think that the country would be so well informed as to the proper annotation as to make the proper discrimination so as to know whether the speech was delivered on the floor of the House or not?

Mr. MURDOCK. Undoubtedly the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is under general impeachment as to veracity all over the country.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. It is not a question of veracity.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is absolutely a question of veracity, and I want to say to the gentleman that the average constituent in his district will very clearly see the distinction between one annotation and the other, and will be able to tell, if the style book is followed, whether a speech is actually made or is put in under leave to print.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. My constituents will never have occasion to ascertain the distinction, because I think I never printed a speech in the RECORD that was not delivered on the floor of the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have no doubt the gentleman has in his district quite a number who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. They all read it.

Mr. MURDOCK. And they want to know the distinction between the speech that is not delivered and one that is delivered on the floor of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I want to call the gentleman's attention to a speech which appears on page 447 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, with the shorter annotation which he says shows that the speech was not actually delivered. I want to say that I believe that was actually delivered, which would indicate that the gentleman from Kansas has not been correctly informed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman from Colorado know it from his own knowledge?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I do not know it from my own knowledge.

Mr. KENDALL. It must have been delivered on the floor, because it has "Applause" in it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the whole matter rests with the Speaker. He has control over the official reporters and he has control, with the Senate, over the Style Book of the Government Printing Office.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Kansas want the Speaker to do?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like the Speaker to acknowledge his error in saying yesterday that the two different annotations did not indicate whether the speech was made on the floor of the House or not or whether it was printed under leave to print. The Speaker is in the RECORD as saying that it does not indicate a difference, and the style book says that it does.

The SPEAKER. If the Speaker said that, the Speaker withdraws that remark and states that he has since examined the Style Book of the Government Printing Office, and the gentleman from Kansas was correct. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Kansas. His whole argument is that the RECORD does not state the facts. It is within the power of any Member on the floor, immediately after the reading of the Journal, to call attention to an error in the RECORD. Why does not the gentleman, as a Member, avail himself of his power to call attention to the fact that where the RECORD says that a gentleman said certain things when, as a matter of fact, he did not, that the RECORD is in error and should read that under leave to print the gentleman printed certain things?

Mr. MURDOCK. Why does not the gentleman from Kentucky do the same thing?

Mr. SHERLEY. Because I propose to reach it in what I consider a more regular way; but if the gentleman from Kansas, instead of criticizing the Speaker for the nonexercise——

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I want to say to the gentleman that I do not criticize the Speaker.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is peculiarly sensitive about the word "criticize," but the gentleman from Kansas made comment on the Speaker's nonperformance of what he considered to be a duty. The same power rests with the gentleman from Kansas. Let the gentleman exercise it if he choose.

Mr. MURDOCK. Or any other Member of the House. All I would like to say is this, that as the matter now stands, under the style book rule governing it, this House and the country should understand that wherever the shorter annotation is used it is an indication, at least within the lights of the Government Printing Office, that that speech was printed and not delivered in the House, and when the longer annotation appears it is an indication to the country that the speech was actually made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask a question for information. Who gave the authority to the Printing Office to make any rules about the heading of a speech at all?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am or have been in the past a practical printer, and the rules made in the average printing office in the United States were handed down from an origin somewhere in Germany along about 400 years ago, and they are not susceptible to change by courts or legislature; I think they are susceptible, however, to a suggestion from the Speaker of the House.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I knew that the press was very powerful, but I never knew it was so powerful as that.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that this rule of the style book to which the gentleman refers is a new rule, and is not one of the old rules of the Printing Office?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am frank to confess that I do not know what the origin of the rule is, but evidently it is a very old rule.

Mr. MANN. I would say to the gentleman that I have inserted remarks in the RECORD under leave to print several times, and always with a long caption. The rule is a new one, if it is enforced at all. These speeches under leave to print do not need to go through the Official Reporter's hands at all. I would like to ask the gentleman how the Government Printing Office can tell if a man rises here and the RECORD shows that the gentleman from so-and-so addressed the House and that his remarks are held for revision, and then he puts in a long speech, how the Government Printing Office can tell whether the remarks were delivered on the floor of the House or not.

Mr. MURDOCK. As a practical printer, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that I believe the printers judge from the copy they receive. Of course I do not know how they decide.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas has had several years' service here——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting discussion, but it leads to nothing, and I am compelled to ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

ADDITIONAL OFFICERS, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs I call up privileged House resolution 98, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia calls up the following privileged report, which the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 98.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the House of Representatives of the United States how many officers have been or will be added to the Army by virtue of the provision for the adjustment of rank contained in the act of March 3, 1911, and under which clause of said provision the number of officers added to the Army has been or will be determined.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not make a point of order against the resolution, though I do not think it is privileged.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order, and unless the gentleman asks unanimous consent I shall make it.

Mr. HAY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there a report accompanying the resolution?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House report No. 10.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following report: The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred House resolution No. 98, calling for information as to the number of officers added to the Army under the act of March 3, 1911, having considered the same, reports thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. Hay. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HAY. I do.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has made any other attempt to get this information before asking the House to adopt this resolution?

Mr. HAY. No; I have not.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman why it would not be simpler and save the time of the House if the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, would write a letter to the Secretary of War requesting this information? He certainly would get the information desired.

Mr. HAY. Because I thought, Mr. Speaker, this is information for the House itself, and is not information that should be confined to myself.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman could give it whatever publicity he desired.

Mr. HARDWICK. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is this proceeding by unanimous consent; has unanimous consent been granted?

Mr. HAY. It has. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion by Mr. HAY to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was, on his motion, laid on the table.

TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place on the free list agricultural implements and other articles.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements and other articles, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, and the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the bill has already been reported to the House and its first reading dispensed with yesterday evening.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill was simply reported by title.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means have reported this free-list bill to the House for its consideration for two purposes. One is that the committee recognize that the great underlying industry on which rests the prosperity of the entire country is that of agriculture. A bill passed the House several days ago that places on the free list, if it becomes a law, practically all the agricultural products of this country that were not already there outside of the citrus and semi-tropical fruits grown in California and Florida. It has always been maintained on this side of the House—and I believe it to be true—that the tariff on wheat and other farm products no more affects the prices of such products than a tariff levied on short-staple cotton would affect its price. It is not by way of compensation to the farmers that we have offered this bill, because we believe that the great cereal producers of this country are compelled to go to the markets of the world to dispose of their surplus products, and that such surplus products fix their prices in the world markets. We believe fully that the passage of the reciprocity treaty with Canada will not work a serious injury to any of the farming classes of the United States, but we also recognize, too, that, as a large number of the agricultural products of the country to-day are on the free list, if the reciprocity treaty passes this session of Congress practically all of them will be on the free list this year, and that it is not just to levy taxes on the tools of trade and the necessities of life that the farming classes must use and are dependent upon when they must go to the great world markets to dispose of their surplus products.

Now, one of the two principal objects of this bill is to remove from the protected list those implements of trade that the farmer must use in producing his crops. The other object is to reduce the cost of living to the masses of the American people by putting their food on the free list.

The putting of these agricultural products on the free list will in times of short crops prevent combinations from cornering the food market of the country, because supplies from foreign countries will come into America and break such corners.

The bill is not a long one. The first section provides for placing on the free list the agricultural implements that are necessary for the farmer's use. Now, I do not propose to discuss this question from the standpoint of a protectionist, because I am not a protectionist, and neither is my party composed of protectionists. We do not believe in levying prohibitive taxes at the customhouse.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask the gentleman not to interrupt me at this time. We do not believe in levying taxes at the customhouse for the benefit of any man or the benefit of any industry. Our position is that the taxes levied at the customhouse are for the sole purpose of producing revenue to support the Government of the United States, and that we are not justified in levying taxes for any other purpose. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Therefore, when we approach the question of putting articles on the free list the sole point involved, so far as we are concerned, is whether the Government of the United States can dispense with the revenue derived from these articles.

This bill, if taken by itself, will probably reduce the revenue by about $10,000,000. The estimates in the report I have filed in the House amount to a little over $10,000,000, but I have endeavored to make full estimates, and I feel assured that the reduction of revenue will amount to less than the estimates contained in the report. On the other hand there is a reduction in the revenue of about $5,000,000 by the reciprocity agreement with Canada. These two bills largely cover the same articles; those involved in the reciprocity agreement and also in this bill effect a remission of duties to the amount of $1,653,313, and hence the actual amount of the reduction of revenue because of this bill will, in my judgment, be less than $8,500,000, instead of $10,000,000.

It may be asked where we expect to get the revenue to run the Government, if we are going to reduce the customs taxes and cut off the revenue from that source. I say to the House that when we put these articles on the free list we can not of necessity make up the revenue from customs duties on these same articles. This bill and the reciprocity agreement will reduce the revenue about $12,000,000 or $13,000,000. Now, if you ask how we are to make up that revenue, I state to you that we do not expect to make it up. We believe and are confident that in managing the expenditures of the Government and making the appropriations for the fiscal years to follow we can reduce the expenses of this Government more than the $13,000,000 of revenue that we have cut off in these bills. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not think there is any doubt about that; and we feel assured that we can confidently assert to the country that our reductions in the expenditures of the Government will amount to far more than the reductions in the bill under consideration.

The reciprocity-agreement bill and this free-list bill are not the only revenue bills we intend to bring before the House. As has been stated before, we propose to revise the tariff, schedule by schedule. We propose hereafter to bring in the different schedules of the tariff bill as we have the opportunity to consider them and present them to the House for its consideration one schedule at a time. We believe that this is the most intelligent way for the House to consider a revision of the tariff.

If we presented to the House at one time an entire tariff bill, there is not a Member here who served in the last Congress who does not know that it is impossible for the membership of this body to fairly and fully consider so comprehensive a measure when it is presented as a whole. But if we proceed by schedules, considering only one at a time, we believe the membership of the House will fully and fairly understand the scope of the bill, and at the same time have a full and a fair opportunity to act upon it.

Now, as to the question of revenue in the other schedules, the Democratic Party, as I have said before, does not stand for the wiping out of the customhouses. We expect to raise the necessary revenue to run this Government at the customhouses, but we contend that in many of the schedules and many of the items in the tariff law now on the statute books the rates are prohibitory and prevent the importation of goods from abroad, as well as a fair and reasonable competition.

And it is not necessary to say that when you build your tariff wall so high that foreign goods can not enter the country you can not raise revenue on them. But if you will lower your rates of duty to a point where reasonable and fair competition is arrived at, more goods will come into the country, and consequently more revenue will be collected at the customhouses.

In presenting these schedules of the tariff bill to the House for its consideration, we believe that by reason of a fair reduction in the tariff rates in the present schedules we will, instead of reducing, actually increase the revenue at the customhouses. Under the Dingley bill—and the Payne bill is equally as prohibitive in all essential features—the importations of cotton goods as covered by Schedule I amounted to only about 2.8 per cent of the consumption of these goods in this country; the imports of woolen to only about 6.3 per cent of the consumption of woolen goods. On some of the other schedules the quantity of importations compared with the American consumption did not amount to 1 per cent. Of course, in all of these schedules there were some articles that were highly competitive. There were a large number of articles on which the duties were clearly prohibitive, and on which revenue could not be raised. Now, our clear duty is to reduce the tariff on articles on which the present rates are prohibitive, and to increase the quantity of imports to a reasonable extent, and thereby increase the amount of revenue from the customs.

Now, you may say, and the stand-pat, prohibitive tariff advocates always do say, that the American market belongs to the American producer and the American manufacturer, and if you are letting in goods from abroad you are shutting down factories at home. I believe that the American manufacturer and the American producer are entitled to a large percentage of the American market, but they are not entitled to a monopoly. They are entitled to a fair opportunity to dispose of their goods at home, but they are not entitled to have the tariff wall built so high that it prohibits competition and gives them a chance, by combinations at home, to exploit the American people for the benefit of themselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Either an individual or any great industry having 90 per cent of a business of the American people, or 90 per cent of the American market, in his control has a monopoly. There is not a man in this country who, if he controlled absolutely 90 per cent of the market, would not say that he had a monopoly. And yet among the great industries of this country, such as iron, and steel, and wool, and cotton, and glass, and lumber, there is not a single industry that is not to-day controlling more than 90 per cent of the American market; most of them more than 95 per cent of the American market. So I say a reasonable reduction of the tariff to a competitive basis, where there is a chance for fair competition to regulate prices, will not only be beneficial to the American people, but will increase the revenue at the customhouses; so that, instead of having a deficit in the Treasury of the United States, as we have to-day, we can increase the revenues to such an extent that the Government will have all the money required for governmental expenditures.

Now, as to this particular bill, very little revenue is obtained from most of the items. As I said, we are not looking at the question from the standpoint of protection, the standpoint from which the gentlemen on the other side of the House will look at it. But even from their viewpoint, most of these items should go on the free list. You gentlemen are not opposed to a free list. You have a free list in the laws you have written on the statute books. The difference between a free list made by you and one made by us is that you have always been in favor of making such a list either on articles that were noncompetitive in the American market and did not interfere with any manufacturing enterprise in the United States, or by putting articles on the free list to favor the American manufacturer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Two years ago the articles that you put on the free list were not in the interest of the American people, but were in the interest of American monopoly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The first articles we place on the free list are agricultural implements. Now, I desire to call your attention to this fact, that the census of 1905 shows that the domestic production of agricultural implements amounted to $111,345,000, that the importations coming into this country were less than $14,000, and that the duties paid at the customhouses from this magnificent tax levied on agricultural implements amounted to $2,775.

You levied a tax at the customhouse on the agricultural implements used by the farmers of this country, which only raised the pitiful sum of $2,775, and we propose to deprive the Treasury of the United States of $2,775, and in lieu thereof to give to the American farmer absolute freedom in the purchase of the agricultural implements he needs for working his farm. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to call your attention also to the fact that in that same year, when the production of agricultural implements amounted to $111,345,000, we exported $20,722,000 worth to the markets of the world, and during the last fiscal year our exports of these implements amounted to over $28,000,000.

Twenty-eight million dollars of agricultural implements sent into all the markets of the world, in free competition with the manufacturers of other countries! After paying the freight and sometimes adverse tariff rates to get into those countries, our manufacturers of these farming implements were able to compete with manufacturers there and sell a very large percentage of their total product; not their surplus consigned to a dumping ground, but a very large percentage, more than 20 per cent, of their total product, in free competition with the markets of the world. And yet when you wrote the Payne tariff bill and brought it before this House, with all your solicitude for the American farmer, you levied a tax, ranging from 20 to 30 per cent, and in some cases 40 per cent, on what he had to buy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, as to leather products. The census of 1905 showed that the total production of leather products in this country amounted to $525,000,000 for the calendar year 1904. It has increased materially since that time. The imports for consumption in 1905 amounted to $437,000, and the duties paid at the customhouses were only $146,000, on a great industry that produces in this country over half a billion dollars' worth of products; $146,000, not enough revenue to support some of the commissions that you have created, on that side of the House, in recent years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the other hand, our exports of boots, shoes, and leather products amounted to $11,500,000 for the year 1905, and the amount has increased since that time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman is using the figures for 1890.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him. My eye caught the wrong line of figures in the table. The correct amount is $33,000,000; $33,000,000 worth of the products of the leather industry of this country in 1905 went to the markets of the world, paying freight and adverse tariff rates and competing in those markets.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I do not care to be interrupted at present. When you came to write the Payne tariff bill you levied a practically prohibitive duty on these articles; not a revenue duty. Can any man in this House say, when the duty levied on leather products could produce only $146,000 revenue in a great industry that produces half a billion dollars worth of goods, that it was not prohibitive? You built a wall for the benefit of the manufacturer and against the interests of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, let me call your attention to your legislation on that subject. Take boots and shoes. The year before the Payne tariff bill was enacted into law the production of boots and shoes in this country amounted to something like $320,000,000.

The total importations of boots and shoes into the United States amounted to $129,240 in 1908. The rate of duty was 25 per cent. The great boot and shoe interests came before the Ways and Means Committee and clamored for free hides. They said that they must have free hides in order that their industry might prosper, an industry that was exporting large quantities to every European market. More than that, the leading men in the boot and shoe industry came before the Ways and Means Committee and stated that if we would put hides on the free list, we could wipe out every particle of tariff on their product; that they would go out into the markets of the world in free competition with all the world, and that nothing but the broad dome of heaven would control the expansion of their trade. Yet when they found that they could get free hides they came back before the Ways and Means Committee and took back their statement, and instead of taking off the duty and putting boots and shoes on the free list, when you had presented them with a free gift from the Treasury of the United States of between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000, you put a tax of 10 per cent ad valorem on boots and shoes, and that is practically as prohibitive to-day as the tax of 25 per cent was under the Dingley Act. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The importations before amounted to only about $129,000, and the total importations last year, 1910, only amounted to $175,000.

Only a difference of $46,000 in the importations of boots and shoes coming into this country after you reduce the tax from 25 per cent ad valorem to 10 per cent ad valorem. Can any man deny that it is as prohibitive a tax to-day as it was before?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I deny it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. More than that, I want to call your attention to the fact that a considerable proportion of the boots and shoes that come into this country are not competitive articles with American boots and shoes. They are fancy styles and fancy makes that are not manufactured in this country, and there is practically no competition from abroad with the boots and shoes that you and I and the people of this country wear.

Now, that being the case, where was your justification in giving this great industry out of the Public Treasury between two and three million dollars as a free gift and yet retaining a prohibitive tax on boots and shoes, when the leaders of that industry came before the Committee on Ways and Means and told you in the beginning that you need not do it? Can there be any other reason for doing it than that you wanted to protect a monopoly at the expense of the American people? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As to sewing machines, the total production, as shown by the census of 1905, amounted to over $13,000,000 in this country, and the importations amounted to nothing. The exports for 1905 amounted to over $6,000,000 and to more than seven and one-half million dollars in 1910. Why do you retain this prohibitive tax on sewing machines? A machine sells in this country to the poor workingman who earns his daily bread by daily toil at $20 to $30.

I am informed by men who have been in the oriental trade that the same machine is laid down in the Orient at $8.25, wholesale price, including freight. If that tax is not in the interest of protected monopoly, why did you keep it in the Payne bill? You get no revenue from it; not a dollar. You levy a tax without a dollar of revenue, and keep it there in order that you may have a tariff wall behind which a monopolistic combination may thrive and flourish. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We propose to put sewing machines on the free list. You may say this will not destroy the monopoly. It may be that you are right, but at any rate the law we make will not justify the monopoly. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question for information. I find in your tables that sewing machines are not reported separately for the years 1890, 1900, 1905, and 1909, but are for 1910. Have they not been segregated before?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose at the customhouse the customs figures have always kept an estimate of the sewing machines. The figures I give are taken from the Census Bureau. I think the classification of articles in the present census has been broadened over former censuses; that is, it is given more in detail than in the census of 1905 or 1890.

Now, as to cotton ties—hoop and binding ties for cotton. The production in 1905 was $12,760,000. The total imports only amounted to $7,136. The total revenue was $2,576. On the other hand, we exported $127,000 worth of cotton ties. Considering the fact that this is the chief cotton-producing country, it shows that cotton ties made in America are able to compete in the free and open markets of the world.

It further shows that the Government is deriving practically no revenue from the tax. But I go further than that. When the Wilson bill was enacted into law the Democratic Party put binding twine on the free list for the northern farmer and cotton ties on the free list for the southern farmer. Each of them sends a great crop into the market; each competes in the world markets for supremacy; and the Democratic Party thought it was just, right, and fair that when these great agricultural products had to go into the markets of the world in open competition that baling and binding twine and cotton ties should be furnished to them on the same free basis of their competitors.

We gave it to the northern farmer, we gave it to the southern farmer; but when you came to write the Dingley bill, you left the binding twine on the free list for the northern farmer, but, in the interest of the northern steel mills, you put back the tax on cotton ties with which the southern farmer has to bale his cotton crop; you put back a prohibitive tariff that raises no revenue—purely in the interest of a manufacturing enterprise that had no competition. Can your side of the House ever justify that proposition? Can you go back to your friends on the northern farms and say, "Yes; we will give you and keep on the statute books free binding twine for your benefit because you go to the markets of the world, while we will tax the southern farmer on his cotton crop in the interest of our northern monopoly"? If you are not going to do that, then why did you put it in the Dingley bill, and why did you keep it in the Payne bill, and why are you not willing to vote it off in this bill?

Practically all of the articles on this free-list bill have a prohibitive tax upon them. With the exception of one article—cotton bagging and burlaps—they produce but a few millions of revenue. I am free to admit that the duty on burlaps is not prohibitive, that it is a revenue article to-day, but I say we are justified in dispensing with the revenue on cotton bagging and burlaps and giving it to the American people, because of the conditions that exist in this country. The great cotton crop of the United States brings back to the people of this country more money than any other crop or article that we send abroad. It does more to maintain your balance of trade with the nations of the earth than any other commodity. It does more to advance your trade and commerce with other nations than any other commodity; and the cotton bagging that is made in the United States to-day is of such inferior quality, made of such poor material, that a serious loss is sustained by the producers of cotton in shipping abroad. There is not a great agricultural product in the world that is so poorly prepared for market as our cotton crop, due largely to your attempt to put a tax on these people and thereby prevent them from purchasing suitable baling cloth at a fair and reasonable price. This country loses every year in our export of cotton thousands and thousands of dollars by reason of the fact that the crop is so badly baled and poorly wrapped in American bagging and is so injured in transportation that its grade and value are reduced in the ultimate market.

Under these circumstances, notwithstanding this particular item of the bill does produce revenue, yet since our cotton-bagging industry has not been able to produce a fair and suitable covering for cotton which must go to the markets of the world, we feel justified in giving up this revenue.

Mr. Chairman, this practically covers the proposed free list we have offered, except food and food products.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will my colleague yield for a question at that point for information?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield for a question, but I prefer not to be interrupted.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I simply want to inquire from the gentleman as to wire. There are two provisions in this bill as to wire, one in lines 15 and 16, on page 2, and the other in lines 2 and 3, on page 3, and I want to ask the gentleman what kind of wire he refers to, and where that schedule is to be found under the existing tariff bill covering that particular kind of wire?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not refer the gentleman to the paragraph.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not see how the gentleman can possibly base any——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. I do not care to enter into an argument with my friend. I will try to answer the question, but I prefer not to be interrupted. The wire that is put on the free list in section 2 is intended to cover the class of wire that is used by farmers who bale hay and straw and commodities of that kind. We did not follow your example. You left binding twine free. You put back the tax on cotton ties, but when we come to put cotton ties on the free list we are also willing to put on the free list the baling wire that your northern farmer uses to bale his hay and other products.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman mean to include all wire that can by any possibility be used for binding agricultural products, or, on the other hand, for fences?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is very clear what we mean.

Mr. BARTLETT. On the next page there is a reference to fence wire.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly. I will answer the question. The intention of the committee in preparing this bill was to limit the wire that comes in to that used for baling purposes in one paragraph and in the other paragraph to limit it to barbed wire and wire used for fencing purposes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Wire suitable for fencing purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Wire suitable for fencing purposes. Of course the gentleman knows we are very large exporters of barbed wire. There can be no doubt about the classification of barbed wire, as it is used for fencing purposes only.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This is "other" wire.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, wire used for fencing purposes, wire suitable for fencing purposes. Now, wire other than barbed wire, suitable for fencing, is mesh wire, net wire, woven wire, and nobody can doubt or mistake it, for such wire is not used

for any other purpose, and the bill distinctly says, in a later clause, "suitable for fencing." I am free to say to the gentleman that it is not the intention of the committee to have the bill admit wire for other purposes than for fencing. I have no doubt when we reach the iron and steel schedule we will take up other wire, and in all probability there will be a reduction on other wire. There may be other things in the iron and steel schedule that will be placed on the free list, but this bill was not intended to cover a very comprehensive list and make everything duty free that ought to be, nor was it intended to cover all instances where duties ought to be reduced.

It is merely, as I said in the beginning, an endeavor to give to the American farmer certain things which are necessary for his prosperity in the raising of the great crops of the country, and on the other hand to remove the tariff tax from all food products which the masses of the people must buy for their everyday needs. When we take up the tariff bill, schedule by schedule, we will try to adjust rates according to our theory and belief as to what the tariff should be.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not ask these questions in a spirit of controversy at all, but it seems to me that the Treasury officials will have serious difficulty in construing the provisions of a law that is so broad, because at present wire comes in under our Treasury specifications, and I would like to know how the gentleman bases his estimate of loss of revenue on wire when there is no such provision as this in the existing tariff.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is difficult to make such estimates, but as I said in the beginning, we have overestimated the loss of revenue, because in estimating we have included barbed wire, wire rods, wire strands, or wire rope, and the duty on all of those articles in 1905 only amounted to $294,000. Of course, if the figures related to fence wire only, the duty would be very much less than the amount shown in this report. The entire clause indicates only a revenue loss for the year of less than $300,000, which is not very serious.

But I am surprised that the gentleman should call attention to the manner in which the Treasury Department is going to construe this bill when the Treasury decisions are full, page by page, of constructions of the Dingley bill, and it has really been necessary for that side of the House to establish a special court at a large expense to the American people to enable them to determine what the Payne tariff means as written by my friend from Ohio. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, the other important article of this bill is lumber. I am not going into a full discussion of the lumber tariff or the provisions of this bill in relation thereto. To some extent this bill increases the amount of free importations into this country above those contained in the reciprocity bill and in the negotiations which the President has perfected with the Dominion of Canada. The Democratic platform has declared in favor of free lumber. The importation of lumber under the Dingley bill and under the Payne bill amounts to a little over 1 per cent of our consumption.

To a large extent the lumber tariff has been prohibitive all the time. We have put lumber on the free list because we believe we are justified in dispensing with the amount of revenue involved, and we give an opportunity to the American citizen to have cheaper lumber with which to build his home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As to food products, I am not willing to say that placing food products on the free list will in all cases materially affect the price. It will, as I said in the beginning, prevent monopoly. If this bill passes, it will allow free competition between the meats of Argentina and those sold by the Beef Trust. There is no question but that to-day the price of meat affects the price of cattle, and the price of cattle is fixed by the great combinations which control the meat products of this country. These combinations fix the price of meat according to the demands of the market and the necessities of the case. This is the only way that we can secure any competition in meat products. It opens the market, especially along the eastern seaboard, to competition in meat products from Argentina. I believe this will reduce the cost of meat products and hence the cost of living. I am sure that the future will demonstrate that putting these articles on the free list will prevent the markets from being monopolized in flour and in meat for the benefit of certain special interests which control the markets. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he has any comments to make, I am perfectly willing for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield to him.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I want to know——

Mr. JAMES. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has the time.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause on the Republican side.] May I ask how much time the gentleman from Alabama used?

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly one hour.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the other day in the opening of the debate on the tariff question at this tariff session of Congress the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] felicitated himself and his party upon the wonderful work which had already been performed by that party at this session of Congress, and stated, amid wild and clamorous applause on that side of the House, that the bills already passed by the House at this session of Congress exceeded in importance all of the legislation which had been enacted during the last 16 years that the Republicans had had control of this House and the 14 years they had had control of the country. During that time probably the most important legislation which has been enacted in a century had been enacted by a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and signed by a Republican President. When we came into control 14 years ago we found a depressed and bleeding country, with industries closed, with people suffering. Our people had almost lost faith in their ability to prosper. We reminded them by our legislation that the same blood coursed through their veins which had coursed there for generations, that the same sun shone upon the same fertile fields, that the same mines were ready to be worked, that nature was as bountiful now as ever, and that with renewed courage and proper legislation prosperity might again come to the land. And fulfilling our promises, prosperity again did come to our land as it never had been exceeded before. We took up many matters of legislation after the passage of the tariff law 14 years ago and the settlement of the question as to the money standard of the country; we freed Cuba; we acquired Hawaii; we developed the agricultural resources of our country and the Agriculture Department as the greatest educator in the land; we established the principle of the irrigation of our arid lands through Government support; we adopted legislation providing for control of the railways of the country and placing the powers now found in the Interstate Commerce Commission; we passed a law for pure foods and drugs; we passed laws for safety appliances on the railroads; we provided for proper quarantine regulations; we established a Department of Commerce and Labor; we created a Bureau of Standards and a Bureau of Mines and Mining; we passed the white-slave law, now working so efficiently. In many other directions we enacted legislation which no one would repeal. And against all of these that side of the House applauded the statement that already at this session of Congress the Democrats had passed through this House, at least, more efficient legislation than we had in the 14 years preceding.

And what have they done at this session of Congress which leads the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and that side of the House to say that they have already been of greater benefit to the country than the 14 years of legislation under Republican control?

They passed a resolution providing for the election of Senators by direct vote, which was previously passed in four Republican Houses during the time the Republicans were in control, and the only change in it was one which would seek to strike down the power of the General Government to preserve itself in case of necessity.

They passed a bill providing for the publication of campaign expenses before elections instead of after, and that was a bill that was already passed at the last session by a Republican House.

They have now added the Canadian reciprocity bill, which they did not prepare.

I shall not take time to dwell upon the great achievement which the gentleman refers to in connection with the reduction of expenses in the House by cutting off what he calls useless employees. Those expenses have been reduced only in the caucus, not on the pay rolls. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I call their attention only, in passing, to the fact that while one of the officers to be dispensed with was the assistant journal clerk of the House, and the gentleman who formerly occupied that position has been discharged, the place has been filled by another man, drawing the salary but not performing the duties. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I wish, Mr. Chairman, now that my friends on the other side of the House have presented a measure which they themselves have prepared, to consider that. They did not prepare any one

of the three which they have already passed. They now present a measure which they have prepared. Let us consider their statesmanship from the point of view of their work, not from the point of view of their following our work.

The bill now under consideration proposes to put a number of things on the free list, and the first of these are agricultural implements.

This paragraph in the bill is as follows:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

As to a large share of these implements named in the bill, they are already on the free list, coming from any country which does not discriminate against us in reference to the same items. The Payne law provides that, as to a large share of the items described in the bill, they shall come in free when coming from any country which admits the same products free going from our land to their land.

Paragraph 476 of the Payne tariff law provides that—

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines, and cotton gins, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That any of the foregoing, when imported from any country, dependency, province, or colony which imposes no tax or duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be imported free of duty.

Now, the proposition in this pending bill is not for reciprocity, but to give to the other countries which discriminate against us our markets without restriction.

It is true, as suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], that the imports of agricultural implements are not large. Agricultural implements sell cheaper in the United States than in any other country in the world, and probably will continue to do so, whatever tariff regulations are made, except that with absolute free trade there will come times when other countries will dump their surplus upon us, to the demoralization of our industries. The International Harvester Co., which is usually referred to as the Agricultural Implement Trust, if I remember correctly, not only has a manufacturing plant in Canada, but one in France, in Germany, in Russia, and, I think, in Sweden. It is not unlikely that times may come from time to time when that great corporation will, in its disposition of its surplus products manufactured in these other countries, ship that surplus to be sold here, not at lower prices, but at the same price, and yet the result would be that they would be made by foreign labor and not by domestic labor at home.

We accept the proposition made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that on this side of the House we are in favor of producing at home as much of the articles consumed as we properly can and of purchasing abroad as few as we can. We prefer to consume the articles which in their manufacture have given labor to our own fellow citizens, rather than to give preference to the citizens of another country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I am led to make an inquiry of some gentleman on that side of the House who is well informed in reference to this bill, as to what it means. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] a few moments ago asked the gentleman from Alabama as to the meaning of some provisions in this bill. The gentleman from Alabama wisely, as it seemed to me, did not undertake to answer very definitely. The gentleman from Ohio, however, asked the gentleman from Alabama what he meant by a provision in the bill. It makes no difference what the gentleman from Alabama means by a provision in the bill. The question is, What does a law say? The gentleman from Alabama, or the gentleman from Ohio, or myself, will not be called upon in the courts to construe this law. Every day the customs court is now deciding questions of great importance with reference to the meaning of a law which endeavors to be very technical and very particular, but under the provisions of this bill, if it becomes a law, there will be an army of lawyers and importers and agents endeavoring to ascertain what it means. What are agricultural implements? I await the answer of any of the distinguished gentlemen in this House who claim to be the farmers' friends. What are agricultural implements? [Applause on the Republican side.] The bill says:

All other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

What are agricultural implements? Do they include horticultural implements? Do they include market-garden implements? I suppose everyone believes that a mowing machine is an agricultural implement; but is a wheelbarrow?

I hold in my hand the advertisement of Peter Henderson & Co., New York City, one of the great wholesale and retail seed houses and market-garden supply houses of the world. Are market gardens a part of agriculture? Are market-garden implements agricultural implements? Why does not some gentleman on that side of the House who knows all about the tariff give me the information?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. LENROOT will tell you.

Mr. MANN. I am not asking the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. He is not in the confidence of the gentleman who made up this bill. Can the gentleman from Tennessee tell me? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have heard many gentlemen on that side of the House describe themselves as farmers' friends, "because," each one says, "I am a farmer myself;" and yet not one of them knows what an agricultural implement is. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] And, after all, their information would not guide the court, probably, because while they often qualify themselves in this House as experts in reference to agriculture, I reckon usually it does not go any further than the floor of this House. Now, I am an agriculturist myself. [Laughter.] To me axes are agricultural implements. I can not run my farm without an ax. Can you? Are axes agricultural implements? Are they to come in free?

Mr. STANLEY. Can the gentleman run his farm without a hat?

Mr. MANN. I go bareheaded—not quite so much bareheaded as the gentleman from Kentucky, however. [Laughter.] Are forks agricultural implements? Are they to come in free?

Mr. GARRETT. Pitchforks?

Mr. MANN. Pitchforks or potato forks, whichever the gentleman prefers.

Mr. GARRETT. Table forks?

Mr. MANN. Are garden lines agricultural implements? I am reading from a catalogue of garden tools, issued by the great house of Peter Henderson & Co. The same thing will be found in every seed-house catalogue as necessary articles for market gardening. If market gardening is not a part of agriculture, what is? Are hay knives agricultural implements?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman for information.

Mr. STANLEY. I am not surprised that the agriculturalist from Chicago is pining to know what an agricultural implement is.

Mr. MANN. I am.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not think it is a matter of satire. I think it is a demonstration of candid ignorance.

Mr. MANN. That is right. Why does not the gentleman give me the information?

Mr. STANLEY. An agricultural implement, generically speaking, is an implement used in the tilling of the soil, whether you are raising a potato or raising an ear of corn. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman, then, includes all market gardening tools?

Mr. STANLEY. Why, certainly. I would not cut the gardeners out. You would.

Mr. MANN. All right. Are knives agricultural implements?

Mr. STANLEY. Not table knives.

Mr. MANN. That is not the question. Are budding knives agricultural implements? They are used in every nursery in the country.

Mr. STANLEY. If they are used in tilling the soil, they would be.

Mr. MANN. They are used in connection with the tilling of the soil. The gentleman from Iowa here, who is a nurseryman, knows that you can not run a nursery without them.

Mr. LOBECK. Is a budding knife kept for sale in an agricultural implement store? You never saw one there. I would like to ask the gentleman if he ever saw a budding knife in an agricultural store?

Mr. MANN. Not only have I seen them sold there, but I have purchased them there. I expect the gentleman does not know what a budding knife is.

Mr. LOBECK. The gentleman knows what a budding knife is.

Mr. MANN. I have known one ever since I was so high, and I know how to use them, too.

Mr. LOBECK. They are kept in the hardware stores.

Mr. MANN. Of course garden rakes are agricultural implements; are saws? You can not run a nursery without a saw; you can not prune trees without a saw; and you can not run a horticultural orchard without a saw. Are they agricultural implements?

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. I am somewhat surprised——

Mr. MANN. I knew that. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Doubtless your side is surprised to find trouble with the bill.

Mr. STANLEY. We are more surprised than troubled or dismayed. It is not difficult to draw a distinction between those implements which are necessary for the cultivation of the soil and those implements, like carpenters' tools, that a farmer might use in cutting down a tree, or those necessary articles of clothing that he might have to put on before going out to cultivate the farm. I do not anticipate that the court would find itself in any such maze as does the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Even in Kentucky where they have orchards they have to have saws; they are essential to the proper maintenance of the nursery. You can not maintain an apple orchard without the use of a saw. I do not think you could do that in Kentucky, for I know that when Kentucky does things it does them well. All over the country they have great orchards, and in every orchard there must be different kinds of saws. Is not that agriculture; does not agriculture include horticulture?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Does the gentleman think that a saw is a farming implement or a carpenter's implement—what is his opinion?

Mr. MANN. I say without hesitation that it will require the construction of the court, and the construction is doubtful when you say that agricultural implements of all kinds and descriptions shall be brought in. There was never a tariff bill passed before with such general language. It has always been the custom to provide, for instance, in regard to agricultural implements "not herein otherwise provided for," or "not specially provided for." There has been no difficulty in the tariff laws, as a rule, because of other things that are particularly specified, but when you leave out that provision and undertake by general provision to cover everything of the kind it repeals everything in the existing law.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman speaks about specifications in the former tariff bill. If I recollect, paragraph 476 of the Payne-Aldrich bill does not specify anything except farm implements.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not recollect it correctly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Has the gentleman a copy of the bill?

Mr. MANN. I have. What paragraph did the gentleman say?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Paragraph 476.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I will tell the gentleman what that covers. That covers plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural tools, planters, mowers, horserakes, thrashing machines, and cotton gins, with a provision that they shall be admitted free from any country which admits the same products from here there.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I do not want to divert the gentleman's attention.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman need not be afraid of that.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I want to get some information.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman and I are in the same pursuit.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I wish the gentleman would inform the House how many countries give us reciprocal free trade on farm implements.

Mr. MANN. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Can the gentleman name any country except England?

Mr. MANN. I can not give the gentleman the information.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I have heard the statement made on the floor.

Mr. MANN. Practically all the European countries have a tariff on farm implements going there.

Now, let us take another thing. What does the expression "farm wagons and farm carts" mean? Does that mean a wagon that has to be used on the farm, or a kind of a wagon that can be purchased and used in town? Is the Treasury Department to follow up the wagon and see whether Mr. Smith puts it on his farm or uses it in town? [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] Can a man who runs a cart here in Washington buy it as a farm cart, if he takes it to his farm, without duty, and can he bring it into town and use it here, or must he pay duty on it then? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Can anyone tell me on the Democratic side of this House—this wise bunch of statesmen who have finally drawn a bill of their own after passing three which we have prepared?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would the gentleman construe an automobile as an agricultural implement? Farmers use them during Republican administrations.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman means those who farm the farmers use them. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Now, the bill provides agricultural implements, in whole or in part, of every kind and description. Does that include shafting of all kinds?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman just now asked what the expression "agricultural implements" meant. Does the gentleman know of any decision of the customs authorities with reference to whether, in section 476 of the Payne bill, the language "agricultural drills, planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines" is confined to those used on the farm, or whether it would apply to such as are used by Peter Henderson in raising feed or garden truck?

Mr. MANN. I think if the gentleman reads the section again, he will not ask the question. The section that the gentleman refers to does not cover all agricultural implements.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say that it did. I asked the gentleman a plain question—whether or not the language "agricultural drills, planters, mowers, horserakes, and cultivators," and so forth, would be construed to apply to a drill, a planter, a mower, a horserake, or a cultivator used by such men engaged in such business as Peter Henderson, whom the gentleman cited?

Mr. MANN. Certainly. The kind of implements specifically described includes all of them, whoever they are used by. There is no doubt or uncertainty about that.

Now, probably gentlemen on the other side of the House have not discovered the fact that "other agricultural implements" are not brought in under paragraph 476 of the Payne law. Other agricultural implements are brought in under the provisions with reference to manufactured articles paying a duty according to the chief value, as to whether the chief value is metal or wood. There are only certain implements brought in under paragraph 476, and they are specifically mentioned, but this bill throws wide open the door without mentioning or defining in any way that anyone can tell whether the thing brought in is agricultural or not. Let us take shafting. You can not run a thrashing machine without shafting.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why, they have to use shafting on grinding machines on the farm.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman a question. Would not the Treasury officials, in construing a Democratic law extending the free list, construe it liberally so as to cover just as many articles as the language would possibly include?

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman himself think it would cover all kinds of shafting?

Mr. SIMS. I would want it to cover everything that I think that reasonable construction of language would give.

Mr. MANN. But that is the question, What will it cover? Does it include all kinds of shafting?

Mr. SIMS. Solve the doubt in favor of free trade. That is what I mean.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman will not be called upon to construe the language, nor would he solve it either.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman has read from somebody's advertising list here of a great many articles and propounded the inquiry as to whether or not under the pending bill they would be admitted free as agricultural implements. I want to call his attention to this part of the bill under consideration, with a view of seeing whether or not the language contained in the bill is not broad enough to admit the very things he has enumerated free of duty. It reads:

> And on all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman thinks it would admit it.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I believe it would.

Mr. MANN. How about saws?

Mr. COX of Indiana. If it is an agricultural implement. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have not any doubt.

Mr. MANN. All saws would be imported as agricultural implements, all shafting would be imported as parts of agricultural implements, all bolts would be imported as parts of agricultural implements, and knives would be imported as parts of

agricultural implements. Agricultural implements would be broadened out to include much; then what would you have left?

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. I do.

Mr. OLMSTED. If the term "agricultural implements" be construed into the broad free-trade one suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee and intimated by the gentleman from Indiana, would it not vastly reduce the revenues of the Government far beyond the amount estimated in the report of the committee in favor of this bill?

Mr. MANN. Of course that is self-evident. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to spend too much time on agricultural implements——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. It is very interesting; go ahead.

Mr. MANN (continuing). Because I have much more interesting matter. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I have some tables and letters here, Mr. Chairman, which I think I will not take the time to read, and I would ask leave now to insert them in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks leave to insert the matter indicated in his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. I call to the attention of the House the following:

Comparative statement of the retail prices of binders, mowers, reapers, and rakes in the United States and the principal European countries as shown by the reports of Bureau of Manufactures, United States Department of Commerce and Labor.

	Binders.	Reapers.	Mowers.	Rakes.
United States	$125.00	$75.00	$30.00	$22.00
Great Britain	135.16	81.22	55.80	26.70
France	173.70	105.18	63.69	29.91
Germany	203.00	113.60	67.50	27.00
Denmark	167.50	91.12	60.30	20.82
Sweden	160.80	80.04	60.30	24.12
Hungary	243.60	121.80	81.20	36.54
South Russia	169.95	96.82	66.95	27.29
North Russia	180.25	91.70	66.95	29.05
West Siberia	167.98	101.97	72.10	30.90

NOTE.—The foreign prices are taken from the official reports published in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports:

French prices, issue of Feb. 23, 1909 (No. 3413).

Prices for Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary, Russia, and west Siberia, issue of Mar. 3, 1909 (No. 3420).

Prices in Great Britain, issue of Apr. 8, 1909 (No. 3450).

And here is a letter from the general manager of the International Harvester Co.:

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.,
Chicago, April 18, 1911.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Answering you favor of April 14, I beg to say:

First. This company would not be seriously affected by placing agricultural implements on the free list. Its only objection is to accomplishing that purpose by a general law instead of by a reciprocity agreement under which this country would obtain some compensating benefit from the abolition of the duty. We have long been in favor of reciprocal trade agreements with other nations, because only through them can American foreign trade be built up or maintained. High foreign tariffs and the lack of reciprocity treaties have made it necessary for this company to establish manufacturing plants in Canada, France, Germany, Russia, and Sweden.

Second. The placing of agricultural implements upon the free list would not, we think, materially reduce their price in this country or cause any large importation of them, because of the low prices at which such implements are now sold. But if the prices are thereby reduced and foreign importations are largely increased, the hundreds of American manufacturers of agricultural implements who have not plants in foreign countries would certainly have good reason to object.

Third. The goods manufactured by this company—and we believe it is true generally of American agricultural implements—are sold in foreign countries, Canada included, at prices very considerably higher than are paid for the same implements in the United States. This subject was fully investigated by the Bureau of Manufactures more than two years ago. The Daily Consular and Trade Reports of February, March, and April, 1909, show that the American farmer buys his harvesting machinery for lower prices than they can be bought for anywhere else in the world.

In our opinion a reciprocal trade agreement is a better plan for accomplishing the desired results than a general law under which we obtain no compensating benefits.

Very truly, yours, C. S. FUNK, *General Manager.*

Now, I ask for information as to what the provision of the bill in reference to burlaps and sacking covers? It says:

And burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other materials suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

What is an agricultural product? Is flour? Does this propose to admit free of duty cotton flour sacking? Can anybody tell? Does anybody know? Is it proposed to admit free of duty the class of cotton now so largely made in the South, the cheaper cloth, much of which is used for sacking? Is it, or is it not? Does anyone know? Is not it just as well in passing a great tariff measure to find out in advance a few things that it means? Does anyone know what a burlap is? I have heard of burlaps for covering cotton. I have hung them on my walls for decoration. They are a very popular style now to decorate the walls in place of wall paper, a little more expensive, perhaps, than the burlap for baling cotton, but the burlap that is composed wholly or in part of jute under this will be admitted free. If you look at the dictionary you will find that burlap means a material made from hemp or jute. This changes the ordinary definition, and properly enough—burlaps made from anything, naming a lot of articles. Oilcloth is a burlap—it may be a very good thing to admit it free—burlap with a little paint crushed into it, or something of that sort. Is it to be admitted free or not? Gentlemen will notice in the bill in reference to wire quite a discrimination in two parts of the bill. I assume that when gentlemen preparing language to place in the same law relating to the same subject make a discrimination that they mean a discrimination.

In lines 15 and 16 it provides for admitting free wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products. It must be assumed that such wire is for the purpose of baling. Wire under that provision can only be admitted which is for the purpose of baling, and that is fairly definite, though in all previous tariff laws it has been considered proper, I believe, to describe definitely the size of wires by gauge, the gauge of wires being standard and well known, so that anyone familiar would know what it meant. But when it comes to the top of page 3 it is proposed to admit all kinds of "wire suitable for fencing." Telegraph wire is suitable for fencing. Is it to come in free? I understood the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to say that wire for fencing was only barbed wire or made-up wire. Why, not at all. There are many methods now of clasping together two lines of wire so as to make a fence on the farm, not made up anywhere else. I have put them together myself within the last year—good-sized wire, fastened together by yourself on the farm, and that wire is certainly suitable for fencing. It is about the size of telegraph wire. Is it to come in free? Is telephone wire to come in free, too? Does anybody know? What is the size of wire suitable for fencing? I dare say that many a farmer uses baled-hay wire for repairing fences—that would come in free—but does wire suitable for fencing include every size between that and the large size that is used sometimes for fencing and which is very heavy?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why should it not?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman think this includes copper wire, as well as steel wire?

Mr. MANN. I made up my own mind on the subject that the only thing it would exclude, practically, would be copper wire, because not even our fanciest farmers could use copper wire for fencing.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But it would be suitable for fencing.

Mr. MANN. It would, except for the price. But it would include practically all kinds of steel wire. Is that the intention? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said no, but the bill says yes. Which will you take? Which do you think the court will look at—what some man says on the floor of the House in a speech or what the law reads which is laid before him?

I shall not discuss at length the cotton-tie proposition. I have heard it said, though I do not vouch for the accuracy of the statement, that cotton ties are put in bundles of 30 ties, which weigh 45 pounds. Is that correct? That makes a pound and a half to a tie, and I am informed that they sell for about 2 cents a pound anywhere in the country; that it takes 6 ties to bale a bale of cotton, which ties would weigh 9 pounds and cost the farmer 18 cents; that in selling cotton in the market the purchaser pays for the tie in the baling up to 20 pounds or 22 pounds.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I can state to the gentleman that his information on that subject is absolute misinformation. May I make a statement?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. In the contracts for export cotton agreements are always made where a deduction of 6 per cent from the amount of the value of the bale of cotton, or the bales of cotton, is deducted for tare, and in the domestic contracts the contract is made for a deduction of from 4 to 5 per cent for tare. And some time during this debate I hope to present to

the House facts that will absolutely refute the information which the gentleman said he has obtained.

Mr. MANN. I think it would be well to refute it, because I understand that on those exchanges which deal in cotton—and I do not vouch for the information—as a matter of fact, they do allow the tare to the extent of 20 pounds.

Mr. BARTLETT. Twenty-two to 26 pounds.

Mr. MANN. Twenty-two pounds.

Mr. BARTLETT. Twenty-two to 26 pounds.

Mr. MANN. And that, as a result, the farmer who pays 18 cents for the cotton ties that bale his cotton receives 14 cents a pound for them.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is absolutely misinformed on that subject.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman himself to admit that on the exchanges they did allow tare to the extent of 22 pounds.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say on the exchanges. I said in making the sale and fixing the price; when you sell cotton for export a deduction of 6 per cent is made, and in making sales in the domestic market a deduction of from 4 to 5 per cent is made.

Mr. MANN. Very well. On this subject I call attention to the following letter:

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION,
New York, April 18, 1911.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring further to your letter of the 14th instant with reference to the above bill, which proposes to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots, shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Permit me to call your attention to various steel products covered by the bill:

Cotton ties.—The present duty, under paragraph 125 of the Payne tariff law, is three-tenths cent per pound, while the corresponding paragraph in the Dingley law provided a rate of five-tenths cent per pound.

Cotton ties are put up in bundles, each bundle containing 30 ties weighing 45 pounds, or an average of 1½ pounds per tie. According to the rules adopted by all the cotton exchanges in the United States and the leading commercial association of cotton buyers 6 ties weighing 9 pounds are ordinarily used to each bale of cotton. These ties are retailed, delivered at the railroad stations throughout the cotton belt, at about 2 cents per pound, making the cost to the farmer 18 cents per bale of cotton. One bale of cotton weighing 500 pounds gross, valued at 14 cents per pound, is worth $70. The farmer at present pays 18 cents for the cotton ties and sells them, included in the weight of his bale of cotton, for $1.26. Based on the present market price of a bale of cotton, the cost of the cotton ties is equivalent to about one-fourth of 1 per cent of the total value of the bale. The duty on 9 pounds of cotton ties required for a bale of cotton at three-tenths cent per pound is 2.7 cents, equivalent to about one-twenty-fifth of 1 per cent of the total value of the bale.

According to the rules and practice of the New York Cotton Exchange, cotton has always been sold at the gross weight, which includes the weight of the cotton ties and the bagging. This same rule and practice prevail in all the cotton exchanges throughout the United States. The standard practice, covering all contracts for the purchase or sale of cotton, provides a limit of 22 pounds per bale for the weight of the bagging and the cotton ties. All tare (that is, weight of bagging and cotton ties) in excess of 22 pounds is not paid for.

Wire rods.—Paragraph No. 134 of the Payne tariff bill provides a duty of three-tenths cent per pound, equivalent to $6.72 per gross ton.

The average manufacturing cost of this commodity in the United States is about $27 per gross ton, f. o. b. works at Pittsburg, Birmingham, or Chicago. The foreign manufacturers' selling price, f. o. b. New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Savannah, Mobile, Pensacola, New Orleans, or Galveston, is $27 per gross ton. The duty of $6.72 per gross ton provided in the present tariff is barely sufficient to cover the difference between the cost of manufacture in the United States and the principal manufacturing countries of Europe.

Barbed fence wire, wire strands, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and wire staples.—All of these materials are galvanized steel products manufactured from wire rods. The cost of converting the rods into these finished commodities is much higher in the United States than it is in any of the principal manufacturing countries of Europe, owing to the higher labor cost prevailing in this country.

The present duty of three-fourths of a cent per pound on barbed wire is believed to be hardly equivalent to the lower cost of production of European manufacturers, as compared with the manufacturing cost in the United States.

Wire rope.—This commodity is manufactured from either plain or galvanized wire. The process of manufacture requires large and expensive plants, equipped with special machinery and employing skilled labor at high wages.

The rates of duty provided in the present tariff range from 2 to 2.70 cents per pound. The placing of wire rope on the free list would have a most serious, if not disastrous, effect on the industry in this country.

The average daily wage earnings at wire mills in this country are as follows:

Average daily wage earnings at wire mills.

Foremen	$4.25
Wire drawers	3.35
Cleaners and coaters	$1.65–3.00
Annealers	1.80–2.25
Nail-machine operators	1.60–3.00
Inspectors	1.65–3.25
Galvanizers	2.55–3.25
Barb wire and fence machine operators	1.85–4.85
Stationary engineers	2.40–3.40
Machinists	2.10–3.60
Millwrights	2.60–3.65
Ordinary labor, 14 to 22 cents per hour	1.65–2.65
Approximate average for all labor employed around wire mills	2.65

The above scale of wages is about two and one-fifth times greater than that prevailing in the same industry in Great Britain, Germany, France, and Belgium; in other words, the wages paid in the iron and steel industry in European countries are about 55 per cent less than those paid for the same labor in this country.

Under these circumstances, it is quite evident that the placing of the foregoing articles on the free list will have a disastrous effect upon the manufacturing industries of this country, entailing great hardship and loss of employment to a vast number of American workmen.

The only way in which American manufacturers could hope to compete with European manufacturers in this market would be to reduce the American wage scale to the level of that paid European workmen. Owing to the high standards of living enjoyed by our working people, such a readjustment could not be accomplished without great suffering and a possible paralysis of business.

Yours, very truly,

E. H. GARY, *Chairman.*

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the provision in reference to leather and boots and shoes. It is one of the curiosities of legislation, and I would not submit the statement that I propose to make without having first submitted it to a Treasury expert for opinion, to see whether I was an infernal fool or not. [Laughter.] The paragraph in this free-list bill reads as follows:

Grain, buff, split, rough, and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Hides of cattle are free, and under the bill it is proposed to make leather and boots and shoes made from cattle hides free. That is all right. That is euphonious. But we import a great quantity of leather which is not made from hides of cattle or calfskin, and this does not admit, as I understand it, patent, japanned, varnished, or enameled leather free made from kid or goat skins. The law puts quite a tariff on that character of leather. This would admit boots and shoes made for the farmer free, but not boots and shoes made for his wife free, because her shoes are not made from cattle hides. But what does it do? Having kept a tariff on enameled and japanned and patent leather, it admits them free if they are partly manufactured. The manufacturer in this country who is making boots and shoes is compelled to pay a tariff on his patent or enameled or varnished leather or any kid or goat skin leather, but if he will have it cut into uppers in the other country it comes in free of duty. How philosophical that is! [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The raw material can not be admitted free, but if it be manufactured partly abroad, then it can be brought in free——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Thereby helping American labor—nit! [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. What does it do? Leaving the tariff on fancy leather, kid leather, and goat leather of all kinds, it then admits free of duty leather of all sorts cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles. Keeping the tariff on all kinds of leather except cattle leather, it admits free of duty all other kinds of leather if partly manufactured, which would admit gloves free if partly manufactured. You keep a tariff on the kid and goat skins, but if they cut them up ready to be sewed into gloves, then they are to be admitted free. If they cut them up into shoe uppers or vamps, then they are to be admitted free. If they cut up leather to be made into belts, then it is to be admitted free.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] was candid in saying that this was not a protective measure. But I had supposed that even on that side of the House it was not desired to legislate against equality of American manufactures. And yet here is a premium put directly in the bill upon the manufacture abroad instead of at home. If the manufacturer here wants to keep on making shoes and not pay the tariff on the leather and bring in the shoe uppers and vamps manufactured abroad, he can bring them in free. What wonderful statesmanship that is! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The total importations of leather and tanned skins and manufactures of the same in the last fiscal year were valued at sixteen million and odd dollars, on which the duties were five million and odd dollars, equivalent to 32.01 per cent.

In the report of the Committee on Ways and Means the value of the importations for last year under the leather and boot and shoe paragraph was given at $1,319,622. But, as a matter of fact, apparently nearly all of the $16,000,000 worth could and probably would be brought in free if partly manufactured or cut into forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles, and the estimate in the report of the committee as to the tariff collected is therefore wholly misleading.

Mr. Chairman, I have had not a great deal of personal sympathy with those gentlemen engaged in the boot and shoe busi-

ness who were vigorously insisting upon having free hides and yet want a tariff on shoes, especially since many of them stated when they were urging the removal of the tariff on hides that they would be satisfied at the same time to have the tariff taken off shoes.

If they were the only ones involved, it would not matter much to me; but after all it is to the interest of our country to have as much as possible of the business in the way of manufacturing done at home, and I protest against a bill which gives not equality but preference to the manufacturer abroad. [Applause on the Republican side.] Having provided first in the bill that leather partly manufactured shall come in free, while the same leather if not manufactured at all pays a duty, it then proposes to put the product of the shoemaker upon the free list, but leave him still to pay a tariff on the things which he uses.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. In 1909 our exports of leather, shoes, and harness were $41,000,000. Since free hides have been given to these gentlemen they exported in 1910 $51,127,000 worth of boots and shoes, harness, and leather goods. Does the gentleman seriously contend that these gentlemen who are able to export $51,000,000 worth of goods, and sell them in competition with what the gentleman calls the poorly paid labor of foreign countries, need that protection when it comes to selling at home, when the freight rates are in their favor? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have often observed that anybody on the Democratic side of the House can get up and ask a question amid wild applause by some of the new Members on that side.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If the applause is offensive to the gentleman, I ask the gentlemen who indulged in it to withdraw it.

Mr. MANN. The applause is not offensive to the gentleman at all. I admire both the spirit and the ignorance from which it proceeds. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am sure——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to both gentlemen at once.

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman from Illinois think that a new Member has not even the right to applaud?

Mr. MANN. I think he has a right, and I love to see him exercise it, as the gentleman from Oklahoma often did when he first came here. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am sure the gentleman loves to hear that applause, because this is not the first time that he has alluded to applause that has come from this side of the House when somebody on this side has landed on him; and because he has so frequently alluded to the applause over here, I am sure that he must love it.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I am not objecting, even to the gentleman from Missouri, who often submits remarks, but seldom information. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is not argument, and I will make no reply to it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because of the confusion that existed, I was unable to catch the gentleman's reply to the question of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. Will the gentleman from Illinois repeat it?

Mr. MANN. At the proper time I propose to answer the gentleman from Kentucky. I should like to make this remark——

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to his colleague?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois if, in alluding to the applause of new Members, he meant thereby to say that the new Members on this side of the House would not have made the applause if such new Members were properly informed as to the subject matter under discussion?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's question is so involved that I will undertake to read it in the RECORD later, and at some time in the future, if I have time, will reply to it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois again yield to his colleague?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to know if the reference made by the gentleman from Illinois to the new Members and to the applause of the new Members was intended to say to them that they were too ignorant to know the subject matter under discussion?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if I were compelled to answer that question I might answer it one way as applied to the gentleman now addressing me and another way as applied to the other members of the committee. For that reason I prefer not to answer it. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I prefer to proceed for a moment. The question submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] shows what seems to me a very creditable record on the part of the shoe manufacturers of the country, and while he assumes that because they have done a great business, therefore they ought to be swatted in the face, I think because they do a great business they are entitled to a fair consideration and a hearing before adverse legislation by Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JAMES. The point to which I referred——

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my answer to his question——

Mr. JAMES. I thought the gentleman was through; his side seemed to think so.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. No; that was only one volley. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. What is proposed by the bill? The American shoe manufacturer to-day is at least on even terms with his foreign competitor. You say that he has the advantage of a tariff of 5 or 10 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman sufficient time to conclude his remarks.

Mr. MANN. It will be claimed by the gentleman from Kentucky that the American manufacturer now has an advantage in his favor by reason of the tariff. That is true. What does the gentleman propose to do? Under this tariff which we have had in our favor we have built up a great industry, which has exported goods abroad. These gentlemen by this bill propose to strike down that industry and take away not the advantage only which the American manufacturer has, but to give his foreign competitor the advantage. Take the leather of the tanner. You propose to admit leather made from cattle hides free of duty, but you propose to leave the tariff on tanning extract. Is that fair?

We imported last year 98,000,000 pounds of tanning extract and paid a tariff on it. We imported 90,000,000 pounds of quebracho extract, upon which there was collected a tariff of three-quarters of a cent a pound. Do you think it is placing the tanner on an equal footing with his foreign competitor to give him free hides and give them free hides, and make the American tanner pay for his tanning extract and give them their tanning extract free of duty?

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. JAMES. Does the gentleman seriously contend that these boot and shoe manufacturers, who went before the Ways and Means Committee and said, "If you will give us free hides, you can take off the tariff on boots and shoes," are in any danger when they are now exporting $13,000,000 worth of boots and shoes to every part of the civilized world and selling them in competition with foreign competitors, where they have to pay the freight before they can get on the ground? Does not the gentleman think they are fairly safe when they have the freight rate on their side and free hides given to them?

Mr. MANN. In the first place, they do not have the freight rate on their side. If the gentleman from Kentucky was as familiar with the freight question as he is with many others, he would know that it is often possible to ship goods from here or from a much more distant point in the country to Europe for less money than it costs to ship them from here to New York City.

Mr. JAMES. My experience——

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's experience with foreign freight rates is nil.

Mr. JAMES. My experience with the American manufacturer is that he is as cool, clear-headed, and long sighted as any manufacturer in foreign countries when it comes to obtaining freight rates.

Mr. MANN. I expect the gentleman's experience with the foreign manufacturer is not very great.

Mr. JAMES. That may be true.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that it is as great as mine, and I do not profess to have any great experience on the subject. Now, what does this bill propose to do here? To levy a penalty on the American manufacturer. How has the American

manufacturer achieved his success in the foreign market in making his shoes? We developed the shoe machinery for the making of cheap shoes. We put our ingenuity to work to provide machinery which has driven out the shoemaker in the country everywhere, nearly, and shoes are now made cheaply by machinery. But does the gentleman from Kentucky or anybody else think that a monopoly of brains or ingenuity remains in America? Germans have their men over here now studying our manufacture of shoes and our machinery.

Our shoe manufacturers are within the control of a patent monopoly on shoe machines. The foreign manufacturer is not within the control of a patent monopoly on shoe machinery, because in Germany and in France and other countries there is competition in this shoe machinery, all in the main modeled after our shoe machinery, but over there not controlled by the patents which control it here. They are able to produce in many instances now, and their trade is growing, the same kind of shoes, made with the same machinery, with cheaper labor, than our manufacturers can do. But you propose to keep a tariff on rubber cement which goes into shoes of 20 per cent, of 25 per cent on cotton drill or duck which goes into shoes, of 45 per cent on eyelets, or more if they are celluloid, of 44 cents per pound and 50 per cent on felt of wool that goes into shoes, or 45 per cent if it is felt of cotton. There are other articles that go into the making of shoes that have a tariff upon them. You propose to leave the tariff on all of these things that go into shoes, the cost of which amounts to considerable, and take off the tariff from the finished product, and then say to the manufacturer, you are on even terms with the foreign manufacturer, although the foreign manufacturer does not have to pay this tariff.

I shall insert in the RECORD some letters I have received in regard to boots and shoes and leather in relation to the free list:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SHOE AND LEATHER ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO APRIL 17, 1911.

Whereas a bill is pending before Congress which seeks to place leather, shoes, and harness on the free list; and

Whereas our industries could not compete successfully with the products of foreign countries made under lower wage conditions without such measure of protection as may be necessary to offset the difference in the low cost of labor in foreign countries and the cost of labor of American mechanics; and

Whereas the production of shoes, leather, and harness are independent competitive industries to a greater extent than almost any other; and

Whereas the complication and ramifications are so many that tariff changes, if any, should be made only after a most thorough study of conditions and labor costs at home and abroad, and also the consideration of the duties now imposed on component parts and articles entering into the cost of leather, shoes, and harness which now are admitted free in competitive foreign countries; and

Whereas this measure was drawn without hearings or opportunity being given anyone to submit evidence as to its effect upon the many thousands of establishments and workpeople scattered over every State; and

Whereas the placing of leather, shoes, and harness on the free list also controverts alike the protective and revenue principles of tariff legislation; and

Whereas the placing of these articles upon the free list would be unwarranted, revolutionary, and a radical departure from all previous legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we protest against the Underwood bill in so far as it attempts to place leather, shoes, and harness on the free list, and demand that our industries be granted hearings before being subjected to drastic, injurious, and unjust legislation.

Similar resolutions were passed by the National Association of Tanners:

AMERICAN OAK LEATHER CO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, April 18, 1911.

DEAR SIR: Replying to yours of the 14th, referred to us from our Chicago house, we believe it would be a serious mistake in the present condition of the leather industry to put leather on the free list.

European tanners now have several advantages in the production of leather, and to put it on the free list would enable them to produce and market their product in this country at prices to meet which would show a loss to our home industry.

We now have to import large quantities of hides, some from Europe, others from countries which can deliver in Europe to better advantage than to our country.

Most of our tanneries are far inland, necessitating heavy railroad-freight charges on hides imported. Also freight rates on leather from these inland tanneries to New England States are much greater than the freight from Europe to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore.

We have to import large quantities of tanning extract; quebracho alone amounted to 147,109,443 pounds in 1909, which is taxed three-fourths cent per pound. English tanners get this free of duty.

The price of cod oil is increased by the import duty of 15 cents per gallon. The same applies to linseed oil, of which we use large quantities, taxed at 15 cents per gallon. These only as part of the materials used carrying a tax.

All these items being free of duty in England, and with their cheaper labor and low ocean rate of freight, if not prevented by an import tax, the English tanner will be able to put his leather into the large eastern shoe manufacturing cities at a less price than at which it can possibly be produced in our home tanneries.

Heavy leathers now have only a protective duty of 5 per cent, and our markets are at any time subject to being invaded by European tanners to our serious embarrassment.

We earnestly protest against any further reduction of import duty on any grades of leather.

Yours, truly, THE AMERICAN OAK LEATHER CO.
By J. F. TAYLOR, *Treasurer.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

APRIL 18, 1911.

Hon. O. W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have before me House bill 4413, which was introduced by you April 12.

Referring to lines 15 to 22, inclusive, which refer to boots, shoes, leathers, and kindred articles, will try and explain our position as it appeals to me, with a view of attempting to get you to alter your views as regards the boot and shoe trade.

As the bill reads, you have made all shoes free, except those made from goatskin and patent leather, shoes made from sides or goatskins, as well as any shoes made from fabrics, and all shoes made out of any leathers not of the bovine species.

Your bill reads so that only leathers of the bovine species are admitted free. Finished kid skins and all kinds of varnished or enameled leather, which, if leather is to be put on the free list, should also be included.

If shoes and leather are to be free, why these exceptions?

If boots and shoes and all finished leathers are to be on the free list, can you expect shoe manufacturers to meet competitive conditions unless all the materials which are used in making a pair of shoes are also on the free list? This applies with equal force to any and all the ingredients which may be used in tanning leather.

For your information I want to give you a few of the many items that are used in making a pair of shoes: Rubber cement, cotton drill and duck, various dressings, eyelets (brass, steel, enameled, and celluloid), buttons, felt, flannel, flour, rubber goring, glue, laces, nails of different sizes and kinds, needles, oilcloth, paste, pitch, rivets, shellac, silk thread, silk for top facing, stays of cloth, linen thread, cotton thread, twine, velvet, tacks, wax, wire (brass and steel).

Surely it is not expected that shoe manufacturers in America can compete with Europeans and have any of the materials which they use dutiable and have the finished product—boots and shoes—free. Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that we have in the United States about 1,300 shoe manufacturers and about 2,500 jobbers, all competing and striving for business. Naturally, with such intense internal competition it is but right to assume, and justly so, that shoes are sold at a very small margin of profit; in fact, so small that, although shoemaking is one of the largest industries, it is one of the most unremunerative.

Take, for instance, shoe machinery; it is to-day absolutely in the control of one company, and whatever price it may put on its shoe machinery or the conditions it may make must be complied with by the shoe manufacturer. Certainly, if shoes are admitted free, shoe machinery should also be free of duty, as Europeans not only have the same machines which we use, made by the same company, but, in addition, have independent companies competing, which give them a decided advantage.

During the last tariff readjustment, if you will remember, hides were made free, boots and shoes were reduced to a 10 per cent ad valorem basis, sole leather was cut to a 5 per cent ad valorem basis, and calfskins were reduced to 15 per cent ad valorem, and we do not believe that any further reduction on any of these commodities would be for the general good of the industry; in fact, we know from the facts we have at our command that a further reduction would very greatly cripple the industry mentioned.

Take, for instance, a welt shoe such as is manufactured in the West, which retails at $3.50 to $6 per pair; the actual labor cost on that shoe varies in different localities and according to the quality of the work from 40 to 70 cents per pair. We have a duty of 10 per cent at this time on these shoes, while the labor cost of Europe is from 40 to 60 per cent less. Unless we have some protection, I am afraid it will be a very sad day for the shoe manufacturer, and this is a condition that I do not believe you want to bring about.

We do not feel that the Democratic Party would be justified in singling out an industry which has developed as the boot and shoe manufacturing industry, free of any trust agreement or arrangement, and leaving many of the other large industries closely allied, strongly protected, intrenched as they now are.

I believe you ought to be fair and meet the issue squarely. Our industry to-day is not overprotected in any sense, and a 10 per cent duty is no more than we have a right to expect under the present condition in this country.

I hope you will reconsider this matter, and for the present at least see your way clear to eliminate boots and shoes from the free list.

If you persist in putting boots and shoes on the free list, leaving all other manufactured articles dutiable, the shoe manufacturer of necessity must reduce wages to the European basis in order to compete, and will be at a serious disadvantage, as skilled labor will seek the other fields and work in those industries that have a protected wage.

Hoping you will pardon the length of this letter, but being vitally interested I wanted to give you all the facts as best I could, and beg to remain,

Very respectfully, yours, THE FLORSHEIM SHOE CO.
By MILTON S. FLORSHEIM, *President.*

CHICAGO, *April 18, 1911.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledging receipt of your letter of the 14th instant inclosing copy of bill 4413 for our consideration and answering your inquiry as to our objection to and the effect of the passage of such a bill, would state if this bill becomes a law it will result in incalculable harm to the shoe manufacturing industry of this country; it will vastly increase importations from abroad, especially on the cheaper and medium grades of boots and shoes, and in our opinion it will ultimately tend toward a reduction in the prices paid for labor by boot and shoe manufacturers in this country in competition with the cheaper labor of Europe, especially of Germany, France, and Austria, where wages in the shoe manufacturing industry are far below those paid in this country.

You may or not be aware of the fact that European countries, especially Germany, are importing our lasts, patterns, and shoe machinery where it is superior to their own and sending their young men over here to learn the American system of shoe manufacturing. It is only fair to assume that with their splendid industrial equipment they will soon invade this market.

We therefore respectfully protest against the passage of this bill, especially without a proper hearing of the shoe interests, whose very life would be jeopardized if this bill were to become a law. We are amazed that an attempt should be made to effect the passage of this bill without granting the shoe interests involved the courtesy of presenting evidence of the evil effects of this bill on so great an industry as the shoe industry of this country.

We thank you for calling our attention to the bill, and hope we may count upon your assistance in securing an immediate hearing for the shoe interests by the Ways and Means Committee before the bill leaves that committee.

Yours, respectfully,

SELZ, SCHWAB & CO.,
J. HARRY SELZ,
Second Vice President.

J. P. SMITH SHOE CO.,
Chicago, April 17, 1911.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: I have your letter of April 14 regarding the new free-list bill in reference to boots and shoes. My brother, Edward Smith, has also referred your letter to him to me to reply to.

I am inclosing you a circular letter to the members of the National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, under date of April 13, from the National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, and I believe this letter will give you more information than you could reach from any other source.

The manufacturing of shoes in this country that are sold to the consumers up to $4 per pair is done on very close margins, and with the exception of the manufacturers who do an exceedingly large volume of business the manufacturing of shoes has not been a very prosperous business, for the reason of the close margins.

Now, I am going to give you some facts regarding our own manufacturing business: We are one among the largest manufacturers in this country in our particular grades, and outside of a line of shoes that we make under a patent the net margins average about 3 per cent, and as the line of shoes above referred to, made under a patent that we control, is only 20 per cent of our volume, you readily see the necessity of us making a very large number of pairs per annum in order to make the business profitable.

The large volume of shoes that are consumed in this country are shoes that are sold to the consumers at $4 and under. Taking into consideration the difference in the wages paid to the shoemakers in this country and in foreign countries, I can not help but think if the duty was taken off of shoes that within a short time either the volume of shoes made in the United States would be largely decreased or the wages would have to be reduced to meet the low wage scale of the foreign countries.

The improved shoe machinery that is being used to-day does not require a manufacturer to employ the skilled labor that was employed 15 or 20 years ago, and there is no reason why this machinery could not be introduced by foreign manufacturers, enabling them to make shoes that would meet the demands of our country, and with the duty off would place them in a position to undersell manufacturers of this country, unless we reduced the wages of our help to meet the foreign wage scale, plus the cost of transportation.

In former years it required several years for a shoemaker to learn the trade. With the improved machinery that has been introduced since that time a shoe passes through the hands of about 100 different people in a factory before it is completed, so you can see that each workman does a very small part toward completing the shoe, and good shoe labor now can be made from green help within three or four months where formerly it took several years.

The average pay to the male help in our factory is about $22 per week, and with the exception of the young girls, who do a minor part of the work, the average pay to the female help in our factory is about $13 per week.

I am satisfied that there is no wearing apparel that is sold to the consumers that nets so close a margin both to the manufacturers and retailers as shoes. There are about 1,500 shoe manufacturers in this country, and those that have accumulated any great amount of money you could count on your fingers, and they have been almost a lifetime doing it.

The individuality that each manufacturer introduces into his product in the way of patterns and lasts makes it almost impossible to combine the shoe business into few hands, as has been done on many articles of more staple lines, and the result is that the competition in this country is exceedingly sharp.

Trust you will excuse this lengthy letter, but knowing you personally, as I do, I am giving you the facts along the lines of my 40 years' experience in shoe manufacturing.

Yours, truly,

J. P. SMITH,
President J. P. Smith Shoe Co.

WATSON-PLUMMER SHOE CO.,
Chicago, April 19, 1911.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of April 14: The removal of tariff on leather and shoes would work a great hardship on the American mechanic. By actual figures at hand the shoe mechanic in Germany, England, and Switzerland receives a maximum of 65 per cent of the price paid to the American shoemaker on a pair of shoes, and the elimination of the tariff as a protective measure for American shoemakers would increase the importation of shoes, which is now reaching a very considerable number, brought about by the reduction in the Payne bill. With free leather in England, Germany, and Switzerland (which is a very large producing country) and lower cost of labor, and with no duty to be paid by those competitors on the component parts of shoes and leather, it would give the foreign manufacturer an advantage over the American to the extent of 30 cents per pair on a pair of men's shoes.

Due consideration should be given in the readjustment of the tariff to the duties paid on tanning materials by the manufacturer of leather and on items entering into the construction of shoes other than leather, such as thread, findings, etc., which aggregate in tariff on a shoe that sells at practically $3.50, 15 cents per pair. The tariff on tanning materials entering into the cost of tanning leather in this country amounts to a sum equal to the former tariff on hides.

The amount paid to a shoemaker in England, Germany, and Switzerland on a pair of men's fine shoes averages 30 cents. The same workman in New England and the Middle West receives 56 cents.

American shoes have been exported in the past, due to their attractive features in style and finish. The foreign manufacturer has now adopted these American features, and a very large and growing percentage of advertised American shoes abroad are now made in Germany. Canada keeps our shoes out with a 30 per cent tariff and does not propose to remove it. They are making shoes that will sell readily in this country.

The introduction of American machinery, lasts, forms, and models in foreign factories has developed a very dangerous competitor, and the abrogation of the tariff would most assuredly result disastrously to the American mechanic. We have no machinery advantage over the foreigner at this time, and it is superfluous for me to call either your or your committee's attention to the fact that they have a great advantage over us in the cost of labor.

Yours, very truly,

WATSON-PLUMMER SHOE CO.,
F. A. WATSON, *President.*

EISENDRATH, SCHWAB & CO.,
Chicago, April 19, 1911.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY VERY DEAR SIR: Wish to acknowledge receipt of your very kind favor of the 15th, inclosing a copy of the new free-list bill, and relative to that portion relating to leather and leather products believe that if leather is admitted to this country free of duty it would work irreparable injury to the tanning industry.

In the production or manufacture of leather the three most important items are raw material, labor, and tanning materials. With hides on the free list it enables us to purchase our raw material in any part of the world, and in this respect we are on an equal basis with our foreign competitors. Regarding tanning materials, quite a few of them are imported, so that our foreign competitors here have a slight advantage.

Now, then, it resolves itself down to a question of labor. It is undeniably true that our foreign, or, more strictly speaking, European, tanners actually secure labor for considerably less than we do, and by removing duty on leather or leather products, in order to compete we would be compelled to reduce the price paid our workmen, which would cause considerable trouble, and probably could not be accomplished without possibly strikes or a long-protracted struggle, incurring great loss to the working class as well as the tanners, and pending the solution of this problem our foreign competitors would invade our territory and distribute their goods freely, thereby greatly endangering the future and permanency of our industry.

The tanning industry is not fostered or controlled by any trust or combination, and probably enjoys freer competition than almost any other line of business, gives steady employment to thousands of people during the entire year, it being a pretty well-known fact that there is practically no line of manufacturing that operates as steady as the tanners.

The tanning industry to-day is conducted along extremely close lines, and the profit, if any, for the last several years has been extremely small, and it is absolutely incumbent, if the industry survives, that the tanners must secure more for their finished product. We have no leeway, and if the duty on leather is removed, which will compel us to sell our product for still less money than we are now receiving, we will be compelled to make up this deficiency by securing our labor for considerably less money, which we naturally should feel very loath to do, and, as stated above, do not believe same could be accomplished without a great deal of hardship and suffering to both sides.

History has taught us that price is the best salesman, and with the different advantages that our foreign competitors possess in the way of cheaper materials and very much reduced cost of labor, it would be an easy matter for them to find a ready market for their product in this country, which would inure to the detriment of our industry, and the burden eventually would fall where we all dislike to have it, namely, on the American workingmen.

Very truly, yours,

EISENDRATH, SCHWAB & CO.,
Per A. C. SCHWAB, *Vice President.*

Mr. Chairman, I come now to the discussion of the provision of the bill in reference to meat products. The following is the language of the pending bill:

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

The Canadian reciprocity bill which passed the House the other day put live animals on the free list and left a tariff on meat. This bill proposes to leave the tariff on live animals and take the tariff off meat. There has always been a controverted question as to whether raw materials ought to be admitted free of duty as against the finished product, but it has remained for this bill to raise the question as to whether the finished product ought to be admitted free of duty, retaining the tariff on the raw material. Gentlemen on that side of the House probably assume that if the tariff on live animals coming from Canada is removed, that is a sufficient reason for taking the tariff off meat, without taking the tariff off live animals coming from elsewhere. We import but few live animals from Canada. We imported over 100,000 cattle last year from Mexico, I believe, and under the strange provisions of this bill if those cattle should be killed upon the other side of the line, in Mexico by Mexican labor, the meat would come in free of duty, but if they drive the cattle across the line and have American labor slaughter them, they must pay a duty of $2 a

head on the cattle. That is philosophy for you. One might assume that the only competition we have in reference to meats is Canadian.

There is a great country to the south of us engaged in agriculture, the raising of grains and meats, which I think we do not fully comprehend. Under the terms of this bill preference is given not to the raw material, but to the manufactured products coming from Argentina or elsewhere. We do not import great quantities of meats coming from Argentina, but Argentina is a great exporter of meats and grains. Last year that Republic exported 89,000 head of cattle, 77,000 head of sheep, as live animals, not a great number, but she exported over 540,000,000 pounds of frozen beef, over 160,000,000 pounds of frozen mutton, over 20,000,000 pounds of jerked beef, over 24,000,000 pounds of chilled meats, over 26,000,000 pounds of preserved meat, and about 7,000,000 pounds of pulverized meats. We exported for the fiscal year 1910 75,000,000 pounds of fresh beef as against Argentina's 559,000,000 pounds, besides 20,000,000 pounds of jerked beef. We exported last year 1,989,472 pounds of mutton as against Argentina with 165,000,000 pounds of mutton. We exported during the same period 139,000 head of cattle and Argentina 89,000. We exported during 1900 fresh beef valued at a little over $7,000,000, Argentina over $12,000,000, and during the same time New Zealand exported $18,000,000 worth of frozen meats. We propose now to admit free of duty, in competition with our farmers, all of these meats which are exported from Argentina and New Zealand, but if they should be sent here in the form of live animals, to be killed and cured here, there is a duty on each head.

Do gentlemen on that side of the aisle think, when they talk about a farmers' free-list bill, that the farmers will look kindly upon a bill which offers a premium to Argentina meats in New York or other seaports where it probably costs less to bring the meat from Argentina, in the way of freight, than it does from the plains of Iowa, and still retain the tariff on raw material? We have a tariff, I think, of 4 or 5 cents a pound on hams. That is to be taken off, but the tariff on hogs remains, and while Argentina does not raise great quantities of hogs she imported last year over 100,000,000 bushels of corn, which can as well be turned into hogs in Argentina as it could be in the United States. What is the philosophy of taking the tariff off meats and leaving the tariff on animals from which they are made? What is the point to it? It has not been explained.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. Perhaps the gentleman has not considered the fact that our principal competitor, other than Canada, in the matter of live animals is Mexico, and that Mexico joins Texas. Perhaps there is something in that. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Texas has a majority on the other side.

Mr. MANN. Yes; we imported last year 193,000 head of dutiable cattle, of which over 100,000 came through the port of El Paso.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. The retention of the tariff upon cattle would increase the price to those who slaughter it, would it not—those who are engaged in slaughtering cattle and furnishing beef to the markets?

Mr. MANN. It would probably have that tendency.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then the admission of fresh meat—beef, pork, or mutton—would tend to bring those products in competition with those who are engaged in the slaughtering and sale of slaughtered cattle, would it not?

Mr. MANN. Do not ask me a question with "would it not," because I do not always catch the point. Elucidate it. I yield to the gentleman to elucidate his point.

Mr. BARTLETT. The point is this: You take off the amount a man pays on an ordinary steer dressing 800 pounds, $11 a head; it would take that off. That requires those who are engaged in the slaughter of cattle, the Beef Trust, to pay that additional duty when they import cattle. When you admit the products of fresh meat, beef, and mutton, and those things free, you admit them into competition with the Beef Trust. That is the point I make.

Mr. MANN. I understand the point of the gentleman now, I think. Let us see. The point is, if you keep the tariff on cattle coming into this country and the Beef Trust buys those cattle, that they are at a disadvantage as against other people who import the meat?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is it.

Mr. MANN. Ah, but the gentleman forgets that the great meat packers have already established packing establishments in Argentina and are already engaged in slaughtering animals there to supply the world, and they would just as leave ship them here as they would anywhere else. No little packer can bring in live animals, but the great packers that have their plants in Argentina can slaughter their animals there and bring in the fresh meat here and have an absolute control of the market.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman square that argument just made with the argument previously made, that to admit fresh meat here would hurt the farmers when you say the Beef Trust in Argentina controls the markets of the world?

Mr. MANN. Oh, it does not require squaring.

Mr. JAMES. Round it, then.

Mr. MANN. The Beef Trust to-day with a tariff on live animals is compelled to pay a reasonable price to the American farmer, but the gentleman proposes to let those men under this bill have control of the American market to the detriment of the American farmer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Under the existing law the packer who kills his meat in Argentina exports the meat to Europe, and the American farmer supplies the American market. Under this bill the packer who kills or packs his meats in Argentina will ship them to New York and the American farmer, in meats, will largely go out of business.

This proposes to admit meats of all kinds free. Does anyone know what "meats of all kinds" includes? Does it include chickens? Does it include poultry? Does "meats of all kinds" include poultry? Is it the intention of the bill to keep a duty of 3 cents a pound on each hen alive and admit it free when it is killed?

Mr. GARRETT. Can the gentleman tell us how section 286 of the Payne bill, which says "meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved," has been construed?

Mr. MANN. As to poultry?

Mr. GARRETT. As to meats of all kinds. How is the expression construed as it is found there? The expression which the gentleman has used is "meats of all kinds," and I wonder how it has been construed heretofore, because it may help us to construe this act after it is passed.

Mr. MANN. Paragraph 285 of the Payne law provides—

fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, venison, and other game, except birds, 1½ cents a pound.

You propose now to include meats of all kinds. Does that include birds and poultry?

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman just——

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman asks me a question, but I have the floor and I am asking him a question now.

Mr. GARRETT. I directed the attention of the gentleman to section 286.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman and I do not get on very well together about it, and if he will not answer my question about it he will have to wait. Does the gentleman think that this includes dressed chickens?

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman used the expression "meats of all kinds," and asked what it meant. I merely inquired what it meant in the Payne bill; that is all.

Mr. MANN. It is so simple that I have been leading up to it, so that everybody would understand that the gentleman was forcing the question. What is the paragraph to which he has reference? He dwells upon "meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved," and then stops. It is always a wise thing to read a sentence through before you ask about it. It says:

Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this section.

Poultry is specially provided for, game is specially provided for, and other things are specially provided for. If the gentleman had read the paragraph through, he would not have asked the question.

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman know that if this bill passes it will be construed in connection with existing law?

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly; it will repeal existing law in so far as it is in conflict with it.

Mr. GARRETT. And be construed in connection with what is left unrepealed?

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman did not ask me that for the purpose of getting information on the subject, for the gentleman himself knows that all laws are construed in connection with each other. That could not be information to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is not only an able legislator but a wise lawyer, and is now endeavoring to bolster up a very bad cause. When this bill provides that meats of all kinds shall be admitted free, that repeals any provision in the Payne bill in reference to a tariff upon meats of any kind, does it not?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. In just a second. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question, inasmuch as I have answered his.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not know whether I can answer the gentleman's question or not, but I will try.

Mr. MANN. Section 285 provides that fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and venison and other game, except birds, 1½ cents per pound; section 286 provides that meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem; section 289 provides, poultry, live, 3 cents per pound; dead, 5 cents per pound. Now, is dead poultry admitted free under this bill?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I do not know.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to permit me to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] if he will yield to a motion to recommit this bill to a Democratic caucus? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. They could not make a worse one.

Mr. GARRETT. I am trying to meet the question of the gentleman with candor.

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. GARRETT. This bill which is before the body now is an amendment to existing law.

Mr. MANN. Why, not at all. It is not an amendment to anything. It is a bill on its face.

Mr. GARRETT. It will be construed in connection with other laws.

Mr. MANN. All laws are construed in connection with all other laws on the statute books.

Mr. GARRETT. I do not remember about how poultry has been construed, but I remember that somewhere frogs' legs have been construed as poultry. [Laughter.] Whether or not poultry has been construed as frogs' legs I do not know. What is the gentleman's recollection as to that?

Mr. MANN. Poultry does not require any construction. Here is paragraph 289, under the Payne law, which says:

Poultry, live, 3 cents per pound; dead, 5 cents per pound.

It is under the meat items, and the other meat item expressly excepts it.

Mr. GARRETT. It does not seem as if it should need construction, and yet how has it been construed in the custom-house?

Mr. MANN. It has been construed to levy a duty of 3 cents a pound on live poultry and 5 cents a pound on dead poultry. But if your bill passes it will be construed to levy a tariff of 3 cents a pound on live chickens; but if they kill them in Canada they can bring them across the line free of duty. That is philosophy for you again!

Mr. GARRETT. Then they would bring them over alive, I suppose.

Mr. MANN. No; they would come in free if they are dead.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman stated they would come in free if alive.

Mr. MANN. No; I said they would come in free if dead. I hope the gentleman will read the bill before he again interrupts me.

There is another discrimination in this bill which I ought not to refer to, perhaps, but I am going to do it in a moment. This bill admits sausage and sausage meat free of duty, but it keeps the tariff on dogs. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. We have got enough of them in this country now. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. It admits sausage and sausage meat free of duty, but it keeps the duty on dogs. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. That is a good thing. That is good sausage. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not know whether it is included in the sausage meat or not.

Mr. MADISON. Nobody else does. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. But it seems to me that is putting a tax on raw material and admitting the finished product free of duty. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the provision in the bill in reference to flour, and so forth, is that it admits free of duty—

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods, and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Under existing law can not the American meat packer import hogs and cattle and other live animals by paying the tariff on the animals, and if he exports the meat produced therefrom he draws back all but 1 per cent of the duty?

Mr. MANN. I do not know.

Mr. SIMS. And that will not be repealed, so that the manufacturer can sell his products abroad?

Mr. MANN. Oh, not necessarily. A man from Argentina would be a very brilliant man in mind if he shipped cattle to New York to be cut up there and exported when he could ship the finished product abroad.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman stated that the bill retained the tariff on dogs. In his opinion, will that protect the dog industry in this country? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman that I am not in the dog industry, and if the gentleman does not know any more about it than I do, I will refer it to him. The question was not very bright. I do not know.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman has stated before that new Members here are ignorant. Now, he says the gentleman was not bright.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I did not say the gentleman was not bright. I beg the gentleman's pardon; he is very bright. I can see him shining everywhere he goes. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to take the tariff off the finished product of the grain, but leaves it on the grain. It proposes to take the tariff off flour, but to leave it on wheat. Argentina exported last year 69,000,000 bushels of wheat, which if brought into this country would pay a tariff of 25 cents a bushel, but if manufactured into flour or biscuit in Argentina under the bill would come in free of duty. How does that benefit the American farmer? What is the value of that provision?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman believe that would drive down the price of flour in this country?

Mr. MANN. Why, it is perfectly certain that there have been a good many times in recent years when the price of grain was higher in this country in proportion than it was abroad, and at those times, under this bill, flour would be made in Argentina from wheat raised there and the flour exported to the United States.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then the gentleman contends, if I get the force of his statement, that it would reduce the price of flour in this country. Now, let me ask the gentleman another question, please. What does the gentleman contend, if the Canadian trade agreement is enacted into law, as to whether or not that will reduce the price of wheat in this country?

Mr. MANN. I heard gentlemen discuss in this House for a week or 10 days the controverted question as to whether it would or not.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I never heard the gentleman from Illinois discuss it.

Mr. MANN. No; the gentleman did not; and he never will.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman refuse to express an opinion?

Mr. MANN. Certainly. I am not going into that question. We have left that behind. I want to answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman wants to know if this will reduce the price of flour in the United States. It will cause Argentine wheat to be made into flour in Argentina and exported to the United States in the form of flour, instead of being brought here as wheat and being manufactured into flour in this country, and the labor will be in Argentina instead of the United States. Whether it is cheaper or not will depend upon the market.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. If I remember correctly, the gentleman heartily supported the Canadian trade agreement.

Mr. JAMES. Cut out the "heartily."

Mr. COX of Indiana. No; I think he supported it heartily. If he has any fear——

Mr. MANN. I neither desire commendation nor care for adverse comment from that side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Now, if the gentleman entertains any fear about this paragraph under consideration reducing the price of flour in this country and thereby reducing the price of the farmer's wheat in this country, how does the gentleman

explain the fact that he heartily supported the Canadian trade agreement the other day, when it was so violently contended on his side of the House that if it was enacted into law it would reduce the price of wheat?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Indiana is seeking to confuse me——

Mr. COX of Indiana. No; I am simply trying to get the gentleman to explain.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is seeking to confuse me, because I supported the Canadian reciprocity bill. I did it without any fear. The gentleman from Indiana did it, shaking in his boots. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not shake. I openly supported it. But will the gentleman explain his position——

Mr. MANN. I will not discuss the Canadian reciprocity bill at this time. If I had chosen to discuss it, I would have discussed it before.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman evidently then was afraid to discuss it.

Mr. MANN. No one who knows me believes that I am afraid of anything, much less the gentleman from Indiana. [Laughter.] I am not at all surprised that my friend from Indiana, who trembled when he cast his vote on the reciprocity bill, is seeking now to divert the attention of the House from this bill. The Canadian reciprocity bill was not ideal, even in my judgment, but it was as a rose compared with a worm, when you compare it to this bill.

Mr. COX of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield for a statement, my only purpose in interrupting the gentleman from Illinois is simply to get him to square himself before the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. We understand the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Indiana is very desirous of upholding my standing in the House.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I am not sure but that it needs it.

Mr. MANN. Some time I may call on the gentleman, but I am afraid not. I think, Mr. Chairman, I could easily differentiate between this bill and the Canadian reciprocity bill; but if I can not, the Canadian reciprocity bill was not extremely bad, and this bill certainly is. The reciprocity bill at least endeavored to admit the raw material free and levied a tariff on the finished product. You propose to put a tariff on the raw material and admit the finished product free. Where will you find the philosophy of that in any utterance of the great men of your party? I have heard that side of the House discuss the question that the raw material was entitled to the same protection as the finished product. I am going to wait through this debate and watch the gentlemen squirm and wriggle on that side of the House seeking to square themselves with their consciences, proposing to put a tariff on the raw material and admitting the finished product free, in the interest of the labor of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Argentina exported 2,555,000 bushels of oats last year. If that had been made into oatmeal, it would have come in free of duty, if manufactured in Argentina, but if brought in as oats, it would pay 10 cents a bushel duty. Do you believe in that? Argentina exported 104,000,000 bushels of corn. If ground in any way in Argentina and the labor performed there, it would come in free of duty, but if brought in as corn, it pays a duty, I believe, of 10 cents a bushel.

You propose to admit free of duty all prepared cereal foods. I will give a bright new dollar to the man who can tell me what prepared cereal foods are. There is a chance for you to add to your salary. [Laughter.] What is prepared cereal food? Does anyone know? We know that shredded-wheat biscuit is prepared cereal food, or at least we believe it. We believe that Grape Nuts is a prepared cereal food, and so is Egg-o-See; but is macaroni a prepared cereal food?

It is made very much in the same way and out of the same material as shredded-wheat biscuit, and yet we collected duties last year of over a million dollars on macaroni and vermicelli. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama, Are they prepared cereal foods? What is this "prepared cereal food"? Is it a cereal prepared in some way, and if so, does not it include bread, specifically mentioned, and every other thing of that kind? What is bread but prepared cereal food?

You propose to admit all prepared cereal foods free of duty and leave the tariff on material from which they are manufactured.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I will.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. In the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois, is distilled rye and distilled corn a prepared cereal food? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman had asked me whether the products that go with the articles which he mentioned were cereal foods I should have referred him to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [laughter], who ought to be, and probably is, well posted on prepared cereal drinks, coming from the State he does.

Mr. JAMES. I will say to the gentleman that no Kentuckian who is familiar with Kentucky whisky ever called it a "cereal food." [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, with regard to that I can not agree with my friend from Kentucky, because I have seen many Kentuckians who called it both food and drink. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. But not a "cereal food."

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the observation that those individuals labored under that delusion who went to Peoria, Ill., for supplies and did not think long about anything after it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I will admit that the Kentucky beverage has some advantages over doctored neutral spirits as they are made in Peoria. Now, Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes to admit biscuit, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

What does this cover? Does it cover those articles if they have raisins added to them or nuts added to them?

Mr. COX of Indiana. That is sweetening.

Mr. MANN. Raisins are not sweetening. Does it cover articles if they have nuts added to them? There is a special tariff, I think, now upon these articles that have fancy additions. Does this provision propose to admit free of duty every kind of a wafer and biscuit which is not sweetened, no matter what else is added? That is what it says. Is that the intention? Can anyone tell? Does anybody know? Did the Democratic caucus pass a resolution covering the question?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman seriously ever see any kind of wafer or biscuit or other food of that kind with raisins and nuts in it that was not sweetened?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mother made them. [Laughter.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mother never made the gentleman any such stuff as that.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is clear out of the world. He is not familiar with the trade. Under this provision of the bill there will be brought into the country, if it becomes a law, biscuits and wafers with nuts and other articles in them by the millions of pounds, if the balance or the cost of trade justify this, as it may; but does anyone know what it covers? Can anyone tell?

Mr. Chairman, just a word more, because I have talked longer than I had intended to. [Cries of "Go ahead!"] Well, it is partly out of regard to the gentlemen who hear me, who I hope will want to hear me again, and partly out of regard to myself and my conscience.

Mr. KENDALL. You are making us very dissatisfied with the bill, but go on.

Mr. MANN. One amusing thing in the bill is this—I suppose it is hypercritical on my part to notice it: The bill proposes to make fencing posts free of duty.

Mr. COX of Indiana. That is all right.

Mr. MANN. No; fence posts are now free of duty. I assume that when a provision is put in a bill it is put there to mean something. Fence posts of wood are now free of duty. What do they intend to cover by fencing posts? Is that the same kind of a post? If it is a fence post, what is the object of putting it in this bill, for it is already in the law? Fence posts of wood are now free of duty under the Payne law. Is this for the purpose of admitting iron fencing posts, or fencing swords, or something of that sort?

Mr. CANNON. Or cement.

Mr. MANN. Or cement or concrete? What is the distinction between fence posts and fencing posts on the Democratic side? So much for that.

The bill proposes to admit all kinds of lumber free of duty. I voted for the amendment known as the free-lumber amendment. I do not remember exactly what it covered when it was before the House on the passage of the Payne bill. I have no great fear of the effect of free lumber; but this is perfectly patent: The proposition to admit free from Canada all kinds of lumber, rough and dressed, leaving to the Canadian Provinces the right to retain their restrictions on the exportation of Crown-land timber will, in effect, transfer to Canada the manufacture of all lumber which comes from there into the dressed material. The Canadian Provinces, under the terms

of this bill, have the power to write into every license which they grant the provision that the lumber cut on that public land shall be manufactured into dressed lumber in Canada. They now have the provision that it shall be manufactured in Canada. The Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec, and the Dominion for the Northwest Provinces have the provision now that that lumber shall be manufactured in Canada.

If manufactured into rough lumber of any kind, it complies with the requirements of the license, but under this bill, if it becomes a law, we admit without restrictions all dressed lumber coming from Canada, and the Canadian Provinces, if they are wise, and they are not lacking in wisdom over the line, will provide that all the timber cut upon the Crown lands shall be fully manufactured in Canada. We could obtain the provision of free dressed lumber and do away with this requirement of the license if we put into this bill a provision in reference to lumber similar to the one included in the reciprocity bill relating to print paper and pulp. There it is provided that the Canadian people shall not enjoy the benefits of freedom of trade on Crown land products unless they remove all their restrictions on the exportation of the raw material. When our Democratic friends took the bill which was prepared on this side, they included some provision to guard the agreement; when they prepared a bill themselves, they forgot all that and absolutely turned over to the Canadian Provinces the control of the dressed lumber coming from there.

Mr. Chairman, but a word more. I have been schooled in that philosophy which believes it were better to give employment to labor at home than abroad; which believes it is better to do a favor for your neighbor than for a distant stranger; which believes that whenever we manufacture an article in this country and the labor is employed here that that labor in the circuit which moves around gives employment to some one else by consuming the article which labor produces. I believe it were wiser to continue the policy which has built up our country instead of now proposing to increase the revenues by lowering the rate of duty and increasing the importations. I believe it better to manufacture the articles here which we can make and consume here rather than to send our money abroad in distant lands in order to employ their labor which consumes their agricultural products. [Loud and continued applause.]

Exports from Argentina of commodities specified during the calendar year 1910.

	Original figures.		In United States equivalents.	
	Unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Unit of quantity.	Quantity.
LIVE ANIMALS.				
Neat cattle	Number	89,733	Number	[1] 89,733
Sheep	do	77,180	do	[1] 77,180
ANIMAL PRODUCTS.				
Beef:				
Frozen	Kilos	245,266,825	Pounds	[2] 540,715,242
Chilled	do	8,441,336	do	[2] 18,609,769
Mutton, frozen	do	75,101,661	do	[2] 165,569,122
Pork:				
Salt	do		do	(3)
Frozen	do	1,010	do	[2] 2,227
Preserved tongues	do	947,842	do	[2] 2,089,612
Jerked beef	do	9,442,449	do	[2] 20,816,823
Bacon	do	17,580	do	[2] 38,757
Chilled meats, various classes	do	11,101,809	do	[2] 24,475,048
Preserved meat	do	12,081,869	do	[2] 26,635,688
Stearine	do	78,372	do	[2] 172,779
Pulverized meat	do	3,169,911	do	[2] 6,988,396
Lard	do	16,171	do	[2] 35,651
AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.				
Oats	Tons	370,948	Bushels (32)	[1] 2,555,909
Barley	Kilos	4,749,987	Bushels (48)	[1] 218,163
Rye	do	926,714	Bushels (56)	[1] 36,482
Corn	Tons	2,660,225	do	[1] 104,727,358
Wheat	do	1,883,592	Bushels (60)	[1] 69,209,449
Bread made of fine bran	Kilos	135,323	Pounds	[2] 298,333
Vermicelli	do	29,812	Pounds (196)	[2] 65,724
Wheat flour	Tons	115,408	Barrels	[2] 1,298,105
Groats	Kilos	930	Pounds	[2] 2,050
Bran	Tons	259,770	Tons (2,240)	[2] 246,807
Coarse bran	Kilos	1,669,872	Tons	[2] 1,643
Corn waste	do	1,390,830	do	[2] 1,376

[1] Dutiable. [2] Free.

Over 806,000,000 pounds (403,000 tons) of meats.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I have only 30 minutes for the discussion of the pending bill I will ask that I be permitted to continue for that length of time without interruption. This House has recently passed a bill carrying into effect the reciprocal trade agreement entered into between the United States and the Dominion of Canada. Now, we are going to consider and pass a bill placing a large number of items of everyday use on the free list, in order that we may do justice to the consumer and remove the objections of the farmer to the reciprocity treaty.

There are none more worthy of our careful consideration than that great body of agriculturists, who not only produce the wealth of the country, but who at all times have been the Nation's surest protection in time of peril. We could not afford to pass any legislation that even in the slightest degree would work an injury to the farming interests. I represent a large agricultural district, whose farmers are intelligent, industrious, progressive, and successful, and we in our district have long since learned that the success of the farmer means the success of the merchant, the success of the manufacturer, the banker, the laborer, and the mechanic.

Mr. Chairman, the reciprocity agreement entered into between the United States and Canada did not entirely meet the wishes of the President, nor, in fact, the wishes of a single Member of the House. We must remember, however, that in the negotiation of reciprocity treaties there are always two countries to the agreement, and that it is impossible for either country to secure from the other all the concessions it desires. If it could have been done without defeating the treaty I would have been glad to have seen it amended in several particulars, but we had to accept it as it was or not at all.

This acceptance, however, does not prevent us from passing other legislation which will remove some of the objections, so far as the interest of our people are concerned, and to that end a Democratic caucus of the House has agreed to pass the bill now under consideration, which will remove many of the objections and, in my judgment, will do justice to and completely satisfy the farming interests of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I never believed at any time, nor do I believe now, that the passage of the reciprocity treaty will lower the price of a single farm product; neither do I believe it will reduce the cost of living to any noticeable extent. After five days' debate on the bill I doubt if there is a single Member of the House who will now stand on the floor and contend for a moment that a tariff on wheat, corn, oats, barley, and all other farm products we produce in greater quantities than we consume will in any way affect the price. It has been conclusively shown that prices of farm products are fixed by the price our surplus brings in the open markets of the world, and that a tariff on all such products is a delusion and a snare. If our farmers did not produce as much as we consume, then a tariff would add to the price, but statistics show that we export annually millions of dollars worth of all kinds of farm products, and it is further shown that our production is rapidly increasing.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that a tariff was placed on farm products for the purpose of misleading and deceiving the farmer; for the purpose of making him believe he is getting some benefit from protection, while at the same time he is being robbed annually by the protected industries of millions of dollars on the things he must buy. I stand here to-day representing a large number of farmers, and protest against the continuance of a system that gives to him no benefit whatever, but compels him to pay tribute to the vicious villainy of commercial vampires whose hearts are as hard as stone and whose milk of human kindness is more bitter than gall. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not at this time want to discuss reciprocity; but, as the bill under consideration is a companion bill, I want to make a few observations in relation to our trade with Canada. Statistics gathered by the Bureau of Commerce and Labor, which can not be denied, show that during the past five years wheat in Canada has sold for a little higher price, on an average, than it has in the United States, and during the years mentioned we have exported into Canada 4,365,988 bushels of wheat, for which they paid us $4,442,307. It is also shown that practically all farm products are higher in Canada than the same products are in the United States. In the five years mentioned we sold to Canada 36,499,370 bushels of corn, valued at $21,704,373. In the same years we sold them 2,086,001 bushels of oats and 234,814 bushels of rye. We sold them, during the same period, corn meal and wheat flour amounting to $1,776,761. We sold them, during the past five

years, horses for which they paid us $14,172,075; cattle, $1,578,179; meat and dairy products, $17,011,017; hay, $667,432. We are shipping large quantities of butter, eggs, and cheese and all kinds of farm products into Canada each year, where the price is higher than it is in the United States. During the past five years we have sold to Canada our products amounting to the enormous sum of $886,417,376, while we have bought of Canada only $393,913,673, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of nearly $500,000,000.

In view of these facts, is not Canada a good country for us to trade with, and what fear should the American farmer have from such competition? It is not contended that the Canadian farmer can produce any product in competition with the American farmer except wheat, and that contention fades away in the light of the facts. It is argued that Canadian land is cheaper than American land and that the yield of wheat per acre is greater. I will admit that Canadian land is cheaper and always will be, and that the yield of wheat the first three years is a little greater per acre than it is in the United States, but it must be remembered that after the third or fourth crop the yield is less per acre in Canada than it is in the States, due to the fact that three or four crops is all you can raise until the land is impoverished to such an extent that it is no longer productive.

On account of the extreme cold weather and the long winters the Canadian farmer can not rotate his crops as we do in the States. He can not grow clover and turn it under and by so doing build up his land and prepare it for another crop of wheat. On account of the climate he is unable to raise corn with which to fatten cattle and hogs, and therefore has no way of keeping up his land to a high degree of productiveness. The fact is, the Canadian farmer buys a piece of land and farms it for about five years and then sells it to some one who does not understand the conditions, and he goes out in new territory and buys land that has never been broken. Finally Canadian land will all be under cultivation, and then for the reasons I have stated none of it will produce as much wheat as land in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the present tariff on wheat is supposed to be 25 cents a bushel, but the fact is it is less than 1 cent a bushel. For 14 years under the Dingley law and now under the Payne law the American miller can buy all the Canadian wheat he wants and grind it into flour for export trade and then draw back from the Government 99 per cent of the duty paid. Under the present law he pays a duty of 25 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat imported from Canada, but when he grinds it into flour for export trade he draws back 99 per cent of the 25 cents on each bushel, leaving only one-quarter of 1 cent a bushel tariff on Canadian wheat. Therefore as the law now stands the American farmer has a protection of only one-fourth of 1 cent a bushel on wheat.

Mr. Chairman, in view of these facts, I contend, sir, that the American farmer has no fear of Canadian competition or the competition of any other country on the face of the earth, so far as the production of his products are concerned, but he does object, and he has the right to object to the fact that he has always sold his product on a free-trade market in open competition with the world, and at the same time had to buy his farm implements, wire fencing, lumber to build his house and barn, harness, boots and shoes, clothing, and, in fact, everything he had to have on a protected market, and has been forced to pay exorbitant and unreasonable prices.

I agree with the farmer that it will do no good, that it will not reduce the cost of living to put wheat on the free list and then continue a duty on flour for the benefit of the Milling Trust. The people do not eat wheat, they eat flour, and if you want to reduce the cost of living put flour on the free list, and that is what is done in the bill now under consideration. I agree with the farmer that it will do no good to put live stock on the free list and then continue a duty on meats for the benefit of the Meat Trust. The people do not eat live stock, they eat "dead stock," and if you want to reduce the cost of living put meats on the free list, and that is what is done in the bill now under consideration. I agree with the farmer that it is unfair to compel him to pay more for his agricultural implements and farm machinery than his competitors in foreign countries pay. You go over in the wheat fields of Japan to-day and there you will see the self-binder winding its way through the golden fields of grain, and on examination and inquiry you will find that it is an American-made self-binder, and that it is sold to the farmer in Japan for less money than an American farmer can buy it at the factory where it is made. It is an undisputed fact that you can go in any country in the world and buy agricultural implements, binders, reapers, mowers, plows, harrows, and so forth, for less money than they are sold here in the United States where they are made. And the same thing is true of practically everything the farmer has to buy.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House have contended for years that a high protective tariff was the worst form of special privilege, but when we have done so you gentlemen on that side of the House have charged us with trying to array labor against capital, with destroying the motive power behind the wheels of industry, and removing the foundation stone of American progress. You have held a majority in this House for 16 years, and have allowed this system to continue, first, under the McKinley bill, then under the Dingley bill, and now under the Payne bill, until it has distorted the functions of a free Government into tools of greed and vehicles of oppression. [Applause.] What has been the result of your system? Why, as a result, the wealth of the country has been concentrated into the hands of a few people. It is enough to alarm us when we know that less than 4,000 men now own over 85 per cent of all the wealth of the United States, while each one of the balance of our 91,000,000 of people own on an average of less than $500 in property. It is not denied that 51 men now own one thirty-fifth of all our wealth, and these 51 men have had much to do with the legislation of the country during the past 15 years. As a result of your system we see the Woolen Trust extorting from the American people over $100,000,000 each year in excess of what would be a fair profit on woolen goods, and a large part of this comes out of the pockets of the farmers and a still larger part out of the pockets of the laboring people working in the mills and the factories of the country. As a result of your system we see the Cotton Trust charging the people over $90,000,000 each year more for their manufactured cotton goods than should be charged, and a large part of this robbery comes out of the pockets of the poor working girls and women behind the counters and in the sweat shops and factories of the United States. As a result of your system we see the Steel Trust wrongfully taking from the people over $150,000,000 each year more than they should take on steel products and paying to their stockholders large dividends on their watered stock. And these are the people who are now trying to make the farmer believe that he is going to be ruined if he refuses to stand for a continuance of protection—that kind of protection that has made millions for the Steel Trust, the Woolen Trust, and the Cotton Trust, but never added one dollar to the price of a single farm product.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, the present system of protection is the worst form of special privilege, and enables its beneficiaries to build up colossal fortunes wrongfully taken from the people. It is nothing short of an outrage, and in the name of right, justice, and fair dealing I protest against it. So far as the tariff is concerned, I contend that the farmer has never as yet had a square deal; but this Democratic House is determined to forever put to an end the discrimination against him and give to all the people some relief from the burdens heaped upon them by the Payne-Aldrich bill by passing the bill now under consideration, which places many items of everyday use on the free list. I will insert a copy of the bill in the RECORD as a part of my remarks on the subject:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act the following articles shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

Mr. Chairman, this bill when enacted into law will not only do justice to the farmer, but will bring no small amount of relief to those living in the towns and cities of the country. By taking the tariff off of flour, meats, oatmeal, rolled oats, cereal foods, salt, boots, shoes, and sewing machines will most certainly reduce the cost of living in the towns and cities to some extent, while placing on the free list all kinds of farming implements, binders, mowers, reapers, harrows, hedders, harvesters, horserakes, planters, cultivators, threshing machines, farm wagons, plows, wire fencing, wire ropes, staples, belting leather, harness, saddles, saddlery, boots, shoes, sewing machines, salt, and all kinds of lumber, both rough and dressed, will without question save the farmers of the country millions of dollars annually.

One of the most important items of this bill is lumber. Every citizen, and especially the farmers, know the effect the tariff on lumber and the organization of the Lumber Trust has had on prices they are compelled to pay. All grades of lumber have advanced with leaps and bounds, until the man of limited means finds it impossible to build for himself a home. It has been charged and nowhere denied that the Lumber Trust, operating under a gentleman's agreement, is yielding a profit of over 200 per cent. A glance at the summer and winter homes of the "lumber kings" in the aristocratic resorts of the country will verify this statement.

Mr. Chairman, I am not only in favor of taking the tariff off of lumber, but I am also in favor of an antitrust law that will wipe out of existence the Lumber Trust, to the end that we may have a few less palaces on the hill and more humble homes in the valley. [Applause.] I was not surprised at my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the apostle of high protection, defending the Lumber Trust and opposing tariff revision. His defense, however, of a protective tariff was just about as satisfactory as the explanation of a colored gentleman who met a bear in the woods. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DIFENDERFER] tells a story of a negro whose name was Rastus and who was out in the woods picking huckleberries, and when his bucket was filled he turned around to start for home, when he saw in front of him a big bear on his hind legs, growling and walking toward him. Rastus said that he thought the only way to save his life was to get out of there, so he sat his bucket down and ran as fast as he could, and after he had gotten away a short distance he looked back and saw the bear eating the huckleberries and concluded while he had lost his berries he at least had saved his life, but later, as he ran on, he looked back again and saw the bear coming after him. He ran faster and faster, but finally saw the bear was going to overtake him. He then discovered in front of him a large pond of ice, and he concluded he could run better on the ice than the bear could, so he started in that direction. "Yes," said one of his listeners, "but who ever heard tell of ice in huckleberry time?" Rastus answered by saying, "Great Heavens; he run me till after Christmas." [Laughter and applause.] So the argument of my friend from Michigan was just about as convincing, just about as plausible as the story told by Rastus.

Mr. Chairman, we are not only going to pass this bill putting lumber on the free list and the other items enumerated in the bill, but we are going to take up other schedules and revise them downward. We are going to take up the woolen schedule and revise it downward and save the people the $100,000,000 that is now being wrongfully taken from them on manufactured woolen goods.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAIR. I decline to yield at this time. We are going to take up the cotton schedule and revise it downward and save the people over $90,000,000 each year on cotton goods. We are going to take up other schedules and revise them downward in conformity with Democratic ideas and in accordance with Democratic promises made during the last campaign. My friends, the last election was fought out on the tariff issue, and the people spoke at the ballot box in no uncertain tones. They commissioned us to revise the tariff, and we are going to discharge that duty by keeping every promise and pledge made to them in the campaign of 1910.

Mr. Chairman, when this bill comes up under the five-minute rule we will see the same performance we saw in this House last Friday, when another bill was open for amendment. You will remember how the enemies of that bill tried to kill it by offering amendments, and the same thing will occur when this bill is read under the five-minute rule. The gentlemen on that side of the House will offer all kinds of amendments proposing to put other items on the free list for the benefit of the people, when their real purpose will be to defeat the bill. You will see them shedding tears in their anxiety to procure greater relief for the farmer, the laborer, and the down-trodden people in general. But, my friends, we must remember that their real purpose is to kill the bill and that it is the duty of every Member of the House who wants to see this bill become a law to vote down every amendment offered. How much faith would you have in the sincerity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] if he should offer an amendment proposing to put some additional item on the free list? How much faith would you have in the sincerity of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] if he should offer an amendment proposing to add something else to the free list? How much faith would you have in the sincerity of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if he should propose an amendment placing an additional item on the free list? Ah, my friends, when the time comes you will see these gentlemen offering amendments for the purpose of defeating the bill, but not for the purpose of giving the people relief. We know it will pass the House, and we have reason to believe, and do believe, that if left in its present form it will pass the Senate and be signed by the President. Therefore it is the duty of every friend of this bill to vote down all amendments offered.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House have been commissioned by the people to revise the tariff, and we are going to revise it downward. We are going to revise it in our own way and in our own time, so far as the House is concerned, and if the people of this country do not get the relief they voted for at the ballot box last November it will not be the fault of the House, but the responsibility will rest on the Senate and the President. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavor not to abuse the confidence of my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, nor the patience of the committee. I am not a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, nor do I feel that the weight of responsibility for maintaining the Democratic faith and the spread of the Democratic propaganda rests entirely on my shoulders. However, as an old-fashioned, straight Democrat, without any prefixes, suffixes, affixes, frills, flounces, furbelows, conditions, or qualifications [laughter], I desire to declare my allegiance to the plan mapped out by the great Democrats who are in charge of affairs in this House at this time and briefly state the reasons for my faith and course of action.

It would seem as though it was intended when I prepared my brief speech, as a little observation of the order of the speakers as we are introduced in alphabetical order will suggest—ADAIR, ADAMSON, AIKEN of South Carolina, and so forth, on the roll—that each Democrat in turn would address the House, not for the purpose of making votes in this House, but for the purpose of stating our position in correcting abuses under Republican domination, what the Democratic doctrine is, and the character of Democratic rule when it shall come into complete control of the Government. I, of course, did not hope that we would receive any votes on that side or convert anybody. It is impossible.

Ephraim is joined to his idols. Let him alone, that he may be given over to hardness of heart and reprobacy of mind, to believe a lie and be damned.

What we are concerned about is securing some votes at the other end of the Capitol and securing the approval of a President who has slighted and ignored one opportunity to heed the admonitions of the people. We want to see if he will heed the last thundering admonition which they gave him last November, or wait for the eternal and final downfall of himself and his party at the next election. [Applause on Democratic side.]

But I had not heard nor had the advantage of the last brilliant performance of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] when this program was mapped out. That versatile gentleman has given us an additional treat, new and improved stunts, sarcastic punctures, a great variety of criticisms, that would fill with dismay less stalwart hearts than those which animate the Democratic majority in this House. I confess I trembled in my boots and was a little rattled when I saw him, by punch after punch, make imaginary holes in the armor of Democracy, and innocently I went and asked Mr. Chairman UNDERWOOD if he would not better call a caucus and call this

thing off. [Laughter.] But he showed wondrous coolness. He did not appear alarmed at all, nor agitated about it, and he advised that we just go ahead and make the speeches, and if the Democratic caucus called it off afterwards I would not be responsible, because I did not know what the gentleman from Illinois was going to say; that is, I did not know he was going to say all of it at this time in this way.

But I want to advise you Democrats who have been so severely pounded, whose doctrines have been so severely riddled and punctured, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the most skillful special pleader who has been in this House within my knowledge, and no doubt would make the most successful defender of criminals that the criminal annals of our courts have ever known. Watch the success with which he parries all attacks upon the Republican Party. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, we do not expect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to approve our work or praise our bill. In fact, he relieved my alarm to a considerable extent when he said he did not desire either praise or censure from this side of the House. He wears the seven bull hides of Ajax. He is invulnerable to either criticism or praise when it comes from the right side of the House. All he wants is the servile following of the gentlemen on the other side, and I am firmly convinced that if the Democratic caucus should approve a bill that should come in here specifically approving that which their conduct has always approved, the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, the gentleman could pick flaws in them, and gentlemen on the other side would vote with him and against the bill. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

There is one fundamental error or willful misstatement constantly repeated and urged in the utterances of all Republicans of whatever brand, and that is that an honest Democratic revision downward of the tariff would cause a reduction of revenue, which they say we can not afford to make.

One distinguished Republican reformer, a self-proclaimed "progressive," lately made the elaborate argument that it was not proper to attempt a revision of the tariff until after the adoption of the income-tax amendment, in order that a hundred millions of revenue should first be provided by the income tax before it would be possible to spare the revenue lost by a downward revision of the tariff. I am constrained to believe that that man knows better; that he would really like to revise the tariff downward on the things he wants to buy and leave the prohibitive duties barring competition from all articles that he and his people wish to sell. That is the same disease that afflicts all protectionists. They do not wish to use the taxing power for the legitimate purposes intended by the Constitution—the raising of revenue. They wish to convert it into an instrument for personal profit, a weapon by which they can prevent competition while they hold up and exploit their fellow countrymen ad libitum, diverting legitimate revenue from the Treasury to flow in enlarged volume and everlasting current of graft into their own pockets. I earnestly favor the income tax myself, but I am not willing to postpone tariff legislation to wait for that. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In that interview the distinguished Senator, for he was such, selected sugar to illustrate his argument. Of course sugar is a recognized revenue producer and doubtless always will be, but the schedule is so viciously arranged as to make the people pay the Sugar Trust many times more than they pay into the Treasury. If the differential on refined sugar, which benefits nobody but the Sugar Trust, were removed or reduced 75 per cent and the duty on raw sugar reduced 25 or 50 per cent, the reduced price would enable the people to use more sugar. Increased consumption would prevent diminution of the revenue, though the graft of the Sugar Trust would be largely curtailed, to the joy and benefit of the people.

That Senator's proposition is as bad as the President's subterfuge to secure delay or defeat of tariff revision by waiting for information from a protective-tariff board which was not charged or expected to learn or report a scintilla of information to aid in an honest revision of the tariff, but, on the contrary, was designed for the purpose of delay and to report heresies to frustrate such revision. The Democrats know how to revise the tariff. What they need is power to pass their bills through the Senate and run the gauntlet of Executive disapproval. If the prohibitive duties in the main schedules—woolen, cotton, chemical, and metal—were reduced only to the point of competition without going down even as low as the best revenue-raising rates, imports would rapidly increase, exchange of business between our people and the people of other countries would swell both imports and exports, and the Treasury would overflow with revenue.

Everyone who knows anything knows that prohibitive duties exclude imports, and, of course, exclude receipts from the Treasury, and from such protected articles no money comes into the Treasury, and that these prohibitive duties serve as barriers to prevent the incoming of competitive articles from foreign lands, thereby compelling our home people to pay whatever prices domestic manufacturers see proper to charge for their articles produced at home. Of course the price charged may approximate the aggregate of the cost of production and the duty.

An abundant revenue having been supplied by reducing prohibitive rates to the competitive point, the Government could afford to dispense with the duty on a few articles of general use and prime necessity or place the duty so low as not to "grind the face of the poor." A large free list, however, is not a cardinal Democratic doctrine. It is a favorite of protectionists, and is not only a valuable handmaiden of protection, but is the inseparable concomitant of protection. In other words, protection robbery does not reach its highest altitudes of monstrosity and obliquity until it can widen the range of its profits by selling its products at the highest possible prices and securing its raw materials as cheaply as possible or absolutely free. The doctrine actuates all protectionists, in whatever section of the country, of whatever brand or type. The Democratic doctrines and policy as to taxation are not to be gauged or judged by this bill alone. I shall heartily support the pending bill as only a piece or part of the Democratic scheme, other parts of which are to follow in due order.

The existing Payne-Aldrich-Reed Smoot tariff bill and the Canadian reciprocity pact which has already passed the House and is now happy on its smooth and peaceful way through the other branch of Congress, make ample provision for all manufacturers, not only to extend their markets for the sale of their products into Canada, but also to secure either free or at reduced rates from Canada all raw materials which they need in their business. Now, as a companion piece and balance wheel to that legislation it is proposed to place upon the free list a few things the transfer of which to the free list is supported by two arguments. One is they are articles of general use and prime necessity, the comparatively inconsiderable revenue from which the Treasury will be able to dispense with by raising a corresponding amount of revenue in some other way. The second is they are the raw materials which the farmer needs to produce and prepare his crops for market. Oh, it is claimed, farm implements and bagging and ties, and so forth, are not raw materials. They are the material essentials and indispensable elements which the farmer must have and use in the manufacture of crops and their preparation for sale. They are just as raw to him as thousands of other things are which are the finished products of other producers, but are claimed by manufacturers to be raw materials to them. Everything that the manufacturers use, no matter from what source derived nor how much labor and expense are involved in production, they consider as raw material to use in their manufacturing business, except cotton-mill machinery, on which eastern mills keep a prohibitive duty to discourage and hinder the building of competing mills in the South. Likewise everything that the farmer uses—guano, plows, wagons, horses, mules, bagging, ties, clothing, shoes, the wages he pays for labor—all are raw material to him. He uses them all, and as the finished product of them he offers his crops for sale on the market, and if there is any rational line of distinction between the finished products and raw materials, the farmer is as much entitled to have that line located in the right place as the manufacturer has. But the truth is there is not in law, politics, reason, rectitude, nor religion any such line.

If there is to be any doctrine based upon an imaginary line between finished product and raw material it should be that whenever the finished product is on the free list or bears a low rate of duty the raw materials entering into it should also be on the free list or also bear a low rate of duty. The only rational doctrine on the subject consonant with the Constitution and consonant with honesty and fairness is that duties should be fairly and honestly laid for governmental purposes only, sufficient to raise revenue to support the Government honestly and economically administered, bearing most heavily upon luxuries, more lightly upon necessaries, and not at all upon those few articles of general use and prime necessity with the revenues from which the Treasury may be able to dispense.

The argument for a line of demarcation between raw material and finished product always offered by protectionists, and, strangely enough, often concurred in by people who oppose protection, is that if the manufacturers can buy their raw material cheaply they can sell the finished product more

cheaply. Of course that is axiomatic, but will they, and do they? Have they ever done so? The truth is, they take all that trade conditions will bear, and conscience does not hurt them because conditions are artificial and produced by unjust and partisan laws. Buying cheaply does not prevent them from selling for as high a price as their wares will command. It simply broadens the zone of their profits. It enables them to graft in both directions, to rob those to whom they sell and those from whom they buy, and they never fail to do what the law permits them to do for their own profit.

This doctrine received its most signal if not its initial emphasis from an effort to convert to the Democratic Party the protectionists of the East by changing the creed of the Democratic Party to suit the interests of these protectionists and tempting their cupidity when appeals to their principles appeared to be unavailing. The experiment failed, but forcibly reminded me of the words of the Blessed Master about proselyting:

> Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.

It is safer for Democrats to avoid trying to be doctrinaires drawing artificial, unorthodox lines of distinction and stick to the good old doctrine that all things are subject to taxation for the support of the government, and for nothing else; but that government should discriminate in arranging rates below the best revenue-raising point, so as to treat luxuries and necessaries properly and wisely, sparingly using the free list for the beneficial purpose of helping the people to articles of general use and prime necessity.

The fundamental doctrine seems to be ignored, or never mentioned, to wit: That the proper or best revenue-raising rate should be the maximum rate ever to be considered. No duty laid above the best revenue-producing rate is levied for any constitutional purpose, but is levied for the bald, bare purpose of prohibiting competition and protecting domestic favorites in robbing their fellow men. A Democratic tariff system, constructed upon proper Democratic principles, would contain no rate higher than was adjudged to be the best revenue-producing rate, and the range would be from that down to nothing.

It would be Utopian, however, to hope to adopt such a system during the present Congress, and the people ought not to be deluded into anticipating any such result. Statesmen and newspapers have not been careful to advise the public of the true situation, that the Democrats control only one House of Congress. The Republicans have the Senate, and all the Republicans in that body, though differing in detail as to the items they want protected and what they want on the free list, are every one protectionists and every one of them would vote against an ideal Democratic tariff bill. It should also be remembered that the President is Republican, and that he is pledged to sign no bill that interferes with protection. So it is idle for the people to hope for a Democratic measure during the present Congress. We may succeed in having some things put on the free list. We may succeed in reducing some of the greatest enormities in the rates of the existing law. If we fail to do anything, the country will understand, by following the proceedings of this House, that the fault shall not lie with us. A great many in high places, and a great many in this House lately in high places, have already suffered bitter disappointment from the discovery that this House can do business. Still greater surprises await them. "Those who came to scoff may yet remain to pray." While we must proceed with prudence, endeavoring in moderation to select those lines of action which give promise of some success, we expect that our record will make it clear to the country that if relief does not come through the present Congress its failure will be due to two obstacles to that relief, one at the other end of the Capitol and the other at the other end of the Avenue. Both of these obstacles can be removed by the people at the next election, and if a complete political revolution is necessary in order to secure relief, the people can and will complete the work so well done in part last November and come into their own after the next election by choosing a majority of Democrats in the Senate and a Democratic President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"CLARK and reform" is a slogan which has placed the Democrats in control of this House, and the same gonfalon may lead the hosts of Democracy to such a signal and glorious victory that the people, for the first time in many years, realizing the blessings of old-fashioned honesty and Democracy in control, may remain awake to perpetuate their own rule, their own power, prosperity, and happiness.

Let not our defeated and demoralized adversaries "mourn as those who have no hope." [Laughter.] There are compensating considerations in almost every event or situation. This bill will afford my distinguished friends from Michigan and Pennsylvania, those two eminent freetraders, Messrs. FORDNEY and DALZELL and others, consolation for their failure to graft this free list on to the reciprocity bill, which they so fondly hoped and earnestly tried to do. Yea more, it will reach farther than Canada, and give them a world-wide field from which to gather all these articles free of duty.

I admonish them also not to indulge in pessimistic predictions about the imaginary wreck and ruin to follow Democratic legislation. The real friends of the people are at the helm in this House, the legitimate successors of those who founded this Government, and for 60 years conducted it to greatness and glory. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If after the next election they also control the other House and occupy the White House, no legitimate business will suffer thereby, no honest industry will be injured. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Graft has no vested right. Inequality has no just claim to immortality, although tolerated for a long time, able to evade justice or even fostered by unjust law. We do not purpose to take away what men have accumulated, nor make distribution thereof, nor declare a popular dividend from their overgrown fortunes. That used to be a favorite stock-in-trade slander. It has now become a stale joke, and the people will yet make of it "a hiss and a byword." We do, however, believe that fair and honest conditions may be to some extent restored so that honesty and industry and merit may have a fair show. Instead of fattening a few favorites we may encourage general prosperity, but present favorites will not be ruined nor starved. Compelled by competition, they will sell to their neighbors as cheaply as to foreigners and strangers, which, under protection, they never do; but they will still enjoy handsome profits and at the same time control a permanent and more agreeable patronage, for neighbors who trade because they are pleased and not because under compulsion will prove far more valuable customers. Then both the favorites and their customers, being able to bring home goods from other countries, by reason of reduced import duties, can alike sell all their surplus throughout all the world. No longer will business stagnate, with factories idle and warehouses bursting with goods waiting for impoverished domestic customers to earn money enough to buy a few more goods at exorbitant prices.

Their goods can then go out by every sail, with every breeze, and on every steamer to the remotest parts of the earth, to be profitably exchanged for the products of every people and every clime, thereby loading returning argosies with a wealth of valuable commodities, to mingle again with the products of our own people, effecting other profitable exchanges, to the common prosperity of all. What we need commercially is to trade with all the world. We are able to challenge the whole world to competition in all things. We can not, however, trade with people who have nothing to sell. They can not buy what we have unless they can sell what they produce. "We can not always sell to people from whom we buy nothing," was the last and wisest remark President McKinley ever made about the tariff. It has been far-reaching in its effect. It is equally true that we can not buy from other people unless our rates of duty are reasonable enough to enable us to bring the goods home after we buy them. Our prosperity and glory are in our own hands. We Democrats of this House propose to do our duty, challenging the other House and the President to do theirs, and confidently leaving the result to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I have felt some reluctance in asking time to participate in this debate, as there are many others of longer service and more experience who are better able to shed light upon this important question, but I justify my action in asking the indulgence of the House for a few minutes by the fact that the constituency that I represent, which is one of the largest represented upon this floor, is deeply interested in the proposed legislation.

This House has recently passed what is known as the Canadian reciprocity bill, and the pending bill is now by some called its companion, but is generally known as the farmers' free-list bill.

The course of the reciprocity bill has probably been the most unique in the history of congressional legislation. It originated in the White House with a Republican Chief Executive, and this extra session of Congress has been called by the President for the express and lone purpose of having it passed by Congress. It was here opposed by many of the past and present leaders of his party upon the floor of the House, and a majority of them recorded their votes against it; but it had the indorsement of a Democratic caucus of this House and its passage was strongly urged by the leaders and supported by the votes of

almost the entire membership of the Democratic majority. One of the questions that to-day agitates the public mind is whether the Republican President has gone Democratic or whether the Democratic House of Representatives has gone Republican.

The debate upon the reciprocity bill was interesting and instructive, sometimes surprising, if not amusing. One of its surprises was to observe many of the old-time and unregenerated "stand-pat" protectionists of eastern manufacturing centers, with no farmers in their districts, pleading for its defeat, for fear that it may hurt the farmers, while many of the ablest and most faithful Representatives in this House from the agricultural districts of the South and West, who represent farmers and who are more familiar with their conditions, their crops, and their markets, have strongly advocated the bill as a good thing for their constituents.

The two chief arguments of the opponents of reciprocity in this House and in the press have been, first, that it will lower the price of farm products, which I hope is a mistake. The other is, that it is an abandonment of the protective policy and will destroy the Republican Party.

Some apprehension has been felt and expressed by the farmers of our country as to the probable effect of the proposed law upon prices of farm products, which, in my opinion, found its origin among the designing alarmists of other callings and other interests who are beneficiaries of the present high tariff laws, the repeal of which they fear that bill may be the forerunner. It was shown in the discussion of that bill in this House that the Lumber Trust, of which Mr. Edward Hines, of Chicago, is the president, has been very active in its efforts to arouse the farmers in opposition to that bill. The circular letter sent out contains the following clause:

> Will you and your connections kindly wire the following Congressmen at Washington quick, urging them to vote against the Canadian reciprocity agreement?

It would be hard for me to understand or to believe that his activity in this was inspired by unselfish motives or by his love for the farmers rather than by a selfish regard for his own interests as the head of a great trust that has been a curse to every farmer and every home builder in the land.

I live in an agricultural district in which the majority of the people are engaged or directly interested in agricultural pursuits, and all others of our citizenship are indirectly interested in their success, as they recognize the fact that the prosperity of all other callings depends upon the success and prosperity of the farmers. As their Representative in this House, I would not of my own volition cast any vote that I thought would do them the slightest injury or injustice. I have myself for 30 years had raised upon my farm corn and wheat and sold them in the markets.

Some of my constituents have expressed opposition and others have expressed their approval of the reciprocity bill, and the responsibility was left upon me to determine what action I should take. I voted for the bill for the following reasons:

First. I believed a majority of my constituents were in favor of it, and I thought it was my duty as their Representative upon this, as upon all questions upon which they are advised and express their opinion, to reflect their wishes by my vote.

Second. The Democratic caucus of this House had indorsed it and instructed me to vote for it, and, as a Democrat, I felt bound by that action, notwithstanding the fact that it originated with and was advocated by a Republican President.

Third. I gave the bill as careful consideration as I could, and was convinced that it will prove to be a benefit to the people of the district that I have the honor to represent and to the country at large, and will moreover prove to be the entering wedge that will open the way to other necessary and highly beneficial tariff reforms that will bring relief to the long-suffering and tax-ridden laborers and farmers of our country.

One of the chief grounds of alarm has been because of the proposed removal of the 25 cents per bushel tariff upon wheat and the 15 cents per bushel upon corn, and the prediction that it will reduce the price of these products to our farmers.

As wheat and corn are the chief products of the farmers of my district, I desire to say a word in answer to this prediction. When I was in law school I remember one of the professors said in his lecture to the class, "The reason of the law is the life of the law." It made a profound impression upon me at the time, and I have often thought since that this fundamental principle might be applied to other subjects. This proposed law will not cheapen the price of wheat, corn, or other farm products unless there is a reason for it, and as I read and understand the statistics and the facts there is absolutely no good reason to believe that the price of these commodities will be affected to any perceptible extent except at local points near the Canadian border. A high tariff law never raises the price of any article in this country that would not be imported here without the imposition of such tariff, and all well-informed men, and especially farmers, know that this is the largest wheat and corn growing Nation on earth, and no country under the sun can produce either wheat or corn, pay the freight upon them, even under free trade, and sell them here in competition with the American farmers. We do not need Canadian wheat or corn, we have annually a large surplus of our own, but Canada does need our corn, as that country produces but little of that article. The United States shipped to Canada in the last fiscal year 6,178,896 bushels of corn.

We must not lose sight of the fact that in giving Canada free trade upon the several articles mentioned in the proposed agreement the Canadian Government must give us free trade upon the same articles into that country.

It has been argued by the opponents of that bill that wheat is cheaper in Canada than it is in the United States. That is sometimes true in some places, and the same may be said of the different markets in the United States. May wheat is now 6 cents higher per bushel in Minneapolis than it is in Chicago; 2 cents higher in Chicago than it is in St. Louis; and 2½ cents higher in St. Louis than it is in Kansas City. There is usually 2 or 3 cents difference in the price of wheat at different delivering points in the county in which I live. These differences in prices are caused by the difference in freight rates, or possibly at times by the manipulations of the markets by speculators.

But a sufficient answer to this argument is that Chicago is the principal grain market of the United States, and all other markets in the country are largely controlled by it. Winnipeg is the principal wheat market of Canada, and on last Saturday, the day after the reciprocity bill was passed in this House, the markets, as shown by the Chicago Tribune, at Winnipeg, Chicago, and St. Louis were as follows:

JULY WHEAT.	Cents.
Winnipeg	96½
Chicago	88½
St. Louis	85½

As the farmers in my district usually market their wheat in July at a price below the St. Louis market they will readily see that the Canadian price can not injuriously affect the price of their wheat, as the price as now indicated there will be 11 cents per bushel higher than the price indicated in the St. Louis market, in which we must sell, or that governs our prices.

I have made an investigation of the statistics affecting our trade with Canada during recent years prepared by the authorities of the Governments of the United States and Canada, from which I have ascertained the following facts:

In the five years ending June 30, 1910, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

These figures show that it has been beneficial to us to trade with Canada even over obstructive tariff walls that have existed, and, in my opinion, our commercial relations would be greatly improved by the removal of that unnatural and obstructive barrier.

Permit me to call attention to the statistics of the same authorities upon some specific articles in which the farmers of the country are greatly interested.

In the five years ending June 30, 1910, it appears the exchange between the two countries of certain farm products were as follows:

Wheat:	
We exported to Canada	$4,442,307
Canada sold to us	766,254
Difference in our favor	3,676,053
Horses:	
We exported to Canada	14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,621,874
Cattle:	
We exported to Canada	1,578,170
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,585
Meat and dairy:	
We exported to Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We exported to Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672

But, Mr. Chairman, there is another unanswerable reason against this agitation for lower prices of corn and wheat. This

country exports to Liverpool or other foreign markets large quantities of both these staple farm products annually. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, which is the last year for which I have been able to obtain statistics, we exported 35,853,412 bushels of corn and 66,923,244 bushels of wheat. Canada ships her surplus of wheat to the same markets, and in view of these facts I am unable to see how free trade with our neighbor across the Canadian border will lower the price of wheat to our American farmers who know that the price in the United States rises and falls with the Liverpool market. On January 18, 1894, in a speech delivered in this House by our present distinguished Member, the ex-Speaker of this House, Mr. CANNON, in answer to questions of Mr. Simpson, of Kansas, he said:

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman not admit that we are now competing in Europe with the different countries of the Old World for the sale of our wheat?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; with Roumania, Russia, and India.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then the gentleman will admit that the price we receive there fixes the price of our articles not only in the United States but in the foreign markets?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; all prices are regulated by the prevailing market, wherever it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 10 minutes more time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. The present able Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. James Wilson, of the agricultural State of Iowa, who in his present position has done so much for the farmers, and to whom many of them have learned to look for advice in things pertaining to agriculture, in a letter to the National Grange, written on February 9, 1911, among other things, said:

There is a difference of 10 or more cents a bushel on wheat and other cereals between the markets of Winnipeg and Minneapolis, but this difference is fully explained by the lack of transportation and elevator facilities and by the greater difficulty that the Canadian farmer now has in point of economic carriage from the Northwest to Liverpool, where by the sale of the world's surplus the price of wheat is fixed for the world. To let the wheat of the Northwest come down to Minneapolis and Chicago will steady the price of wheat, will prevent its fluctuations, will make much more difficult speculation, and will furnish us greater insurance against the short crops and high prices. But that it will in the end, or substantially, reduce the price of wheat, which is fixed for the world in Liverpool, no one familiar with the conditions can assert.

From the investigations that I have made, I believe that the proposed Canadian reciprocity law, if it goes into effect, rather than to prove injurious to my constituents, will prove to be a benefit to them and to the whole country. Canada produces some things that we need better than we can produce them; we produce some things that her people need better than they can produce them; and for the mutual benefit of both countries there should be, in my opinion, a freer exchange of commodities between them. Canada should be our natural ally in sympathy and in commerce, and in every laudable aspiration that will tend to promote human progress and human happiness.

But we do not propose to stop with the passage of the reciprocity bill. This House offers to you to-day this bill known as the farmers' free-list bill, which proposes to place upon the free list agricultural implements, leather, harness, boots and shoes, fencing wire, sewing machines, salt, and other articles of general use among the farmers, which is intended and which unquestionably will if it becomes a law give them great relief in the prices of these articles.

Many of our friends upon the other side of the House in this debate have professed great sympathy and friendship for the farmers, and I do not—I never do—question the sincerity or the veracity of any man, not even a Republican, but I confess that my faith in the sincerity of their professions will be greatly strengthened when they vote for this bill, which is offered for the purpose of giving the farmers of our country relief against the exorbitant prices which they have been compelled to pay under high protective tariff laws for many of the most important farm implements and other commodities necessary to them and their families. Many of these articles of prime necessity have in the past and are now being shipped abroad and sold in foreign lands cheaper than to our farmers at home.

The Democratic Party in presenting and supporting this bill is not only right but is consistent. It has for a half century favored a low tariff for revenue, while the Republican Party has stood for a high tariff for protection by prohibiting or discouraging importations from other countries, thereby building up and fostering monopolies and trusts by unnecessary taxation of all the people. The Democratic Party to-day favors either a low revenue tariff or free trade upon the necessaries of life, such as farm implements, clothing, and other articles that enter into the home of the humble citizen to sustain life or to make its inmates comfortable and happy.

Permit me to say to our friends on the other side of this House who so eloquently plead for the farmers' welfare a few days ago, when there seemed to be some doubt about the effect upon them by the then proposed legislation, we invite you now, we entreat you to-day, to stand by the farmers in your support of this bill, under which there is no doubt about the beneficial effects to the farmers.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in his address last week, which I am pleased to say was one of the best I have ever heard in this House, said his party promised the people in its last national platform that if successful it would revise the tariff and lower the duties, but that after the election, in the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich law, the party violated its promise to the people, and the broken party pledge led to party disaster and party defeat and gave us a majority on this side of the House. This was a frank and an honest confession from an able and an honest man, and to him and his political associates we offer to-day a chance to correct some of the defects of that law and to remedy some of the omissions of the Republican Party in its disregard of its own promises and its failure to heed the just demands of the people.

We are warned by some of our doubting friends upon the Republican side of this House that this bill will never become a law, but I do not know whether this is a friendly prediction or an unfriendly threat, but I do know that it should not deter us, as the representatives of the people, in the discharge of our duty to them. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

I am not a prophet, but it requires none to foresee that this bill will pass this Democratic House, and if it is defeated in the Republican Senate or vetoed by a Republican Chief Executive the responsibility will rest with the Republican Party and the condemnation of the American people will follow. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am a peaceful man and I come from a peaceful State. Arguments in Massachusetts are seldom driven home by honied eloquence or by the persuasiveness of a shotgun. In neither respect can I adjust myself to that school of oratory which is so much admired in the great metropolis of Scotland Neck in the second district of North Carolina. [Laughter on the Republican side.] When I am smitten upon the right cheek I turn the other also, but in turning it I endeavor to propitiate the good genius of Scotland Neck with a few well-chosen compliments. If I were to be tried for my life I should seek as my counsel the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]; that is to say, I should seek him as my counsel if I were guilty. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman would do wisely, for I have kept many a Republican from off the gallows. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman please address the Chair? [Laughter.] I know of no man who better than he can invert the true appearance of facts. I have observed in the gentleman—or I think that I have observed, though I may be in error—that quality so valuable to jury lawyers, or at all events to jury lawyers in criminal cases and to jury lawyers who act for the plaintiff in tort cases, that quality—and how shall I express my meaning, Mr. Chairman, in parliamentary terms? Let us see, that tendency unconsciously—and observe the word "unconsciously"—to blur the line of demarkation which marks the division where fact ends and imagination begins. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that that is parliamentary language. You who were here last year remember how the Member from North Carolina delivered his magnificent oration after my poor effort on the tariff. He "answered" my arguments, as he euphemistically expressed it the other day; but there are all sorts of answers—sound answers, unsound answers, and evasive answers.

I have never known anyone so brave as to deny that the arguments of the gentleman from North Carolina are full of sound, and it would be impolite if I were to say that they are evasive. Do you remember last year how the cold perspiration bespangled your brows when he described to you, with that benignant smile for which he is so famous, how "dear little children"—and he said "little children" in such a tender, motherly sort of way [laughter]—how dear little children, in consequence of our protective system, at that very instant in the great cities of New York and Chicago were engaged in searching through dung heaps to find morsels of food wherewith to make soup? And yet, Mr. Chairman, neither the health authorities nor the charitable organizations of those two great cities have ever been able to discover those "dear little children." I am forced to the conclusion that really they were dear little Democrats in embryo practicing for future efficiency in the art of muckraking. [Laughter and applause.]

Oh, how warmly the gentleman shook hands with himself, and you remember how he washed his hands with invisible soap in imperceptible water when he congratulated the people of his political faith that they had just sworn an oath to abstain from the consumption of meat as a device for lowering its price. You remember how the pæans of joy arose from the Democratic side because at last Democrats had been found to follow the example of those great New Englanders who refused to drink the tea that George the Third had taxed. Alas, for your pæans of joy, alas for that melodious war whoop which rises in the beautiful valley between the forks of the Pedee River in South Carolina and echoes here from time to time to punctuate your pæans! Alas, for all those expressions of joy! New England in the days of George the Third remained on the wagon of abstinence, while New England's imitators, a very few days after they had made their eternal vow, ignominiously fell off.

And now, Mr. Chairman, this Scotland Neck Peter the Hermit, after courageously leading a crusade so short a time ago to prove to the American people that farm produce is cheaper in Canada than it is at home, to-day is countermarching his magnificent army to prove that it is not. "Codlin's your friend, not Short," his seductive voice whispers to the American farmer, but the American farmer replies in Kemble's famous words:

When late I attempted your pity to move,
Why seemed you so deaf to my prayers?
Perhaps it was right to dissemble your love,
But why did you kick me down stairs?

A SOP TO CERBERUS.

No one could accuse me of overstatement if I were to assert that the American farmer had successfully restrained himself from giving any exhibition of undue enthusiasm over Canadian reciprocity. To salve his wounded feelings your privy council has brought forward a "farmers' free-trade bill," very much as some repentant darkey who had robbed my henroost might endeavor to propitiate my wrath by returning to me the feathers of the purloined fowl. So you are going to throw a sop to Cerberus. Whether or no that sop will ever reach Cerberus is a subject which I assign for debate to the accredited walking delegate of your party from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and his bo'sun's mate [Mr. HOBSON] in the affirmative, and to the representative of the unterrified Democracy of Brooklyn, N. Y. [Mr. FITZGERALD], in the negative.

But suppose, Mr. Chairman, that ultimately this sop does reach Cerberus. Do you suppose that he is going to be satisfied with the core when you have just abstracted his whole apple? I doubt if so primitive a device will serve to assuage his grief. Far rather am I of the opinion that with one of his three mouths Cerberus will swallow that core, while with the other two mouths he will bark aloud for the sweet blood of revenge. I own, to my sorrow be it said, that I am not as yet quite certain as to just whose lifeblood Cerberus is going to demand, for I am pained to acknowledge that the theft of his apple will not be consummated without Republican accomplices.

THE FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The political future of the Democratic Party does not rest upon the question as to whom you may offend or whom you may please by any particular measure. You have come into power in this House because you have persuaded the people of this country that the cost of living can be lowered without entailing reductions of wages or widespread disaster.

Whether or not your view of the situation is correct is a question which will not be settled within the next two years, for it is idle to suppose that a Republican Senate and a Republican President will give you full sway in carrying out a doctrine which is at complete variance with the beliefs of the Republican Party. But if in 1912 the people of this country remain of the same views which they expressed in 1910 they will give you control of all three branches of this Government. We Republicans can not evade that result by any timid, stern chase in the path which you so long have followed. That is as it should be. I no more blame the voter for turning out men whose doctrines no longer meet his views than I blame you Democrats for pointing out that clear duty to the voter. What I blame you for is this: You have been telling the American people that the conservative action of the Republican Party is owing to the corrupt influences of the trusts. Last year you scouted the idea that any conservative could be acting from conscientious motives.

Now, I know very well that political misrepresentation is not confined to any one side of this Chamber; but of late years political misrepresentation arising from your side has been fraught with more consequence, owing to the conspicuously unfair attitude of that part of the public press which most vociferously proclaims its impartiality. Should the people of this country give you complete control of the Government, I venture to predict that you will drastically and conscientiously destroy the protective system, as it has heretofore been known. I predict that you will enact into law some reforms which will prove beneficial and that you will enact into law even more of those unwholesome innovations of whose success the smattering sociologist is characteristically so certain.

In fact, I do not see how it can well be otherwise. The day has gone by when tariffs of "perfidy and dishonor" can be passed. The day has gone by when legislators can neglect, or even desire to neglect, the issues upon which they have been elected. I am glad that it is so. If you come into power, I hope and believe that you will prove that it is so, for in that way alone can the specter which to-day is haunting representative government be laid at rest.

For the most part, I abhor your principles. For the most part, I predict their ultimate failure in practice. But if the people give you complete control, with all your errors, with all your crudities, you can perform a prodigious service to this country. Carry out your promises, absurd as we may think them; change the laws to conform with the views which you have expressed; do those things and you will perform a service to the Nation and to the whole world, even if each and every act which you put upon the statute book shall demonstrate nothing but the folly of the parent idea in which it was conceived.

Yet, of itself, a strict adherence to your promises will not retain you in power. Your theories and your beliefs, when given the form of law, must entail success and prosperity or once again the people will turn to the men whose theories and beliefs are opposed to your own. If the future shall show that the price of that which labor produces can be lowered without interference with the remuneration of that labor itself, then your tenure of power will be long in the land. But if the future shall show, as I firmly believe will be the case, that the fiscal reforms which you are sowing can result in nothing but a crop of disasters, thence once again the country will turn to the Republican Party, purged of the abuses incident to long, untrammeled power.

AN UNEQUAL PROPOSITION.

Now, in regard to this measure itself, until I heard the revenue explanation which was given by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I had it in mind to ask him why Louisiana sugar should be omitted from this free-trade bill. I concede that the reason he gave was satisfactory, to me at least; yet I can not divest my mind of the belief that there are sectional features to this bill. I turn to my Yearbook and there I find that Virginia produces iron, coal, and tobacco. Surely, those articles are much used by farmers; yet I find no mention of them in this bill. Next come the Carolinas, famous for tobacco and rice. Obviously, rice should have met the fate of other cereals. Georgia is a rice State, too. Florida is famous all over the world for its oranges and other semitropical fruits; yet not one paragraph of this bill touches her chief products. Why did those articles escape your tariff pruning? Alabama is rich in coal and iron, but coal and iron have escaped the deluge. Louisiana and Texas both produce sugar and rice, and Kentucky and Tennessee have coal, iron, and tobacco. Yet, in spite of those obvious omissions of articles which farmers use and which, if consistency is sought, should be included in a "farmer's free-trade bill"——

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman know that any amount of duty on coal would not affect the value of coal in Kentucky, and does he know that there is not a pound of tobacco in the world if admitted free that would come in competition with the tobacco of Kentucky?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not know those things.

Mr. STANLEY. That is a fact.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I am sorry that the Ways and Means Committee did not take the time to have hearings, so that those facts could be brought forward. I presume that in many instances such an answer as that made by the gentleman from Kentucky would be the true answer. I presume that there must be reasons for all these omissions, and I am speaking to-day with the hope that we may discover the meaning of all these unusual coincidences.

Mr. STANLEY. The only tobacco grown in Kentucky is Burley tobacco and Pryor tobacco; and Burley tobacco is not raised anywhere outside of the United States, and the dark, or Pryor, tobacco, 85 or 90 per cent of it, is exported to Europe.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, pending the presentation of the other side of the question by the Republican Members from Kentucky, I omit tobacco from my indictment so far as Kentucky is concerned.

Mr. STANLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Now, in spite of all these obvious omissions from a "farmers' free-trade bill," I am not prepared to say that this measure was conceived in a spirit of sectional unfairness, but I do believe that observations taken from one part of this country alone can not insure the justice of the course of the ship of state.

Can anyone tell me why binding twine is omitted from this bill?

Mr. JAMES. Because it is already on the free list.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Binding twine is not already on the free list, except in the same sense that such agricultural implements as plows, harrows, harvesters, and so forth, are on the free list. Under paragraph 507 binding twine is only on the free list when coming from countries which charge no import duty on binding twine. On the product of countries which charge an import duty on binding twine a duty of one-half cent a pound is imposed. There is just as much reason for including binding twine in the free list in this bill as for including plows, tooth and disk harrows, and so forth.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts mean to admit that that character of a free list is a delusion and a snare?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Oh, the gentleman knows how bills are made up. Amendments are introduced and provisos are inserted on the floor of the House. The mere fact that binding twine appears under the free list, while certain agricultural implements are included under the dutiable list, makes no difference after the two provisos have been read, except to prove that the Ways and Means Committee did not know this fact.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It is always a pleasure, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JAMES. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts say to the House that a tariff is now charged upon binding twine?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. One-half cent a pound, under paragraph 507.

Mr. JAMES. Is it not true that it is admitted free now?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I did not know that it was ever imported. I supposed that it was made entirely in the United States, though I know nothing about it, because I have not looked up the facts. Does the gentleman contend that it pays a duty?

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman's Republican campaign book has bragged for a number of years that you put binding twine on the free list.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. With the approval of your campaign book, I presume.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, no; the gentleman himself admits that he is making a statement here that he does not know anything about—that he really does not know whether it is free or not.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Oh, I can read the language of paragraph 507, but I shall not do so. Any gentleman who thinks that the Ways and Means Committee were not ignorant of the facts can read it for himself. The whole debate this morning showed that the gentleman from Alabama was not aware that binding twine is dutiable.

Mr. JAMES. I wanted to find out whether or not we could get a repudiation from the gentleman of the prior claims of the Republican campaign book.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do not repudiate anything; but I refer the gentleman to Imports and Duties, 1894 to 1907, during the period of the continuance of the Dingley law. See page 369:

"Binding twine from countries which impose a duty on like articles imported from the United States"; one-half cent per pound; 1898, pounds imported, 275; value in dollars, $18; duty collected, the munificent sum of $1.38.

Mr. JAMES. That was under the Dingley law. We are now living under the Payne law.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; but does not the gentleman from Kentucky know that when a paragraph in one law is maintained word for word in another law there is neither a repeal nor a change in existing law?

Mr. JAMES. I do not know that.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No; we never know those things until the court decides them. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been talking about a great many things which the gentleman from Kentucky with some justice implies that I know nothing about.

Mr. JAMES. I did not intend to say that. I think the gentleman knows a great deal about things he talks about.

BOOTS AND SHOES.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I now come to the question of boots and shoes, and I am ready for all comers. [Laughter.] I believe that I am correct in saying that there has always been an import duty on boots and shoes since it was first imposed in 1789. I believe I am correct in saying that for 100 years or thereabouts prior to the passage of the Payne law the duty on boots and shoes never fell below 15 per cent, or its equivalent specific duty. I know that I am correct in saying that under the Wilson Democratic tariff of 1894 the duty on boots and shoes was 20 per cent, and yet the Wilson law provided free hides. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, every peace tariff we ever had provided for free hides with the exception of the Dingley law alone.

For a large part of this long period on which there was a duty on boots and shoes I am prepared to admit that the duty was not necessary for protective purposes. At that time we were the only Nation which understood modern shoemaking, and while the duty on boots and shoes did us no good, assuredly it did no one any harm.

Foreign boots and shoes in those days, even if bounty fed, could not compete with the American product. It was impossible by artificial means to keep up the price in this country, even if the duty on boots and shoes had been 1,000 per cent. Competition in the boot and shoe trade was fierce at that time, just as it is fierce to-day. To those of you who believe that trusts and industrial combinations can maintain artificial prices behind an unduly high tariff wall—and I am quite uncertain whether economically that is so or not—but to those of you who hold that belief I beg to point out the fact that no shadow of a trust has ever existed in the shoe trade.

Five years ago on the floor of this House I showed that conditions were changing with respect to foreign shoemaking. Many a time since that day I have reiterated my views. I have pointed out the fact that the United Shoe Machinery Co. has extended its operations into foreign lands. I have pointed out the fact that this company is to-day preparing to equip a factory anywhere on earth with American machinery and American instructors. It is a fact that not long ago the United Shoe Machinery Co. equipped a factory in Helsingfors, in Finland, with new shoemaking devices, just as completely as they equipped a factory in Haverhill, Mass., at about the same time.

The Payne law cut the duty on boots and shoes from 25 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem on boots whose tops are made of calfskin and hide leather. It cut the duty to 15 per cent on boots and shoes whose tops are made of sheepskin and goatskin. At the time these reductions were made many gentlemen predicted that, in spite of the reduction, the duty was still left at a prohibitive figure. I was not of that opinion. I protested at the time that the danger mark had been passed, and in a few moments I propose to verify that prediction.

There is a vast amount of misunderstanding abroad as to what this boot and shoe paragraph in the pending bill accomplishes. Many people think it applies to all boots and shoes; they are in error. Many people believe that it applies only to farmers' shoes; they also are in error. Many people think that it does not apply to women's shoes, and they are equally mistaken. This bill admits free of duty farmers' heavy boots and shoes of the brogan class, such shoes as the farmer wears when he gets out his stock in the morning. It admits free of duty such shoes as pretty nearly all of you gentlemen have on at the present moment; that is to say, shoes with calfskin uppers or with grain uppers, patent leather shoes, and the like. All these shoes are admitted to-day at a 10 per cent duty, and this bill admits them free.

On the other hand, this bill does not admit free of duty the kind of shoes that the farmers' wives and daughters often wear, or the kind of shoes that many men with small means often wear. Sheepskin and goatskin uppers form a cheap and on the whole very satisfactory substitute for calfskin uppers. For that reason they are used in the manufacture of shoes of the less expensive grades, especially the less expensive grades of women's shoes.

All shoes of that type under the present law are admitted at 15 per cent duty, and that rate of duty remains undisturbed in the pending bill. Now, before you decide to cut the duty at all, I wish to call your attention to some interesting figures. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] this morning selected as his standard of comparison the value of shoe importations for the year of 1908. For the last year of the operation of the Dingley law he ought properly to have selected 1909,

because, as you all know, those figures you get from the Treasury Department are calculated for the fiscal year. Therefore the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1909, is the true standard of comparison, and it is that standard of comparison which I shall use. Then the gentleman from Alabama, in order to prove that there had been no increase in imports under the Payne law, took the Treasury figures for 1910. Remember that the Treasury year of 1910 began June 30, 1909, that the 10 per cent rate on boots and shoes did not go into force until October 1, 1909, and that these foreign competitors had to buy American lasts and patterns before they attacked our market. You will readily understand that it is impossible to judge the effect of the new tariff on the importation of shoes by examining figures for a period terminating on June 30, 1910, only nine months after the reductions were in full force. Accordingly, as a basis of comparison, I ask you to take the figures of the imports of the first six months of the current fiscal year, to wit, the figures from June 30, 1910, to January 1, 1911. During the year 1909, which was the last year of the operation of the Dingley law, the importation of boots and shoes amounted to $104,000. Soon after that law was passed the Boot and Shoe Trade Record of London took the matter up, saying that under the lower tariff British shoe manufacturers should be able to sell their shoes in every city from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Meetings of shoe manufacturers in England were held, and American lasts and American patterns were secured. Soon the result began to be felt.

The Eliet-Kendall Co., of Kansas City, one of the largest shoe jobbers in the country and, I think, the largest in the Southwest, placed an order with an English house. This example is being followed more and more every day, so much so that in the first six months of the current fiscal year—to wit, from June 30, 1910, to January 1, 1911—the imports of shoes into the United States were no less than $377,000. This amount, covering a period of only six months, is a great deal more than three times as much as the entire value of boots and shoes imported into this country during the last 12 months of the operation of the Dingley law. In other words, at the very inception of the foreign attack on our shoe market the importation of shoes has leaped up about 600 per cent, and yet the tide is but just beginning. In my belief, as soon as Switzerland and Germany begin to manufacture for our markets a deluge will be upon us.

I call your attention to the Daily Consular Reports of February 28, 1911, less than two months ago. I read from the report of our consul at Nottingham, England, S. M. Taylor. This is what Mr. Taylor says:

> Prior to August 5, 1909, when the present United States tariff went into effect—

He is mistaken so far as the 10 per cent duty on boots and shoes is concerned. That did not go into effect until October 1—

> the annual export of boots and shoes from this district, the center of the British industry, to the United States did not exceed $500 per year, but following that date, and up to the end of the year, the exports amounted to $3,800, while for the year 1910 they amounted to $85,000. These are invoiced as "high-class walking boots and shoes." They are made on wooden lasts, made here, and in shapes and styles to suit the American demand. The machinery is of the American type, but having regard to recent legislation on patent matters, "American" machinery must now be built in England. The firm that builds this machinery works in connection with a machinery company in the United States. In general, it can be said that the products of these English-built machines, when placed on view in windows with American-made boots and shoes, are hardly distinguishable one from the other. Shipments of these goods have been made to Cincinnati, Boston (two firms), New York (five different firms), Philadelphia (two firms), San Francisco, Pittsburg, Columbus, Ohio (four firms), Chicago, Cleveland, Kansas City (six firms), and Portland, Oreg.

Now, let us look at the other side of the question.

Of course our exportation of shoes to foreign markets continues large. As a matter of fact, though it was not pointed out by the gentleman from Alabama, our exportation of shoes to foreign markets has slightly increased, although the increase, which is by no means proportional, relates principally to Cuba and Mexico. Those countries take from us nearly one-half of the shoes which we export. The other half, which mostly is exported to Europe, goes to those shops where you see signs of "American shoes." Such exports are largely intended for the consumption of American travelers journeying abroad. An American in Europe naturally prefers to buy a pair of shoes of the size, style, and fit to which he has been accustomed at home. But, are we holding our own in those countries where our chief competitors live? Let us see. I have taken from the Weekly Bulletin of April 8, 1911, the only figures I could find, figures comparing our exports for the last seven months of 1910 with our exports for the last seven months of 1909. In the last seven months of 1910 our export of shoes to England had fallen off $99,000 from the figures of 1909. During the same periods our export of shoes to Germany has fallen off $71,000, all in consequence of improved foreign shoemaking methods. In the meantime in Belgium—and Belgium is a very good example of a neutral competitive market—Great Britain is selling seven times as many shoes as we do, France is selling three times as many shoes, and Germany is selling twice as many shoes. Any man who says that the industry of shoe manufacturing is not endangered by free trade in its product is either willfully blind or else he predicates his opinion on the experience of some particular man who makes an export specialty. Now, a word to my associates on the Republican side——

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. STERLING. Do I understand the gentleman to say this bill will only make free the coarse, heavy shoes?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No; it also makes free fine shoes, such as the gentleman has on at this moment. Every shoe whose material in chief value is derived from cattle of the bovine species, and this includes calfskin, is made free by this bill. As a matter of fact, the situation is as follows: Boots and shoes consist of a sole, a vamp, a quarter, and a top. The vamp and quarter taken together are known as the upper. Now, the material which goes into the upper and the top exceeds in value the material which goes into the sole, and therefore if the upper and top should be made of goatskin or sheepskin the shoe comes in at 15 per cent, whether this law passes or not. The point is that the chief value of the material in a shoe of this type does not come from cattle of the bovine species.

Mr. STERLING. One more question. Does the gentleman know how much it would reduce the price of shoes, assuming that the consumer paid all the tariff?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Assuming that the duty is 10 per cent, and assuming that a pair of shoes is worth $2, and assuming that the consumer pays the whole tax—which I deny—10 per cent of $2 would, of course, be 20 cents. As a matter of fact we all know that it is the middlemen who are responsible for the enormous difference between the price at which articles are imported and the price at which they are sold to the customer. As a matter of fact, out of $377,000 worth of shoes which were imported in the first six months of this fiscal year, I think just about two-thirds came in under the 15 per cent duty. I think, to be exact, about $250,000 worth came in under the 15 per cent duty.

In other words, $250,000 worth of shoes would have paid 15 per cent duty, even if the pending bill had been law at that time.

Mr. OLMSTED. May I ask the gentleman if he can state whether or not that reduction in the duty has been of any benefit to the farmers in the way of securing for them reduced prices on shoes?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me whether the taking off of the duty on hides and the consequent rise in the price of hides for over 14 months, or whatever the length of the period was, does not present an equal paradox? I am utterly unable to answer the gentleman. I confess that when I look into the figures the middlemen's profits seem to be so enormous that I can not help feeling from time to time that all these tariff discussions proceed on a false basis.

Mr. STERLING. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think he is mistaken about the price of hides going up.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. For 14 months, nearly, I thought. Very likely I am mistaken as to the length of time.

Mr. STERLING. They went up for a short time after the passage of the Payne tariff bill, but I think hides are off now between 30 and 40 per cent.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The hides of native steers, or Texas steers, in Chicago to-day—that is, packer hides—sell from 12½ to 13½ cents.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman just stated that about two-thirds of the importations of the last six months would not have been affected in case this bill passed.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. On the supposition that during that time this bill had been the law.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Could he state, approximately, about what proportion of the total manufacture of shoes—that is, shoes manufactured on machines in this country—would be affected?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. No: I can not. As a matter of fact, the exact figures are these: Shoes imported during

those six months, under the 10 per cent duty, such shoes as would hereafter come in free if this bill should be passed, amounted in value to $123,052. Shoes imported under the 15 per cent duty amounted in value to $254,452.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman, since hides were put on the free list and the duties on shoes reduced, has there been any reduction in the retail price of shoes?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Not in the retail price. I am very glad that the gentleman brought that question up. It is almost impossible for any purchaser to tell whether shoes at retail have gone up or have gone down merely because he pays a higher or a less price in a retail store for that which he thinks is the same article which he has been in the habit of purchasing. Unless he is expert enough to dissect the shoe in order to see whether the materials of which it consists are the same as the materials of which his former purchases consisted, his opinion is valueless.

Here is the best evidence which I have been able to find: I have here the Government contract prices for the United States Army shoes. The specifications have remained the same. Therefore we have a very good comparison. Now, on black dress shoes, which are calfskin, by the way, and which would come in free, the average contract price for the Army for the year ending June 30, 1909, was $2.80 and the average price for the year ending June 30, 1910, was $2.79. Between June and November, 1910, the price was $2.68¼, and between November and December, 1910, the contract price had fallen to $2.49.9. Russet garrison shoes, which are also calfskin, averaged for the fiscal year 1909, $2.85; for the fiscal year 1910—that is, up to June 30—$2.84; dropped between June and November, 1910, to $2.81½; and dropped again, in November and December, to $2.62¾. The russet marching shoe, which is veal kip—a kip is the skin of an undersized cow or the skin of a calf—would be affected. These shoes have fallen greatly, from $2.80 to $2.58½. Gymnasium shoes have fallen from $1.92 to $1.69. That is the best evidence which I can give any of these gentlemen, because the figures are accurate for the purchase of shoes on the same specifications.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. I believe the gentleman made the statement that he was open to all comers, and therefore I would like to ask him from whom he quotes those figures?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I quote those figures from A. F. Schenkelberger, who has been an advocate of freer trade in hides and leather goods for many, many years and is a strenuous tariff revisionist. His figures were prepared and sent to me to disprove a statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] in the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Schenkelberger is an expert, who used to be, I think, one of the publishers of the Shoe and Leather Reporter or else the Boot and Shoe Recorder.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. Is it not a fact that Hermann & Co. absolutely control, after freezing out every other competitor in the United States, the manufacture of shoes for the Army and Navy of the United States?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I have never heard of Hermann & Co. in my life, and I am probably somewhat familiar with the boot and shoe trade.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. Why, they are gentlemen engaged in the business in the city of Boston, Mass.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I say to the gentleman that I have never heard of such a manufacturer or dealer in my life, in Boston or elsewhere. I do not, of course, say that he does not exist, but——

Mr. DIFENDERFER. I shall be at liberty, then, in the near future, to show to the gentleman that they have had absolute control of the shoes manufactured in this country for the Army and Navy, and that they have frozen out competitors that I know of, who have lost out, and to-day are bankrupt owing to the fact that this firm of Hermann & Co. have used their influence with the Government representatives of the United States, or those in control of the Government of the United States have used their influence to freeze out competitors and have placed them on the blacklist, so to speak, and have even gone so far as to give money so that other firms may not be competitors after freezing them out.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Is that a question?—because it may take me some time to discover the question mark. The gentleman's statement is an impeachment of the Government authorities.

Mr. DALZELL. It is a matter that has to do with the executive departments.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman's suggestion is clearly an indictment of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and his remedy is a bill of impeachment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated heretofore that simultaneously the United Shoe Co. equipped a factory in Norway and one in Haverhill, Mass., with the same kind of machinery?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. That is practically what I said, but it is not exact. They equipped in Helsingfors, in Finland, a factory with every machine which was then in current use in Haverhill, and——

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; in Haverhill.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. And they stand ready to-day to equip any factory in any part of the world with any shoemaking devices without any preference of or priority for this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. How much time would the gentleman desire?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I just want to make a little peroration for the benefit of my constituents. [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. Then I yield to the gentleman whatever additional time he requires.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Before the gentleman makes his peroration, I would like to ask him another question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. This is not for the benefit of my constituents.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If that is so, the factory at Haverhill would have absolutely no advantage over the factory in Finland, either as to machinery or processes of manufacture?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Not if the manufacturer in Finland keeps his establishment up to date. I fancy if you take Nuremberg as an example instead of Helsingfors you would have a parallel case. I have no doubt that Nuremberg gets modern machinery just as quickly as Haverhill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then the only advantage possible in the manufacture of shoes would be solely as to the wages of labor in the shoe factory?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; that and such things as the cost of shoe thread and leather and the various other supplies that go into the making of shoes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is the principal difference, is it not—the cost of labor?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; the cost of labor in the factory and the cost of putting together the bricks to build what we call a factory. Our factories cost a vast amount of money to build, and the manufacturers are obliged to carry an immense amount of debt covering the cost of the buildings, or else they must pay a very high rental.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That also involves the cost of labor?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Yes; that is the cost of labor, in one form or another.

Mr. OLMSTED. May I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The figures which the gentleman gave are those which the Government pays on Government contracts for shoes for the Army. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is not a fact that since the reduction in the rate of duty on shoes by the Payne tariff bill somebody, either the retailer or middleman or somebody else, has absorbed the amount of that reduction, so that the purchaser pays just as much now for shoes as he did two years ago?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I think that is so in the main, but it is hard to say anything positive about it unless you see your shoe dissected. You know the average man usually demands a $2.50 or $3 shoe, such as he has had before. Of course, when the cost of findings goes down competition forces the manufacturer to put in a little better material. On the other hand, when the cost of findings rises, the shoe is skimped. Unless you are an expert you can not very well say whether you are buying a better shoe or a worse shoe at the same price.

Mr. OLMSTED. So far as I am concerned, I can say that they are apparently the same kind of shoe, and I paid more for them this year than I paid in 1909.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Certainly, in many instances retail prices have gone up a good deal in that grade of footwear.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DIFENDERFER]?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. I am prepared to verify what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] has already stated. I myself have been wearing a certain grade of shoes for a number of years. It had been my custom for a long while to go to the same store, and last October I went into the store and laid down a $5 bill for a pair of the same shoes that I had been wearing previously, and I was informed that they were 50 cents a pair higher. I presume the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] has had the same experience.

But in connection with what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has said, I would like to ask this question: Whether it is not a fact that when specifications are issued for a certain grade of Army shoes Shrewsbury leather is indicated in the specifications?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I have not the slightest knowledge of that.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. I will say to the gentleman that that is the case, and in a case like that they can certainly make their price, because they control the Shrewsbury output of leather.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I have been here a great many years, and I have had a great many complaints from individual constituents accusing the various departments of this Government of drawing specifications in order to favor particular persons. Upon investigation, without exception, I have found that my constituents were mistaken in the premises. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if he will go to the War Department and discuss the matter with the Secretary of War, will find that there is an adequate explanation.

Mr. DIFENDERFER. That adequate explanation would only consist in this, that under a test of other leather, known as Calumet leather, by the department, they found that it was better than the Shrewsbury leather that had been corraled by the company making Army shoes. Now, if that is true—and I think I stand in a position to prove that that is correct—then these premises are not well taken.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is nearly 6 o'clock. I am getting hungry and I am not going to have my peroration cut out or have it printed in the RECORD with the words "Not delivered on the floor of the House" on the face of it.

TO REPUBLICANS—THE CORN LAWS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

To you, my associates of the Republican Party who intend to vote for this bill, I have a few words to say. In my heart I do not blame you. Your farmers have been deprived of their protection and they refuse to buy in a protected market. If this were a "fisherman's free-trade bill" it might be I who would be voting for it and you who would be upholding the protective doctrine. I can not refrain from inviting your attention to a great historic parallel.

In 1841 Sir Robert Peel became premier of Great Britain, at the head of the conservative party, which was then avowedly the party of protection, as it is to-day in a less degree. Sir Robert and the conservative party had come into power on the issue of maintaining the protective system.

Bad harvests ensued; Great Britain rang with complaints of the "high cost of living." Whether protection was at fault, whether the situation was but temporary, Sir Robert must needs yield those doctrines which he had preached so long. By a coalition between the Whig Party and the Peel wing of the Conservative or Protection Party the repeal of the corn laws of Great Britain was brought about. At once the whole protective edifice began to crumble. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The British farmer had been deprived of his protection, and he would no longer tolerate the system. But how about Sir Robert and the Conservative Party? Within one month he was driven from power and for many and many a year his party was involved in his ruin.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I can not be further interrupted. I have yielded as much as I am going to.

Mr. STANLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I do not wish to interrupt him. I simply wish to inquire whether this is a peroration or a prophecy.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Let us hope that present-day events may deviate from that memorable historic parallel. It may be, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has so solemnly said, that resistance to this bill will empty many a seat in the Senate of the United States. It may be that it will empty the presidential chair. It may well be that my whole course on protection may empty my seat. If so, amen! We must yield to the will of the people. It is right that we should be superseded if our doctrines no longer meet their views; but I pray to heaven that Sir Robert Peel's example may be repudiated. I pray to heaven that no lust for the feeble continuance of a show of power may ever induce the Republican Party to abandon the principles which it has maintained for 50 years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CARY, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6730) to authorize the leasing of the Batan Island Military Reservation for coal-mining purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

APPORTIONMENT.

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on the Census, reported the bill (H. R. 2983) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. No. 12), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether he expects to call this bill up to-morrow or to wait until after the end of this tariff debate?

Mr. HOUSTON. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that I do not expect to call it up to-morrow, but I want to call it up as soon as I can.

Mr. DALZELL. Unless by a two-thirds vote, Calendar Wednesday can not be dispensed with.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly there will be no opposition to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday to-morrow.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman says there will be none?

Mr. MANN. I think there will be none.

The SPEAKER. There is no business on that calendar.

Mr. DALZELL. Unless Calendar Wednesday is dispensed with by a two-thirds vote that bill would be the regular order.

Mr. MANN. I take it there will be no objection whatever to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. This being a privileged bill, it would not be in order on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. I am not sure it is a privileged bill; but I do not make that point of order.

The SPEAKER. It is a question of the highest privilege.

Mr. HOUSTON. I suppose there would be nothing in the way of this bill, but I do not expect to call it up to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 26, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Long Beach Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 27); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Lewis River, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 28); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of St.

Louis River, Wis. and Minn. (H. Doc. No. 29); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A joint letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and Postmaster General in regard to a Federal building being erected at Oneida, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 30); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAMLIN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 13) for investigation of expenditures in the State Department, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 11), which said resolution and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3404) granting a pension to Andrew M. Jordan; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of Timothy Donahoe; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 5283) for the relief of the estate of Isaac Winston, deceased; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5452) for the relief of Elizabeth Lynch; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 7251) to confer title in fee and to authorize the disposition of certain lots now situate on the Hot Springs Reservation, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 7252) to provide for the erection of a public building at Kittanning, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 7253) providing for the adjustment and payment of accounts of laborers and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7254) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the sale of gas in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7255) to determine powers of United States judges as to instructions to juries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7256) to amend sections 4924 and 4927 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7257) authorizing juries to fix punishment of defendants convicted in United States courts in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7258) recognizing the military service of and giving pensionable status under all pension laws of the United States to persons serving under United States officers as home guards, militia, or other provisional troops during the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7259) granting right of way for road through Government reservation north of National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7260) to appropriate $20,000 for the extension and completion of Hooker Road from St. Elmo up Lookout Mountain, in Hamilton County, Tenn., to United States reservation, Point Park, and battle field on Lookout Mountain and acceptance by cession of said roads by United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7261) to add 31,000 acres of land, by purchase or condemnation, to the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park, and appropriating $761,000 for that purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7262) to provide for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7263) to authorize the counties of Bradley and McMinn, Tenn., by authority of their county courts, to construct a bridge across the Hiwassee River at Charleston and Calhoun, in said counties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7264) to provide for the erection of a public building at McMinnville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7265) to provide for the erection of a public building at Athens, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7266) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sparta, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7267) to provide for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 7268) to better regulate the traffic in intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 7269) providing for the marking and protection of the battle field known as Fort Sanders, in Knox County, Tenn., and for the erection of a monument thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 7270) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Whitewater, Walworth County, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 7271) to provide for the payment of tolls and transit charges on public vessels of the United States and merchant vessels of the United States passing through the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 7272) granting pensions to teamsters of the War of the Rebellion and the Indian wars from 1861 to 1865, inclusive; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 7273) providing for the establishment of a life-saving station between Ocean City and North Beach on the coast of Worcester County, in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7274) authorizing the County of Rio Arriba, in the Territory of New Mexico, to issue bonds for the construction of a courthouse in the said county; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 7275) to allow the city and county of San Francisco, in the State of California, to construct storage reservoirs and other waterworks and accessory structures and to exchange land for reservoir sites in Lake Eleanor and Hetch Hetchy Valleys, in Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 7276) authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 7277) authorizing the construction of an addition to the Federal building at El Paso, Tex., and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 7278) to provide for the labeling of cans, pots, tins, and other receptacles containing meat or meat-food products when hermetically sealed and prepared for foreign or interstate commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7279) authorizing the issue of equipment of arms, ammunition, and such accouterment as accompany same for target practice to the Memorial University, Mason City, Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7280) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Oelwein, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7281) to authorize the erection of a Federal building at Charles City, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A resolution (H. Res. 127) relating to the printing of speeches or statements of Members in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government should pay that part of the public debt of the Commonwealth of Virginia existing at the time of the separation of the State of West Virginia therefrom which, under the rules of equity, may be chargeable to the territory composing the said State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERGER: A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) for the appointment of a committee of investigation; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7282) granting an increase of pension to Frank E. Schoener; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7283) granting an increase of pension to John F. Stallsmith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7284) granting an increase of pension to Titus Goodell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7285) granting an increase of pension to Peter Bear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7286) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Aungst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7287) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel G. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7288) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Ashley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7289) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Beecher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7290) granting an increase of pension to Eugene A. Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7291) granting an increase of pension to William A. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7292) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7293) granting an increase of pension to Frank Bleser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7294) granting an increase of pension to Marshall B. Beach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7295) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Beman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7296) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7297) granting a pension to Lawrence Byrne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7298) granting an increase of pension to George Bame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7299) granting an increase of pension to Perrin H. Calkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7300) granting an increase of pension to Harris W. Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7301) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7302) granting an increase of pension to Edward Cassiday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7303) granting an increase of pension to Alexander M. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7304) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Delbar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7305) granting an increase of pension to David D. Donahue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7306) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Driscoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7307) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Delay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7308) granting a pension to Wilson H. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7309) granting an increase of pension to George W. Enos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7310) granting an increase of pension to Granville H. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7311) granting an increase of pension to Lewis B. Emmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7312) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7313) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Fordyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7314) granting an increase of pension to William S. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7315) granting an increase of pension to Warren Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7316) granting an increase of pension to Julius L. Goff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7317) granting an increase of pension to George E. Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7318) granting an increase of pension to William Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7319) granting an increase of pension to John F. Stallsmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7320) granting an increase of pension to Henry Stork; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7321) granting an increase of pension to Silas B. Shaner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7322) granting an increase of pension to Charles Stokes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7323) granting an increase of pension to Charles Schmidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7324) granting an increase of pension to Frank Tozzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7325) granting an increase of pension to Edwin F. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7326) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7327) granting an increase of pension to John Tyrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7328) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7329) granting an increase of pension to John Frank Uhl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7330) granting an increase of pension to Alex Van Gorder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7331) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7332) granting an increase of pension to Victor Wiess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7333) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Watt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7334) granting an increase of pension to William H. Waters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7335) granting an increase of pension to George H. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7336) granting an increase of pension to William Held; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7337) granting an increase of pension to James Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7338) granting an increase of pension to Hiram M. Holton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7339) granting an increase of pension to George H. Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7340) granting an increase of pension to George Helt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7341) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7342) granting an increase of pension to Abiah Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7343) granting an increase of pension to Matthew Pork; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7344) granting an increase of pension to David Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7345) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Peterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7346) granting an increase of pension to James Jardine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7347) granting an increase of pension to Peter Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7348) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7349) granting an increase of pension to John C. Sheridan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7350) granting an increase of pension to Albert A. Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7351) granting an increase of pension to John Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7352) granting an increase of pension to David R. Routson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7353) granting an increase of pension to John Redd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7354) granting an increase of pension to William Schaeffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7355) granting an increase of pension to Henry Seymour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7356) granting an increase of pension to John J. Kraft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7357) granting an increase of pension to George Kross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7358) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Laux; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7359) granting an increase of pension to Miles C. Judson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7360) granting an increase of pension to Roswell Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7361) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Holt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7362) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Hogan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7363) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Harding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7364) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Lindsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7365) granting an increase of pension to William K. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7366) granting an increase of pension to William J. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7367) granting an increase of pension to Smith A. Marvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7368) granting an increase of pension to William T. Marrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7369) granting an increase of pension to Milton McKinniss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7370) granting an increase of pension to Homer S. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7371) granting an increase of pension to Wesley B. Sultzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7372) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Surruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7373) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7374) granting an increase of pension to Baker Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7375) granting an increase of pension to George W. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7376) granting an increase of pension to Curtis L. Bamber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7377) granting a pension to Thomas J. Mullin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7378) granting a pension to Liberty Gary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7379) for the relief of the estate of William Le Blanc, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7380) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Pound; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7381) granting an increase of pension to Margarita B. Ryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 7382) granting an increase of pension to James F. Bierly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7383) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7384) for the relief of Daniel W. Boutwell; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7385) granting an increase of pension to Simon Fockler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 7386) granting a pension to Mary Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7387) granting a pension to Addie Carmichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7388) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Popejoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 7389) for the relief of the administrator or heirs of John G. Campbell, to permit the prosecution of an Indian depredation claim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 7390) granting an increase of pension to Eli Strimel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7391) for the relief of William E. Bradshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 7392) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7393) granting an increase of pension to William H. Dorsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7394) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Ernest C. North; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7395) for the relief of Willard W. Howe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 7396) granting an increase of pension to John Q. Walling; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7397) granting an increase of pension to Ira Timmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 7398) granting an increase of pension to John Dickerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7399) granting an increase of pension to John S. Copens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7400) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Voorhies; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7401) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Louisa, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 7402) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 7403) granting an increase of pension to Elias D. Keoppel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7404) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Keefer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 7405) granting an increase of pension to Harry J. Eveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 7406) granting an increase of pension to Herman Brumley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7407) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Rapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7408) granting an increase of pension to Martin Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7409) granting an increase of pension to Alvin S. Dean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7410) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Crow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7411) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Ayres; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7412) granting an increase of pension to William E. McLavey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7413) granting a pension to William Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7414) granting a pension to Abigail A. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7415) granting a pension to Jane E. Myrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7416) granting a pension to Matilda R. Kellogg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7417) granting a pension to Frank Smidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7418) for the relief of William H. Patterson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7419) granting an increase of pension to John H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7420) granting an increase of pension to Alvin H. Holcum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7421) granting an increase of pension to John Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 7422) for the relief of Orville T. Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 7423) for the relief of Robert B. Howard, heir of James B. Howard; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 7424) granting an increase of pension to James O. Rich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7425) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Deberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7426) granting an increase of pension to John D. Womble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7427) granting an increase of pension to Bryon C. Knapp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7428) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7429) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Adcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7430) granting an increase of pension to J. L. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7431) for the relief of the estate of David Wise; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 7432) for the relief of S. Ellen Boyd, administratrix of the estate of Mary Dean, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7433) for the relief of Thomas Reilly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7434) for the relief of Patrick Howe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 7435) granting an increase of pension to James F. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7436) granting a pension to Emma M. Heines; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 7437) granting an increase of pension to James C. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 7438) granting a pension to Kate A. McMichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 7439) granting an increase of pension to Stephen C. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 7440) granting a pension to Mary Ann Mott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 7441) granting an increase of pension to John Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7442) granting an increase of pension to Leavitt O. Virgin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 7443) granting an increase of pension to William Raup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7444) granting an increase of pension to Levi Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 7445) granting an increase of pension to John J. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7446) granting an increase of pension to Charles McVey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7447) granting an increase of pension to William J. Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7448) granting an increase of pension to John F. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7449) granting an increase of pension to Martha Bean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7450) granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7451) granting an increase of pension to Emmor H. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7452) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7453) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Weathers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7454) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Jane Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7455) granting an increase of pension to Burnett M. Trew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7456) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Teague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7457) granting an increase of pension to James A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7458) granting an increase of pension to John W. Roy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7459) granting an increase of pension to Matison M. Kilgore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7460) granting an increase of pension to George W. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7461) granting an increase of pension to Benedict Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7462) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Dauchy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7463) granting an increase of pension to Gideon T. Denton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7464) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca A. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7465) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7466) granting an increase of pension to Milton J. Beebe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7467) granting an increase of pension to Lillie Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7468) granting an increase of pension to Solomon A. Rymer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7469) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Humberd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7470) granting a pension to Ella Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Andrew J. Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7472) granting a pension to Mary J. Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7473) granting a pension to Seborn J. Mullins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7474) granting a pension to J. L. McDowell, alias Leander Dickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7475) granting a pension to Sarah J. Watson, or Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7476) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hollaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7477) granting a pension to Margaret J. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7478) granting a pension to Harriet E. Aiken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7479) granting a pension to John B. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7480) granting a pension to Mary Emma Axmacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7481) granting an increase of pension to James Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7482) for the relief of the estate of J. L. Doss, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7483) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Y. B. Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7484) for the relief of James Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7485) for the relief of trustees of the Boiling Fork Baptist Church, of Cowan, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7486) for the relief of Mrs. David Gillespie; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7487) for the relief of Samuel McJunkin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7488) for the relief of John Coppinger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7489) for the relief of Mrs. E. L. Eblen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Charles Hassett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7491) for the relief of James B. Hoge; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7492) for the relief of Jasper N. T. Hamilton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7493) for the relief of Ruth Holder; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7494) for the relief of John M. Heard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7495) for the relief of James Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7496) for the relief of James Nipper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7497) for the relief of Edward D. Pickett; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7498) for the relief of James B. Hoge; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7499) for the relief of W. P. Qualls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7500) for the relief of Isom M. Qualls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7501) for the relief of Joseph G. Richardson, administrator, etc.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7502) for the relief of D. J. Rogers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7503) for the relief of William Roberts; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7504) for the relief of Abner Souder; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7505) for the relief of R. H. Sively; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7506) for the relief of the widow of the late Capt. Daniel C. Trewhitt; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7507) for the relief of P. H. Schoolfield; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7508) for the relief of Ruth Ann True; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7509) for the relief of Jesse A. Wallace; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7510) for the relief of William M. White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7511) for the relief of Jesse Walling; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7512) for the relief of G. R. West; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7513) for the relief of Sarah J. Standefer; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7514) for the relief of A. Shelton, administrator of estate of Elizabeth W. Carper; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7515) for the relief of Mary E. Coppinger; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7516) for the relief of Rachael C. Stiefvater, as reimbursement for the use and destruction of property by the United States Army in 1864; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7517) for the relief of George W. Penney and the heirs of Thomas Penney, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7518) for the relief of the estate of Louisa M. Kirklin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7519) for the relief of the heirs at law of Robert Worthington; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7520) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Wood, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7521) for the relief of the heirs of Margaret Sivley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7522) for the relief of Julia Blount Thacker, Amanda Catherine Johnson, John Clark Rowden, and Samuel Echols Rowden, the only heirs at law of Isaac Curry Rowden and Sarah E. Rowden; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7523) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of McMinn County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7524) for the relief of the trustees of Hennegans Chapel, Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Dunlap, Sequatchie County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7525) for the relief of the estate of George M. Carroll, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7526) for the relief of the estate of Burrell L. Bennett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7527) for the relief of the estate of George P. Carmichael, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7528) for the relief of the estate of William Duncan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7529) for the relief of the estate of Austin Hackworth, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7530) for the relief of the estate of W. G. Hoge, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7531) for the relief of the estate of J. K. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7532) for the relief of the estate of P. W. Key; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7533) for the relief of the estate of Aaron Murdock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7534) for the relief of the estate of John A. Pickett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7535) for the relief of the estate of Washington Pryor, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7536) for the relief of the estate of N. T. Power, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7537) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Smith, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7538) for the relief of the estate of Washington Turner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7539) for the relief of the estate of Patrick Henry Watkins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7540) granting a pension of $30 per month to United States soldiers, War with Mexico; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7541) to appropriate for and pay claim of T. F. Vann, administrator of Leroy P. Campbell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7542) to correct the military records of the United States so as to muster James Kirkland in and out of service in United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7543) granting an honorable discharge to Marion Hixson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7544) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Thomas J. Schrimpsher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7545) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Samuel J. Rayl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7546) to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Gabriel P. Keith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7547) to remove the charge of desertion against the name of Thomas J. Schrimpsher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7548) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry H. Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7549) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of W. W. Sharp, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7550) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Laura E. Raulston, administratrix of James W. Raulston, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7551) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James E. Meacham; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7552) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of John Henson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7553) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of C. H. Corn, administrator of John Chitwood, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7554) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of John Chitwood, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7555) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Robert A. Dickson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7556) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of C. H. Corn, administrator of estate of W. W. Sharp, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7557) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the estate of Josiah J. Bryan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7558) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of W. R. Henson, administrator of John Henson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7559) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William H. Dawson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7560) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Cleveland, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7561) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Chattanooga, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7562) for the relief of the estate of Daniel C. Yarnell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 7563) granting a pension to Benjamin M. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7564) to remove the charge of desertion against Gilbert Acklen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 7565) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bullard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7566) granting a pension to Cornelius Medler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7567) granting a pension to Seymour McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7568) granting a pension to Milo D. Heath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7569) granting a pension to William C. Benz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7570) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Dupray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 7571) granting a pension to John Nelson West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7572) granting an increase of pension to George L. Nye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 7573) for the relief of William B. Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7574) for the relief of Stephen B. Fowler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 7575) granting an increase of pension to James Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7576) for the relief of George R. Curtis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 7577) for the relief of L. C. Chisholm; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 7578) granting an increase of pension to John A. Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 7579) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7580) granting an increase of pension to William F. Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7581) granting an increase of pension to Royal S. Dunham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7582) for the relief of J. E. Mintline; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 7583) granting an increase of pension to Rufus B. Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 7584) granting a pension to George E. Boyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7585) granting a pension to Lewis W. Pattison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 7586) for the relief of the legal representatives of Nathaniel Post, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7587) granting an increase of pension to John E. Quackenbush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of James Devore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 7589) for the relief of Sarah Eastmond; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 7590) granting an increase of pension to M. S. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 7591) granting an increase of pension to Eli Sherrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7592) for the relief of Daniel Lane; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7593) for the relief of Thomas J. Shropshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of certain veterans, seeking general pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the Trades and Labor Council of Coshocton, Ohio, opposing intervention by the United States in Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of 46 Democrats and 15 Republicans of Johnstown, Ohio, against any reduction in the tariff on raw wool; and Brownsville Banner Grange, No. 1738, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the Marble City Lodge, No. 67, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Natural Dam, N. Y., protesting against the reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of James W. Shearer, of West Point, Nebr., and D. S. Crawford Post, No. 197, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the Sulloway bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Victor M. Wheeler (H. R. 6227); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petitions of Watervliet Paper Co., of Watervliet, Mich., and B. Desenberg, of Lawton, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens who live along the rural routes in the State of North Dakota, favoring the increase to rural free delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of M. G. Strauss, of North Dakota, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of citizens of Ollie, Martinsburg, and Fremont, Iowa, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Lillie Frazier, widow of John Frazier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Solomon A. Rymer, of Polk County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Mary Emma Axmacher, widow of Robert Axmacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of James Simpson, of Hamilton County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Samuel H. Humbard, of Bradley County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in the case of John B. Evans, Rafter, Monroe County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Affidavit to accompany bill for relief of John Dupray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolutions of the Pomona Grange, Sonoma County, Cal., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petitions of Potter & Buffington, Providence, R. I., and S. & B. Lederer Co., Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill 32260; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALMER: Resolutions of Washington Camp No. 327, and Local Camp No. 435, Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging passage of the illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Papers to accompany House bill 7044, to repeal the several acts authorizing an internal tax on cotton, and to refund the same; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of John A. Fry, of McNairy County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of Alfred Sargent, of Coldwater, Mich., for increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. E. Mintline, of Coldwater, Mich., requesting an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Petition of the twenty-fifth Illinois congressional district against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Resolutions of Washington Camp No. 148, Patriotic Order Sons of America, located at Succasunna, State of New Jersey, urging the passage of the illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of Riverside Grange, No. 125, Patrons of Husbandry, of Three Bridges, N. J., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *April 26, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Father, soul from whom all blessings flow, feed us with the bread of Heaven, that we may be strong of mind, pure of heart, fearless of action, ever ready to follow whereso-ever Thou dost lead in the spirit of Him who died that we might live. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are no bills on the calendar to be considered on Calendar Wednesday. I therefore move that the House suspend operations under the rule that brings up bills on Calendar Wednesday to-day.

The SPEAKER. It was held by Speaker CANNON that under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, it did not require any motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday. The Chair thinks it was a good ruling and a matter of common sense that that rule should be considered like any other.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if that is the ruling of the Chair, I withdraw my motion, and move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements and other articles.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] such time as he desires.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I listened yesterday to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader of

the minority, in his assault upon the farmers' free-list bill. The gentleman is always entertaining, quite as often technical, generally critical, most generally hypercritical, and he did not deviate from those usual tendencies. [Laughter.]

He asked the mighty question with the triumphant air of the puzzler, "What is an agricultural implement?" Mr. Chairman, it only shows the decadence of the once great Republican Party that they would elevate to the lofty station of minority leader one who admitted without shame that he did not know what an agricultural implement was. [Laughter.] Why, he says, "What are meats?" I will tell you what meats are and what meats were placed on the free list for. Meats are necessary articles of food and were placed on the free list in order to dissolve those nonmeat-eating Republican clubs that were organized all over the United States in 1907 under the benign reign of Republicanism. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Go ask the hungry people of your own city of Chicago, where they had to organize these nonmeat-eating clubs under the prosperity of the grand old Republican Party and its 1907 panic. They can tell you what meats are.

And the purpose of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is that whenever the Beef Trust takes control of the American market and forces the price of meat up so that the people of this country are forced to combine themselves into clubs resolving that they will not eat meat because the price is so high they can not buy it. This bill lets in meat from every part of the civilized world to compete with one of the products of Republicanism, the Beef Trust, that is organized and in control of the markets in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My friend's speech got so dry that he was forced to undertake to prove that cereal foods consisted of Kentucky whisky. [Laughter.] I want to say to my friend from Illinois that no man that has ever eaten these dry eatables ever once suggested that they were in any way comparable with Kentucky whisky. [Laughter.]

But our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] undertook to tell us that this bill was sectional. I want to say to you gentlemen on that side of the House that you have played that old sectionalism gag out and it will not work. Your plea of sectionalism in the past has borne fruit, and under this appeal to hate and prejudice you have succeeded in placing a trust on every article that the people consume. You have kept your party in power for all of these years by your plea of sectionalism, but no longer will the American people listen to this plea when it comes to dealing with things that affect every article which they consume. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] was not quite fair—and he usually is—when he undertook to deal with binding twine, for he tried to create the impression upon the northern farmer, resorting to quibbling——

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I will yield presently, if the gentleman will keep that thought that he has in mind. I am discussing the question of binding twine. The gentleman said that it was not upon the free list—trying to create the impression upon the northern farmer that this old, wicked Democratic Party had come here and placed upon the free list cotton ties and cotton bagging, but had denied to the northern farmer free binding twine. What are the facts? Here they are. Binding twine is upon the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Here is the record: Shipped into this country in 1909 there were 13,558,323 pounds of binding twine, of the value of $984,914, and it did not pay one penny of tariff. Yet this argument is thrown in here, and why? Because you can not meet this bill upon its merits. Be fair in discussing these things for the consideration of the American people, 50 years removed from the struggle of heat and passion to which you would appeal, to longer bend their backs with taxation and pile upon them trusts and monopolies. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In 1910 the imports of binding twine were 9,130,409 pounds, of the value of $681,033, which paid not one cent of tariff. And yet the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] said, in his argument, that there was no binding twine imported, though the record I have shown conclusively proves that nearly 14,000,000 pounds of binding twine were imported in 1909, of a value of almost a million dollars. Most of the binding twine comes from Canada, some of it comes from England, but none of it pays any duty at all. And you gentlemen think sectionalism is to be considered. I am an American that refuses at this late day to predicate the hope or the argument of Democracy upon such a withered proposition as sectionalism. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I might point out, if I desired to urge sectionalism as a reason for the passage of this bill, if I had no better argument upon which to base it, if I desired to appeal to prejudice between the different parts of a common great Republic—I say I might urge that you have given to the northern farmers all these years free binding twine, but have denied free bagging and ties to the southern farmers who produce cotton. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. JAMES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WARBURTON. I will say to the gentleman that I expect to vote for this free-list bill. [Applause on Democratic side.] I am not inimical to the bill, but there is one thing that I hope to see the gentleman himself or some gentleman on that side add to the bill, and that is free rice.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman that all of the articles which we intend to place upon the free list are not included in this bill. There will be others. The gentleman can not go any further upon free articles than I can.

Mr. WARBURTON. How about free sugar?

Mr. JAMES. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of free sugar.

Mr. WARBURTON. Free rice and free sugar?

Mr. JAMES. I am in favor of free rice and free sugar, and if the time comes when we can get an income tax on the fortunes of the rich to produce revenue enough to run the Government, I am willing and will be happy to give to the people free sugar. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WARBURTON. Well, I have introduced a bill placing sugar on the free list and rice on the free list. Will the gentleman vote for it at this session?

Mr. JAMES. If the gentleman will point out to me how we can secure enough revenue to run the Government of the people without creating a deficit which will wreck it, I will gladly vote for it.

Mr. WARBURTON. I would suggest a few other things, for instance, diamonds, to raise them from 10 per cent——

Mr. JAMES. I am with the gentleman. I am delighted to see the gentleman come to our side. The gentleman is an insurgent, is he not?

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. I want to say to the gentleman that I welcome him to our side, because there is more joy on this side over the "tear-wet face of one repentant sinner than over the snowy robes of a hundred who are just." [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. WARBURTON. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that I want to go right down the line on that proposition at this session.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, the gentleman ought to come into the Democratic Party; he ought to tear off his mask and bare his face full and fair to the breeze. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WARBURTON. I suggest to the gentleman——

Mr. JAMES. Oh, I can not let the gentleman take up all of my time. Come over on this side and I will give you my seat. [Laughter.]

I made a speech in 1909 in favor of placing sugar on the free list. There is no defense at all for the differential that exists upon sugar, and it benefits only the Sugar Trust, and I sincerely trust that we will be able, by proper economy in the expenditure of the people's money, to give to the people sugar free of any duty at all. It is used by all the people, goes into every home, and is almost a necessity of life. And I am gratified to know that 30 States in this Union have ratified the income-tax amendment to the Federal Constitution, needing but 5 more to make it a part of our organic law, a law that will do away with the technical construction of the validity of this law by the courts. An income-tax law will afford us a hundred million dollars of revenue upon the fortunes of those most able to pay to sustain the Government that most favors and prospers them. It is a law so just that for a hundred years of our history it met the approval of courts and Congresses; it is a law so just that the Master gave it to us when he announced that a tithe should be given to keep up the churches, to succor the widow and the orphan. And with this righteous tax we will be able to relieve the people of many burdens of a protective tariff, for it will supply revenue to a great degree.

Mr. Chairman, our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] went further, but he is always entertaining. He generally has fish on his mind, and yesterday he had suckers on his mind [laughter], and he tells us that we are legislating in favor of the northerners against the southerners. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the bill he voted for, the Payne-Aldrich bill—and here it is—his party in that bill placed a provision to do what? Let me read it:

> Imported salt, * * * shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than $100.

Your party wrote into this Payne-Aldrich bill a provision that taxes the farmers of my country for the salt that goes into their bread and that cures their meats, but gives to the fish industry, which the gentleman from Massachusetts represents, and to the Beef Trust, which exists in this country, the right to go to the Treasury and get back from the Treasury the money they paid to import salt here if they used it to the extent of more than $100. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And yet the farmers of this country who do not buy a hundred dollars worth of salt a year for use upon their meat and upon their table have no such favoritism shown to them, but the taxes they pay into the Treasury upon salt remain there, except when they are taken out by the Beef Trust or by the fish industry of the gentleman from Massachusetts. That looks to me like sectionalism if we are to consider this bill upon that line and along that path. But our distinguished friend from Iowa made his speech upon the Canadian reciprocity bill and I want to contrast it with the speech of my friend from Illinois. You gentlemen are awfully hard to please. Our friend from Iowa argued with eloquence when the Canadian reciprocity bill was under consideration. He said, "You put cattle on the free list; people do not eat cattle, they eat meat." My friend, Mr. MANN, comes right along and says, "Why, you put meat on the free list and leave cattle off the free list." The criticism of the gentleman from Iowa to this side was that we let cattle in free, we let hogs in free, we let sheep in free, but we do not let in free the beef and pork. The criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is that we let in free the beef and pork, but do not let cattle in free. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is merely an evidence of the general tendency of the Republican Party to criticize without foundation, and I want to ask you gentlemen this thing: You have written a platform. I do not think you will ever do it again [laughter on the Democratic side], especially not this one, but here it is:

The Republican Party declares unequivocally for a revision of the tariff by a special session of Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President—

Of course, I am too kind to comment upon that. I never believed in striking a man when he was down or hitting something that was dead, and I shall not refer to your violation of this promise. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Your Republican platform of 1908 continues:

And commends the steps already taken to this end in the work assigned to the appropriate committees of Congress, which are now investigating the operation and effect of those schedules. In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

You wrote that, did you not? I know most of you are ashamed of it, but your party wrote that into your platform. What does that mean? That you will place upon the bending backs of the farmers of this country who feed this world the burden of giving to the manufacturers of this country a profit. A profit—you say a reasonable profit, but who decides what is a reasonable profit? Are we to conclude that a reasonable profit in this country creates millionaires with fortunes so big they can not give them away? But you place upon these toilers, these tillers of the soil, the burden of giving to these men a profit. I come in their name and ask you not to guarantee to them a profit but to take the brutal hand of oppressive taxation off the tools with which they toil. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Will you do that? Will you place yourselves in the position of saying: I will place upon the farmers of this country the burden of paying a profit by tariff taxation to the manufacturers, and I will not even take the tariff tax, the burden of monopoly, off of the plow, the harrow, and those things that he uses to produce the food without which the people would starve? The drought may come and wither, the frost may come and kill, storms may come and destroy the farmer's growing crop, he who toils from dawn till dark, but no Republican platform yet has ever offered to him a reasonable profit or any profit or any aid in his business. If the farmer's business does not pay, no taxing law is at his command, advocated by republicanism, to take from others enough to give him a profit or even to give him a living. The taxgatherer comes just the same to his door, the mortgage holder demands payment; and I say it is un-American under our system or any other system in existence among free people to tax one class to make the other rich or to tax one class to give another class profit.

I expect to see you northern Republicans, Republicans from New York, Massachusetts, from Ohio, and other States, when you vote, cast that vote to tax the things with which the farmer labors, and then attempt to write, and stand for its enforcement, an iniquitous provision in law that wrings from his pocket a profit to pour into the laps of the manufacturers, trusts, and monopolies. That is the position you gentlemen are in upon this tariff bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] took up the farmers' free-list bill and criticized it. He said that under this provision allowing fencing wire to come in free, telegraph and telephone wire could be imported under the same provision, coming in as fencing wire. I want to examine that and see whether it is true or not. Here is the language:

Barbed fence wire; wire rods; wire strands; wire rope; wire, woven or manufactured, for fencing; and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Now, would the gentleman from Illinois, if he had to construe that as a lawyer, put a cat's eye in his head and come looking around for small insects in the construction of a provision of that sort? Would the gentleman from Illinois stake his reputation as a lawyer—and he is a good one—upon such a technical and far-fetched construction of a passage in this law as that? The gentleman from Illinois knows that telegraph wire and telephone wire is much larger wire than fencing wire. The gentleman from Illinois knows that it is much more costly than fencing wire, and under the glorious Republican prosperity our farmers have not reached that position yet when they have got money enough to fence their farms with telephone and telegraph wire. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican Party, so long accustomed to construing everything in favor of monopoly, might, in looking for some place to assist some of their favorite concerns, distort, contort, and twist an honorable, plain, manly construction of it in favor of the farmer away from him, so as to aid some of the monopolies engaged in telegraph and telephone pursuits. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But you will have to base your objection upon something more tenable than that in order to meet the approval of the American people.

The gentleman made another argument in regard to "agricultural implements." That very language is included in your own tariff bill, namely, the words "agricultural implements." Why did you not make objection then? Why, the gentleman was one of the wheel horses upon the Republican side in favor of the Republican tariff bill, but I never heard any technical construction about what an "agricultural implement" is. Some on your side complain because we are too broad, and others because we are not broad enough; but I will tell you now that there will be no trouble in the construction of this bill when it comes up for the consideration of those gentlemen that you pay high salaries to for the purpose of saying what the language of this bill means.

Now, let us go to your free list. You have a free list in the Payne bill, and I want to call your attention to some of the items. I want to contrast what the Democratic Party stands for as a free-list bill and what the Republican Party stands for as a free-list bill.

On the Republican free list you have acorns. Now, I am not surprised at that, because the "policy of the Republican Party" has created so many hogs in this country that you have to import acorns in order to feed them here. [Laughter.]

But we, instead of giving acorns to the hogs, turn and give flour and meal to the people who need them to eat. You give "broken bells" to the consumers of this country. They will ring false notes, but no more false than the notes you have rung on that side. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But we offer the farmer, instead of broken bells, fencing wire with which to fence his farm.

Another thing you give on the Republican free list—Payne-Aldrich bill—to the people, and they are grateful for this, and you are entitled to lasting credit for this item which you place upon the free list, namely:

Dried blood, not specially provided for.

[Laughter.]

But the Democratic party in this bill says: "We will not force you to eat dried blood, but we will give you beef and veal, and pork, and something that a man can eat, upon the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Your free list provides for the admission without any tariff of catgut and wormgut, but we offer upon our free list to the people cereal food without any taxation at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The next article I find here on the Republican free list is fossils. I thought if there was anything in the world that we had an overabundance of in this country it was fossils. I thought that if there was anything in this country that afflicted the Republican Party it was fossils, and I thought surely you would not invite any importation of them by placing them upon the free list. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

You gentlemen do not seem to learn, as you go along, the necessities of the people. But the Democratic Party, instead of fossils, offers to the wives and mothers of the Republic sewing machines upon the free list. You placed needles upon the free list. You were willing that they might tear their fingers and wear out their eyes using needles, which you did not have the heart to tax. We place sewing machines upon the free list. You placed fish skins upon the free list, and I do not believe that would have been done if my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] had been here. We give them agricultural drills. You placed old junk upon the free list. We give them bagging for cotton; boots and shoes. You placed leeches upon the free list. [Laughter.] I could excuse the Republican Party for placing even fossils on the free list, but how on earth you can find any satisfaction in placing leeches on the free list when we have already too many bloodsuckers in this country, is a strange thing to me. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

No criticism! Why, what a pleasant impression my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] would have made if he had inquired, "What is a leech?" instead of "What are farming implements?" and if, instead of "What are meats?" he had asked the question, "What is junk?" [Laughter.]

The gentleman in discussing the question of shoes was right sharply amused by that proposition. He used a remarkable expression when I asked him the question, "Why are the shoe manufacturers selling abroad $13,000,000 worth of boots and shoes?" When I asked the gentleman from Illinois what explanation he had to make of that, "Why," he said, "I congratulate our manufacturers. They are doing well. But because they are doing well your party ought not to turn and swat them." But what does the Republican Party do?

Instead of swatting them you turn and allow them to swat the American consumer. The shoe people who went before the Ways and Means Committee said, "Give us free hides." I have no doubt that if they had known of the coming avalanche upon Republicanism and the number of hides that were to be hung up at the last election they would not have asked for free hides. [Laughter.] But they asked for hides to be placed on the free list. They said, "If you give us free hides, then we will sell boots and shoes in competition with the world and without any tariff at all." What did your party do? You put hides on the free list, and when you did it you discarded the advice, the acknowledgment, and the desire of these shoe manufacturers when they said you could place their products upon the free list.

And what do we find? In 1909 these gentlemen—the shoe manufacturers in this country—that you are protecting with a tariff tax sold abroad sole leather to the extent of $6,887,000; kid, $3,373,000; patent leather, $169,000; splits, $17,624,000; and other leather, $2,159,000; total, $30,304,000. They sold abroad boots and shoes, $10,305,000; harness, $650,600 worth; total, $41,367,600 worth of goods that these leather manufacturers and boot and shoe manufacturers are sending abroad and selling in competition with all the world; $41,000,000 worth of leather in 1909, including $10,000,000 worth of boots and shoes. And yet you gentlemen turn upon the American consumer who needs the boots and shoes, the farmer who needs the harness, who needs the leather, and say, "Notwithstanding they are able to sell $41,000,000 worth of these articles abroad in competition with the world, we will lay upon you the heavy hand of tariff taxation and make that much more flow into their pockets from the pockets of the mass of our people.

And I want to say here that these men did not understate the facts when they said: "If you will give us free hides we will compete with the world." I voted to give them free hides, and let us see how much they have increased their business. In not quite one year how much have they increased it? In 1910 instead of selling $6,887,000 worth of sole leather in foreign countries they sold $8,419,473 worth of sole leather. Instead of selling $3,673,000 worth of kid, glazed, they sold $16,675,000 worth. They sold a total of $51,123,000 worth of leather goods, as compared with $41,000,000, or an increase of $10,000,000 in foreign trade in one year under free hides. Why, the sale of these articles abroad is much greater than the entire sale of the United States in the early days of the Republic when the Republican Party was fighting for a protective tariff to protect our infant industries. The boot and shoe makers of this country sent abroad boots and shoes to the extent of $13,216,000, or an increase of $3,500,000 in the sale of boots and shoes as compared with last year. Why can they not sell them to the American consumer as cheaply as they can ship them across the ocean and sell them in competition with the world? Where did they sell them? They sold to Great Britain $4,400,000 worth of sole leather. They sold to Great Britain of other leathers $10,900,000, while all the other countries took $6,000,000 worth.

Now, the question I want answered, and you must answer it to justify your system that you are pursuing here, is this: If these men can ship this amount of goods, and they gladly do it, into foreign countries, and sell $51,000,000 in competition with the world, why can they not sell here to the American consumer without any protective tariff at all? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It will not do to undertake to answer this argument by saying that they are sold as cheaply here as abroad. That statement is untrue; that you have fought and are now fighting for a protective tariff shows it to be untrue. If they were sold as cheaply here as they are abroad, why would you ask for a protective tariff? If our manufacturers of shoes and harness and leather can pay the freight rates across the mighty deep and go into far-away Japan and China and Germany and England and France and Russia and lay down our leather goods in competition with the world, what have they to fear from competition from those countries upon their own soil? The very fact that they are fighting for this tariff shows that they are extorting higher prices from the American consumer than they get from the foreigner. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Yet your party after giving free hides for the benefit of these people turned and kept the tariff upon the finished article, and the tariff to-day is laid against every consumer in this country who purchases anything made out of leather.

Some of the gentlemen upon the Republican side have taken the position that the tariff upon farm products helps the farmer. Gentlemen, my word for it—and I can sustain this by the record—there can be no price for the American farmer for his home product better than that which he gets for the surplus in the foreign markets. When the American farmer is forced to send abroad 100,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn he does it because he can not sell it here, and he can not sell it here because our people can not consume it. Then the price of the surplus product is fixed in the foreign market, and no man will send a bushel of wheat or a bushel of corn or a single ounce of produce from this country and sell it to the foreigner for less than he can sell it for to the American consumer. Why does he ship it abroad? Because of the fact that he gets a better price for it abroad, or because he gets as good a price for it abroad after deducting the freight from the shipment? Let us see if that statement can be sustained. The price of wheat in England every year absolutely squares with the price of wheat in this country when you deduct from the English price the cost of shipment. The very fact that we ship more than 100,000,000 bushels of wheat to England every year is conclusive proof of the fact that it brings a better price there or it would not be shipped. What farmer would ship hogs to the city market when he could sell them upon his own farm at a better price? What farmer would ship his wheat to the city market if he could sell it in his home county for a better price? I know the Republican Party has tried to fool the farmer for years upon this question of a protective tariff upon his wheat and corn. The record shows completely that that is a fraud and a delusion upon the American farmer. Under this system of deception you have undertaken to keep the American farmer quiet while his pockets were picked by the manufacturers, to whom you guarantee a profit. You have kept this fraudulent policy up for the benefit of those giant monopolies that have grown so great they send their products into the foreign markets of the world and sell in competition with all the world there, and then organize trusts and monopolies and annihilate absolutely every semblance of competition here. As a further proof of the fact that the farmer receives no benefit from a protective tariff upon his grain and other products, I give here the domestic and foreign prices of wheat, oats, cattle, and horses for the years 1905 to 1909, inclusive.

Domestic and foreign prices.

[Foreign prices are taken from Report of Agriculture and Fisheries, London. Vol. XLIV, Pt. III, 1909. Domestic prices from Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., 1909.]

WHEAT.

[Per bushel.]

	Average price in London.	Average farm price in the United States.
		Cents.
1905	$0.92	74.8
1906	.87	66.7
1907	.94	87.4
1908	1.00	92.8
1909	1.14	99.0

Domestic and foreign prices—Continued.

OATS.

[Per bushel.]

	Average price in London.	Average farm price in the United States.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
1905	54	34.3
1906	57	29.1
1907	59	44.3
1908	55	47.2
1909	57	40.5

FAT CATTLE (WHOLESALE).

[Per pound.]

	London.	Chicago.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
1905	7¾	5½–7
1906	7¾	5½–7
1907	8	5½–7½
1908	8	5½–8½
1909	8½	5¾–10½

HORSES.

[Per head.]

	London.	New York.	Farm value.
1905	$129	$91	$87
1906	150	108	98
1907	135	131	112
1908	166	138	107
1909	173	156	107

I desire to call a witness out of President Taft's Cabinet, Secretary Wilson himself, who, in a letter to the National Grange of February 9, 1911, relative to the prices the farmer receives, uses this language:

The United States produces surplus wheat above domestic requirements. This surplus production is sold in foreign countries. The price of our exported surplus is governed by the world's requirements, being regulated by the law of supply and demand, and the price of wheat in the United States, while we are exporting, is governed by the price at which the surplus is sold, as a general proposition. Occasionally wheat corners may interfere with the law of supply and demand and temporarily affect the price.

Wheat is never cornered until it is out of the farmer's hands and in the hands of some Chicago trust king. The price he forces up on wheat does not aid the farmer—his wheat is all sold—but the effect is that the laborer who buys his bread is held up and robbed by the millionaire who corners wheat. So this tariff on wheat of 25 cents per bushel never benefits any one except the grain gambler, who with his corner upon wheat drives up the price of the poor man's bread.

But it is unnecessary to pursue this question as to whether a protective tariff benefits the farmer.

My friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has been a great advocate of free lumber. This bill does give us free lumber, and I will tell you why I am for free lumber, notwithstanding our friends on that side have told us so often of the glory of Republican prosperity. I am not of that class of Americans that would seek to dispute the prosperity of my people if I could do otherwise. I am only too glad when our people prosper and to cheer them on in their prosperity. But when you tell me the people of this country are prospering under Republican control I want to call your attention to the fact that, according to the census of 1900, the total dwellings in this country were 14,474,771. The total number of tenants, those who had to rent their homes, were 8,246,747. That shows that practically 42,000,000 American people occupy this very day and will sleep this very night in homes they can not call their own, in homes upon which they have to pay a rent.

I want to make men patriotic, and I want to give to the laboring man an opportunity to build his home. Whenever you give an opportunity to 42,000,000 Americans who do not own their homes—notwithstanding your boasted Republican prosperity—whenever you give them a chance to build their home, which we are offering them by giving them free lumber, you make a patriot out of each one and give to each man a home, and then he has got something he can call his own and something he is willing to defend. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Free lumber! I would call attention of the Republican side to the fact that free lumber is a Democratic doctrine. Free lumber was placed in the Democratic platform of 1908, and it is there to-day, and the Republican side is again following the teaching of the forerunning footsteps of aggressive Democracy demanding for the people of this country free lumber out of which they can build their homes. [Applause.]

How the Republican side can fail to advocate free lumber is a mystery to me. James G. Blaine said that he was a friend of free lumber. He said that the hand of taxation should never rest on that article out of which people build the homes in which they live, out of which they build the churches in which they worship, out of which they make the cradles in which they rock their first born, and out of which they make the coffins in which they bury their dead.

But Blaine is gone, and Republicanism for which he stood has decayed, and the party now is clothing themselves in his habiliments and going forth with his distinguished name and claiming that they represent the Republicanism of Blaine when they advocate the levy of a tax on all of the people for the benefit of the Lumber Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And why is it that our Republican friends will not give our old friends, the farmers, the benefit of these articles upon the free list? The farmer has borne your burden for a long time; he has paid the tariff tax a long time, and he has heard the arguments you have made; and as you argued that the tariff on wheat raised the price of wheat the good old Republican farmer applauded; as you argued that the tariff on flour lessened the price of flour he applauded. And so now he only comes and asks for these things with which he works to be untaxed. Of course the gentleman from Illinois, from the great city of Chicago, which has no waving fields of wheat or corn, which has no products of the farm, can well ask, "What are farming implements?" But you gentlemen on the other side who climb over the fence and go into the furrow with the good old farmer and beg him for his vote as you follow along behind him in the furrow, he may turn long enough to ask you why you did not take off the tariff on this plow that he was using, off of the harrow and his farming machinery. What will your answer be? That is likely to cause you a heap of trouble. I like my friends on the Republican side, and I would rather see them back here than any other Republicans I know, but the only chance you have of coming back is to vote for this free-list bill that we have written and propose here for the benefit of the American farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills, planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins; farm wagons and farm carts.

All in our free-list bill.

My friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks what is a farm wagon. Why, of course I did not expect him to know what a farm wagon was. My friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], delightful as he always is in debate, suggested that maybe it included automobiles. That is just in keeping with the Republican construction. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] I have no doubt that if this passes and a trust Republican comes to construe it, of course it is a farm wagon for the benefit of the old farmer, but that some shrewd Republican, who has been growing fat on the profits that your platform "guaranteed them," will point out with the adroitness of my friend LONGWORTH that it means automobiles. [Laughter and applause.] I have no doubt of that, but no one on our side is now riding in automobiles. CHAMP CLARK even does not ride in an automobile. [Laughter and applause.] He has refused to take advantage of Uncle Joe's machine, because that thing operated so swiftly and so recklessly that even a man of CHAMP CLARK's daring was afraid to take the automobile that had been used by Uncle JOE CANNON. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Could my friend tell us what has become of those mules that we heard so much about last winter? [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. JAMES. Oh, the mule is always a friend of the Democratic Party and the people. The mule is never like the emblem that belongs to your party, the elephant, which is always on dress parade. The mule is always plowing and doing work, trying to feed somebody, aiding some one. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The elephant that speaks for your party is like your party, always parading and never doing anything, always claiming and never performing. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I was amused at one of the most distinguished Republicans in the House, and I believe he knows as much about the tariff as anybody else, but his mind has been in a groove along a certain channel of taxing somebody else and getting profits for somebody else, always for his own folks, of course—I was amused at his saying that this bill in using the words—

And all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts—

would be so construed that the monopolies would mold iron ore and pig iron into parts like repair parts for plows and machines

and bring them in here free of duty. Mr. Chairman, that is another strained construction of our Republican friends. Why do you not meet this bill on its merits? Why try to pick flaws in it? It is because you can not attack it on its merits that you are drifting to that argument.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

I do not see anything sectional about that. The farmer of the North grows hay. He grows other agricultural products. Mr. Chairman, these articles on which wire is used in baling can be produced in the North as well as in the South.

When it comes to the question of leather some one told me—I did not have the pleasure of hearing all of the speech—that our friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] argued that this did not let in all sorts of shoes. Well, that is true, I expect. The finer class of shoes and that character of shoe that the farmer's family never see and are not able to buy. I do not suppose this bill does include them. This is a farmer's free-list bill. We are going to get to these other schedules as we go along. You gentleman will have enough of free-list articles, and they will all be those articles that are needed by the families of the United States. This is the character of articles that we are going to put on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are not going to put on the free list your dried blood and your leeches and junk. We are going to put on something that a man can use and that a family can use. That is the Democratic policy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, for information, whether the Democratic Party proposes to do all this revising this summer?

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can possess his soul in patience. We will do it in our own time and in our own way if it takes all summer. We are not afraid of the heat, because the people have been suffering long under the burdens that your party has placed upon them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to appeal to the Republican side and ask them to aid us to pass this bill. I heard a peculiar argument made here the other day by one class of Republicans. I regret to see you divided into warring sides. It makes my heart bleed [laughter] to see a once militant Republican Party, so aggressive, so united, always the party of constructive legislation, always the bearer of prosperity, now divided and at each other's throats, taking separate roads and announcing differing doctrines.

I tell you it makes me grieve overmuch. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I want to say to the gentlemen upon the other side who argued, when the reciprocity bill was under consideration, and said, "Oh, we must attach this free-list schedule to the reciprocity bill," my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], the second in command of the insurgent forces, because I believe the first in command is in another body, introduced here the free-list schedule to go on the reciprocity bill. And what was their argument? My friend NORRIS indulged in that argument, too. They argued that if we put both of these bills together, the reciprocity bill being a bad bill and the free-list bill being a good bill, that the Senate would pass both of them together, which the Senate would refuse to pass separately, and they maintained the man you elected would, if we passed them separately, veto the good bill and sign the bad one; but if we passed them both together he would affix his signature to both, the good and the bad. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am unwilling to indulge in that argument against even a Republican President. I fought him in many of the States of this Union; I did not believe he ought to have been elected; but I am not willing to stand upon the floor of this House and say that our President—for he is our President now—if we passed these two measures separately, would sign the bad one and veto the good one. Aye, as strong a Democrat as I am, I am willing to concede to a Republican President too much patriotism to sign one bill because it is bad and veto another one because it is good. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And if your President has an opportunity at this free-list schedule, as I believe he will have, because in another end of this Capitol your party has but 9 majority, if you count both contending factions in it, and I believe enough on your side will come to us to pass this bill, never on earth will enough courage be mustered in the big frame of your big President to veto this bill which takes the hand of taxation off the implements with which the American farmer tills the American soil. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to appeal to my Republican friends upon that side of the House to help.

I believe that Thomas Jefferson uttered the truth when he spoke of the farmer better than anyone ever has, or, perhaps, than anyone ever will, when he said of these millions of American farmers:

The cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens; they are the most vigorous, the most independent, the most virtuous; they are tied to their country and wedded to its liberty and interests by the most lasting bonds.

I want to appeal to both sides of this House for the passage of this bill. I appeal irrespective of politics in behalf of the American farmer, and I beg this House to pass this bill giving to the farmers of our Republic free farming implements—tools of trade, implements to till the earth free from any tariff taxation. In the name of millions of honest hearts which beat in the bosoms of these Americans behind the plow, upon the harrow, at the drill, those who make the harvesters sing in fields of golden grain, I beg you in their name to take the heavy hand of taxation off of the tools with which they woo from the earth the food which feeds the millions of this world. The farmer asks no guaranty of a reasonable profit which the Republican Party gives the manufacturer from the pockets of the farmers themselves. The farmer only asks that you let him have untaxed by tariffs and unmonopolized by trusts the tools of his trade. Give the farmers this relief. They are the future hope of this Republic, as they have been its past reliance. For these men I appeal for the passage of this bill. The farmer stands under your Republican policies bowed by the weight of your oppressive tariff, even upon the implements with which he farms.

He leans upon his hoe and gazes upon the ground,
The emptiness of ages in his face and on his back the burden of the world.

Can you, will you, deny him this relief? God grant that you will pass this bill. [Loud and continued applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he desires to yield now?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, for several years there has been a tendency in the business world toward combination. There is no doubt but what economy in production and manufacture can be brought about by the combining of energy and of capital. But history has shown that men do not go into these combinations from any ideas of philanthropy, and that when any combination has succeeded in monopolizing and controlling the production or distribution of any given article the price to the ultimate consumer is increased and the unfair and unreasonable profits are pocketed by the men or corporations in control.

When competition has been throttled monopoly has taken possession, and if unrestrained and uncontrolled the result has always been an unfair and an unequal distribution of the products of labor and of wealth. The favored few have unduly profited at the expense of the unorganized thousands. From the dawn of history there have been laws against monopoly and unreasonable restraint of trade, but great combinations, on account of their wealth and influence, have been able to employ the brightest and keenest minds of the age to invent and put into operation plans and methods whereby these laws can be circumvented and avoided and the combination allowed to continue to levy their unholy and unrighteous tribute.

The combinations that have attracted the most attention and have first drawn the fire of the courts have usually been those which have affected a comparatively few people, but in such a large degree as to make it an object for every individual affected to go into court for redress. But I shall speak of a combination that levies its tribute in pennies, but counts its contributors by the million. Other monopolies levy their tribute but once, but this monster is a daily uninvited guest at every breakfast table in the land. Other combinations confine their energies to the country of their origin, but this one makes its daily visits to every humble home in the civilized world. Most of the trusts and combinations to which our attention has been attracted in the past have been composed of men and subsidiary corporations, but this gigantic institution numbers among its stockholders a sovereign State and one of the independent nations of the world.

In 1906 Sao Paulo, one of the States of the Brazilian Government, undertook to control the world's supply of coffee. About 85 per cent of the world's supply of coffee is raised in Brazil, and of the Brazilian coffee a very large proportion of it is raised in the State of Sao Paulo. The method employed for the purpose of cornering the world's supply of coffee was for this State to buy all the coffee produced within its borders and

to issue bonds thereon and hold the coffee until the price went up and then sell at the advanced figure. It was supposed that the proportion of the world's supply of coffee raised in this State would be sufficient, if held out of the market, to control the price all over the civilized world.

The undertaking, however, was too great for the State of Sao Paulo to successfully control the situation, and after two years of trial had shown that the plan would in the end fail, a new and more gigantic scheme was devised. In 1908 this new plan was consummated and put into active operation. The history of the civilized world will not show another as gigantic an undertaking as was this. In order to carry out its purpose, the assistance of the Brazilian Government was procured and some of the largest financial concerns in the civilized world became interested partners in the colossal scheme. This plan to corner the coffee of the world provided that bonds to the amount of $75,000,000 should be issued by the State of Sao Paulo and that the payment of both principal and interest of these bonds should be guaranteed by the Brazilian Government. Out of the proceeds of the sale of these bonds it was agreed that the coffee produced in the State of Sao Paulo and all of the adjoining States should be purchased and held out of the market until the price could be artificially controlled. These bonds were handled by English, German, French, Dutch, and American bankers. Rothschild & Sons and J. Henry Schroder & Co., of London, took $25,000,000 of them. The Societe General and the Banque de Paris, of France, took $25,000,000. S. Bleichschroder, of Berlin, took $10,000,000 of the bonds. The National Bank of Belgium took $5,000,000. The other $10,000,000 were taken by J. P. Morgan & Co., the National City Bank, and the First National Bank, all of New York City.

It was also agreed that a committee of seven men should be selected to supervise and control the sale of the coffee purchased with the proceeds of these bonds. Six members of this committee were to be selected by these financial firms whose names I have given, who furnished the money to finance the scheme, and the other member of the committee was to be selected by the Government of Brazil. The coffee purchased was to be shipped to representatives of these financial concerns and the possession thereof held as a further security for the bonds. Such coffee was to be stored in warehouses in America, England, Germany, Holland, and France and sold in such quantities and at such prices as should be agreed upon by this committee of supervision. As a further guaranty for the payment of the bonds and interest, the Brazilian Government agreed to levy an export or surtax on coffee shipped out of that country and to remit the proceeds of this tax weekly to these financial backers, the same to be applied in payment of the necessary expenses in looking after the details of the agreement and in the interest on the bonds as it should mature. It was likewise agreed that the Brazilian Government should enact a law that would prohibit the planting of any additional coffee trees and to prevent as far as possible an increase in the supply. This agreement has been in successful operation since the latter part of the year 1908. In accordance with its terms, the Brazilian Government enacted a law preventing the planting of additional coffee trees and provided for severe penalties for any offense against this provision of the statute. Inspectors were appointed who went through the country and destroyed any new trees that had been planted and administered severe punishment against those who were guilty of an infraction of the law.

The bonds were duly issued and, in accordance with the provisions of the agreement, Brazilian coffee was purchased and shipped to different parts of the world, where it was held in storage until the price advanced sufficiently to make the scheme profitable, when it was sold, but in such quantities as would not break down this artificial market.

It takes three or four years after a coffee tree is planted before it comes in bearing, and the tree does not reach its full bearing capacity for six or seven years, but after the tree has once reached maturity it does not lose its vitality or decline in its productivity until it is 40 or 50 years old. At the time of this agreement, in 1908, there were a great many thousands of coffee trees planted in Brazil that had not reached the bearing stage, so that it was quite evident to the promoters of this plan that, even though no additional trees be planted, there would be quite a large increase in the production of coffee as fast as the trees then planted should reach the stage of production. The bonds were not to mature until 1919, and ample provision was made for the control of the coffee market up to that time, even though the production should for several years increase beyond consumption. It was no doubt understood by these promoters that their scheme of valorization would have a tendency to increase the planting of coffee trees by other coffee-producing countries of the world, but they knew that by the practical ownership and control of from 80 to 85 per cent of the coffee of the world, even though other coffee-producing countries would increase their supply, they would be able to control the coffee market.

On account of the new trees that came into bearing after the agreement was made, and which trees had been planted prior to the making of the agreement, the production of coffee in Brazil increased for several years at a greater rate than the consumption of coffee, but so firm was the hold of this gigantic combination upon the coffee markets of the world that they have been able to absolutely control the supply and the sale of coffee throughout the civilized world. The coffee as it was purchased was sent to the different ports of Europe and America, where it was held until the price of coffee went up, and was then sold only in such quantities as would not break the market. The price of coffee has steadily advanced from month to month since the time this agreement went into effect, until on the 1st day of January of this year it had more than doubled in price. The wholesale price of No. 7 Rio coffee in New York in December, 1908, was 6½ cents a pound. From that time on the price, with practically no variation whatever, slowly but steadily advanced from month to month, and on the 1st day of January, 1911, the same coffee in the same market was selling at 13¼ cents a pound.

The Government of Brazil did everything in its power to carry out its portion of the agreement. It sometimes increased the export tax, which had a twofold effect—it had a tendency to decrease the exportation of coffee from Brazil, and thus decrease the world's supply, and it increased the money received as an export tax to be applied upon the expenses of the scheme and the payment of interest on the bonds.

In order that there might be no doubt as to the ability of this combination to hold up the price of coffee, it was at one time seriously proposed that the law providing for a surtax on coffee exported from Brazil should be changed, and instead of taking a tax payable in money the Government should take one-tenth of the coffee exported, and that this coffee so taken in tithe should be loaded into barges, carried out into the ocean, and sunk in the sea.

At another time the proposition was seriously considered of taking one-tenth of the coffee produced in Brazil and burning it. This proposition was at one time approved by this committee of seven, who, as I have said, had charge of the disposition of the valorized coffee, and had it not been for a fear that this wanton destruction of coffee would arouse a sentiment of criticism throughout the world and call particular attention to the methods that were being devised to control the market price of coffee there is no doubt but what this particular plan would have been executed.

Of this committee of seven, Baron Schroder, of London, is the chairman and Herman Sielcken, of New York City, is the American member.

On the 27th day of April, 1909, there was a meeting of this committee in London. They had under consideration, among other things, this particular method of curtailing the supply of coffee, and at that time they issued a circular letter to the coffee trade, from which I copy the following:

A meeting of the committee charged with the management of the State of Sao Paulo government coffee was held to-day under the chairmanship of Baron Bruno Schroder, and the following members were present:

1. Dr. Francisco Ferreira Ramos.
2. M. le Vicomte des Touches.
3. The Societe Generale.
4. Mr. Herman Sielcken.
5. The firm of Theodor Wille.
6. Mr. Edouard Bunge.
7. The firm of J. Henry Schroder & Co.

The following statement was approved:

1. With reference to clause 2 of the circular dated 5th January, 1909, the committee states that no sales of coffee have been made, that the contemplated sale of 500,000 bags will not be undertaken until the trade is ready to pay the price stipulated therein, or its equivalent in any of the markets, and that in no case shall the sales during the current year exceed 500,000 bags.

2. The Government has lately had under its consideration the advisability of replacing the existing law limiting the export of coffee by a new law creating an extra duty of 10 per cent on all exports of coffee, payable in kind, such coffee to be destroyed under the control of the committee. This law would, in the opinion of the Government, bring about the same result as the existing law, but in a more satisfactory manner. The change would appear to the Government to be most desirable, as it would obviate the rush to market the crop, which would undoubtedly take place under the existing law; the planter would thereby be given time to properly prepare his coffee; the exports would then, as in former years, be spread over the whole 12 months, and the quality of the coffee exported would be improved by the destruction of the lowest grades. Such alteration of the law would also be desirable in the interests of the coffee trade, of labor, and of the railway and shipping companies, and would at the same time assure the stability of the exchange.

The Government has now approached the committee officially on the subject, having set forth its reasons, as above, for desiring an alteration of the law, and the committee, after careful consideration of all

interests, is of opinion that the proposed change of the law is desirable and will consider the feasibility of such an alteration.

The Federal Government of Brazil is ready to sanction the proposed change in the law.

It might be well to note, in passing, that these bonds were taken by the financiers, whose names I have given, at 85 cents on the dollar. They drew 6 per cent interest, a higher rate than the bonds of any nation on the face of the earth.

In order that Members may get a definite idea as to the steady advance in the price of coffee that has taken place since the beginning of this valorization plan, and in order that all may see how steadily the market has advanced and how complete the control thereof has been on the part of this combination, I will incorporate in the RECORD a table showing the wholesale weekly price at New York of Rio Standard No. 7 coffee from December 5, 1908, to the 7th day of January, 1911.

1908.	Cents.
Dec. 5	6¼
Dec. 12	6¼
Dec. 19	6¼
Dec. 26	6¼
1909.	
Jan. 2	6⅜
Jan. 9	6⅜
Jan. 16	7
Jan. 23	7⅛
Jan. 30	7⅛
Feb. 6	7⅛
Feb. 13	7⅛
Feb. 20	8
Feb. 27	8
Mar. 6	8⅛
Mar. 13	8
Mar. 20	8⅛
Mar. 27	8⅛
Apr. 3	8⅜
Apr. 10	8⅛
Apr. 17	8⅛
Apr. 24	8¼
May 1	8¼
May 8	8¼
May 15	8⅛
May 22	7⅜
May 29	7⅜
June 5	7⅜
June 12	7⅜
June 19	7⅜
June 26	7⅜
July 3	7⅜
July 10	7⅜
July 17	7⅜
July 24	7⅛
July 31	7⅜
Aug. 7	7¼
Aug. 14	7¼
Aug. 21	7¼
Aug. 28	7¼
Sept. 4	7¼
Sept. 11	7¼
Sept. 18	7¼
Sept. 25	7
Oct. 2	7¼
Oct. 9	7¼
Oct. 16	8
Oct. 23	8
Oct. 30	8
Nov. 6	8⅛
Nov. 13	8⅜
Nov. 20	8¼
Nov. 27	8⅜
Dec. 4	8⅜
Dec. 11	8⅜
Dec. 18	8⅜
Dec. 24	8⅜

1910.	Cents.
Jan. 1	8⅜
Jan. 8	8⅜
Jan. 15	8⅜
Jan. 22	8⅜
Jan. 29	8⅜
Feb. 5	8⅜
Feb. 12	8⅜
Feb. 19	8⅜
Feb. 26	8⅜
Mar. 5	8⅜
Mar. 12	8⅜
Mar. 19	8⅜
Mar. 26	8⅜
Apr. 2	8⅜
Apr. 9	8⅛
Apr. 16	8⅛
Apr. 23	8⅜
Apr. 30	8⅜
May 7	8⅛
May 14	8⅛
May 21	8⅛
May 28	8
June 4	8⅛
June 11	8⅛
June 18	8⅛
June 25	8⅛
July 2	8⅜
July 9	8⅜
July 16	8⅜
July 23	8⅛
July 30	8⅜
Aug. 6	8⅜
Aug. 13	8⅝
Aug. 20	9⅛
Aug. 27	9⅞
Sept. 3	10⅛
Sept. 10	10⅛
Sept. 17	10⅛
Sept. 24	10⅜
Oct. 1	11
Oct. 5	10⅞
Oct. 8	11
Oct. 15	10⅞
Oct. 22	10⅛
Oct. 29	10⅜
Nov. 5	10⅞
Nov. 12	11⅛
Nov. 19	12⅜
Nov. 26	13
Dec. 3	13¼
Dec. 10	13¼
Dec. 17	13⅜
Dec. 24, no quotation; Christmas eve.	
Dec. 31	13½
1911.	
Jan. 7	13½

These prices are the closing wholesale prices on every Saturday from December 5, 1908, to January 7, 1911.

Mr. Chairman, right here I desire to incorporate in my remarks not only this table but several others, and I would ask permission at this time to incorporate such tables as I have without taking up the time to read them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to incorporate the tables referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NORRIS. It must be remembered that the attempt to control the coffee market of the world really began in 1906, although, as I have explained, the first two years of the valorization scheme, the combination did not include all of the American and European financiers I have mentioned and did not have behind it all of the stringent laws in its behalf afterwards passed by the Brazilian Government. The price of coffee at the beginning of the valorization plan in 1906 was considerably lower than at the date of the beginning of the table which I have inserted.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield.

Mr. SHARP. I desire to ask the gentleman in regard to the statements he is to incorporate in the RECORD. May I ask if you have also the prices obtained for coffee in England as well as in the United States during the period mentioned?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have not.

Mr. SHARP. I ask that question because while we were discussing the Payne-Aldrich bill I remember very well Mr. PAYNE arose in his seat and, in answer to a question that was asked him, tried to explain why coffee sold in this country for nearly four times the price at which it was imported, and he frankly stated that the Committee on Ways and Means had been bothered by that fact and they then could not account for it.

I spent some little time in investigating the subject, and I found that at that time, although the same price was paid by the importers in Great Britain for the coffee of similar brands and qualities, yet it sold universally over there for about 60 per cent of the price at which it sold in the United States; and the same was true of tea.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I will take up that question a little further on. It is probably explained in the fact that the different States in Brazil, as I shall explain in detail, have spent a great deal of money and a great deal of effort in trying to increase the use of coffee in Great Britain. I will take it up later, and if I do not cover the point the gentleman wants, if he will ask me then, and I have the information, I will be glad to give it to him.

There is no doubt but what this attempt I have been speaking about would have failed had it not been for the combination entered into in 1908 by the Brazilian Government and the financiers of Europe and America. That the increase in the price of coffee during the period of this valorization was not due to natural causes, but was purely artificial, is easily demonstrated.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the gentleman will permit one question right there.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman refers to a table which shows the increase in price. Will he state approximately the increase?

Mr. NORRIS. The price doubled from 1908 to the 1st of January of this year.

Mr. COOPER. One hundred per cent in three years?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; a little more than doubled up to the 1st of January.

Mr. CANNON. That is, the coffee as it is imported?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir. That is, the wholesale price at New York City. I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it would not be difficult to demonstrate that this wonderful increase in the price did not come about naturally.

The world's consumption of coffee has averaged for the last four years about 17,900,000 bags. The world's production of coffee for the same period has averaged over 18,600,000 bags. So, in the face of a continual and yearly overproduction of coffee, the price has steadily and regularly advanced. During this time the annual production of coffee by Brazil has exceeded 14,000,000 bags.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. How much in a bag?

Mr. NORRIS. A bag is 133 pounds. During this same period of four years there was imported from Brazil into the United States about 23,000,000 bags of coffee; and from all other countries there were imported into the United States during the same period a little over 5,000,000 bags of coffee. This shows how easy it is to control the market price of coffee if the combination is able to control absolutely the output of Brazil.

As bearing upon this question of the control of price regardless of natural conditions, it is interesting to note a recent report that was made by Dr. Olavo Egeidio, secretary of finance of Sao Paulo, to the president of that State. At the beginning of the present year Dr. Egeidio made a full report of the transactions connected with the valorization of coffee. I quote from this report:

> There is no foundation whatsoever to the suggestion which has sometimes been made that the benefits which followed the Government's action were due simply to natural causes and were not in any way influenced by such action. What happened was just the contrary, and it may be easily verified by examining the figures for the crops of four years preceding and four years succeeding the intervention.

Dr. Egeidio then proceeds to show from statistics that the world's production of coffee for the four years in which the market price has been under control has exceeded by a large amount the world's production of coffee for the four years preceding such intervention. He shows that for the four years preceding the so-called valorization the average yearly production of the world's coffee was 15,574,000 bags, and that for the four years following the commencement of the valorization scheme the average world's production of coffee was 18,418,000 bags. In addition to this, it appears that for one of the years since the valorization plan has been in force the world's production of coffee reached the stupendous amount of over 23,000,000 bags;

and yet, notwithstanding this enormous overproduction of coffee, the price steadily advanced. He shows that during all this time there has been an overproduction of coffee and that the combination has had such complete control as to continually increase the price. He concludes his report with the following language:

All honor therefore to Dr. Jorge Tibirica and his able secretaries, your excellency among them, for conceiving the idea of valorization of coffee by direct intervention.

Notwithstanding the immense profits that have already come to the promoters of this scheme, the day of largest reward and financial gain for this gigantic combination is still in the future. If they are able to increase the price of coffee when the production is greater than the consumption, then what will the result be when the law of supply and demand, instead of working against them, will be working in their favor? What will be their harvest during the later years of this combination, when the yearly increase in the consumption of coffee shall have surpassed the yearly production? For the last 15 years the annual increase in the consumption of coffee has averaged 400,000 bags. The annual production, as far as Brazil is concerned, has about reached its maximum. As long as no additional coffee trees are planted in Brazil it will not be long until the world's demand for coffee will exceed the supply. If the yearly consumption of coffee continues to increase at the same rate that it has increased in the past, the world will demand about 22,000,000 bags of coffee yearly by the time that this combination ends according to its own terms. But this is not all. The different States of Brazil as well as the Brazilian Government itself are engaged in a world-wide campaign to increase the per capita consumption of coffee.

And now I am coming to the point where the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] interrupted me in regard to the efforts they are making to increase the consumption of coffee in different countries, and I have no doubt but that it has some effect upon the price in England.

In the development of this scheme the Brazilian Government has appropriated $150,000 gold to be expended in the propaganda for the increased use of coffee abroad. The condition of the appropriation, however, being that the coffee-producing States of Brazil should each appropriate a similar amount for the same purpose.

In the recent budget of the State of Sao Paulo there was included an appropriation of $300,000 for this purpose, and I understand that the State of Minas Geraes and the State of Rio de Janeiro have made appropriations of $150,000 each, to be added to this fund. Altogether there is, in round numbers, an appropriation of about $750,000, which is to be expended in one year in behalf of a more extended use of coffee.

And I want to say right here that I am not making these observations about the attempt of the Brazilian States and Brazil to increase the consumption of coffee in a spirit of criticism.

It is, perhaps, commendable. I mention it only to show, and I think it has the tendency to show, that the yearly increase in the consumption of coffee will not decrease, but in all probability increase at a greater rate than it has in the past on account of this effort being made. It is perhaps not intended that this campaign is to include the United States, because the consumption of coffee per capita in the United States is now greater than in most any other country of the civilized world. The per capita consumption of coffee in Great Britain is less than 1 pound, in France it is 5 pounds, in Germany it is 7 pounds, and in the United States 12 pounds, and the per capita consumption in Russia is very small. This money will undoubtedly be used to increase the consumption of coffee in those countries where the per capita consumption is the lowest.

A year or so ago, in carrying out this plan for the increased use of coffee, arrangements were made with a firm in London by which it was agreed that this firm should be paid $243,325 to superintend and manage the campaign in England for five years for that purpose. The arrangement made with this firm provided for the preparation of coffee under the supervision of a representative of the State of Sao Paulo, and all the details of the plan have been agreed upon. Advertising matter has been furnished and the finest grades of coffee have been supplied in order to create an appetite for coffee among the people of England. The coffee is specially selected and prepared under Government inspection, and, in addition to the money paid to the firm for superintending the management of the business, large allowances are made for expenses and commissions on the part of the jobber, and a commission of 23 per cent on the product is allowed to the retailer. Similar methods are contemplated for other Governments, so that if the plan is successfully carried out the per capita consumption of coffee in all these countries will be greatly increased and the profits of this enormous combination be increased manyfold.

The question might naturally arise in the mind of any thinking person that since the world's production of coffee has been exceeding the world's consumption, this combination would be accumulating an enormous supply of coffee, and that unless conditions change they would eventually be compelled to dispose of this surplus in the markets of the world. As I have already pointed out, the production of coffee has by this combination been limited and the maximum production must soon be reached. While the consumption of coffee is naturally increasing at the rate of 400,000 bags per year, it is safe also to estimate that the efforts which I have mentioned toward the increased use of coffee will have its effect and, therefore, that the world's demand will increase at a much greater annual rate than it has in the past. When the demand for coffee exceeds the supply, then it will be easy to put upon the market this stored coffee in such quantities and in such places as not to break the market. It is estimated that by the year 1915, at least, the world's demand for coffee will equal the world's production, and from that time on the demand will exceed the production, and long before 1919 the visible supply of coffee will have entirely disappeared and the coffee drinkers of the world will be completely at the mercy of this gigantic combination. This was taken into consideration at the time this scheme was devised, and was carefully investigated and thought out. In a report which appeared in a Rio de Janeiro publication about the time this combination was formed, there was a very careful review of the entire situation. In that report it was estimated that by 1915, four years before the expiration of this trust, the world's consumption of coffee would be 20,000,000 bags, and that the world's production of coffee would be considerably less. So that the promoters of this trust would have more than five years to dispose of the surplus at the enormous artificial prices which their combination has brought about.

As I have said, the steady advance of the price of coffee would have a tendency to increase the planting of coffee trees in the countries not controlled by this combination. There has been and will continue to be some increase in the production of coffee in these other countries, but yet there is no doubt but what this increase will be much smaller than might appear to be warranted at first blush. We must remember that this gigantic combination expires by its own terms at the close of the year 1919. It is apparent, therefore, that any man who is thinking of adding to his coffee plantation, or any Government that desires to increase its coffee production, will take into consideration the fact that this artificial method of counteracting the law of supply and demand and holding up the price of coffee will cease in 1919, which would be just about the time that the new trees planted on account of the high price of coffee would come into bearing. Men would therefore hesitate to put their money into coffee plantations with the uncertainty of the future staring them in the face. Unless some new scheme is invented or some new and different combination entered into, the year 1920 will find these bonds paid off and the millions of profit divided up among the members of this international combination, and the law of supply and demand will again be permitted to hold sway.

In the face of these conditions it is doubtful whether there will be any abnormal increase in the production of coffee on the part of the other coffee-producing countries of the world. I presume when 1919 is reached the members of this great international Coffee Trust will look over the situation and will decide, according to the conditions that exist then, whether it will be profitable to continue the combination and renew the agreement by which they are now exacting, and will until that time continue to exact, contributions from the coffee-consuming world.

As interesting and as instructive as all these facts are, the question naturally recurs, "What are we going to do about it?" There is no doubt but what the laws of the United States can not be directly applied either to a foreign State or a foreign nation. Neither can we bring into the courts of the United States the citizens and corporations of Europe. The members of this combination who are residents and citizens of our own country are subject to our laws, and if they have violated them can be punished, even though their coconspirators can not be directly reached. There is no doubt in my mind but what we can, indirectly at least, reach the Government of Brazil and its States by the proper change in our tariff laws. It is to the question of reaching Brazil and her States and the American members of this combination that I now desire to address myself.

First, let us take the several American corporations that are parties to this international agreement. If the facts as I have narrated them are true, there can be no possible doubt but what these institutions have violated the Sherman Antitrust Act, and

are therefore subject to its penalties. Section 1 of that act is as follows:

Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

This law has been in force over 20 years and has been construed on numerous occasions by the Supreme Court. I shall not take the time to follow these decisions, but will content myself with the statement that any student who will follow the construction that has at various times been given to this section must be led to the inevitable conclusion that conduct such as I have narrated, when once established, has always and without exception been held by this court to be a violation of this section. The court has often held that the "restraint" mentioned in this section applies not only to a restraint among the members of a combination, but it applies likewise to any restraint that the combination imposes upon outside parties who are not members of the combination.

There can be no doubt but what one of the very objects of this combination is a monopoly in the trade of coffee. Section 2 of the Sherman Act applies particularly to monopolies and to attempts to monopolize or to combinations and conspiracies to monopolize. This section reads as follows:

Every person who shall monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

Assuming that I have correctly stated the facts in regard to this combination, the inevitable result must follow that every person or corporation connected with this combination has violated this section; and if they are within the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, they can be convicted and punished for violation of section 2 of this act. This section, like section 1, has been often construed by the Supreme Court, and its meaning in no respect is left in doubt. Any person who shall "monopolize" or "attempt to monopolize" or "combine or conspire" to monopolize "any part" of trade or commerce is guilty of a violation of the act. In addition to these two sections, section 4 of the same act gives the courts of the United States power to restrain and to prohibit such violations by the writ of injunction. It would seem, therefore, as far as individuals or corporations in our own country are concerned, that the laws are sufficient, and that these persons, parties, or corporations can be proceeded against in a civil action by injunction that would break up the combination, and can likewise be prosecuted in a criminal suit for a violation of both sections 1 and 2.

In connection with the enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law as against this combination, and also, in general, as against all violators of the law, I desire to call attention to section 6 of that famous statute. It reads as follows:

Any property owned under any contract or by any combination, or pursuant to any conspiracy (and being the subject thereof) mentioned in section 1 of this act, and being in the course of transportation from one State to another, or to a foreign country, shall be forfeited to the United States, and may be seized and condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure, and condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law.

It has no doubt often occurred that great combinations have been able out of the profits of their unlawful business to pay for the fines and penalties charged against them for the violation of the statute and still have a snug surplus on the right side of the ledger as a result of their unlawful operations. A few applications of the remedy provided in section 6 would make the violation of this statute unprofitable as well as illegal. In the famous Addyston Pipe case (85 Fed. Rep., 271), the United States circuit court of appeals for the sixth district held that an action under this particular section could not be joined in an equity suit under section 4, to enjoin the defendants from continuing their unlawful conduct. It was held there, however, and it seems to be a plain provision of the section, that the property of such a combination being in the course of transportation from one State to another, or to a foreign country, may be seized and condemned in the method provided by law for the condemnation of property that is imported into the United States contrary to our tariff laws. These custom laws have been enacted and changed from time to time, but there have always been and still are in force provisions of law for the seizure and condemnation of such property which are both summary and severe. Such proceedings are prosecuted according to the custom laws of our country, and the same district attorneys who are charged by section 4 with the enforcement of this antitrust statute are likewise charged with the duty of instituting proceedings under section 6.

It is an open secret that it has cost and is still costing a large amount of money to enforce the different provisions of this antitrust statute against combinations and monopolies. If section 6 were enforced in all cases of the violation of section 1 of the act and the property that is the subject of the illegal combination was seized and forfeited to the United States, these great combinations, to a great extent at least, would be compelled to pay the governmental costs of the prosecution for their violation of the law.

In this connection I desire to call attention to section 73 of the act of August 27, 1894, the same being Twenty-eighth Statutes at Large, 570. This section reads as follows:

SEC. 73. That every combination, conspiracy, trust, agreement, or contract is hereby declared to be contrary to public policy, illegal, and void when the same is made by or between two or more persons or corporations either of whom is engaged in importing any article from any foreign country into the United States, and when such combination, conspiracy, trust, agreement, or contract is intended to operate in restraint of lawful trade, or free competition in lawful trade or commerce, or to increase the market price in any part of the United States of any article or articles imported or intended to be imported into the United States, or of any manufacture into which such imported article enters or is intended to enter. Every person who is or shall hereafter be engaged in the importation of goods or any commodity from any foreign country in violation of this section of this act, or who shall combine or conspire with another to violate the same, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof in any court of the United States, such person shall be fined in a sum not less than $100 and not exceeding $5,000, and shall be further punished by imprisonment, in the discretion of the court, for a term not less than 3 months nor exceeding 12 months.

The provisions of this section apply only where there is a conspiracy between two or more persons or corporations in which any one of them is engaged in importing any article from a foreign country into the United States. It seems that there can be no doubt but what some of the persons or corporations interested in this valorization scheme are so engaged and that their contract without doubt operates in restraint of trade and free competition, and that they are amenable to the punishments provided in this section. The very object and foundation of the entire scheme was to increase the price of coffee. Whether the financiers who furnished the money for this plan were themselves personally and directly engaged in the importation of coffee would not, in my judgment, be material. In order to carry out their plan the coffee had to be imported. Somebody must import it, and therefore some one who is a party to the contract must, either through himself or some other person or corporation, be engaged in the importation of the coffee.

I come now to the question as to whether there is any practical way for the United States Government to legally deal with a foreign nation or State where such nation or State has entered into a combination the effect of which is to monopolize trade and artificially increase the cost of any article of commerce to the American consumer.

In the discussion of this question, I believe it must be admitted, to begin with, that there is no direct way by which the United States can interfere with any sovereign nation or State in the enactment of its laws or in the adoption of such rules and regulations as it may deem advisable, regardless of how severe such laws, rules, or regulations may be against the commerce of the United States, and regardless of what effect the same may have upon the price that our people must pay for the commodities imported from such country. All the laws which we may pass and the rules and regulations which may be adopted in pursuance of such laws can have no direct application or effect upon any other nation. It is no doubt true that if any particular product or article of commerce, on account of geographical condition or conditions of climate, can be raised and produced only in one particular country, then such country has the right to make any law it sees fit in regard to the exportation of such product and can, if it so desires, prohibit entirely the exportation of such product, or can provide by law for any conditions or regulations it may deem best under which such articles can be exported. However, the condition of trade and commerce among the civilized nations of the modern world is such that no nation can live unto itself alone. If a country produces of any particular article more than it can consume, it must find a market for the surplus among the other countries of the world. In addition to this, there is not a nation to-day but what desires, to a greater or lesser extent, some of the products of other countries which it is unable to produce. In this respect there is perhaps no country in the world so well situated as our own, and if international trade and commerce among the nations of the world were entirely suspended and prohibited, we would perhaps be able to meet the then existing conditions with less damage to ourselves and with less interference with the comfort and happiness of our people than any other nation on the globe.

Trade and commerce between the different civilized nations of the world are practically necessary and imperative, and it

therefore becomes a matter of no extreme difficulty for the Congress of the United States to pass such laws as will make it to the advantage of any foreign nation to deal with us and with our produce in a fair and honest manner. It would be easy for us to pass the necessary laws under which Brazil would find it very unprofitable for her to continue her attempt at monopolizing and thereby increasing the price that American consumers must pay for her products which we use.

Section 2 of the present tariff act has for its object the prevention by any foreign power of any discrimination against the products of the United States. This section, however, did not contemplate the prevention of the conditions which have been brought about on the part of the Brazilian Government in her attempt to valorize coffee, and it is undoubtedly true that this section as it now stands would not enable us to meet the emergency. This is the section that provides for the maximum and minimum tariff. In substance it provides that where any foreign country makes any discrimination against the United States or the products thereof imported into such country, then and in such case all articles imported from such foreign country shall, in addition to the duty provided for in section 1 of the act, pay an additional duty of 25 per centum ad valorem.

This section, among other things, provides that all foreign nations shall be exempt from the payment of this additional or maximum rate if such foreign country "imposes no terms or restrictions, either in the way of tariff rates or provisions, trade or other regulations, charges, exactions, or in any other manner, directly or indirectly, upon the importation into or the sale in such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States which unduly discriminate against the United States or the products thereof." It will be noted that this statute in effect provides that the maximum rate of duty can not be imposed unless the laws, rules, or regulations of the foreign country "unduly discriminate" against the products of the United States. In the case of Brazil it would undoubtedly be held that her action that I have described was not a "discrimination" against the United States, because all of these laws, rules, and regulations apply to the balance of the world as well as to our own country, and there would therefore be no discrimination. In other words, all the nations of the earth are treated the same. If this great combination to which she is a party applied only to us, the penalty provided in section 2 of our tariff act could be applied to her, but since she not only conspires against America but does the same with everybody else she is able to avoid the penalties of the act.

By a slight amendment to this section we could possibly meet the contingency. If we provided by an amendment to this act that to entitle any foreign country to our minimum tariff rates it would not only be necessary that such country should not discriminate against our products, but that such country should not by law, rule, or regulation, or otherwise, become a party to any combination or conspiracy the effect of which was to monopolize trade between the United States and foreign nations, and by virtue of such monopoly to increase the price of commodities to our consumers, then she would be compelled to cease such unfair treatment and withdraw from such conspiracy or subject all of her products imported into the United States to the penalties provided in this section. Brazil can not afford to engage in a tariff controversy with the United States. We are one of her best customers. We have provided by law for the admission of a large proportion of her exports into our country free of duty. I will insert in the RECORD a table showing the amount and value of her exports for the year 1909.

Articles.	Quantity.	Value.
Coffee	16,880,696 bags	$161,922,682
Rubber	39,027 metric tons	91,578,388
Hides	35,784 metric tons	8,812,660
Yerba-maté	68,017 metric tons	8,025,333
Cacao	33,818 metric tons	7,739,870
Tobacco	29,782 metric tons	6,443,681
Skins	3,897 metric tons	4,709,492
Sugar	68,483 metric tons	3,247,504
Cotton	9,969 metric tons	2,861,662
Bar gold	4,323 kilos	2,252,898
Manganese	241,000 metric tons	1,730,311
Chestnuts		1,493,712
Carnaba wax	3,042 metric tons	1,230,638
Bran	38,158 metric tons	1,210,572
Cotton seed	33,615 metric tons	711,401
Monasite sand	6,462 metric tons	708,092
Precious stones		288,212
Total of 17 articles		304,967,108
Miscellaneous articles		3,364,721
Total exports		308,331,829

It will be seen from this that the total value of the exports from Brazil for the year 1909 was $308,331,829. Of this amount the United States took by far the major portion. There is no other country that took more than one-third of the amount of exports that were taken by the United States. We took of these exports $123,817,298. The nearest other competitor was the United Kingdom, which took a little over $49,000,000.

It is conceded that if we amend section 2 of the tariff law so as to deprive Brazil of our minimum tariff rates that such amendment would not affect the importations from Brazil which are on the free list, and since coffee is on the free list it could still be imported free from Brazil, even though our maximum rates applied, because such maximum rates would only apply to such articles as are on the dutiable list. In order that we may understand just exactly what articles from Brazil will be affected by such action, I append a table showing importations from Brazil during the fiscal year 1910 which were on the dutiable list, giving the quantities imported, the rate of duty, and the duty collected.

Dutiable imports from Brazil to the United States, fiscal year 1910.

[General imports with estimated duties collected thereon.]

	Quantities.	Amount.	Rate of duty.	Estimated duty.
			Per cent.	
Feathers and downs, crude		$21,178	20	$4,235.60
Hides of cattle.....pounds	[1] 211,098	[1] 35,704	15	5,355.60
Plants, orchids, palms, bulbs, etc		3,293	[2] 18	592.74
Other plants, not specified		4,787	30	1,436.10
Seeds, castor beans.....bushels	158,351	192,397	[3] 25	39,587.75
Other seeds not specified		21,836	[2] 34	7,424.24
Sugar: Cane not above No. 16 Dutch standard in color.....pounds	6,860,735	151,637	[2] 53	80,367.61
Wool: Class 3.....do	84,898	7,460	[3] 4	3,295.92
Monozite sand.....do	1,322,760	113,293	[3] 4	52,910.40
All other articles dutiable		3,751		1,355.53
Total dutiable imports		555,336		196,661.49

[1] Hides of cattle free on and after Aug. 6, 1909; figures cover period July 1 to Aug. 5, 1909, inclusive.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Cents.

Mr. STERLING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. Do I understand the gentleman's idea to be that we should put coffee on the protected list?

Mr. NORRIS. No. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed just a little further, I will reach that question and take it up, and show just exactly what we might do and could do in regard to it.

Mr. STERLING. If we should put a tariff on coffee, all that the importers would have to do would be to add that duty to the cost of the coffee, I presume?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I am going to discuss that question, but I am not going to advocate the placing of a tariff on coffee; although if we are going to go into it, it could easily be shown that we are practically the only country in the world that admits coffee free. They have duties in the other countries. I shall say more about it later on. We pay more for coffee than anybody else.

If this amendment suggested would not bring the proper relief, it would be a very easy matter to further amend our tariff law as it applies to Brazil so as to put all, or at least parts, of her importations upon the dutiable list until she should cease giving her support to the valorization scheme. I know it will be said that if we undertook to place a duty on coffee it would injure the American consumer rather than help him; but I do not believe it is necessary for us to put coffee on the dutiable list. If we should pass an amendment to our tariff law that would provide that the coffee produced in all other countries except Brazil should come in free, and then limit the free coffee from Brazil to such an amount which, together with the coffee imported from other countries, should equal and perhaps somewhat exceed the consumption in our country, and then provide for a high duty upon the balance of Brazilian coffee, I think we would meet the situation and compel Brazil to come to terms.

I think that, Mr. Chairman, is an answer to the question suggested by my friend from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Let us see how this kind of a law would work.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Would not the original proposition that was presented by the Ways and Means Committee last Congress, providing that a tariff equal to whatever export tax is put on by any other country—would not that be more effective than the method proposed by the gentleman?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe it would be. Of course it might work absolutely right; I would not say. I have some doubt about it. But I do not see how this plan that I have suggested could be in any way objectionable. Let us see, I say, how this kind of a law would work.

I think it would be conceded, to begin with, that if there was a duty on Brazilian coffee, and coffee from all other countries should be admitted free from duty, it would result in the coffee from all other coffee-producing countries being imported into the United States. It would bring to our ports practically all the coffee produced anywhere outside of Brazil, because practically all the coffee-consuming countries of the world levy a heavy duty upon the importation of coffee into their respective countries. If coffee produced everywhere except in Brazil had free entrance into the United States, while it had to pay a duty in other countries, the result would certainly be that it would practically all come to us. I will print in the RECORD a table showing the rate of duty charged by the principal countries of the world upon importations of coffee.

Statement of duty charged by various countries on coffee.

Austria-Hungary (per 100 kilos):
Raw, 95 crowns (about 8 cents per pound).
Roasted, 120 crowns (about 11 cents per pound).
(Crown=20.3 cents.)
Belgium (per 100 kilos):
Not roasted, free.
Roasted, 10 francs (about 1 cent per pound).
(Franc=19.3 cents.)
France (per 100 kilos):
Raw, maximum, 300 francs (about 27 cents per pound); minimum, 136 francs (about 12 cents per pound).
(Franc=19.3 cents.)
Germany (per 100 kilos):
Raw, 60 marks (about 6 cents per pound).
Roasted, ground or not, 85 marks (about 9 cents per pound).
(Mark=$0.238.)
Netherlands: Free.
Russia (per pood):
Raw, in the bean, 5.85 rubles (about 8¼ cents per pound).
Roasted, in the bean or ground or compressed, 9 rubles (per pood, weight of packing included).
(Ruble=51.5 cents; pood=36 pounds.)
United Kingdom (per pound), 2 pence (about 4 cents per pound).
United States: Free.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman any figures to show what proportion of all our importations of coffee are of Brazilian coffee?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I have figures on that. I am going to give them later.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not hear that.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I have some tables showing that. I will take that up right now, if the gentleman from Ohio will give me his attention.

It must be noted, of course, that the people of the United States consume more coffee annually than is produced by all the coffee-producing countries of the world outside of Brazil, and if we stopped at this point we would, perhaps, get no relief to the consumers of coffee, because if the free coffee did not equal the consumption then the owner of the free coffee would, of course, raise the price to the level of the tax-paying coffee. In other words, the coffee which paid the duty and which it would be necessary to put with the free coffee in order to equal the amount of coffee we consume would fix the price of coffee to the consumer. To meet this difficulty we could provide by the proper enactment to admit from Brazil up to a certain limit her coffee free of duty, on the same theory that we admit to a certain limit tobacco free of duty from the Philippine Islands. In round numbers, we consume annually between seven and eight million bags of coffee. The coffee-producing countries of the world outside of Brazil produce and export from their respective countries from four to five million bags of coffee. I think it is nearer five millions and sometimes over five rather than under. If we provide by law that from three to three and a half million bags of coffee from Brazil should be annually admitted free, and then charge a high duty on the importations of the balance of Brazilian coffee imported, while admitting all the coffee of the balance of the world free, we would, in my judgment, completely meet the situation. This would, in effect, give the American consumers of coffee the lower prices that would come through the admission of free coffee, while it would practically exclude from our market all Brazilian coffee which we would not need for consumption.

It must be remembered also that Brazil produces a large amount of other products which we admit into our country free of duty. These same products are produced by the other South American and Central American countries, and by Mexico. It would be an easy matter to charge Brazil an import duty on her importations of such products while admitting them free from the other countries named.

The effect of this would be to place Brazil at a great disadvantage in the markets of the United States with all other countries whose products are similar to those produced by Brazil. She would lose a large part of the trade with her most valuable customer. During the year 1910 we purchased from Brazil, outside of coffee, about $70,000,000 of her products, which we admitted free of duty. If we should provide by law for the same discrimination against these products as I have outlined that it would be possible for us to provide as regards her coffee, she would find herself without a market for her surplus products, and as a matter of self-preservation she would be compelled to comply with our law and desist from further participation in any scheme of valorization.

The success that has come to this combination in its attempt to valorize coffee has been so marked that for some time there has been agitated in Brazil the proposition of organizing a similar combination in regard to rubber. The increased demand for several years all over the civilized world for rubber, particularly in the automobile industry, has materially increased the price of the product. From present indications the world's demand for rubber will continue to increase at a wonderful rate. It would therefore be a very desirable commodity in which to organize a gigantic world's trust with a view of controlling the supply and thus increase the price to the consumer.

During the calendar year 1910 there was imported into the United States 90,139,332 pounds of rubber. Of this amount we received from Brazil 36,236,475 pounds, valued at $41,582,766. During the calendar year 1909 there was imported into the United States 93,967,414 pounds of rubber. Of this amount Brazil sent us 44,219,868 pounds, valued at $43,099,654. During the same calendar year (1909) there was imported into the United Kingdom from all other countries 83,471,360 pounds of rubber. Of this amount Brazil furnished her 34,578,880 pounds, valued at $41,982,000. During the same calendar year there was imported into Germany 48,893,618 pounds of rubber. Of this amount Brazil furnished 10,566,647 pounds, valued at $12,550,000. During the calendar year 1909 there was imported into France from all other countries 25,579,973 pounds of rubber. Of this amount Brazil furnished 4,418,018 pounds, valued at $6,962,000; showing that Brazil produces and furnishes a large majority of the rubber that is used in the civilized world, although not nearly as great a per cent as she does of coffee.

It must be remembered in analyzing these figures that all the rubber imported from Brazil into the various countries named was produced in Brazil, while as a matter of fact the importations from other countries often included rubber that had not been produced in the countries from which it was exported, and undoubtedly some of this rubber imported from such other countries was produced in Brazil.

It will be seen from this that Brazil does not produce as large a proportion of the world's rubber as she does of the world's coffee, and it will therefore be a little more difficult for her to carry out a scheme of valorization as applied to rubber with the same success that she has had in the valorization of coffee. There is no doubt but what it is generally understood in rubber circles that an attempt is being made to valorize rubber and that Brazil is lending her influence to this scheme.

In the New York Journal of Commerce of February 24, 1911, it is stated as a matter of news that the recent advance in rubber was undoubtedly caused by the circulation of the report that there was taking place in rubber circles some such scheme like that of the Brazilian Government's valorization of coffee. It is generally believed that the Brazilian Government has taken a hand in this proposition, and that if the necessary arrangements can be brought about the world will soon see the valorization applied to rubber as it has been applied to coffee. In this article it was stated that the indications were that the Bank of Brazil, a Government institution, was undertaking to organize financial interests in Brazil for the purpose of controlling rubber, and that, while official announcement of the connection of the Government with the scheme was not made, it was ascertained on inquiry that the Brazilian Government itself was behind the proposition. It was stated that this bank had already organized branches at the chief Amazon River ports, and

the president of the bank had sailed for Europe and the United States with the intention of making the necessary financial arrangements in these countries. From other sources I have learned that it is currently reported in Brazil trade circles that the Brazilian Government itself intends to advance $20,000,000 for the purpose of starting this huge combination and bringing about the control of the rubber market of the world.

We have recently heard a great deal about the control of the potash industry by Germany. It has been claimed that there is an attempt on the part of Germany to monopolize and control the potash industry of the world. Without attempting to express any opinion as to the merits of this controversy, it can at least be said that Germany's step has in its favor the more or less plausible claim that it is simply an effort on her part to conserve her natural resources, while the Brazilian Government has even curtailed the resources at least of some of its people in order for the chosen ones to profit thereby. Is the world soon to see an era of combination greater than the tendency which has existed in that direction in the past? Are we to pass from combinations of men, wealth, and corporations controlling the products in one particular country to another step wherein men, financiers, and corporations of different nations shall combine to control and monopolize articles of commerce over the entire world, and then from that to the still further step that the nations themselves shall become participants in these great combines with the view of monopolizing the products of their own countries at the expense of the consumers of the balance of the world? The success of the valorization of coffee and the apparent tendencies toward a similar attempt in regard to rubber, with perhaps an effort on the part of Germany to do the same as regards potash, would indicate that the tendency of the times is in that direction.

If the conspiracy to monopolize and control the market price of any product is composed of men and corporations, the combination thus formed is an ordinary, common trust, but if the combination has behind it the power and influence of a great nation, it is dignified with the new term "valorization." Reduced to common language, it is simply a hold-up of the people by a combination composed of men, corporations, money, and nations that extends and reaches out over the entire civilized world.

I have no doubt but what such a combination can be and will be nullified and dissolved by the proper amendments to our tariff law, which I have suggested, but if such a change in the law is not sufficient or will not accomplish the ends, then we will ultimately be forced to the necessity, in self-defense and in defense of our people, to go ourselves into the valorization business. In looking over the world of commerce it at once becomes apparent that the United States is, on account of its geographical location and the diversity of its products, industries, and manufactures, in a better condition to thus valorize any of the common necessities of life than any other nation of the world. In the calendar year of 1909 the world produced 854,316 metric tons of copper, of which the United States produced 501,372 metric tons, the product of the United States being 58.69 per cent of the world's production. The average yearly production of copper from 1900 to 1909, both inclusive, has been 663,832 metric tons. The average yearly production of the United States during that period has been 369,418 metric tons, the same being 55.68 per cent of the world's production. Copper is used all over the civilized world in various manufacturing enterprises. The increase of the use of electricity has increased to a great extent the use of copper. Germany, in particular, in her manufacturing enterprises uses and must have a large amount of copper, and during the calendar year of 1909 she consumed in her manufacturing industries 154,673 metric tons of copper. Of this amount she purchased from us 143,718 metric tons. A metric ton is 2,204.6 pounds. Without American copper many of the most important manufacturing industries of Germany, as well as the balance of the civilized world, would be compelled to shut down.

During this same year—1909—England imported from all other countries 2,188,762,240 pounds of cotton. Of this amount 1,640,484,160 pounds were supplied by the United States. During the same year Germany imported and used in her manufacturing industries 1,068,514,505 pounds of cotton. Of this amount she imported from the United States 810,472,688 pounds. During the same calendar year France imported and used in her various manufacturing industries 702,581,760 pounds of cotton. Of this amount she purchased from us 558,539,819 pounds. During the same year Austria-Hungary imported for her manufacturing industries 414,316,298 pounds, of which she purchased from us 233,916,878 pounds. Italy imported 420,730,273 pounds, of which 303,092,817 pounds came from the United States. The same is practically true of all the other civilized nations of the world. Without American cotton the spindles of the civilized world would become idle. The same comparison might be made with many of the other common necessaries of life.

I offer these figures and facts not because I advocate or am in favor of the United States entering into any such unfair and unjust combination to control arbitrarily and unreasonably the price of any of the common necessities of life, but to show that if we were driven to the extremity of meeting international combinations by methods so unjust and so unfair, we are so situated and in possession of so many natural resources and the necessaries of life that we could more than hold our own in such a contest. I do not believe there will be any necessity for resorting to such procedure. As I have said before, I think the proper changes in our tariff laws will bring about the necessary relief, as far as foreign nations and States are concerned, and that the proper enforcement of laws already on our statute books will prevent citizens of our own country from engaging in or becoming parties to any conspiracy or combination having for its object the monopoly of trade and the increase of the price of commodities.

It is gratifying also to note that the participation on the part of Brazil in this world-wide combination to control the price of coffee has received the attention of lawmakers and people generally in countries other than our own. The subject has been discussed, with a view to investigation, in the German Reichstag. On the 15th of December last the Deutsche Kaffee-Zeitung, published at Berlin, went into a full discussion of this Brazilian coffee valorization scheme, and as a result of this exposition and other investigations that have been made in Germany on the subject, the indications are that the German Government will enact the necessary legislation to prevent, in Germany at least, the carrying out of this colossal combination.

I have been moved in the suggestion I have offered not by any spirit of hatred or animosity toward Brazil, but by a firm belief that we should enact the necessary legislation to prevent the further robbing of our people by this gigantic combine, and that we should not hesitate to act simply because a great and friendly nation is one of the guilty parties in the deal. We ought to be just as careful to protect our citizens against monopoly if the promoters of such monopoly are sovereign States as though the affair were accomplished by our citizens alone. I ask nothing for our own people but what is fair and right, and we ought not hesitate to give it to them regardless of who the wrongdoers may be. As a Nation and as a people we are in possession and control of the natural resources and are occupying a situation that, by demanding and asserting only what is right and fair, we will be able to secure justice to our people without doing any injury to the people of any other nation. To this we are entitled, and we should be content with nothing less. With a spirit of entire friendliness toward the balance of the world we should demand and exact common justice to our own people. We should apply the doctrine of the golden rule to all the people of the earth and at the same time should insist that the rule work both ways. We should give justice to all others and should demand that the recipients of our favor repay us in kind. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I have listened with very great interest to the speech of the gentleman, and frankly say that it is a subject that I have had little leisure or, if I have had leisure, have lacked industry to investigate; but I would be glad to have the gentleman tell me if he knows the importing price now of the coffee berry.

Mr. NORRIS. I have it here. I think I can give it to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Eight cents?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. CANNON. Not so much as that?

Mr. NORRIS. It is more than that. I have here a letter, dated March 24, in which it is stated that on Monday, March 20, the commonest kind of Rios—that is, No. 7 Rio—and I will say to the gentleman that that is the grade upon which most of the figures are based unless it is otherwise stated—were firmly held at 12½ cents; Santos, at 12¾ to 13; Santos and Rios No. 4 were offered at 13¼ cents. He goes on to say that good roasting and drinking Santos, 3 and 4, were 13¾ to 14⅝, according to quality.

Mr. CANNON. That was the importing price or the jobbers' price?

Mr. NORRIS. I take it that that was the importers' price. I will say to the gentleman that the table I quoted in my speech, running up to the 1st of January, shows that on January 1 the price of coffee was 13½ cents.

Mr. CANNON. The importing price or the jobbers' price?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to know the price. Has the gentleman investigated the price that we all pay when we buy coffee for consumption?

Mr. NORRIS. I have made no extended investigation. I have, I presume, the same knowledge that the gentleman has if he buys coffee. I can not say that my information is absolutely reliable, but I understand that the average price of retail coffee, taking all grades and averaging them, is 25 cents, over the country.

Mr. CANNON. Generally roasted and put in packages?

Mr. NORRIS. I think, perhaps, roasted and put in packages it would be a little more, would sell a little higher than that; perhaps from 30 to 40 or 45 cents. I think the cheapest kind is not sold in that way.

Mr. CANNON. My recollection is 30 to 40 cents on my grocery bills.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the coffee that is put in packages would probably sell for over 30 or 40 cents; but averaging all the coffees, including the poorer grades, that would bring the price down.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman investigated far enough to know whether the combination made by Brazil and other people in the world, capitalized as it is, has charge of the preparation of the coffee from the time that it is imported and lands free or duty paid in the various countries to the time that it reaches the retailer, and whether prices are dictated by this combination to the retailer, at which he sells?

Mr. NORRIS. I have not any information on the subject as to whether they control or attempt to control any further than the sale to the big jobber, although the American member of the committee controlling the valorized coffee is a member of one of the largest coffee-jobbing firms in the United States. I would like to say in connection with this that in this letter of the date of March 24 the writer of the letter, a coffee expert, gives an opinion, together with some information. I will read an extract:

> In talking the situation over with a gentleman who represents a large Brazilian coffee-importing interest, and who has been a bear for the past 10 years, and who remained a bear up to 3 months ago, he told me that if the Brazil coffee remained in the hands of the present owners that there was nothing to prevent them from putting the price of coffee to 20 cents by December 31 of this year, and that he firmly believed that we would see Rio number 7 sell at 20 cents before this year was out.

Mr. CANNON. I do not see why, if the combination is as it seems to be, that is not practicable. But it seems to me, the importing price being 13 cents or 14 cents, and when it is roasted and ground and put in packages and sold to the consumer, oh, say, 28 to 30 cents a pound, that is almost 100 per cent for roasting and grinding and delivering to 92,000,000 people. The gentleman presents a very interesting state of facts, which, it seems to me, if possible, ought to be dealt with, but probably there is a much greater manipulation somewhere after the coffee is imported that smells of monopoly.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is true with every product that goes from a big jobber down to the consumer through the retailer—that there is a great deal of increase in the price—and, to look at it abstractly, it looks too great. But, of course, there is a reason why there should be a greater advance in price than where it is handled in quantities of several million bags at a time. As to the combination I have been speaking of, I have not traced it any further, but it is very probable that this combination reaches beyond the valorization plan.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I think the committee would be glad to know how these very large profits made by the combination are divided up. First, whether the bankers who advance the money get any more than 6 per cent on the principal when it is closed out.

Mr. NORRIS. In the first place, the bonds drew 6 per cent interest and, I understand, were underwritten by those who took them at 85 cents on the dollar. In order to pay out there was an enormous profit, and in order to insure their paying out they had to control the price of coffee.

I find in various reports and articles that there is a large expense connected with it that all comes out of the export tax and from other sources. As to all the other sources of income and revenue, I am not able to tell and have not been able to discover.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Does the agreement provide for a sinking fund to pay these bonds in 1919?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Are they all to be paid off through a sinking fund?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; all to be paid by 1919.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Aside from what the gentleman has just stated, I would like to ask the gentleman if the Brazilian Government gets the balance of the profit?

Mr. NORRIS. I can not tell you what the Brazilian Government gets beyond what I have stated. In the reports I have had access to, made to the Brazilian Government by some of its officers, and a part of which I have read, they mention a profit to the Brazilian Government. I would not say on my own investigation that the Brazilian Government was getting, as a Government, any profit out of it. They may be, but I do not know about it.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman know whether or not the price is raised to the producers of coffee in Brazil according as the price is raised in the market?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I could not say. I suppose in Brazil most of the people raise their own coffee and do not have to buy it.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I mean the people who raise coffee that is put into this pool for distribution throughout the world.

Mr. NORRIS. Do they get an increase in the price?

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I think they do.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. And does the gentleman think they get the main part of the profit that comes from this raising of the price of coffee throughout the world?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not think they do.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has made any investigation as to the cost of producing coffee in Brazil?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I have not.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would say that a year or two ago, when looking up the Porto Rican question in the consideration of the coffee grown there, I investigated it somewhat, and satisfied myself as a result of such investigation that the average grade of coffee costs to produce in Brazil about 3 cents a pound, and could pay an export duty of 3 cents a pound; and coffee could be laid down in New York at 7 cents a pound, and would be unless the price were increased by some artificial means.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the gentleman that at the time of the beginning of this valorization plan No. 7 Rio was selling in New York at about 6 cents a pound.

Mr. OLMSTED. Everything above 6 or 7 cents a pound is the result of artificial enhancement of the price.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so, because for several years there was more coffee produced than there was consumed.

Mr. STERLING. One question more. Is it true that the Government of Brazil has limited the production of coffee by legislation?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I could not say it was by legislation, but they have limited it by law. I do not know whether it is necessary to have legislation, or whether an edict or something of that kind was issued.

Mr. SABATH. They have limited the sale of it, have they not?

Mr. NORRIS. They have limited the production, which of course limits the sale.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, it is very fortunate at this juncture, when the control over the fiscal policies of the Nation is changing hands, that the Democratic Party coming into power should immediately submit to the consideration of this House a limited free-list bill. Such a bill is particularly fortunate because it does not involve the discussion of schedules. Our fathers, in considering tariff policies, gave their time and thought chiefly to the discussion of the fundamental principles involved, and upon these principles they founded broad policies. But for the last 20 years the consideration of tariff bills has degenerated into the formulation of a series of complicated mathematical schedules determined chiefly by the interests benefited, each interest bent on getting all it can.

BACK TO PRINCIPLES.

A whole generation has grown up under the influence of such a method of treatment, and local, selfish interests have supplanted broad principles and policies in the framing of tariff bills. It is high time to return to the methods of our fathers, and the country is to be congratulated that now, for the first time in this generation, Congress has before it a bill that involves no adjustment of schedules, a free-list bill that can be and should be disposed of from consideration of broad policies and fundamental principles.

TWOFOLD EFFECT OF BILL.

The purpose and the effect of this bill may be divided into two parts. One is to relieve as far as may be the high cost of living. The other is to readjust our fiscal policies to do justice to the agricultural population. I shall not at this time make an extended discussion of the items in the bill, but pass rather to a discussion of the fundamental principles upon which they are founded, at the outset I wish to call attention to the fact that in this bill the Democratic Party has proceeded wisely in the methods adopted to attain the twofold object, namely, to lower the cost of living to all and to adjust equitably the conditions in the farming industries.

STRIKES AT MONOPOLY.

To lower the cost of living the bill does not aim to interfere with legitimate laws of supply and demand and the natural high prices that bring prosperity to the producers, but it strikes at the interference with natural laws through restraint of trade. It is a matter of general knowledge that monopolies have gained control of many of our necessities of life, and always as a middleman, by which prices are put up to the consumers and put down to the producers. This bill strikes at the middleman monopoly and without lowering prices received by the producers will relieve the burdens now laid on the consumer.

LIGHTENS BURDENS OF FARMERS.

To relieve the discrimination so long practiced against those engaged in agricultural pursuits the bill does not undertake to give the farmer artificial protection, but it does relieve him from unjust burdens of taxation now laid on the articles required on his farm. For more than a generation the whole effect of our fiscal policies has been a discrimination in favor of city pursuits and against agricultural pursuits, so much so that the equilibrium of population has been disturbed by a steady stream flowing from the country to the city. At the outbreak of the Civil War it is estimated that over 80 per cent of our population were engaged in agricultural pursuits; to-day the new census will probably show that only 30 per cent are so engaged.

ABNORMAL GROWTH OF CITY LIFE.

The discrimination in favor of city pursuits began incidentally in the adjustment of fiscal policies to meet the demands of war expenses and of the great public debt incurred by the war. It was simply a repetition of history that the burdens of the war should fall chiefly on the shoulders of the farmers. But when the war debt was practically paid, the burdens on the farmer were not removed. On the contrary, in the three principal tariff bills of the last 30 years—the McKinley bill, the Dingley bill, and the Payne bill—the burdens on those engaged in agricultural pursuits were steadily increased; discrimination in favor of manufacturing pursuits as against agricultural pursuits became a settled policy; the flow of population from the country to the city has never abated; immigrants coming from abroad remain in the cities. Never before in the history of the world has there been such an abnormal growth of city life with so little growth of country life, and it can have no other basic foundation but the artificial discrimination of our fiscal policies in favor of cities and against the farms.

We can not escape the parallelism between the census reports showing the great velocity of the current from the farm to the city and the increase in the duties on manufactured articles from one tariff bill to another. In fact these bills show on their faces that our fiscal policies have been framed primarily at the instance of, if not under the promises of, great manufacturing industries located in the cities and not with regard to the interests of the farmers or of the country as a whole.

THE MENACE OF DEGENERACY.

I will not at this juncture discuss the grave perils that attend an abnormal growth of city life, but can not refrain from pointing out that such a growth preceded the downfall of all the great nations that have perished. It is in city life that national degeneracy does its deadly work. It is in city life that the people come under the dominion of alcoholic poisoning, which not only saps the life force of those who drink, but causes their progeny to be abnormal and degenerate from childhood. The effect of a vast degenerate vote upon the purity of the ballot has already blighted self-government in our great cities. The yearly consumption of alcoholic beverage per capita in the United States has gone up from 4 gallons in 1850 to more than 25 gallons to-day, and is increasing steadily with the preponderance of city life. This bill does not go far, but it is a step toward correcting a vicious policy of discrimination in favor of city life that has come to menace the foundations of the Republic.

I intend, Mr. Chairman, to adhere to my purpose of confining my remarks in the limited time allotted me to discussing the principles involved in this bill and not the individual items, but there is one item that ought to be taken up as affecting a great public policy, our trade relations, and notably our balance of trade with the rest of the world, the item bearing upon the culture of cotton.

In the last few days Members of this House, notably the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and some of the papers, have alleged that this bill discriminates in favor of the southern farmer because it puts cotton bagging and cotton ties on the free list. The fact is that the discrimination has been against the southern farmer all these years. The last Democratic tariff bill, the Wilson-Gorman bill, put binding twine and yarn on the free list along with cotton bagging and ties, treating the western farmer and the southern farmer alike, but the Republican tariff that followed, while leaving binding twine and yarn on the free list, put a high duty on cotton bagging and ties, and Republican Congresses have turned a deaf ear to the demands of the southern farmer, and have kept the tariff high, while a monopoly absorbed the manufacture of cotton bagging and ties. This bill simply gives a tardy relief from monopoly and removes the discrimination against cotton culture.

COTTON A GREAT NATIONAL QUESTION.

I wish to call the attention of this House to the fact that the question of cotton is not a local but a national question of the first importance. Unfortunately, cotton was formerly associated with slave labor, and this association engendered a prejudice that has steadily persisted in the minds of our National Government and has resulted in great injustice to those engaged in cotton culture and in great financial loss to the Nation. Nearly a half century has elapsed since the proclamation of emancipation and the close of the Civil War, and we should look at the facts dispassionately. After the surrender, and after the full restoration of citizenship, cotton belonging to southern citizens was seized by our Government without compensation, amounting to more than $5,000,000, and not till the Sixty-first Congress has action been taken looking toward indemnifying the citizens so openly and admittedly wronged.

HISTORIC PREJUDICE AGAINST COTTON.

This unlawful seizure of cotton was quickly followed by a direct tax on cotton, a measure that was unconstitutional on its face, but before the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional over $67,000,000 were collected, and to this day the Treasury of the United States carries $67,000,000 taken away unlawfully by the Government from its citizens. When the income tax was declared unconstitutional, the taxes collected were promptly returned, but this vast sum exacted from a people in dire distress has lain in the Treasury and no action has been taken to return it to its lawful owners.

Last year there was a question of a contest between the bears and the bulls on the cotton market. For once since the Civil War the bulls, favored, you might say, by Providence and the weather, were able to hold their own and keep the price of cotton up to the level of supply and demand, whereupon, for the first time in the history of this Government, the Department of Justice proceeded to prosecute the bulls because they formed a pool to control a few hundred thousand bales of cotton out of a crop of over 11,000,000 bales to protect their own interests and keep up the price of cotton, and made no effort to prosecute the bears for combinations openly made to advance their own interests by putting down the price of cotton. The Government found indictments in July when the cotton market was dull, criminal indictments that called for speedy trial, and kept them sealed until last year's crop was marketed and then at a critical time brought them forth and furnished the strongest factor in putting down the price of cotton.

THE GOVERNMENT A BEAR ON THE COTTON MARKET.

It is estimated that more than 1,000,000 bales of cotton futures were speedily sold abroad by spinners and bear speculators—cotton that had never even been planted—sold at a price far below the price at which actual cotton could be bought, all for the purpose and with the effect of breaking the market. It is estimated that the Government appearing constantly as a powerful bear factor on the cotton market is costing America over $50,000,000 loss annually in its proceeds of sales of cotton abroad. Before the bull pool had been formed the bear interests had depressed the price of futures to 8½ cents per pound; as a result of bull operations the crop of 1909 was marketed at nearly 15 cents a pound, a price in keeping with the small crop. America's sales abroad actually brought $450,000,000 cash, whereas at the bear prices it would have been $250,000,000, a difference of $200,000,000. It seems incredible that our Government should go out of its way to become and remain a bear

on the cotton market and cut down the profits of the sales of our own people to the people abroad. Never has the Government undertaken to prosecute the bears on the cotton market; never has it undertaken to prosecute bulls or bears on the wheat market or any other produce market. On the cotton market, where we sell over half of our total crop abroad, our Government should appear as a bull and not as a bear.

That brings me to the point I wish to make, namely, that the cotton industry is not sectional but is the most national of all our industries.

AMERICA A LEGITIMATE BULL ON THE COTTON MARKET.

Supplying, as we do, about 70 per cent of all the cotton of the world, our Government should give every legitimate assistance to our producers to grow and to market their crops and should adopt the policy in both its branches, legislative and executive, of a bull on the cotton market. Germany produces a large fraction of the actual output of potash, though not as large a portion as we have of cotton, and the German Government, legislative and executive, has put itself upon the market as a powerful bull agent for potash. We have just listened to eloquent remarks about coffee. Brazil produces a large fraction of the coffee of the world, though not as large a portion as we do of cotton, and the Brazilian Government has taken hold of the coffee market as a powerful and dominating bull agent. Think what this cotton crop of ours would add to our national wealth and prosperity if prejudice did not blind us to its claims and its possibilities.

AMERICA HAS A PRACTICAL MONOPOLY OF THE COTTON PRODUCTION OF THE WORLD.

We produce to-day in the neighborhood of 70 per cent, nearly three-fourths, of all the cotton produced in the whole world. Cotton has at times been $1, $1.25, and $1.50 a pound, and yet, while the nations of the world have tried, in all parts of the world, to grow and develop the cotton industry, they have always failed. They have found rich soil; they have found equitable, average temperature, but they have never found the meteorological conditions required for cotton culture. Take the physical geography of the United States you will see that it is like a great funnel, with the Appalachian system running parallel to the coast to the north and east, and then half way across the continent the Rocky Mountain system running north and west.

THE CONTINENTAL FUNNEL.

The vast plain between these systems has the Great Lakes at the northern end, deep and cold, and the Gulf and southern Atlantic at the southern end, with no mountain barriers between. Not far out from the seaboard is the Gulf Stream. That warm current, gathering in the equatorial regions, curves and sweeps up parallel to the coast. At a higher temperature than the surrounding water and atmosphere vast volumes of heavy moist-laden air rise from its surface to the upper region of the air.

In the late winter and spring the draft of that great continental funnel draws from the south and the southeast. The vast volumes of moisture above the Gulf Stream are drawn across the Southern States and up the Mississippi Valley. The effect of the Great Lakes, which are cold the year round, is to cause precipitation. The great waterfall in the Great Lake region and Mississippi Valley does not come from the Great Lakes. They are inland. It could not come from them primarily. The moisture does not cross the mountains and come from the east or the west. It could not. It comes up the Mississippi Valley from the Gulf and the Gulf Stream, and produces the vast corn area of the Middle West and the cotton area of the South.

The draft of the funnel coming from the south and southeast in the late winter and spring and early summer is reversed in the middle and late summer and early fall and discharges the dry air from the continent at the time when this sun crop wants no more moisture, but wants the sun. In all other tropical and subtropical lands the heat and the moisture do not come at the right time for cotton. As a rule the moisture comes when the plant wants dry weather. The meteorological combination we have in the Southern States is not duplicated anywhere else in the whole world and gives us a monopoly of cotton culture. It is time that our American people should realize the fact that nature has put into our hands the power to control the first great necessity of all civilized human life.

COTTON THE FIRST GREAT NECESSITY OF HUMAN LIFE.

Clothing comes first, because food products are very variable. Man's digestion is very adaptable. But for clothing there is but one article that can supply the world. Fig leaves were found inadequate after the fall. Furs and skins are gone. Silk is not practicable and wool is limited. The great masses of all the men who live in the world must wear cotton if they would not go naked. Every time that a population is increased a certain percentage, that many more people must be clothed with cotton. We have to-day in our country over 20,000,000 more people to clothe than we had at the last census. The increase of population in Europe must be clothed with cotton. As the Gospel joined with the steamship and the electric wire adds new peoples to the world's civilization, those peoples, the vast myriads of Asia and Africa, must be clothed with cotton grown largely in America.

What a short-sighted policy it is, what economic suicide, for America herself to join with the spinners, the bears of Europe and Asia, to depress the price of cotton.

For 30 years a small group of men, spinners, and those who make money in the cotton futures, have been able to dominate the cotton market and depress the price. They form combines openly, shut down mills, and offer future cotton that has never been planted, at $10 and $15 a bale less than they would have to pay for cotton actually in the market. When buyers step in to take up these offers, the Government interferes and the price goes down all over the world.

GOVERNMENTAL DISCRIMINATION.

Bear combinations of spinners and "spot houses" go on openly unmolested, but a bull combination to handle less than a fiftieth part of a single crop precipitates prosecutions conducted in just the manner best suited to the operations of the bears.

I would like to turn the vision of Members to the possibilities in our reach if we adopt an intelligent attitude toward cotton, both its culture and its manufacture. As long as we sell great quantities of raw cotton abroad, the Nation, its people and its Government, should keep the price of cotton high. But we should not be content with selling raw cotton for others to get the profits in the manufacture and sale of the finished product. It is not raw cotton but the cloth that constitutes the necessity of life and the major profits always go to those who make and sell the finished product.

AMERICA MUST CONTROL CLOTHING OF THE WORLD.

We can and must make and control the clothing of the world. We should proceed on sound economic lines to increase our mills till we spin and weave here in our own country all the cotton that we produce. America would then hold in its hand a permanent power that would bring all the rest of the world to its feet. They would have to come, or else go naked. This power would enable us ultimately to dominate the commerce, the finance, and at last, the policies of the world.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Does the gentleman intend to discuss any further the effect of gambling in futures of cotton?

Mr. HOBSON. I expect at a little later date to bring it up.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. A later date than to-day?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes. I hope to see it made a subject of exhaustive investigation by this House, and in that connection I expect to bring out all the points bearing upon the subject.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. One more question. Will the gentleman at the same time discuss the question of gambling in grain, concerning which I introduced a bill on the first day of this session—to forbid it—following the lines of the cotton bill?

Mr. HOBSON. I can not speak for the committee of investigation, but all of those subjects can be brought up for investigation by one committee or several committees.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. CANTRILL. Will the gentleman from Alabama permit me to offer a suggestion, that the Department of Justice prosecuted the tobacco farmers of Kentucky when by their own efforts they had raised the price of tobacco from 5 to 15 cents a pound, and sent its officers to Kentucky and dragged Kentucky farmers into the Federal courts and prosecuted them and fined them. I simply offer that as a suggestion to bear out what the gentleman says as to the prosecution of the cotton farmer and the policy of the Republican Party now in control as against the farmer.

Mr. HOBSON. I am glad that the gentleman brings that point out. No policy of government could be more pernicious than that of persecuting those who produce American staples and allowing to go free those who combine to put down the price of those staples.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will take up the thread of my discourse. In achieving this future of greatness the country should look to the South. The South to-day is the greatest undeveloped asset this nation has. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I do not propose on this occasion to discuss the general question of the resources of the South, but I desire to suggest to you who come from sections further developed, from whose districts farmers are going out in search of cheaper lands, that land values in the South are but from one-sixth to one-seventh of what they are in the Middle West. The Agricultural Department has demonstrated—and I have had it done in my district—that by equal care you can produce more on an acre of land there, where the tax value is $10 an acre, than on an acre of land in Illinois, where the tax value is $72 an acre. I wish to suggest further that the completion of the Panama Canal is going to cause the South to be discovered and peopled and land values will advance faster than they ever did in the Middle West. Why should farmers selling their high-price lands in the Middle West go to the cold Canadian northwest or to the arid southwest and buy lands three times as dear as more fertile lands in the salubrious Southern States.

THE SOUTH THE NATURAL HOME OF MANUFACTURING.

But I wish at this juncture to point out that in the great industrial expansion to produce the clothing of the world, the South is the logical region for the factories. The raw material—cotton—is on the spot. The power, both coal and water power are at hand. It is estimated that the South has 60,000 square miles of coal fields, the greatest undeveloped coal fields in the civilized world, and that it has 5,000,000 horsepower of waterfalls available under usual methods and 10,000,000 horsepower ultimately available, more than half of all the undeveloped water power in America. The white population of the South is demonstrating a high capacity for skilled labor when trained. More than two-thirds of all the inland navigable waterways are in the South, most of them flowing to the Gulf, giving short water transportation to tidewater—straight in line for the future center of distribution of world staples.

Nowhere else in this country or in any country can you find the raw materials and the power together in quantity with advantages for transportation. This wonderful combination applies to industries based on iron and industries based on cotton—the two greatest basic materials. Near my district is found great deposits of iron in one range of hills, great deposits of coking coal in the hills in front and limestone for fluxing in the valley between. If any one of you will come down in my district and erect a cotton mill, I will see to it that you are given a coal mine to erect it on, and you can build it in a cotton field that will supply the raw material. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I regret very much that I did not have an opportunity to hear all of his remarks. What I have heard of them was very interesting and instructive. I want to make this inquiry of the gentleman. Suppose Canada grew cotton, and American cotton were protected by a tariff, would the gentleman be in favor of removing the protection from the cotton grower?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly. You do not have to protect yourself against yourself. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Do you regard Canada as yourself?

Mr. HOBSON. Canada does not grow cotton.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I said, suppose Canada grew cotton.

Mr. HOBSON. Precisely.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Evidently the gentleman did not understand me.

Mr. HOBSON. I see. Mr. Chairman, I have just demonstrated that in all the realm of physical science such a supposition is impossible.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Certainly; it is an insupposable case.

Mr. HOBSON. I can not bring myself to leap over impossibilities, any more than nature can over a vacuum.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I wanted to ask the gentleman to draw the long bow of his imagination. He has a very active imagination.

Mr. HOBSON. And I am going to draw it in a few minutes, and I hope to the entire satisfaction of the gentleman, on that same line.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Could not the gentleman draw it now?

Mr. HOBSON. Yes; I could. It would be very simple and easy. If we have natural conditions here that warrant cotton as a great permanent industry, and if our people are the equal of others, particularly if we can demonstrate that they are the superiors of any of their competitors, and especially if we can demonstrate that their natural resources in this supply are superior to those of their competitors, then I would say that they need no protection in the world; and furthermore, that to give them any protection would be tending to build up a wall around them, like trying to keep children inside of a yard instead of letting them go out into the open fields.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit me? The gentleman has demonstrated that the cotton grower of the United States has practically a monopoly of cotton production for the world. He has demonstrated that climatic conditions in the South are extremely favorable to cotton growing. Now, I am asking the gentleman to suppose conditions in Canada to be as favorable to the production of cotton as conditions in the Southern States. The gentleman may say that is an insupposable case, but I am asking him to assume that. Then I am asking him to assume protection against Canadian cotton. Then I am asking the gentleman if he would be willing to remove the protection to the cotton grower of the United States?

Mr. HOBSON. I will say to the gentleman that the proposition is very plain in my mind, as a matter of principle. Assuming that this industry could be a permanent one and had passed its infancy I would certainly be willing to see all protection removed. If it could not be a permanently profitable industry we would have to protect it if we wanted it at all. But there are very few industries that as a people we ought to maintain permanently at a loss.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Precisely.

Mr. HOBSON. I will say to the gentleman, as I intended to say a little later, that I am both a protectionist and a free trader.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to say he could not suppose an insupposable case, but he seems to be able to do it. The gentleman has evidently drawn his long bow.

Mr. HOBSON. I am sure the gentleman can make his speech later.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. HOBSON. But not for a general discussion of abstractions. Of course it can be applied to other articles, but as applied to cotton——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. One moment. Just a word. It applies to reciprocity, and it applies to the general proposition of fair dealing with the various industrial divisions in this country, and I submit it to the gentleman because he is a fair thinker. I pay him that tribute.

Mr. HOBSON. I appreciate the gentleman's compliment.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman is a man of intellectual integrity, and I have a high regard for the gentleman.

Mr. HOBSON. I think I can return the compliment, which I appreciate.

YOUNG MAN, GO SOUTH.

Coming back to my subject, in the next 20 or 30 years our young men do not have to go to Canada, to the Northwest, to buy $30 land, nor to the Southwest, among the deserts, and resort to artificial irrigation; nor do they have to go to the Tropics or the islands of the seas. The greatest opportunity to grow up with the country ever offered is the opportunity now offered by the South. Here is the greatest field of development that the world has ever seen, with ridiculously cheap lands with great and varied fertility located in the choicest part of the Temperate Zone close to the future center of distribution of the great world staples, with unmatched facilities for water transportation, offering the raw materials and the power for manufacturing in close proximity for the greatest world staples, with possibilities for a monopoly of the greatest of all staples, cotton and its manufactures, the prime necessity of all human life. These marvelous combinations make the South the greatest asset the Nation has ever had. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE SOUTH A GREAT SOCIAL AND MORAL ASSET.

Further, this asset is not simply material. In the South to-day over 95 per cent of all the people are descendants of a generation of Americans that signed the Declaration of Independence and fought through the Revolutionary War, the purest American blood in America and probably the purest Anglo-Saxon blood in the world. In my own district the people are 99

per cent American and Anglo-Saxon. I do not depreciate any other strain of blood that is going in to make our Nation great, but it is a fact that each type of blood has its own specialty; and that the Anglo-Saxon type has as its specialty the question of evolving and maintaining free institutions.

In the great wave of materialism and commercialism that has swept this country and is sweeping the whole world and is shaking the foundations of liberty, this country needs the asset that would come if it could draw fully upon this great body of old Anglo-Saxon blood that has escaped this wave.

THE RISE OF THE SOUTH THE OFFSET TO COMMERCIALISM.

An unusually large percentage of these Anglo-Saxons are illiterate because the conditions of wealth, consequent upon the Civil War and the period of reconstruction, have not been such as permitted their education. But the material development of the South will bring to them the benefit of education, and in their full development they will come into this Congress, come into the great councils of all the great parties of this country and the councils of the Nation; they will help wonderfully to bring a return to old-fashioned devotion to principle on the part of public officials, and to strengthen the foundations upon which our institutions must rest if the Government is to endure. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

TARIFF PRINCIPLES.

That brings me to the second part of my discussion, namely, what are the underlying principles that should guide us in voting on this tariff measure or other tariff measures. The gentleman from Illinois, the minority leader, yesterday—and I am sorry he is not here—spent two hours in discrediting schedules and he gave one-half minute to stating his philosophy. Here is his philosophy, namely: He is in favor of the home producer and would not allow articles to come in from abroad because he wants them produced at home. The gentleman has not, as far as I know, expounded any system for raising the revenues necessary for the Government. His philosophy of the tariff, namely, a prohibitory tariff, would leave the Government without revenue. I have stated in discussing the reciprocity bill that I am in favor of direct methods of taxation and favor the progressive substitution of income tax, inheritance tax, and other direct tax laws to produce the revenues of the Government, so that consideration of the tariff might be settled on economic grounds.

THEORY OF HOME INDUSTRIES.

But suppose in giving the work at home you maintain industries at a loss and strike at the general prosperity, the additional work you would supply in the industries in question would be small in comparison to the loss of work in general. The true philosophy would be to have the people constantly engaged in the most profitable employment, buying from others what it would be a loss to produce at home.

If the minority leader were here I would ask him, not only what arrangement he would make for revenue if he cut off importation, but how he explains Republican measures that at times have placed an unwieldy surplus in the Treasury and precipitated extravagance, not to say corruption.

A PROTECTIVE TARIFF AN INIQUITOUS REVENUE MEASURE.

The fact is, at one time the Republican tariff measures formed for protection only produced a deficit and shook public confidence, tending to cause panics; at another time they flood the Treasury with surplus, tending to extravagance and corruption.

It is the Democratic side that has always and now is giving real serious consideration to the question of the revenues while framing the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For twenty-odd years the tariff has been framed practically without regard to its effect upon the revenues, and our Government for 20 years has had no sound fiscal policy. It has had no real budget. It was really refreshing to hear the leader of the majority yesterday give an exposition of the proper adjustment of tariffs with a view to meeting the revenue needs of the Government, economically administered. But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the foundation of a true tariff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, what is the true foundation of protection? What was enunciated by the fathers who inaugurated protection policies in this country? They stated it in simple words as protection to infant industries.

THE PROTECTION OF THE FATHERS.

The avowed object and the real object of the fathers was to promote the development of our industries by protection in the period of their weakness, so that when grown they would make us independent of the world for those products. In the sense of protecting a legitimate industry in the early stages of its life I would give protection, and such protection is warranted by the laws of life. But the time comes in the life of every organism when the protection needed in the early stages is no longer needed, and being then artificial, if continued will produce retrogression and ultimately degeneracy. Follow the development of a child, for example. A father protects his boy in childhood and youth, and during this period protection promotes the boy's development; but the time comes in the life of the boy when he reaches manhood. If the father keeps him under the parental roof and continues his protection the young man's development will be retarded and he will never reach his full growth. For his own highest development he needs the competition of the world. The same is true with an industry.

LEGITIMATE PROTECTION.

Protect a legitimate industry up to a point where that industry fills the home market and protection is beneficial to the industry, but at that point protection should end. There might be an exception in the case of a product necessary to make our country independent of the rest of the world, for which we have not the natural conditions for competition, where protection would have to be permanent, but this would apply to few, if any, of our great industries.

We are starting new industries from time to time. Let us give them protection. But the great industries that come down to this city every time a tariff measure is framed and clamor for higher and higher protection have all grown up to the proportions of the American market and have reached the period where legitimate protection should end.

CONTINUED HIGH PROTECTION THE MOTHER OF TRUSTS AND THE FATHER OF MONOPOLY.

With a high tariff wall, if the various common producers get together, they can all get the benefit of that wall, and raise their prices up to its level. If they do not come together, if they compete, none of them will get the benefit of the tariff wall, consequently we find producers combining and all our great industries organized to eliminate competition. They either combine openly or they have a gentlemen's agreement. In many cases they have actually consolidated until they control the whole output, or substantially the output, and dictate the price.

Continued protection leads inevitably to monopoly and the oppression that comes with it. Holding a monopoly in a necessity of life gives the power to tax the American people, which as a source of profit is greater than all the gold mines in the world. Tyrants used to tax the people of small resources and accumulate vast treasures, but the power to tax the American people with their one hundred and thirty billions of property is such a vast source of gain that the moment it is acquired the holdings can be doubled, trebled, increased tenfold, and pay dividends.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

This is largely the secret of the high cost of living. This is why we have had such universal rank abuse in watering of stocks, and raising of prices to pay dividends on the watered stock. This is why we have had such mushroom growths of millionaires and multimillionaires. But that is not all. Making the large dividends within this high-tariff wall the stockholders care but little about the great markets of the world where competition causes the dividends to be reasonable.

CORRUPTS POLITICS.

Instead of continuing development the industries give their main attention to fortifying their control or monopoly. They go into politics and hold out great rewards to men and parties for continued favors, they shut down plants, as they have done in Birmingham, as a threat, they precipitate panics, they undertake to destroy statesmen, to chastise parties, to overturn administrations, to intimidate the American people.

What happens to the industry we are supposed to be protecting? Do they continue a healthy development? On the contrary. I realize that we are having an increase of population here by immigration of nearly a million a year, which with the natural increase of population increases the home market, and the industries naturally grow to that market, but for the last 20 years there has been no serious effort on the part of these industries to go out and capture the great markets of the world.

DWARFS THE INDUSTRIES THEMSELVES.

This Nation can never be on a sound, permanent, economic basis until its industries have for their markets the great reservoir of the world's consumption. The perpetuation of these high tariffs beyond their legitimate period is dwarfing the development of the industries themselves. It has reached the second period of the organic life of the Nation's industries, where it is producing degeneracy.

I realize perfectly well what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] had in mind in asking me questions about competition with Canada. He would probably have followed them up by claiming that American labor engaged in these industries needs protection. I do not hesitate to say that when this monopolistic power is acquired labor gets less than it got before, no matter how enormous the profits. The Steel Trust will clear a net dividend greater than all the wages paid to all the labor without volunteering a dollar raise in wages. The truth is that labor engaged in the highly protected industries to-day is the poorest paid labor in America. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

OPPRESSES LABOR.

The supreme power in the hands of a monopoly enables it the better to oppress labor. You do not pay a dollar more for labor than you have to; neither do I; neither does a soulless corporation. No matter how great their profits they undertake to get labor as cheaply as they can. They operate in two ways. At strategic moments they shut down part of their plant. It matters little to them, because they will put up the prices of the commodity to the American people and make the American people bear their losses. They shut down their plants, reduce the demand for labor, and throw labor on the market, and thereby lower the price. Holding a monopoly enables them to wield the weapon of shut-outs, so demoralizing to labor and so harmful to the public. But they are not satisfied with that weapon. They undertake to increase the supply of labor on the market by bringing in aliens. I pointed out in the remarks I made on the reciprocity measure that it is the policy, and a natural policy, for these great industries to promote immigration from Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOBSON. I would ask five minutes more. I do not want to impose upon the gentleman from Alabama, but I would be obliged if he could spare me that much time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional time.

PERVERTS IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HOBSON. As I was saying, the great overprotected industries are at the basis of a large part of our immigration. They fight every immigration law we try to put on the statute books. They reach out to crowded Europe for pauper labor. Pauper labor comes which can not pay its passage, but it comes somehow—some way—and when it comes it does not go out to the farms where, as I pointed out, the demand is so great, but it remains in the cities, remains around the factories, remains at the mouth of the mines, to glut the labor market and put the price of labor down. It is ridiculous to maintain that American labor is now protected in any industry against any pauper labor of Europe. Labor is the one thing that is eternally on the free list in Republican tariff measures. I do not mean to say that American labor, if freed from the grip of monopoly and monopolistic prices, needs any protection against the labor of Europe. I will not take the time now to repeat what I stated in my remarks on reciprocity that the average American laborer turns out $2,450 worth of product a year, the Canadian $1,455, the Australian $900, the Frenchman $640, the Englishman $556, the German $460. The average American laborer produces four times as much as the average European laborer. It is alleged he gets twice the amount of wages. I question it; but, suppose he did? He is then only one-half as well paid as the European laborer for what he produces. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If, instead of being dwarfed by the high tariff, our great industries proceeded systematically to capture their proportion of the world's markets they would seldom if ever shut down plants, but would run plants full time and steadily increase the number of plants. The increasing demand for labor would cause the price of labor to go up, and the laborer, freed from the clutches of monopoly, would find his proportionate share of the profits of production continually increasing while the cost of living continually declined. A proper revision of the tariff would usher in a veritable new era of prosperity for American labor. Thus the most powerful economic reasons demand speedy reform in our tariff policies—the high cost of living, the actual dwarfing of our industries themselves, the great hardships to American labor.

MENACE TO AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are deeper reasons even than these economic ones why we should hasten reform. The perpetuation of such abnormal conditions of taxation is menacing our political institutions. Great interests go into politics and pour vast sums into political campaigns in order to secure privileges at the hands of the victorious party. It is not an overstatement to say that more than once has the popular will been reversed in national elections by money put into doubtful States, and many times has the will of the people been disregarded in the election of Senators or even of Representatives. The successful party, more dependent on great moneyed interests than upon the will of the people, has naturally enacted laws and administered laws with scant regard for the public welfare, and with but slight concern for economy and efficiency. Widespread extravagance, not to say corruption, have been inevitable, and inefficiency has been almost universal. In addition, we can not but view with alarm the effect of continual refusal on the part of the party in power to make legitimate reforms. Dammed up so long, the current of reform is threatening us with the floods of radicalism.

CAUSE OF SECTIONALISM AND BLIGHT UPON STATESMEN.

Furthermore, the availability of the Government for exploitation has caused each interest, each locality, each section to take a narrow, selfish view of the function of government. For 20 years these conditions have been producing parochial statesmen, men really sincere and earnest, who on this floor do not hesitate to advocate unwise policies for the nation, provided only they can gain selfish advantages for their localities, while the National Treasury is considered legitimate prey for anyone to raid. Our statesmen have come to operate for to-day with a magnifying glass turned upon the temporary interests of a district; they should operate with a telescope turned upon the whole world and upon all history to establish policies for a nation that is to endure a thousand years.

PERVERTS THE FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT.

The harmful effect upon our political institutions goes yet deeper and reaches the very conception in the public mind of the functions of government. The true sphere of an enduring government is in the regulating system, leaving the producing and distributing systems to private enterprise. Our tariff system has produced such a perversion in the public mind that one of the great parties in its platform advocates the Government's taking such a part in private enterprise as to insure the profits. No government in the world can long endure that burdens itself with such activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has been extended for three minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman desires, I will yield 10 minutes more.

Mr. HOBSON. I will be glad to have it, but I will try not to consume it all, as I do not wish to impose on the time of others who are to speak this afternoon.

I wish to complete this thought, Mr. Chairman, namely, that we are tending to produce a condition here in America that is striking at the foundation of our political institutions, namely, the conception in the minds of our people that the Government is something to go out and affect the producing system and the distributing system, for individuals and combinations to get all out of it they can; whereas the Government is founded primarily to be the regulating system, to lay down principles and maintain the administration of justice and equity for and between all the people.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IS THE MAIN OBJECT OF GOVERNMENT.

I lived for three years on the Continent of Europe and I have lived in Asia. I have seen many of the peoples of the world and their systems and have had occasion to see the effect of those systems upon the development of their citizens. The greatest thing in this part of the universe is human life. Human life comes into the world in an embryonic state and has to evolve and develop. The evolution and development of human life is the greatest thing in the world. The primary object of any Government that would fulfill its highest functions is to establish those conditions under which all its people would attain the highest development. Now the law of development is repeated regular exercise of the faculties. In order to have repeated regular exercise of the faculties there must be opportunities for same in regular avocations. In order to realize a maximum of opportunities for all the peoples there must be equality of opportunity between the individuals. Therefore the guarantee of equality of opportunity between its citizens is the highest object of government. It is not only the essence of liberty, but the foundation of progress and development.

EUROPEAN, AMERICAN, CANADIAN.

Let us be concrete and take a young peasant, such as one finds in any country in Europe. He may be endowed by nature with

wonderful God-given faculties. Of course there are exceptions, but speaking broadly he is not going to have a chance to fully develop his faculties. His opportunities for exercising them will be limited to a certain small sphere, limited by his own strata of society. Pass to the other stages on up until you get to the nobility and the royalty. Take the crown prince. In many cases I have seen the crown prince would have improved his development if he had gotten down the ax or gone between the handles of the plow.

But he can not. He has to sit on a throne and rule; perhaps the very thing that may ruin his development. With artificial stratification of society, limiting individuals to the activities of one strata only, the average citizen in each strata falls short in his development, and the nation must fall short in the aggregate. Come to America. The system that our forefathers founded and that we should perpetuate and develop is a system whose very essence is a guarantee, not only of equality of public burdens, but equality of public opportunities. This tells the secret many have wondered at of America's marvelous growth, the marvel of all history. This tells the secret of the contrast between America's growth and the growth of Canada, where the start was made at the same time, under similar physical conditions and natural advantages. On one side of an imaginary line is the undeveloped country; on the other populous cities.

REPUBLICAN HERESY.

The most alarming event of modern times is the appearance in the platform of a great party of a plank that calls upon the Government to guarantee "profits" to those on the lists of protection. This plank does violence to the American conception of the functions of government. It takes the Government into the forbidden spheres of business, and causes it to fail in its duty in the legitimate sphere of regulation.

The policy defined by this plank, persisted in, would lead straight to the permanent development of privileged classes and the disruption of free institutions. Until that plank is purged from the platform and from the purposes of the Republican Party it should forfeit the support of all independent citizens who hold country above party.

OUR GLORIOUS INHERITANCE.

It is time for us as a people to restore the conditions bequeathed to us by our forefathers—the conditions of equality, of opportunity—where any American boy, no matter where born, no matter how humble the circumstances of his birth, no matter how richly endowed with capacity, can develop his faculties to the utmost, by having a free access, with equal chances of success, to any occupation, any business, any profession. Any American boy should have access to the development that comes with grappling with great problems of his day—economic, political, social. Every American boy should have a clear field, without let or hindrance, for leadership, for holding positions of honor and trust at the hands of his State, at the hands of his country. With our institutions preserved, the humblest-born American boy can have the developing uplift of the feeling that he in a devoted life can help shape his country's great world policies; and with such a country as we have, advocating such wonderful principles of equal justice and peace and brotherhood over all the earth, that he can help mold the destiny of mankind, effecting the happiness of myriads yet unborn. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

AMERICA AND ROME.

Alongside the possibilities of such a noble ambition here in America, the ambitions of history, that have so fascinated us, like those of Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, all combined are as naught. There is but one parallel in the history of this world, and that came about as the result of equality of opportunity. That was when Rome had liberty, and under equality of opportunity extended its empire to the uttermost corners of the earth. Then the old Romans proudly proclaimed that to be a Roman was greater than a king.

The time is near at hand when we, in restoring the integrity of the institutions that our forefathers founded, can proclaim that to be an American is greater than an emperor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A CALL FOR PATRIOTISM.

The time has come for a new baptism of patriotism and devotion to country, for a return to the basic principles of government established by our fathers, so that we can successfully meet the great problems that have come upon us in an industrial age, and in solving them not only perpetuate the institutions of our fathers but make them even stronger and nobler than we have received them. I believe that the adoption of this measure is a step—an important step, though only a step—in that direction. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to make a request.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask how the balance of time stands in this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has used 4 hours and 18 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has used 4 hours and 26 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Four hours and twenty-six minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DALZELL. Eight minutes difference.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield 30 minutes on that side.

Mr. DALZELL. All right.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitancy in saying that we have listened to one of the most interesting speeches that I have heard delivered on this floor. I believe that if we would only follow out the line suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] we would not have very much trouble in formulating a revenue measure. The trouble has been that we use every tariff bill as a political football, each side of the House seeking to make political capital out of it. If the spirit which the gentleman suggests could control all of us; if we could broaden out somewhat and get away from the idea that each of us is interested only in the things that especially affect our individual districts; if we could be statesmen in the broadest sense of the word, the people of this country would be very much better off.

But in the past—and, so far as I know, throughout the entire history of this country—the lines proceeded upon have been directly the opposite of this idea. For years the selfish idea of protection has prevailed in this country—protection not to the whole people, protection not to all the people alike, but protection to certain individuals engaged in certain special lines of business. In other words the heel of the protectionist has been upon the necks of the farmers and the laboring people of this country for a great many years, but now, it seems to me, the opportunity has come for us to remove said heel and, by this bill, to give the people of this country many of the prime necessities of life duty free.

I feel that I can say with the good old poet—

This is the day I long have sought
And mourned because I found it not.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am looking forward to the day, which I hope is not far distant, when it can be announced that three-fourths of the States of the Union have adopted the income-tax amendment to the Constitution, after which time we can enact a graduated income-tax law which will compel the wealth of this country to bear its just proportion of the burdens of government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But until that time, Mr. Chairman, every sane man realizes that the expenses of the Government will go on, and that Congress must provide means for meeting those expenses. Experience has taught us that in order that money enough can be provided to meet these expenses about $350,000,000 annually must be raised by a duty on imports. Therefore it is utterly impossible for us to put all the things on the free list that we would like to put there. The other day we passed through this House the Canadian reciprocity bill, which places upon the free list certain necessities of life, and reduced the present tariff on others, but that agreement only affected articles of import between the United States and Canada. I did not fully agree with the terms of that trade pact, but I believed that it was a step in the right direction, hence I voted for it, and I believe this bill, known as the farmers' free list, is several steps in the right direction, for it not only applies to the importations of the things mentioned in the bill from Canada, but from all the countries of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I sat for a week and listened to the debate on the reciprocity bill, and confess to you that it was amusing to hear the reasons assigned by the opponents of that bill for opposing it. Without a single exception, I believe, they put their opposition on the ground, as they claimed, that the farmer was being discriminated against. Why, here was my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] agonizing over the condition of the poor farmer, when, in fact, there is not a farm in 150 miles of Pittsburg, his home. Of course I would not intimate that the gentlemen who opposed that bill were not entirely sin-

cere in their solicitude for the farmers of the country, but I could not help but notice that each one of them who were here in the last Congress, except some of our insurgent friends, voted against free lumber when the Payne-Aldrich bill was before the House, and the Canadian reciprocity bill puts lumber on the free list. Being human, I could not help but wonder if the fact that lumber was put on the free list had anything to do with their opposition to that bill. I presume not, or else they would have been frank enough to have said so. If it did, however, I would suggest that if they had bottled up all the briny tears they shed in sympathy for the poor farmer they could have run their sawmills by water power, in which event I am sure they could compete with Canada without the aid of a tariff on lumber. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss this pending bill in its relation to the farmer, and it does immediately and directly concern him.

This bill places upon the free list the following articles: Agricultural implements; cotton bagging and ties; boots, shoes, harness, saddlery, and other leather products; fencing wire; lumber; sewing machines; salt, and so forth.

Every one of these articles are prime necessities of life—things which the farmers of this country must buy.

I congratulate the Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee in bringing out this bill, for it goes far toward redeeming the promises which my party made to the people.

And, Mr. Chairman, while I am congratulating, let me congratulate my party on the splendid energy, determination, speed, and unanimity which it is proceeding to make good every promise it made to the country.

True to the promises which we made to the people, we promptly took from the Speaker the power to appoint the standing committees of the House and placed that power where it belongs, in the membership of the House, making the Speaker what the Constitution intended he should be, a presiding officer and not a czar. And, without the aid of the objectionable special rule or limiting debate or shutting off amendments, we have in less than three weeks passed through the House the following important bills, to wit:

First. A joint resolution providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people.

Second. A drastic publicity law, known as the Rucker bill, requiring all political parties, not more than 15 days nor less than 10 days prior to any election, to publish a detailed statement of all contributions made above $10, giving name of contributor, also how disbursed, and to file a like supplemental statement every three days thereafter down to the day of election, intending thereby to prevent corruption at the ballot box by the use of large sums of money.

Third. Canadian reciprocity.

And now we are considering, and will in a day or two pass, this free-list bill.

This record has certainly never been equaled by any political party. We will follow this up with an adjustment of the woolen, the cotton, steel, and other schedules in their order.

It seems to me that every citizen who believes in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people ought to be proud of this record.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having felicitated my party upon this splendid record made and to be made in a few weeks, I must get back to a discussion of this bill.

The opponents of this bill and the reciprocity bill, and they are practically the same people, talk about injuring the farmer by taking the tariff off his products. I am loath to believe that there is any man on this floor who knows so little as to actually believe that a tariff on wheat, corn, or other cereals adds to the price of these things to the farmer.

I am reminded that our erstwhile distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], did the other day, in a speech on the reciprocity bill, in a sort of half-hearted way deny that the price of the farmers' wheat was fixed in foreign markets. Of course men sometimes, in the interest of consistency, take positions they otherwise would not take, for if he had admitted that the price of our wheat was fixed in foreign markets he would have given his whole case away. But the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] did read into that speech an admission of the gentleman from Illinois, made in a speech on this floor in 1894, that the price of our wheat is fixed in the foreign markets. The colloquy was between Mr. Simpson, of Kansas, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], as follows:

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?
Mr. CANNON. Certainly.
Mr. SIMPSON. Does the gentleman not admit that we are now competing in Europe with the different countries of the Old World for the sale of our wheat?
Mr. CANNON. Certainly; with Roumania, Russia, and India.
Mr. SIMPSON. Then the gentleman will admit that the price we receive there fixes the price of our article not only in the United States but in the foreign markets?
Mr. CANNON. Certainly; all prices are regulated by the prevailing market, wherever it is.

Now, if that statement was true—and it was—in 1894 it is true in this good year of our Lord 1911. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I stated two years ago in a speech which I made on this floor when we were discussing the Payne-Aldrich bill that "no man is protected who is compelled to sell his products in the open markets of the world." This was and is a true statement of a fact.

Let us take wheat, for an example. There has never been a year since I can remember when the farmers of this country did not raise a surplus. Of necessity they must find a market for this surplus. This market can only be found outside the United States. The moment the farmers' wheat passes beyond the limits of the United States the pretended tariff on it can be of no effect. His wheat goes to Liverpool, and when offered for sale there it comes in competition with the surplus wheat of Canada, Australia, Russia, India, and every other country that raises a surplus of wheat, and the price it brings is fixed in this open market. And the price fixed in this open market controls the price here. Therefore, how can a tariff on wheat benefit the farmer? And the same is true of corn, oats, and other cereals. In view of these facts, then, how can reciprocity with Canada injure our farmers? To be more specific: We raise a surplus each year, so does Canada, and both countries seek the same market in Europe and the price of wheat of both countries is fixed there, where there is no tariff, and the price there fixes the price both here and in Canada, and the only material difference there can be in the prices in the different localities is the cost of transportation to market and elevator facilities. Of course I recognize the fact that the price of these staples is sometimes affected temporarily by the grain gamblers, whom I wish to God were in the bottom of the sea. Democrats know that this is true, and in order that my Republican friends may be convinced that I am right I will quote from high Republican authority.

Hon. James Wilson, the present Republican Secretary of Agriculture, in a letter written by him to the National Grange on February 9, 1911, among other things said:

> There is a difference of 10 or more cents a bushel on wheat and other cereals between the markets of Winnipeg and Minneapolis, but this difference is fully explained by the lack of transportation and elevator facilities and by the greater difficulty that the Canadian farmer now has in point of economic carriage from the Northwest to Liverpool, where by the sale of the world's surplus the price of wheat is fixed for the world.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, Mr. Secretary Wilson says:

> The United States produces surplus wheat above domestic requirements. This surplus production is sold in foreign countries. The price of our exported surplus is governed by the world's requirements, being regulated by the law of supply and demand, and the price of wheat in the United States, while we are exporting, is governed by the price at which the surplus is sold, as a general proposition. Occasionally wheat corners may interfere with the law of supply and demand and temporarily affect the price.

If this be true, then how can the farmer be hurt by reciprocity with Canada?

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of this country are intelligent. They know that when you talk about a tariff on their wheat, corn, oats, and other cereals being a benefit to them that you are only seeking to deceive them. They know, or at least many of them do, that the tariff was put on these things as an excuse for putting a high tariff on certain manufactured articles which they are compelled to buy.

Mr. Chairman, to show that all the farmers are not fooled by the siren voice of the protectionist, I want to read to you a letter which I received the other day from a farmer in my district. I am not authorized by him to use this letter for publication, consequently will suppress the name and place.

The letter is as follows:

> There seems to be well-organized effort to create the impression that the farmers, regardless of party, are opposed to Canadian reciprocity, and I presume that you have received numerous letters to this effect. I have heard several expressions, but invariably from Republicans.
>
> Democrats condemn the principle involved in the pact—that is, "free raw material and little or no reduction in the manufactured product"—but they know that "protection" on farm products, wool excepted, is a farce and a humbug, levied only to deceive and furnish an excuse for high duties on manufactured goods, and the sooner the fallacy is exposed and the "bundle separated" the earlier we will be relieved from the extortion from which we have suffered. Rest assured that this noise is made by protectionist and his dupes, and that the Democrats who till the soil have no part in it.
>
> I hope that you may not only be able to pass this bill, but several schedule bills during the extra session.

Mr. PROUTY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?
Mr. HAMLIN. Certainly.

Mr. PROUTY. Is this gentleman engaged in raising sheep?

Mr. HAMLIN. No. He may have a few sheep, but he is a large farmer in one of the best agricultural counties in the United States.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HAMLIN. I will.

Mr. STANLEY. His letter certainly reads like that of a man who did not have the head of a sheep. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is the gentleman from Missouri able to tell the reason of the exception of wool in this economic letter?

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not know what was in the mind of the writer——

Mr. STANLEY. If the gentleman from Missouri will allow me, I will say that it is because we do not produce as much wool as we use. Where we import a commodity the market to which it is exported fixes the price, as was said by Secretary Wilson, by Adam Smith, by John Stuart Mill, and every other man who ever lived who wrote and thought on the subject of political economy.

Mr. HAMLIN. I want to finish my answer. As I said, I can not tell what was in the mind of the writer of that letter; but if you had asked me why wool was excepted, I should give the answer that has been given by my friend from Kentucky, with this addition, that the reason that protection amounts to nothing upon wheat and corn and other cereals is because we raise a surplus in this country and are compelled to find a market beyond the limits of the United States.

Now, that is not true of wool. We do not raise a surplus of wool, and the sheep industry in this country seems to be declining. I will not say that the tariff on wool may not be of some benefit to the farmer, and I presume that is what this farmer had in mind; but he had sense enough to know—which seems to be a knowledge beyond that possessed by some gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber—that the tariff on wheat, corn, and oats is no protection to the farmer.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit an observation on that subject?

Mr. HAMLIN. No; but I will yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. The statement which the gentleman has been making is clear that the price of commodities where there is a surplus raised is controlled by the price in the market where the surplus is disposed of. I think it is essential that an exception should be noted that where the home product is controlled by a trust it may have a higher home price than the foreign price.

Mr. HAMLIN. I hinted at that a moment ago. The control of any article of commerce by a trust creates an abnormal condition, sets aside the law of supply and demand, and creates fictitious prices.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Now, will the gentleman extend to me the same courtesy that he did to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes; if the gentleman will not take up any more time than did the gentleman from Texas, for my time is limited.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I followed with great interest the development by the gentleman of the argument that the market where the surplus is disposed of controls, but I think the fallacy of the argument lies in this, that the world's market may control or have great influence upon the surplus of that product seeking a market, but it has but little influence on the large proportion we consume in our own country, unless the world's open market can become a competitor to supply our home consumption, which Liverpool can not do as to wheat and corn.

Mr. HAMLIN. The fallacy of the gentleman's statement is demonstrated by actual conditions. The gentleman never heard of a farmer going into town and saying, "I am going to have so much a bushel for my wheat." The farmer realizes that he is at the mercy of the markets of the world, and his first inquiry is, "What is wheat worth to-day?" And the man who is buying wheat can not give him this information until he first hears from either the Chicago or New York market, and these markets will give out no prices until they have heard from Liverpool indicating what the market price is there that day.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. On the other hand, as a matter that I have observed a great deal, I desire to state that there is scarcely a day in the northwestern wheat market but what the price obtained by the farmer in the Dakotas is larger by quite a considerable sum than the price paid in Liverpool, minus the freight. In other words, the American market in the Northwest at the present time, because of a large demand for the consumption of wheat among 92,000,000 people, which is a protected market to the American farmer, yields a higher price than he could get for the same commodity if he were compelled to sell it abroad.

Mr. HAMLIN. But the official reports do not bear out the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The official reports do.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then if that be true the gentleman can put the official figures in his speech

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will put it in this speech of the gentleman if he will give me the time.

Mr. HAMLIN. I have not the time; the gentleman will doubtless make a speech in his own time.

Mr. Chairman, the enemies of this bill and also of the reciprocity bill, and who are all protectionists in some degree—ranging from an insurgent Republican whose opinion on any proposition is best represented by an "x," stated algebraically, to a Pennsylvania standpatter—accuse us of bringing in the farmer free-list bill, so called, to pacify, and in a way compensate, the farmer for the injury which will be done him by this reciprocity with Canada.

Of course that allegation is not warranted by the facts. Reciprocity with Canada will not hurt the farmer; therefore he needs no compensating law.

Reciprocity with a country that buys more of the products of our farmers each year than we buy of them can not hurt our farmers. And the official figures show that that is what Canada does. In five years, ending June 30 last—

We sold in Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

It seems to me that no tariff ought to stand between us and such a country, for the more trade we can have with them the better it is for us.

Let us take some of the principal products of our farms, and it applies especially to our Missouri farms, and see whether reciprocity with Canada can injure our farmers.

Government statistics show that for five years ending June 30 last:

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Meat and dairy:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672

Of these items we sold to Canada $53,030,755 more than Canada sold to us.

No, Mr. Chairman, this bill now before the House is not brought in to compensate the farmers on account of any anticipated injury to them by reason of reciprocity with Canada, but it is brought in to compensate them and other laboring people in a measure for having submitted for years to being robbed by a high tariff which you Republicans imposed upon the things which they were compelled to buy for the benefit of a few people who have contributed the money to keep you in power. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And they are the very men who are behind this propaganda to try to make the farmers believe that reciprocity will hurt them.

The RECORD shows that there were 79 of you Republicans who voted against the reciprocity bill because you said that you believed it discriminated against the farmer.

If you are sincere in your protestation of friendship for the farmers you will vote for this bill, because it puts the things which he is compelled to buy on the free list, as follows:

FARM IMPLEMENTS.

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

SHOES AND LEATHER.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

FENCING WIRE.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

LUMBER.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

SEWING MACHINES

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

We are told by certain Republicans on this side of the House that this free-list bill will not pass the Senate and will therefore never become a law. As to that I admit I do not know. I confess that I am not in the confidence of the Republican Party, but whether a Republican Senate will pass this bill or not, or if it does whether a Republican President will sign it or not, will not deter us as Democrats from keeping faith with the people. We will do our duty and pass it through the House where we have the majority and are responsible, and then if your party in the Senate wants to turn it down you can take the responsibility. In the language of our admirable leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD, I quote:

I will say to the gentleman that the bill puts on the free list agricultural implements, fencing wire, and salt and free lumber for your northern farmers. It puts on the free list free cotton bagging and free hides for the southern farmers.

It puts on the free list free meats, free bread, free salt for the people who live in the cities and who are crying for cheaper food products to reduce the cost of living. I say to you that when this bill arrives in the United States Senate, if it is not acted upon, there will be a judgment day on the Republican side of the Senate, and if the President does not sign it there will be a judgment day at the White House.

And I will add to this statement that if the Republican Party refuses to pass this bill through the Senate or the President refuses to approve it there will be a Missouri Democrat placed in the White House and an Alabama Democrat in the Speaker's chair. [Applause.]

My Democratic colleagues, we told the people that if they would place us in power we would enact laws which would tend to cheapen the cost of living. We told them that we would try to relieve them of the burdens of the infamous trust in this country. Measured by either of these standards, this bill stands the test, and we can well afford to give it our hearty support.

Every class of articles mentioned in this bill is now controlled by a trust. What are they? The Agricultural Implement Trust, the Steel Trust, the Leather Trust, the Salt Trust, the Lumber Trust, the Meat Trust, Jute Bagging Trust—some of the largest trusts of the country which have secured a monopoly on these necessities of life by virtue of being protected by a tariff on these things and have forced up prices beyond reason or endurance.

This bill puts their products on the free list.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that in revising the tariff we are inviting a relentless war with the entrenched special interests that have enjoyed many years' special privileges under the McKinley, Dingley, and Payne-Aldrich tariff laws. They will not surrender without a terrific struggle.

These interests have so long, under these laws, been permitted to plunder the people that they have come to believe that it is a kind of a divine right they have. And with their increased riches they have grown arrogant. They do not hesitate to attack any man or set of men who dares for a moment to question their right to these special privileges. Only two short years ago these same fellows were freely dropping their shekels into the Republican campaign contribution box and singing the praises of Mr. Taft. He was elected, and now that he shows some little signs of recognizing that there are other people on earth besides these "captains of industries" who deserve some little consideration they turn upon him and make a dire prediction as to his political future that would do credit to the most optimistic Democrat.

Listen to what their organ, the American Economist, has to say this week:

[Correspondence American Economist.]

WASHINGTON, *April 20.*

If President Taft is able to retain his complacent and cheerful smile in the midst of existing conditions in Congress, and in the political arena of the United States generally he is giving a splendid imitation of that famous Emperor of Rome who is said to have performed on a violin while a conflagration was in progress.

Never in the history of the Republican Party has there been such an exhibition of want of leadership by the head of a party as has been displayed by President Taft in dealing with the tariff question and the principles for which his party stands in its platform. Indeed, so lamentable is the situation that few Republicans at this time are found willing to hazard any prediction other than that President Taft must be the nominee of his party in 1912, because no other Republican will accept the nomination, and that Mr. Taft will be the worst defeated candidate since William J. Bryan ran for the office in 1896.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

SO MOTE IT BE!

Thus it will be seen that these selfish special interests, the beneficiaries of a high tariff, know no friends but self, worship no god but Mammon, and will stop at nothing to accomplish their selfish purposes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why should not the things mentioned in this bill be put on the free list? The manufacturers of agricultural implements are supplying the farmers of the world with implements, often at a lower price than they will sell to our farmers here at home.

The Steel Trust invades every market in the known world.

The American-made shoe is worn by all civilized people of the earth. And so it is with the other articles mentioned in the bill. I am glad that they can go out and conquer the markets of the world, but if they can compete in foreign markets after paying transportation charges it is worse than ridiculous to say that they can not compete here at home without the aid of a tariff.

Let us have a "square deal."

No difference what we may do, Mr. Chairman, our actions will be misrepresented, our motives questioned, and our purpose maligned by these selfish interests; but as men we ought to have the courage of our convictions and do what we believe to be right and abide by the consequences. As I have often said, I have an abiding faith in the judgment, intelligence, and fairness of the people, and as for me I am willing to submit my record to them.

I realize that it requires time to accomplish these great reforms and that we will be unable to do many things that we would like to do, but let us do our utmost to keep our promises to the people, and in doing this our conduct will meet with their approval and, what is even more comforting, the approval of our own consciences. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING].

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate in this House on reciprocity; I have listened to the debate on the bill that is now before the House, and two years ago I listened to the debate on the tariff bill that was passed at that time. I have been impressed during all this time with the idea that the agricultural interests have not always had fair consideration in legislation involving questions of the tariff. It has always been that gentlemen on that side of the House have undertaken to legislate against the farmer in tariff legislation, and it sometimes happens that there are gentlemen on this side, who represent districts that are not agricultural, who are willing to join the Democratic free-trade party and sacrifice the farmer for the benefit of other interests. Gentlemen on that side of the House are pleased to call this a bill in the interest of the American farmer. If they imagine that they can fool the farmers of the North and West by legislation which opens his markets, the markets of the United States, to everything which he produces; if they think they can make him believe that that is in his interest, they are very much mistaken. To the gentlemen on this side of the House who call themselves protectionists, but who vote for free farm products, I desire to say that when you discriminate between industries that need protection you threaten the very existence of the protective principle.

It can not be justly said that Members on this side of the House who are demanding protection for agricultural products act from any selfish motive, nor can it be said that the farmers of the country who demand protection for the product of their labor are selfish. The great mass of American farmers do not deny protection to American manufacturers. They believe protection should be granted wherever needed, and only ask the same equal protection under the law for that which they produce. The farmers of the country during the history of protective tariff have patiently paid tribute to the infant industries. They have done much to help build up this great home market, with a hope that they would have the right to enjoy it as against other agricultural countries. When the products of foreign farms sought to invade that market the Republican Party gave the farmer protection in the McKinley law. You gentlemen on that side very promptly repealed that law, and in a great measure deprived the farmer of that equal protection to which he was entitled. It was restored to him again in the Dingley tariff, and under that law the farmer has enjoyed a reasonable degree of prosperity, due to the fact that he was not

at the mercy of competition from cheaper farm products of other countries.

No sooner is the Democratic Party again clothed with power in this House than it, true to its traditions, makes this onslaught on the American farmer.

Some gentlemen on that side have deplored, with seeming regret, that there should be a spirit of sectionalism develop in this debate. The first to suggest a spirit of sectionalism was the leader on that side, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

In his opening speech on the bill he said the Republican Party had seen fit to place binding twine, used by farmers of the North and West to bind their grain, on the free list, but had left cotton ties, used by the farmers of the South to bind their cotton, on the protected list. So he is the gentleman who first injected that question into this debate. Let me call attention of gentlemen on that side and on this who represent States like Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, and all the great Northwest—the States that produce the sheep and cattle, the States that produce the wheat, the oats, and the barley—to some of the things contained in this farmers' free list. This bill proposes to open our markets free of duty to all the meats and breadstuffs of all the world. Canadian reciprocity admits free from Canada cattle, sheep, swine, wheat, oats, and barley, and all things produced on our farms.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman consider that cattle, sheep, horses, and stock are raised in Texas and the South just as much as they are in the West?

Mr. STERLING. Yes. Texas produces a great many cattle and sheep.

Mr. HARDY. Then why is that a matter of sectionalism?

Mr. STERLING. It is not. I am not charging the gentleman with a spirit of sectionalism. I predict that the gentleman from Texas, when he realizes the effect of this legislation on the cattle industry of that great State, and his constituents call his attention to the fact that we are admitting beef and mutton free from Mexico, will regret his action with reference to this legislation.

Mr. HARDY. That may be; I do not think it will. But the question I was asking was whether that was sectional or not.

Mr. STERLING. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas, under our present tariff law there was imported from Mexico, in 1909, 65,000 head of cattle. The year before there was brought into this country from Mexico 100,000 head of cattle, and if that State does not feel this invasion of Mexican cattle now they will feel it later when cattle from Mexico, raised on cheaper land by cheaper labor, come into the American market without paying any tariff duty.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Will that seem like sectionalism and favoring our part of the country?

Mr. STERLING. I am not saying the gentleman from Texas, or anyone, is acting in that spirit. I am seeking to answer what has been injected into this debate on that question by gentlemen on that side. Now, let me call the attention of gentlemen on both sides who represent States like New York and the New England States and Michigan and Wisconsin—States that produce poultry and butter and cheese and fruits—that all these things come into our markets free under Canadian reciprocity.

And thus it is when we consider these two Democratic measures together, Canadian reciprocity and the farmers' free list, these twin enemies of agriculture, the farmers of the North and West are brought into free competition with the world in the production of cattle, sheep, swine, wheat, corn, oats, barley, hay, dairy products, poultry, vegetables, and fruit, everything that is produced by the farmers in the States which we represent.

On the other hand, this farmers' free list does not make sugar free. Rice is still on the protected list; lemons, oranges, and peanuts will still enjoy protection; and, singularly, these are products of the farms of the South. I think some of them, at least, are entitled to protection—to that same degree of protection to which the farm products of the North and West are entitled. Under the Republican doctrine, which is now and always has been as broad as the Union, all of these things are entitled to that protection which measures the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. These industries of the South came to the Republican Party for that protection, and they got it. They accepted it, and it is evident that gentlemen on that side are willing to retain it. In my opinion, these plain truths are sufficient to show to the country that the Republican Party is not now and never has been sectional in its administration of the protective system.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. How many States in the South produce sugar?

Mr. STERLING. One, mainly. I presume that Louisiana produces most of the sugar.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. It is the only Southern State that does produce it.

Mr. STERLING. What difference does it make? It is produced in the South, and it is essentially a southern industry, and these gentlemen think it ought to be protected. I will say, further, that when the Republican Party sought to reduce the tariff on sugar just to the amount of 5 cents per 100 pounds, practically every man on that side voted against that reduction by voting against the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I do not like to interfere with the gentleman's remarks, but still I would like an answer to my question.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STERLING. I thought I answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. You spoke of sugar as a southern product. So far as I know there is only one State in the South that produces any sugar at all. Now, how many northern States are engaged in raising sugar?

Mr. STERLING. The South produces the bulk of the sugar. You gentlemen that represent the sugar-producing districts of the South have demanded protection all the time, and the Republican Party has given it to you; and they have not given it to you because it is a southern industry, but because it is an American industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Now, I would like to say a word in reply to the gentleman, if he will yield.

Mr. STERLING. I do not yield for a speech, only for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I wanted to say that there are lots of people here who do not ask for protection on anything.

Mr. STERLING. This free list admits, free of duty, biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles when not sweetened. It even seeks to deprive the baker in this country of an equal chance in the American market for the product of his labor, except when his product contains sugar. Why this distinction between plain and sweetened bread and wafers? There may be some good reason for it, but I am unable to understand what that reason is. Is it because the gentlemen are so diligent and so careful of the rights of the Sugar Trust that they even except the biscuits that are produced from the wheat of the northern farmer if they happen to contain the ingredient of sugar that happens to come from the South? What shall we say to our constituents when they ask why this distinction between the products of the North and the products of the South? It will not be sufficient to say that we were obeying the edicts of the party caucus.

The gentleman [Mr. KITCHIN] who opened the debate on that side on reciprocity boldly declared that the purpose of the Democratic Congress was the destruction of those laws that had been passed by the Republican Party in recent years. I want to say that, in my judgment, they are proceeding very rapidly in that direction. They are proceeding, as the first step, to repeal the very laws under which the American people have prospered in the last 15 years more than they had ever prospered in the same period in all the history of the country. It being their purpose, however, to tear down, they are proceeding effectively to that end by first assailing the farmer. On his success and prosperity depend the success and prosperity of all. He is the foundation stone of the whole structure.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. May I interrupt the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. STERLING. I will.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I desire to inform the gentleman that he is mistaken about what we are insisting on. We are insisting on striking down the tariff barrier that keeps American cattle, American corn, American wheat, American farm products from being sold in Canada; and in consideration for taking our commodities into Canada, to get their tariff out of our way, we are willing to take ours out of their way, because the balance of trade is in our favor.

Mr. STERLING. If that is the purpose of that side of the House, they ought to introduce bills along that line.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is precisely what it is.

Mr. STERLING. The gentleman should suggest to that side of the House, who are now in the majority, that that should be the purpose of his party.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we are selling more farm products in Canada than Canada sells in the United States, and by increasing the facilities for trade we are benefiting and not injuring the farmers.

Mr. STERLING. That is due to the fact that we are protecting agricultural products under Republican legislation. Is it not well enough to let that condition alone? Why destroy that situation? We do not want Canadian agricultural products to come into this country in excess of what we send there.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Have they not had protection against us?

Mr. STERLING. Yes; and will continue to have it on about everything which we export to Canada.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask the gentleman if the Canadian tariff has not been an impediment against us as much as ours has been an impediment against them? I presume the gentleman wants to put the case fairly before the country, and those are the facts borne out by the statistics.

Mr. STERLING. I have investigated somewhat the question of our trade with Canada. I know that when the former similar reciprocal trade treaty between the two countries was abrogated in 1866 the balance of trade was $8,000,000 in favor of Canada. Since that treaty was abrogated the volume of trade has not only increased year after year, with very great regularity, but the balance of trade has changed, until now it is $120,000,000 in our favor.

Now, I ask, Why change a trade relation that has developed so splendidly for the American people?

Going back to the suggestion that I made awhile ago, that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] had boldly proclaimed to the House and to the country that it was the purpose of his party to tear down the splendid legislation under which prosperity had been built up, Canadian reciprocity is the first step in that direction, and this free-list bill is the second. The gentleman was no false oracle. This new majority has come not to build up, but to destroy. This can be said of you: You are true to your history and your traditions. You destroyed before when you were given power, and you will do so again.

It is said that the provisions of this bill will compensate the farmer for injuries committed against him in the bill for Canadian reciprocity. If, as you contended when Canadian reciprocity was before the House, it would not injure the farmer, what is the need of compensation? If you are sincere that that bill would not wound agriculture, why this balm to heal the wounds?

Let us see what it is you offer as compensation to the American farmer for throwing this great market open to the agricultural products of the world. You have placed agricultural implements, boots and shoes, lumber, and fence wire on the free list. What assurance can you give us that this will reduce the cost of these commodities to the consumer? Gentlemen on that side of the House and some on this told us two years ago that if Congress would put hides on the free list it would reduce the cost of shoes to the consumer. I did not believe you then, and I do not believe you now. Hides were placed on the free list, under the tariff act of 1909, and the duty on boots and shoes was greatly reduced. Hides have gone down in price to the farmer, until now he gets from $3 to $6 less for hides than he did then. Shoes have gone up in price, until the American consumer is paying a little more than he did when hides were protected. You can not fool the American people with this false prophecy a second time.

Nor do I understand the force of your argument when you say that if farm implements be placed on the free list they will be bought cheaper by the American farmer. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] discussed that question to-day and gave us some very important statistics, which proved conclusively in my mind that cheaper farm implements would not result from this legislation. A number of gentlemen have charged very freely that the price of these things is controlled by monopoly. If that be so, they will still be controlled by monopoly after this bill becomes a law. The gentleman from Kentucky called attention to the fact that the manufacturers of farm implements in the United States were exporting $28,000,000 worth every year. They are not only masters of the market here, but likewise in foreign countries. If other nations can not compete in their own countries with American manufacturers in this line of products, how can they compete in our own markets for the trade of the American farmer, with or without the tariff?

I agree with you that lumber should be on the free list, not that it would give cheaper lumber to the American consumer, for in my opinion the price of lumber to the consumer is largely fixed by trade agreements, and that price would be so fixed, whether it comes from our own soil or from Canadian soil. I would be glad, however, to see lumber coming from Canada to conserve, as far as possible, the remnants of our fading forests, and I would cheerfully vote again, as I have done in the past, for free lumber if you gentlemen on that side of the House will present the question freed from this unwise and unjust proposition that our markets shall be opened to the farm products of all the world.

It was only a few days since that your leader [Mr. UNDERWOOD] proclaimed to the House that you proposed to revise the tariff one schedule at a time. If that is your sincere intention, why do you present this bill in this form, containing articles from numerous schedules in the tariff law?

Give to the Members on both sides of this House the opportunity to cast their votes on these propositions separately. By this bill you admit a very little good legislation in order to get through a great deal of bad and ruinous legislation. When you ask the farmer to sell all of his great products in a free market in order to buy his little lumber in a free market he will say to you that your exchange of markets is unfair to him and the price you demand is too high.

What will be the result if we pass this bill placing agricultural implements on the free list? It has been stated here that already some American manufacturers of agricultural implements have moved to Canada in order to get their products into Canada free of duty. What will be the result now, with Canada charging us a tariff on agricultural implements, and we admitting them free from Canada? Will not the inevitable result be, under the laws of trade, to compel the American manufacturers to move across the line, where they will not only have the Canadian market free, but will also have the market in the United States free—when they will have the markets of both these great agricultural countries free—if you pass this bill?

Will it be of benefit to the American farmer to drive this great industry, monopoly though it be, into Canadian territory? It will deprive us of the vast amount of labor now engaged in making farm machinery in the United States and transfer it to other hands across the line.

I do not know how many men are employed in this industry in the United States, but there are thousands upon thousands of them. As I see it, we should continue to give to these men the right to work and a chance to clothe and care for their families, and to the American farmer a chance to feed them.

Let us not forget our first duty is to the citizens of our own country. Observing this principle, it will be a true guide to the solution of many of these great economic problems. It shall be the rule of my official acts, the lodestar toward which my feet shall plod.

In deciding whether or not this will be of benefit to the American farmer, it is important to consider the probable competition that may come to him from other countries in those things which he produces. It is well to know something of the production of other agricultural countries and of the amount of grain and meats they produce, as compared with the amount that we produce, per capita. The United States, with 90,000,000 people, produces annually about 700,000,000 bushels of wheat, or about 7 bushels per capita. We produce 2,660,000,000 bushels of corn, or about 26 bushels per capita. We produce 1,007,000,000 bushels of oats, or 12 bushels per capita. We have in this country 64,000,000 cattle, which is a little more than two-thirds of a head per capita; 57,000,000 sheep, a little less than two-thirds of a head per capita; and 47,000,000 hogs, or about one-half head per capita.

Canada has a population of 8,000,000 people. It produced in 1909, 167,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 21 bushels per capita. That is three times as much per capita as is produced in the United States. Canada raised 375,000,000 bushels of oats, or 47 bushels per capita. That is four times as much to the person as we produced in this country. Canada has 20,000,000 sheep, or two and one-half head per capita, which is nearly four times as many to the person as we produce in this country.

Argentina has a population of 6,000,000. That country produced 162,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 27 bushels per capita, nearly four times as much as we produce to the person. That country produces 136,000,000 bushels of corn, about 23 bushels to the person, or almost as much as the United States produces. Argentina has 26,000,000 cattle, or four and one-third

head to the person, which is six and one-half times as many cattle per capita as we have in the United States. That country has 77,000,000 sheep, or 13 sheep to the person, nearly 20 times as many as we have in the United States. It has 3,000,000 hogs, the same per capita as we have. That country exported in 1909, 9,000,000 bushels of oats and 90,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mexico has almost as many cattle per capita as has the United States, and it has more sheep and goats per capita. That country exported to the United States in 1909, 65,000 cattle and 100,000 the year before, in spite of the tariff duty of $3.75 per head.

The Republic of Brazil has a population of 20,000,000. Its cattle number 25,000,000, or one and one-fourth head per capita, and that is nearly twice as many to the person as has the United States.

Uruguay has a population of 1,000,000 people. In 1902 that Republic had 7,000,000 cattle, or 7 head per capita. That is 10 times as many per capita as we have in the United States. It had 18,000,000 sheep, which is 18 head per capita, and that is more than 30 times as many to the person as we have in this country.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why these countries can not produce sheep and cattle and meat stuffs and breadstuffs more cheaply than we can produce them in the United States. Canada has just as good access to our chief cattle and sheep markets as have many of our own farmers. They are raising cattle and sheep on land that is worth $10 per acre. Farmers in Ohio and Illinois and Indiana and all those great meat-producing States are raising sheep and cattle on land that is worth $150 and $250 per acre. I submit that our farmers can not compete under those conditions with the meat-producing people of Canada. They are raising wheat and oats and barley on cheap land. It is not sufficient to say that the only difference in the price between those grains in Canada and in the United States is due to the difference in transportation. Take it anywhere along the line where there is no difference in transportation, where the wheat and oats and barley and cattle on that side of the line are just as near to Duluth and Chicago and Minneapolis as on this side of the line, there is a difference in the price of these commodities, notwithstanding some statements to the contrary. It is wholly immaterial to the American farmer as to what the price of these things is at the shipping port or at the great city on the seacoast where they are loaded for the foreign markets. The question with him is, What are they worth on the farm? They are not worth as much on the farm in Canada as on the farm in the Dakotas and Minnesota and Iowa and Missouri and the other States where they are produced. Now, why this difference in price? It is because of a duty on these things, and just the instant that duty is removed those commodities will seek a common level. Wheat will go up a little in the town on the Canadian side of the line; it will go down a little in the town on this side of the line; and the American farmer is bound to suffer in the value of his products.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] made a statement the other day that in his judgment neither reciprocity nor the free-list bill would affect the price of wheat. On last Wednesday I copied from a local paper in my city a dispatch which appeared in the market reports from Chicago. I will read it:

> Wheat is bearish, due to proposed reciprocity with Canada. The prospect of the passage of the treaty has had a depressing effect and wheat is lower.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STERLING. I will.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it not a fact that last week, while we were debating the Canadian reciprocity bill, wheat went from 80 cents on Monday to 85 cents on Saturday?

Mr. STERLING. It did not. Here are the market reports from Chicago on last Wednesday, and so far as I have seen the market reports from Chicago they have been against wheat all the time, and have been going against wheat from the time the President sent his message on reciprocity to this House down to the present time.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STERLING. Is the gentleman from Ohio talking about cash wheat?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. Then he is mistaken about it. It might be that some days wheat has sprung up a little, but the tendency has been downward all the time, until to-day the wheat in the bins of the American farmer is worth 28 cents a bushel less than it was a year ago at this time.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. MADISON. It is true that wheat has been falling in price in recent months. Does the gentleman know when the decline began?

Mr. STERLING. It began very markedly, I am sure, about the time that Congress acted on the reciprocity measure at the last session.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. MADISON. Is it not true that the decline began in October when there was not even a suggestion of Canadian reciprocity?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. It is always lower in October.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. On the 26th of January, the day the reciprocity bill was introduced in the House accompanied by the message of the President of the United States, the kind of wheat that the northwestern farmers raise was $1.06⅜ per bushel cash in Minneapolis, and in Winnipeg on that day it was 97 cents. Two days afterwards, on the 28th, in Winnipeg, wheat went up a cent and a half, and the Minneapolis market went down 5 cents, and prices have been going gradually downward for this grade of wheat ever since, until within the last two or three days it has gone up 2 or 3 cents. That is the kind of wheat that the farmers in the Northwest raise 250,000,000 bushels of. These farmers have already lost pretty nearly $5,000,000 on the crop they had in their bins.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a statement?

Mr. STERLING. If it is brief.

Mr. MADISON. I want to state that the fact is, and every man who has followed the market reports knows it, that the decline in wheat began last October or September, and has been continuous from that time until now. It began before there was a single suggestion of reciprocity, and there is no evidence that the President's message or the discussion on reciprocity—aside from the immediate day when the Canadian reciprocity matter was brought into this Congress—had anything on earth to do with the decline in wheat.

Mr. STERLING. I will say in reply that it makes no difference what we say here about these things, when it appears to be the fact that on the great wheat markets of the country the price of wheat is depressed, and buyers and sellers of wheat give that as the reason why it has gone down. That ought to settle the question as to what influence is at work destroying the value of the farmers' wheat.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STERLING. I will.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. If the gentleman from Kansas will look up the record for an indefinite number of years past, he will find that wheat invariably in the United States is reduced in price from about July or August and continues in reduction for some months, and begins to advance in price about December or January. He will find that that has always been the record in this country until they sprung this reciprocity proposition. This time it has gone down and remained down, and it can be due to no other cause than proposed reciprocity.

Mr. STERLING. The wheat markets of the country charge the decline to reciprocity. That ought to satisfy the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken of the possibilities of competition with Canada. What may we expect from the rich agricultural lands to the south of us? It is true that this bill does not admit cattle and sheep free from Mexico, but it does admit beef and mutton and lamb and veal. It admits all meats, fresh and cured, free from Mexico, along with all other countries. Gentlemen talk about striking a blow at the monopolies. Have we not reached a point in this debate when it would be proper for some one to suggest the name of a monopoly that would be suppressed or injuriously affected by this bill?

I know it will not be the packers. They will build packing houses just across the line, buy cheaper cattle from the haciendas of Mexico, send it into the great marts of the United States free of duty, and sell it to the American consumer, still at monopoly prices. The same conditions will apply to other countries and to other industries. The inevitable laws of trade will simply compel a change of location of the industry to a cheaper field for raw material, without affecting the monopolistic power of the industry to sell its products to the ultimate consumer at any price it may fix. Your whole scheme is in the

interest of monopoly. You propose to give it a cheaper market in which to buy, and the certain and only result will be to increase the margin of monopoly's profits.

The packers in Argentina are already prepared for this pleasing advantage which you propose to give them. Even American packers are there to receive the benefits which you hold out to what you choose to call the Beef Trust. It will be a very easy matter for this powerful influence to dominate the price of beef at Buenos Aires as well as at Chicago.

Let me quote from a report on trade conditions in Argentina, issued last year by the International Bureau of American Republics:

Meat preparation: In 1902 there were three frigorificas (cold-storage plants). Since then they have increased so rapidly as to introduce injurious competition. A recent movement has been made toward consolidating the larger ones, so as to control the market, and it is said that American capital is interested.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Did the gentleman support the amendment offered to the reciprocity bill by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN]?

Mr. STERLING. I did not.

Mr. GARRETT. Really, what I meant was to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that my friend from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] presented his amendment, and gave as a reason for it that it was striking a blow at the Beef Trust. The gentleman says that it is not.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. Chairman, let us look a little further at the situation in Mexico. It is a wonderfully fertile country. They have an immense territory, with the best beef and mutton producing grasses in all the world. The land is worth $3, $7, and $10 an acre. They can produce beef and mutton very cheaply. They have cheaper access to the great centers of population in the United States than have the farmers of the Mississippi Valley. They have water transportation to all the great markets on both our eastern and western seaboards. Mexico has water transportation to the very heart of the Mississippi Valley, and they can produce meat and grain and sell it in the American markets cheaper than can the American farmer.

For 40 years the farmers of the East and of the Middle West have been in competition with the great grass ranges of the West, where cattle and sheep have been grown cheaply on the public lands. That competition has about ended, but no sooner is he relieved of that unequal competition than you propose to burden him with another, more unequal and more enduring, by placing him in competition with all the cheap grass lands of both the North and South American Continents, of which there are countless millions of acres.

And that is not all—indeed that is but one-half of it—you propose to put him in competition with the lowest grade and lowest paid agricultural labor anywhere in the civilized world—with the greasers of Mexico and the mixed bloods of South America.

That, gentlemen, is the proposition you offer the American farmer to heal the wounds which you made by passing the reciprocity bill. Your farmers' free list is a humbug. If it becomes a law, it will, as the years go by, lay prostrate that greatest of all industries—American agriculture.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The friends of these two Democratic measures have had much trouble with their arguments. They assert that this legislation would not reduce the price received by the farmer for his products. They also assert that it will decrease the cost of these products to the consumer. I feel quite sure they have not succeeded in even satisfying themselves of the soundness of either statement. As a matter of fact, it must be apparent to all of us that neither statement is true. If one buys cheaper, then some one must sell cheaper. If the ultimate consumer gets his meat and breadstuffs cheaper, who in the line of trade will make this discount to him? There is at least one, and sometimes several, middlemen between the farmer at one end of the line and the ultimate consumer at the other. Next to the farmer is standing either the miller, the packer, or the cold-storage man. Next comes the jobber, the wholesaler, and the retailer, and, lastly, the ultimate consumer. Who in this line proposes to discount his selling price so that the ultimate consumer can live cheaper? If anyone does, it will be the farmer, because he is the only man in the line that does not control the price at which he sells. He is the only one who asks the buyer how much he will pay. All the rest of them tell the buyer how much he must pay. These trusts and monopolies of which we speak are doing business somewhere between the original producer and the ultimate consumer, and where monopolies do exist, they exist for the sole and only purpose of fixing the price at which they will sell to the consumer. They can do this with reference to these great necessities of life whether they come from the soil of the United States or from foreign soil. You need not expect them to make any gratuitous reductions to the consumer even though they do buy cheaper in the markets of the world.

The farmers' price is fixed largely by the supply and the demand. You propose by this legislation to so increase the supply in our great markets that the price to the American farmer will be the same as to the farmers in cheaper countries. This legislation is bound to reduce the price on the farm without affecting the price to the consumer. It simply widens the margin of profits for the middlemen, even though they may be monopolies, which stand between the original producer and the ultimate consumer.

HOW TO DEAL WITH MONOPOLIES.

You can not suppress and prevent monopolies by tariff legislation. Other countries are burdened with monopolies as well as this, and the people of this country under free trade pay tribute to foreign as well as domestic monopolies. But the people have the power to prevent all monopolies in this country, and it is within the province of the Congress to make that power effective. It is our plain duty to submit to the States of the Union an amendment to the Constitution giving to Congress the power to suppress and prevent monopolies by appropriate legislation. Permit me to say that I have introduced in this Congress a joint resolution for that purpose, and I ask of every Member his thoughtful consideration of that question.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] deplored the fact that the people were drifting from the country to the town. So do I. It shows that there is something wrong in our economic system. The purpose of humanity is to live, and it will seek the place where life is easiest. Men are attracted to the cities and the great industrial centers because they find there living to be a little more certain and their labor a little more remunerative. Even under present conditions the tendency is toward the town. Life is not quite so easy in the country as in the city, and the gentleman from Alabama proposes by this legislation to widen the difference between life in the country and in the city, and thus accelerate this movement which he so greatly regrets.

Mr. Chairman, I would be glad, indeed, if we could check this mad desire, this hot haste on the part of the Democratic Party to strike this blow at the agricultural interests of the country. It will hardly be possible to defeat the passage of this bill in the House. Some good may come, however, from this early determination of the Democracy to carry the country back to that ruinous free-trade policy which they inaugurated when last in power. I trust the country will discover the purpose and effect of this legislation before that party can gain supremacy in all the branches of government. I do not believe the people desire to go back to conditions that existed under that party. The legislation which you have urged so far tends in that direction, and the hope of the country rests in finding you out before you have achieved your purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he desires to yield any more time this evening?

Mr. DALZELL. I can not use any more time this evening.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHNE was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken on this bill or who speak on the bill may have leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD within five legislative days after the completion of the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. May I ask the gentleman if that includes gentlemen who are merely yielded the floor for the purpose of asking leave to extend remarks?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Any gentleman who addresses the House will be included in this request.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman said those who spoke on this bill. Of course, that is not speaking on the bill.

The SPEAKER. It is always construed that way. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that everybody who has spoken on this bill or who may hereafter speak on it shall have leave for five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman's request was for five legislative days after the bill is completed.

The SPEAKER. For five legislative days after the bill is passed. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means if he proposes on to-morrow to give way to the Committee on the Census to bring in the reapportionment bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that is the understanding.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire the information so those of us who are interested in it will be here to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the apportionment bill will be called up in the morning and completed before this bill is again considered. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 27, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting report of Special Agent W. A. Graham Clark on cotton goods in Latin America, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means (H. Doc. No. 37).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 109) to investigate the Post Office Department and service, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 13), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 7594) to consolidate certain branches of the War Department and the Army, and to decrease the expense thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 7595) to increase the compensation of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7596) to establish a fish hatchery at Peoria, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7597) to amend river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, making appropriation for improvement of upper White River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7598) to repeal section 1 of the act of March 3, 1875, entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 7599) to increase appropriation for site and erection of public building at Ashland, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 7600) to provide for the survey of the Tombigbee River in Alabama and Mississippi; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 7601) to prohibit the use of drinking cups and to prevent the communicating of infectious diseases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7602) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint a deputy collector of customs at Belhaven, N. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7603) authorizing the establishment of experimental parcel post limited to the delivery limits of rural routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 7604) to authorize commissions to issue in the cases of officers retired or advanced on the retired list with increased rank; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 7605) for the extension of Maryland Avenue east of Fifteenth Street to M Street NE.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 7606) to provide for the incorporation, control, and government of associations organized to carry on business entering into or becoming a part of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 7607) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lake Geneva, Walworth County, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 7608) to amend section 233 of the Postal Laws and Regulations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7609) to revise and amend the statutes relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 7610) to add 31,000 acres of land, by purchase or condemnation, to the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park, and appropriating $761,000 for that purpose; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7611) to provide for holding the district court of the United States for Porto Rico during the absence from the island of the United States district judge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) reducing the number of Capitol police; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 128) declaring vacant certain offices in the service of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PRAY: A memorial of the Legislature of Montana, favoring legislation for the termination of the treaty with Russia of 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 7612) granting an increase of pension to Ezra P. Gallion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7613) granting a pension to Gabino Bernal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7614) granting a pension to Joseph Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7615) granting an increase of pension to George W. Medick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 7616) granting an increase of pension to David W. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7617) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shreck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7618) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Twichell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7619) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 7620) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Spehn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7621) granting an increase of pension to J. J. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 7622) granting a pension to James C. Shackleford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 7623) granting an increase of pension to Stephen F. Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7624) granting an increase of pension to Selon H. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER (by request): A bill (H. R. 7625) retiring Thomas Harrison, a clerk in the Naval Observatory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 7626) granting an increase of pension to John Mahoney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7627) to correct the military record of Alfred A. Burris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7628) for the relief of Andrew B. Ritter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7629) granting an increase of pension to William R. Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7630) to pension Army teamsters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 7631) for the relief of Asa S. Hugill; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: A bill (H. R. 7632) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Harrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 7633) granting a pension to Catherine M. Wardell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 7634) granting a pension to Frank Selmar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 7635) granting a pension to Sarah McIntosh McGill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7636) granting an increase of pension to Eliza S. Byram; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 7637) granting an increase of pension to James F. Churchill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7638) granting an increase of pension to Gardiner Roberts, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7639) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 7640) to correct the military record of Frederic E. Fiske; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7641) granting a pension to Bryant T. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7642) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7643) granting a pension to William D. Medley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7644) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cyrus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7645) granting an increase of pension to John Walton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 7646) granting a pension to Emma J. Crocker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7647) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Stephen I. Haff and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 7648) granting an increase of pension to J. P. Hayman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7649) granting an increase of pension to James M. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 7650) for the relief of I. S. Rogers and J. L. Worthley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7651) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7652) granting an increase of pension to Jose La Lerz Lovato; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7653) granting an increase of pension to Andrew W. Duggan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7654) granting an increase of pension to John P. Goshen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 7655) granting an increase of pension to William H. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7656) to grant an honorable discharge to William H. Riddensdale; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7657) to refund moneys paid into the Treasury of the United States through mistake; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 7658) granting an increase of pension to William H. McCune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7659) granting an increase of pension to Herman F. Bonorden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 7660) granting a pension to Eliza Lake Sprague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7661) granting a pension to Nora Wayman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7662) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 7663) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Shipman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7664) granting an increase of pension to John Dryman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7665) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7666) granting a pension to James A. House; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 7667) granting a pension to Cecil R. Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7668) granting a pension to Thomas M. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7669) for the relief of the estate of the late Thomas C. Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7670) for the relief of the estate of T. H. B. Myers, surviving partner of John Myers & Son; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7671) for the relief of the estate of Samuel R. Fowle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7672) for the relief of Mary J. Manning; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7673) for the relief of the estate of B. F. Havens; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7674) for the relief of the estate of the late Jesse R. Stubbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7675) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Catholic Church in Washington, N. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7676) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, in Washington, N. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7677) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Presbyterian Church in Washington, N. C.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7678) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. W. Howett, administrator of William Howett, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7679) to carry into effect the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1909, relating to surveys of waters of North Carolina where fishing is prohibited by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 7680) granting an increase of pension to George W. Corl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7681) to correct the military record of John W. Conkling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITACRE: A bill (H. R. 7682) granting an increase of pension to John W. Randels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7683) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Junkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7684) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Stover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7685) granting an increase of pension to David M. Kirkstetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7686) granting an increase of pension to Lyman H. Milner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7687) granting a pension to James Vanfossan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7688) for the relief of Henry J. Bolander; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7689) for the relief of John G. Riley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the withdrawal of troops along the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Resolution of the Cleveland conference board of the International Molders' Union of North America, protesting against the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine as a hardship on the working classes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers accompanying H. R. 6160, granting an increase of pension to William Bennett; by Oscar Arnold, of Fond du Lac, Wis., requesting a pension; and to accompany a bill for the relief of Abner Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of Luke P. O'Toole, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of 139 citizens of Vanwert, favoring the establishment of a national health depart-

ment; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of O. C. Barber, of Akron, Ohio, favoring physical valuation of railroads, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Carolina Bagging Co., of Henderson, N. C., against the free-list bill admitting jute free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of citizens of Hedrick and Eldon, Iowa, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAMB: Resolutions of Subdivision 475, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Texas; Branch No. 95, Glass-Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada; Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs, and Hyperion Club, of Nelsonville, Ohio; American Federation of Labor, Lodge No. 12868, Bedford, Ind.; Trades and Labor Assembly of Massillon, Ohio; and Union 713, Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, favoring repeal of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of Italian citizens of Omaha, Nebr., requesting that the tax on Italian lemons be repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, for general pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of the W. E. Barret Co., Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of the Esch phosphorus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Resolutions of Central Council Irish County Clubs, of Boston, Mass., opposing any new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRAY: Petitions of Washington Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Butte; Trades and Labor Council, Bozeman; and Local Union No. 12837, Great Falls, all in the State of Montana, in favor of legislation proposed by the Immigration Commission; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of 19 farmers of Chouteau County, Mont., in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Farmers' Alliance of Gallatin County, Mont., against Canadian reciprocity and in favor of protection; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of the citizens of Lansing, Mich., for the proper observance of the Sabbath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of George Bubb & Sons and others, of Williamsport, Pa., against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *April 27, 1911.*

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the request of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], the Chair lays before the Senate a communication, which will be read by the Secretary.

The communication was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, UNITED STATES SENATE.

To Hon. JAMES S. SHERMAN,
President of the Senate.

DEAR SIR: Will you communicate to the Senate my resignation as President pro tempore of the Senate and convey to them my grateful thanks for the long service they have given me in this honorable office?

Sincerely, yours,

WM. P. FRYE,
President pro tempore.

WASHINGTON, *April 27, 1911.*

CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST, ALASKA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 20th instant, certain information relative to lands in the Chugach National Forest, Alaska. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources and printed.

Mr. NELSON. It should go to the Committee on Public Lands, I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make a motion to that effect?

Mr. CULBERSON. Let the title be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the title of the communication. The Chair was requested by a Senator to refer it to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources, and, unless some motion was made to the contrary, the Chair felt constrained to make that reference.

The SECRETARY. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting information responsive to Senate resolution of April 20, 1911, relative to certain lands in the Chugach National Forest, Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the communication and accompanying illustrations will be referred to the Committee on Conservation of National Resources and ordered to be printed (S. Doc. No. 12).

COTTON GOODS IN LATIN AMERICA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report by Commercial Agent W. A. Graham Clark on cotton goods in Latin America (H. Doc. No. 37), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ONEIDA, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of an investigation made as to the needs for a public building at Oneida, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court in the following causes:

The vessel schooner *Alciope*, Robert Rice, master (H. Doc. No. 32);

The vessel ship *Goddess of Plenty*, Thomas Chirnside, master (H. Doc. No. 36);

The vessel ship *Golden Age*, Caleb Earl, master (H. Doc. No. 33);

The vessel ship *Nancy*, Joseph Dill, master (H. Doc. No. 35);

The vessel schooner *Kitty and Maria*, John Logan, master (H. Doc. No. 31); and

The vessel brig *Eliza*, John Miller, master (H. Doc. No. 34).

The foregoing findings and conclusions were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the congregations of the Church of the Brethren of Mill Creek, Va., Overbrook, Kans., and Elk City, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation to suppress the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Chicago, Ill., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 161, United Association of Journeymen Plumbers, Gas Fitters, Steam Fitters, and Steam Fitters' Helpers, of Quincy, Ill., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Homer Post, No. 263, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, of Homer, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Sulloway old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Concord, N. H., April 19, 1911.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed by both branches of our legislature during the closing week:

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That whereas a bill known as the Sulloway bill, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War

and the War with Mexico, has been introduced in the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives of New Hampshire (the senate concurring)*, That we approve of the provisions of said bill and do hereby respectfully urge our Representatives and Senators in Congress to vote for and use every honorable means to secure the passage of said bill.

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution, signed by the clerks of both branches of this legislature, be sent to the Representatives and Senators from New Hampshire in the Congress of the United States."

In accordance with the above resolution we are herewith transmitting the same.

Yours, respectfully,

HARRIE M. YOUNG,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
MARTIN W. FITZPATRICK,
Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of Felts Mills Union, No. 6; of Marble City Union, No. 67; of Palmer Union, No. 7; and of Thomson Union, No. 158, of Schuylerville, all of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, in the State of New York, and of sundry citizens of Claremont and Franklin, N. H., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Concord Harness Co., of Concord, N. H., praying that harness leather be placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRIGGS presented memorials of Local Granges of Monmouth, Johnsonburg, Cedarville, Pemberton, Pennington, Spring Mills, Egg Harbor, Delaware, and Marlton, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Musicians' Mutual Benefit Association, of Elizabeth, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit competition by military or naval bands with civilian organizations, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Mercer County Federation of Labor, of Trenton, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing higher pay for Federal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of the waters of Niagara Falls, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Dodd Post, Major Dandy Post, Wheeler Post, Lincoln Post, and Slocum Post, all of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Local Camps of Peapack and Pennington, Patriotic Order Sons of America; of Friendship Council and Anthony Wayne Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics; and of sundry citizens, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of Local Union No. 203, Federation of Musicians, American Federation of Labor, of Hammond, Ind., and a petition of Local Union No. 12868, of Bedford, Ind., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of Columbus Grange, No. 2174, of Columbus, and of West Grove Grange, No. 2117, Patrons of Husbandry, of Pennville; of Sugar Grove Grange, of Whitley County; and of sundry citizens of Elkhart, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of William Russ, W. T. Epmeier, George Wintemhimer, and six other citizens of Evansville, Ind., all stockholders in the United Wireless Co. of America, praying that an investigation be made into the wireless-telegraph system of the country, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Henry H. Moore and 10 other veterans of the Civil War, of Mooreland, Ind., and a petition of Boone Post, No. 202, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, of Zionsville, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hymera, Ind., and a memorial of members of the Socialist Party of Mishawaka, Ind., remonstrating against the mobilizing of the United States troops on the Mexican border, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Britain, Torrington, Naugatuck, and Waterbury, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 56, Patrons of Husbandry, of East Haddam, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of the Oakland Board of Trade, of Pittsburg, Pa., and a petition of Local Branch No. 95, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, of Brackenridge, Pa., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Reading, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce local postage to 1 cent per ounce, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 698, Patrons of Husbandry, of Charlesville, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Parnell Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Washington Camps No. 588, of Newtown; No. 46, of Minersville; No. 102, of Steelton; No. 427, of Molltown; and No. 273, of Hatboro, of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, and of Lawrence Lodge, No. 487, International Association of Mechanics of Pittsburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BURNHAM presented memorials of sundry citizens of Warner and Franklin, N. H., and of Local Union No. 25, of Ballston, and Local Union of Ticonderoga, of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented a memorial of sundry farmers and business men of Brown County, S. Dak., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the American National Live Stock Association and of the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, remonstrating against live stock and meats being placed on the free list, and also against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of Ficksburg Post, No. 72, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Humboldt; of Major Rankin Post, No. 439, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Kincaid, Kans.; and of sundry veterans of the Civil War, of Erie, in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Sulloway old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MYERS. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 11—A memorial to Congress of the United States urging the ratification of the trade agreement with the Dominion of Canada.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill to enact into law the trade agreement between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas the ratification of this agreement will materially reduce the present high cost of living to the people of the United States and will furnish an increased market for the products of the Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring), That this assembly hereby urgently petition the Congress of the United States to ratify said trade agreement without delay.

Mr. POMERENE. I present a joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, petitioning Congress to

provide for the call of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting polygamy. I ask that the joint resolution be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

THE STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Ohio, ss:*

I, Charles H. Graves, secretary of state of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that the following is an exemplified copy, carefully compared by me with the original rolls now on file in this office, and in my official custody as secretary of state, as required by the laws of the State of Ohio, of a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio on the 15th day of March, A. D. 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal, at Columbus, this 16th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] CHAS. H. GRAVES,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 13—To define the law against polygamy as clearly as the law is defined against bigamy.

The contract made by Utah with the United States Government when admitted as a State was that polygamy should cease. From that day to the present Joseph Smith and the majority of his followers have lived in polygamy and new polygamous conditions have continued. The doctrine of the Mormon Church is the more spiritual its followers become the more will they practice polygamy. The Government of the United States takes precedence over the government of the Mormon Church. When the Mormon hierarchy discovers that the sentiment of the people of the United States is positive in its denunciation of polygamy, the Mormon Church has a new revelation, and again throughout the press of the country is the announcement of the doing away of polygamy. Soon the announcement is made to the press that there was no authority for the statement. The question that faces every legislator is, Shall the United States Government be maintained or shall the Mormon hierarchy rule the Government? It is only necessary to refer to the proceedings before the United States Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections to be convinced that polygamy is the fundamental doctrine of the Mormon Church. Reference should also be made to Pearson's Magazine for September, October, and November, 1910, which will clearly explain the situation.

The consensus of opinion of statesmen and the great majority who are considering the welfare of our Nation is an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting polygamy and polygamous practices. A concurrence resolution for an amendment to the Federal Constitution prohibiting polygamy and polygamous practices has passed 13 States—New York, West Virginia, Delaware, Missouri, Maine, Iowa, North Dakota, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, California, and Washington. When two-thirds of the States have passed this resolution Congress will act as in the case of the concurrence resolution which has passed all but four of the States in regard to the direct vote of the people for Senators of the United States. The following resolution is a Federal concurrence resolution, is not referred to a committee, is acted upon by both houses, does not lie on the table, but, under the rules, to be called up and acted upon by the assembly as a whole:

Whereas it appears from investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States, and otherwise, that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now, therefore

Resolved, That the application be made, and hereby is made, to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited, and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation.

Resolved, That the legislatures of all other States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to join in this application by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein; also to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

S. J. VINING,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
HUGH L. NICHOLS,
President of the Senate.

Adopted, March 15, 1911.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of Washington Camp, No. 18, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, of Viola, Del., and a petition of Washington Camp, No. 3, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, of Kenton, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented memorials of sundry employees of the paper mills at Appleton, of sundry citizens of Schofield, of sundry employees of the paper mills at Wausau, of sundry citizens of Garfield, Weston, Grand Rapids, and Mattoon, of the Valley Iron Works Co., of Appleton, of sundry citizens of Rothschild, and of sundry employees of the paper mills at Kimberly, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CURTIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Effingham, Centralia, Oskaloosa, Seneca, Sabetha, Valley Falls, and Nortonville, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of Henry Clouten, of West Roxbury, Mass., and of 200 citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of a national department of public health, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

He also presented a petition of the New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, praying for the establishment of a permanent tariff board, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the New England Shoe & Leather Association, remonstrating against placing leather boots and shoes on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Elmwood, Stanley, Boyd, Colfax, Kewaunee County, Arkansaw, Lamont, Fond du Lac County, and Lamartine, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Arkansaw, Wis., remonstrating against the mobilizing of United States troops on the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIPPITT:

A bill (S. 1640) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Turner;

A bill (S. 1641) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Young;

A bill (S. 1642) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Corey;

A bill (S. 1643) granting an increase of pension to Lucien E. Kent;

A bill (S. 1644) granting an increase of pension to Abby E. Perkins;

A bill (S. 1645) granting an increase of pension to George L. Keach; and

A bill (S. 1646) granting an increase of pension to Eliza L. House; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 1647) to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 1648) granting an increase of pension to Norman B. Van House (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1649) granting an increase of pension to Henry Crall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1650) to amend section 110 of "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 1651) granting an increase of pension to William Reilly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1652) for the relief of Elizabeth Lynch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIGGS:

A bill (S. 1653) to provide American register for the steam yacht *Diana;* to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1654) granting an increase of pension to Stella D. Webster; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1655) appropriating $10,000 to aid in the erection of a monument in memory of the late President James A. Garfield, at Long Branch, N. J.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1656) to regulate the construction of buildings along alleyways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HEYBURN:

A bill (S. 1657) granting a pension to Amelia Xandry; and

A bill (S. 1658) granting a pension to Alexander M. Roe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1659) to grant an honorable discharge to Harry P. Eakin;

A bill (S. 1660) to correct the military record of Edward M. Warren; and

A bill (S. 1661) to grant an honorable discharge to Emmet M. Lowery (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1662) granting an increase of pension to Ira Lyle;

A bill (S. 1663) granting an increase of pension to Christian J. Koch;

A bill (S. 1664) granting an increase of pension to Simon B. Barr;

A bill (S. 1665) granting a pension to Zella J. Burdick (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1666) granting a pension to Emma C. Young (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 1667) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Gilbert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1668) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Weeks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 1669) granting an increase of pension to Seth Goldthwait; and

A bill (S. 1670) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Buswell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 1671) granting an increase of pension to Emerette A. Walter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 1672) to amend section 4132 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 1673) providing for the retirement of certain officers of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1674) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Adams; and

A bill (S. 1675) granting an increase of pension to William A. Sims; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 1676) granting a pension to Mary E. Putney; and

A bill (S. 1677) granting a pension to Isaac Wharton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 1678) granting an increase of pension to Elmore G. Shelt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 1679) for the relief of Amos Van Fossen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1680) granting an increase of pension to Wells Minor; and

A bill (S. 1681) granting an increase of pension to John W. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 1682) for the relief of B. H. Harrison (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 1683) for the relief of Baer, Senior & Co.'s successors and C. Ingenohl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 1684) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 1685) granting an increase of pension to George E. Wentworth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 1686) granting an increase of pension to Segarlin C. Knighton;

A bill (S. 1687) granting an increase of pension to James S. Woodman;

A bill (S. 1688) granting a pension to Ottiwell M. Roberts; and

A bill (S. 1689) granting an increase of pension to John Dixon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 1690) to amend section 1 of an act approved January 30, 1897, entitled "An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes"; and

A bill (S. 1691) for the relief of the Miami Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 1692) providing for transferring the remains of Dr. William Jones from the Philippine Islands to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 1693) granting an increase of pension to William Stoneking (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNTER:

A bill (S. 1694) for the relief of the county court of Allen County, Ky.; and

A bill (S. 1695) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the claim of Irene E. Johnson, administratrix of the estate of Leo L. Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1696) granting a pension to Lizzie L. Russ (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) increasing the membership of the Joint Committee of Congress upon the Library (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. NELSON submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CLERICAL FORCE OF SENATORS.

Mr. CULBERSON. I submit a Senate resolution (S. Res. 24) and ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire into the matter and report as early as practicable a resolution whereby all Senators holding chairmanships of inactive committees and all Senators without chairmanships at all shall have their clerical force equalized as to number and compensation.

COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer the following order and ask for its present consideration.

The order was read, as follows:

Ordered, That so much of Rule XXIV of the Senate as provides for appointment of the standing and other committees of the Senate by ballot be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The order is entered, and the rule is suspended by unanimous consent.

Mr. GALLINGER. I offer the following resolution (S. Res. 25) and move its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask that the resolution may lie over until the next session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to present consideration.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution first be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Sixty-second Congress, effective May 1, 1911.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not necessary to read the names, if objection is made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to present consideration. The resolution will go over.

Mr. STONE. Before that is done, I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that the names be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think that a wise suggestion on the part of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be done. The resolution will be printed in the RECORD as if read in full, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

The resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER is as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Sixty-second Congress, effective May 1, 1911:

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.—Messrs. Bailey (chairman), Stone, Cullom, Nelson, and Poindexter.

On Agriculture and Forestry.—Messrs. Burnham (chairman), Warren, Perkins, Guggenheim, Page, Crawford, Bradley, Lorimer, Gronna, Bankhead, Gore, Chamberlain, Smith of South Carolina, Percy, Terrell, and Lea.

On Appropriations.—Messrs. Warren (chairman), Perkins, Gallinger, Curtis, Gamble, Smoot, Nixon, Dixon, Bourne, Wetmore, Tillman, Foster, Culberson, Martin of Virginia, Overman, Owen, and Smith of Maryland.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.—Messrs. Briggs (chairman), Dillingham, Bristow, Clarke of Arkansas, and Williams.

On Canadian Relations.—Messrs. Oliver (chairman), Cummins, Burton, Root, McLean, Tillman, Foster, Gore, and Smith of Maryland.

On the Census.—Messrs. La Follette (chairman), Guggenheim, Cummins, du Pont, McLean, Townsend, Lippitt, Bailey, Shively, Thornton, Chilton, and Pomerene.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment.—Messrs. Cummins (chairman), La Follette, Lodge, Smoot, Borah, Dixon, Gallinger, Clarke of Arkansas, Rayner, Owen, Johnston of Alabama, and Myers.

On Claims.—Messrs. Crawford (chairman), Smoot, Bristow, Oliver, Bradley, Page, Jones, McLean, Townsend, Martin of Virginia, Overman, Davis, Paynter, Bryan, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Coast and Insular Survey.—Messrs. Townsend (chairman), Richardson, Frye, Cullom, Works, Culberson, Davis, Bankhead, and Terrell.

On Coast Defenses.—Messrs. Curtis (chairman), Nixon, du Pont, Crane, Root, Works, Simmons, Foster, Smith of Maryland, Terrell, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Commerce.—Messrs. Frye (chairman), Nelson, Perkins, Smith of Michigan, Bourne, Burton, Burnham, Stephenson, Crawford, Oliver, Martin of Virginia, Simmons, Newlands, Bankhead, Fletcher, Percy, and Reed.

On Conservation of National Resources.—Messrs. Dixon (chairman), Clark of Wyoming, Dillingham, Briggs, Guggenheim, Jones, Richardson, Gronna, Townsend, Newlands, Overman, Bankhead, Smith of South Carolina, Watson, and Lea.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Newlands (chairman), Shively, Brown, La Follette, and Lippitt.

On Cuban Relations.—Messrs. Page (chairman), Burnham, Clapp, Curtis, Crane, Kenyon, Simmons, Stone, Watson, and O'Gorman.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.—Messrs. Clarke of Arkansas (chairman), Kern, and Burnham.

On the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Gallinger (chairman), Dillingham, Curtis, Jones, Oliver, Lorimer, Works, Kenyon, Martin of Virginia, Paynter, Johnston of Alabama, Smith of Maryland, Pomerene, and Lea.

On Education and Labor.—Messrs. Borah (chairman), Penrose, du Pont, Page, McLean, Kenyon, Rayner, Bankhead, Shively, Swanson, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Engrossed Bills.—Messrs. Simmons (chairman), Lodge, and Burton.

On Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. Stephenson (chairman), Gronna, and Foster.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.—Messrs. Paynter (chairman), Culberson, Simmons, Richardson, Crawford, Perkins, and Townsend.

On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Lippitt (chairman), Stephenson, Gronna, Simmons, and Gore.

On Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Poindexter (chairman), McCumber, Frye, Davis, and Chamberlain.

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. Bradley (chairman), Burnham, Borah, Bailey, and Rayner.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. Gronna (chairman), Dillingham, Bradley, Martin of Virginia, and Tillman.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department.—Messrs. Bristow (chairman), Smith of Michigan, Penrose, Bacon, and Chilton.

On Expenditures in the Department of State.—Messrs. Kenyon (chairman), Warren, La Follette, Stone, and Percy.

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Burton (chairman), Briggs, Works, Smith of Maryland, and Lea.

On Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. Works (chairman), du Pont, Cullom, Foster, and Johnson of Maine.

On Finance.—Messrs. Penrose (chairman), Cullom, Lodge, McCumber, Smoot, Gallinger, Clark of Wyoming, Heyburn, La Follette, Bailey, Simmons, Stone, Williams, Kern, and Johnson of Maine.

On Fisheries.—Messrs. Jones (chairman), Bourne, Perkins, Briggs, Curtis, Bailey, Overman, Fletcher, and Thornton.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.—Messrs. Tillman (chairman), Fletcher, Clapp, Nixon, and Smith of Michigan.

On Foreign Relations.—Messrs. Cullom (chairman), Frye, Lodge, Smith of Michigan, Root, McCumber, Sutherland, Borah, Burton, Bacon, Stone, Shively, Clarke of Arkansas, Rayner, and Hitchcock.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.—Messrs. McLean (chairman), Perkins, Burnham, Lodge, Poindexter, Tillman, Overman, Taylor, and Hitchcock.

On the Geological Survey.—Messrs. Taylor (chairman), Rayner, Smith of South Carolina, Briggs, Wetmore, Page, and Kenyon.

On Immigration.—Messrs. Lodge (chairman), Dillingham, Penrose, Brown, Richardson, Burton, Gronna, Davis, Gore, Smith of South Carolina, Percy, Kern, and O'Gorman.

On Indian Affairs.—Messrs. Gamble (chairman), Clapp, McCumber, Sutherland, La Follette, Curtis, Brown, Dixon, Page, Stone, Davis, Owen, Chamberlain, Watson, and Myers.

On Indian Depredations.—Messrs. Rayner (chairman), Davis, Johnston of Alabama, Owen, Percy, Curtis, Dixon, Stephenson, Crawford, Brandegee, and Lippitt.

On Industrial Expositions.—Messrs. Root (chairman), Jones, Crane, Stephenson, Oliver, Gronna, Works, Rayner, Overman, Taylor, Paynter, Swanson, and Newlands.

On Interoceanic Canals.—Messrs. Brandegee (chairman), Borah, Crawford, Bristow, Perkins, Page, Jones, Townsend, Simmons, Johnston of Alabama, Percy, Thornton, Chilton, and O'Gorman.

On Interstate Commerce.—Messrs. Clapp (chairman), Cullom, Crane, Nixon, Cummins, Brandegee, Oliver, Lippitt, Townsend, Tillman, Foster, Newlands, Clarke of Arkansas, Gore, Watson, and Pomerene.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.—Messrs. Smith of Maryland (chairman), Bryan, Bradley, Richardson, and Poindexter.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. Nixon (chairman), Warren, Sutherland, Borah, Jones, Brandegee, Works, Bailey, Newlands, Gore, Smith of Maryland, Chamberlain, and Myers.

Joint Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the United States.—Messrs. Heyburn (chairman), Sutherland, Clarke of Arkansas, and Percy.

On the Judiciary.—Messrs. Clark of Wyoming (chairman), Nelson, Dillingham, Sutherland, Brandegee, Borah, Brown, Cummins, Root, Bacon, Culberson, Overman, Rayner, Paynter, Chilton, and O'Gorman.

On the Library.—Messrs. Wetmore (chairman), Briggs, Cummins, Root, Burton, Newlands, Shively, and Swanson.

On Manufactures.—Messrs. Heyburn (chairman), Oliver, Lorimer, La Follette, Cummins, McLean, Smith of South Carolina, Terrell, Reed, Pomerene, and O'Gorman.

On Military Affairs.—Messrs. du Pont (chairman), Warren, Dixon, Briggs, Brown, Guggenheim, Bristow, Jones, Lorimer, Foster, Johnston of Alabama, Clarke of Arkansas, Taylor, Chamberlain, Hitchcock, and Williams.

On Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Lorimer (chairman), Heyburn, Nixon, Sutherland, Guggenheim, Poindexter, Tillman, Johnston of Alabama, Watson, and Myers.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries.—Messrs. Davis (chairman), Owen, Thornton, Brown, Burton, Stephenson, and Wetmore.

On Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Perkins (chairman), Penrose, Wetmore, Clapp, Lodge, Smith of Michigan, Page, Poindexter, Tillman, Smith of Maryland, Thornton, Swanson, Bryan, and Johnson of Maine.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.—Messrs. Richardson (chairman), Clapp, Lorimer, Nelson, Burnham, Brandegee, Poindexter, Clarke of Arkansas, Owen, Fletcher, Watson, and Kern.

On Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. Owen (chairman), Chamberlain, Shively, Reed, Frye, Smith of Michigan, Stephenson, McCumber, and Brown.

On Patents.—Messrs. Brown (chairman), Brandegee, Kenyon, Works, Shively, Smith of South Carolina, and Gore.

On Pensions.—Messrs. McCumber (chairman), Burnham, Smoot, Curtis, du Pont, Brown, Bradley, Poindexter, Taylor, Gore, Shively, Bryan, Johnson of Maine, and Pomerene.

On the Philippines.—Messrs. Guggenheim (chairman), Lodge, Nixon, Heyburn, Bristow, Crawford, McLean, Lippitt, Johnston of Alabama, Paynter, Chamberlain, Fletcher, Hitchcock, and Reed.

On Post Offices and Post Roads.—Messrs. Bourne (chairman), Penrose, Crane, Guggenheim, Briggs, Richardson, Bradley, Bristow, Lorimer, Bankhead, Taylor, Terrell, Smith of South Carolina, Swanson, Bryan, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Printing.—Messrs. Smoot (chairman), Gallinger, Richardson, Page, Kenyon, Smith of Maryland, Fletcher, and Chilton.

On Private Land Claims.—Messrs. Bacon (chairman), Davis, Thornton, Smith of Michigan, Oliver, Lorimer, and Gronna.

On Privileges and Elections.—Messrs. Dillingham (chairman), Gamble, Heyburn, Clapp, Sutherland, Bradley, Jones, Oliver, Kenyon, Bailey, Paynter, Johnston of Alabama, Fletcher, Kern, and Lea.

On Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Sutherland (chairman), Warren, Heyburn, Wetmore, Gamble, du Pont, Stephenson, Bourne, Poindexter, Culberson, Taylor, Swanson, Owen, Watson, Martine of New Jersey, and Reed.

On Public Health and National Quarantine.—Messrs. Culberson (chairman), Fletcher, Thornton, Owen, Williams, Smoot, Crawford, Crane, Gronna, Lippitt, and Works.

On Public Lands.—Messrs. Nelson (chairman), Clark of Wyoming, Gamble, Smoot, Heyburn, Dixon, Jones, Guggenheim, Works, Newlands, Davis, Chamberlain, Thornton, Bryan, and Myers.

On Railroads.—Messrs. Gore (chairman), Bacon, Taylor, Watson, Reed, Clark of Wyoming, Nelson, Bourne, Bristow, Penrose, and McCumber.

On Revolutionary Claims.—Messrs. Stone (chairman), Chilton, Bradley, Root, and Borah.

On Rules.—Messrs. Crane (chairman), Warren, Gallinger, Nelson, Cummins, Bacon, Bailey, and Overman.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs. Bankhead (chairman), Bacon, Borah, Clapp, and Gamble.

On Territories.—Messrs. Smith of Michigan (chairman), Nelson, Burnham, Brown, Bristow, McLean, Lippitt, Owen, Chamberlain, Shively, Johnson of Maine, and Hitchcock.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.—Messrs. Smith of South Carolina (chairman), Rayner, Gore, Bankhead, Clark of Wyoming, McCumber, Brandegee, Bourne, and Burton.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.—Messrs. Foster (chairman), Watson, Clark of Wyoming, Nixon, and Townsend.

On the University of the United States.—Messrs. Johnston of Alabama (chairman), Foster, Overman, Terrell, Williams, Frye, Dillingham, Curtis, Wetmore, Dixon, and Cummins.

On Woman Suffrage.—Messrs. Overman (chairman), Johnston of Alabama, Wetmore, du Pont, and Bourne.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 7 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 28, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 27, 1911.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Elliot Marshal, of Missouri, to be surveyor of customs for the port of St. Joseph, in the State of Missouri, in place of John Albus, jr., whose term of service expired by limitation February 2, 1910.

FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Samuel Adams, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Frank Pierce, resigned.

ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

James A. Fowler, of Tennessee, to be assistant to the Attorney General, vice William S. Kenyon, resigned.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Ernest Knaebel, of Colorado, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice James A. Fowler, nominated to be assistant to the Attorney General.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Edwin G. Coleman, now receiver of public moneys at Lemmon, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Lemmon, vice Cyrus C. Carpenter, resigned.

Paul D. Kribs, now register of the land office at Aberdeen, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Timber Lake, S. Dak. The land office at Aberdeen is to be removed to Timber Lake, pursuant to Executive order of February 18.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Samuel W. Huntington, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Lemmon, S. Dak., vice Edwin G. Coleman, nominated to be register of the land office at Lemmon.

Jacob L. Parrott, of Mobridge, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Timber Lake, S. Dak. The land office at Aberdeen is to be removed to Timber Lake, pursuant to Executive order of February 18.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. John F. Guilfoyle, Seventh Cavalry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Cunliffe H. Murray, Fourteenth Cavalry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Matthias W. Day, Sixth Cavalry, to be colonel from March 21, 1911, vice Col. George S. Anderson, Ninth Cavalry, who accepted an appointment as brigadier general on that date.

Maj. Joseph A. Gaston, First Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Charles H. Watts, Ninth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Henry L. Ripley, Eighth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Frank A. Edwards, Twelfth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. James B. Erwin, Ninth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Hoel S. Bishop, Fifteenth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. George H. Morgan, Third Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Edwin P. Andrus, Second Cavalry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Daniel H. Boughton, Fifth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 5, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Walter L. Finley, Thirteenth Cavalry, detailed as inspector general on that date.

Maj. Franklin O. Johnson, detailed paymaster, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. John F. Guilfoyle, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

Maj. Lloyd M. Brett, First Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. William D. Beach, Eleventh Cavalry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Augustus C. Macomb, Ninth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Homer W. Wheeler, Fifth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Thomas J. Lewis, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. James Lockett, Fourth Cavalry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Charles H. Grierson, Tenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 21, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Matthias W. Day, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. George O. Cress, Fourth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Augustus P. Blocksom, Tenth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. James B. Hughes, Fourth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Joseph A. Gaston, First Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Robert A. Brown, Fourth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Hugh L. Scott, Fourteenth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Willard A. Holbrook, Fifth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Henry L. Ripley, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Lewis M. Koehler, Fourth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Jacob G. Galbraith, Fourth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Robert E. L. Michie, Twelfth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. James B. Erwin, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. John S. Fair, Ninth Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. George O. Cress, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert J. Reaney, Second Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. James B. Hughes, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Sherrard Coleman, Eight Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Robert A. Brown, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. William F. Herringshaw, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Willard A. Holbrook, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Joseph A. Baer, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Lewis M. Koehler, Fourth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Frank O. Whitlock, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Robert E. L. Michie, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas A. Rothwell, Fifth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. John S. Fair, Ninth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas E. Cathro, Thirteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Robert J. Reaney, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. E. R. Warner McCabe, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Sherrard Coleman, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James B. Henry, jr., Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. William F. Herringshaw, Thirteenth Cavalry, promoted.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Edwin St. J. Greble, Third Field Artillery, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Edward T. Brown, Fifth Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Edward A. Millar, Fifth Field Artillery, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Eli D. Hoyle, Sixth Field Artillery, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. John Conklin, Second Field Artillery, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Granger Adams, Fifth Field Artillery, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Samuel D. Sturgis, First Field Artillery, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Edwin St. J. Greble, Third Field Artillery, promoted.

Maj. Lucien G. Berry, Third Field Artillery, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Charles G. Treat, Fourth Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. William J. Snow, Sixth Field Artillery, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Edward A. Millar, Fifth Field Artillery, promoted.

Capt. George C. Gatley, Third Field Artillery, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. John Conklin, Second Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Joseph F. Barnes, Second Field Artillery, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. William J. Snow, Sixth Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. William P. Ennis, First Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. George G. Gatley, Third Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. John G. Tyndall, Fourth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Joseph F. Barnes, Second Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Alfred L. P. Sands, Sixth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. William P. Ennis, First Field Artillery, promoted.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Frederick S. Strong, detailed adjutant general, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Erasmus M. Weaver, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Warren P. Newcomb, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Charles G. Woodward,

detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Charles L. Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from March 13, 1911, vice Col. William R. Hamilton, retired from active service March 12, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Clarence P. Townsley, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from April 1, 1911, vice Col. Frederick Marsh, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Isaac N. Lewis, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. William C. Rafferty, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Harry L. Hawthorne, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Warren P. Newcomb, promoted.

Maj. John D. Barrette, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Charles J. Bailey, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Elmer W. Hubbard, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Adelbert Cronkhite, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Gustave W. S. Stevens, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. George T. Bartlett, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Richmond P. Davis, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 13, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Charles L. Phillips, promoted.

Maj. Wirt Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from April 1, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Clarence P. Townsley, promoted.

Maj. George F. Landers, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from April 1, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Charles H. Hunter, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. George W. Gatchell, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from April 12, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. John W. Ruckman, detailed as inspector general on that date.

Capt. Alston Hamilton, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Ira A. Haynes, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. John C. Gilmore, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Willoughby Walke, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Joseph L. Knowlton, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Isaac N. Lewis, promoted.

Capt. Joseph Wheeler, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Harry L. Hawthorne, promoted.

Capt. Robert E. Callan, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. John D. Barrette, promoted.

Capt. Edwin Landon, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Elmer W. Hubbard, promoted.

Capt. Clarence H. McNeil, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Gustave W. S. Stevens, promoted.

Capt. Joseph P. Tracy, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Oscar I. Straub, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Percy M. Kessler, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Alfred M. Hunter, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Johnson Hagood, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Henry D. Todd, jr., detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. George T. Patterson, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. William C. Davis, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Frank K. Fergusson, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. George Blakely, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Robert S. Abernethy, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Gordon G. Heiner, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Edwin O. Sarratt, Coast Artillery Corps, to be major from April 1, 1911, vice Maj. Wirt Robinson, promoted.

First Lieut. Graham Parker, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Alston Hamilton, promoted.

First Lieut. Norris Stayton, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. John C. Gilmore, jr., promoted.

First Lieut. Richard Furnival, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Joseph Wheeler, jr., promoted.

First Lieut. George A. Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Robert E. Callan, promoted.

First Lieut. Ralph E. Herring, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Edwin Landon, promoted.

First Lieut. William E. De Sombre, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Clarence H. McNeil, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edwin K. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Graham Parker, promoted.

Second Lieut. Clarence T. Marsh, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Norris Stayton, promoted.

Second Lieut. John B. Maynard, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Richard Furnival, promoted.

Second Lieut. Jacob Frank, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. George A. Taylor, promoted.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Charles McClure, detailed adjutant general, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Thomas C. Woodbury, Third Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. James S. Rogers, First Infantry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Edwin B. Bolton, Fourth Infantry, retired from active service March 10, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Robert L. Bullard, Eighth Infantry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Charles St. J. Chubb, Thirtieth Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Edwin F. Glenn, Twenty-third Infantry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. William P. Evans, Twenty-fifth Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Millard F. Waltz, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Col. Francis H. French, Twenty-eighth Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Samuel W. Dunning, Seventh Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. William C. Buttler, Twenty-second Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Joseph M. T. Partello (since retired from active service), Fourth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. George S. Young, Twenty-first Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. George Bell, jr., detailed inspector general, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. George R. Cecil, Tenth Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Frank B. McCoy, Seventeenth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. William A. Mann, Third Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Richard M. Blatchford, Eleventh Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Alexis R. Paxton, Twenty-fourth Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. John H. Beacom, Sixth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. William Lassiter, Fourth Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Lawrence J. Hearn, Third Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Robert C. Van Vliet, Sixteenth Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Charles W. Penrose, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. James S. Rogers, First Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Francis J. Kernan, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Robert L. Bullard, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Chase W. Kennedy, Sixteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Edwin F. Glenn, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Thomas W. Griffith, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Millard F. Waltz, Twenty-seventh Infantry, promoted.

Maj. George W. McIver, Ninth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. William A. Nichols, Thirteenth Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Wilds P. Richardson, Thirteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Reuben B. Turner, Twenty-ninth Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Charles H. Barth, Twelfth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Daniel A. Frederick, Nineteenth Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Omar Bundy, detailed inspector general, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Hunter Liggett, Fifteenth Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Everard E. Hatch, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Samuel W. Miller, Twenty-fifth Infantry, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. David C. Shanks, Fourth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Edward H. Plummer, Twenty-eighth Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. William H. Allaire, Twenty-third Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Henry Kirby, Sixth Infantry, advanced to the grade of colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Maj. Willson Y. Stamper, Twenty-first Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 20, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. Samuel W. Dunning, unassigned, detailed as adjutant general on that date.

Capt. Michael J. Lenihan, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Samuel W. Dunning, Seventh Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Mark L. Hersey, Sixth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Joseph M. T. Partello, Fourth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Frank H. Albright, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. John S. Parke, Fourteenth Infantry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Frederic D. Evans, Eighteenth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Frank B. McCoy, Seventeenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. James Baylies, Tenth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Charles R. Noyes, Ninth Infantry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Earl C. Carnahan, Eleventh Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Richard M. Blatchford, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Edson A. Lewis, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. John H. Beacom, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William S. Sinclair, Fifth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Michael J. Lenihan, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Richmond Smith, Eleventh Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Mark L. Hersey, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles L. Willard, Fifteenth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Frank H. Albright, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert H. Sillman, Fifteenth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Frederic D. Evans, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Samuel W. Widdifield, Eighth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. James Baylies, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Rufus B. Clark, Third Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Earl C. Carnahan, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Arthur P. Watts, Eighteenth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Edson A. Lewis, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Walton Goodwin, jr., Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. William S. Sinclair, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Philip B. Peyton, Sixteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Richmond Smith, Eleventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Karl Truesdell, Fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Charles L. Willard, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederick B. Terrell, Nineteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Robert H. Sillman, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Howard G. Sharpe, Twenty-third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Samuel W. Widdifield, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. David H. Scott, Thirteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Rufus B. Clark, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles A. Dravo, Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Arthur P. Watts, Eighteenth Infantry, promoted.

ADVANCEMENT IN THE ARMY.

Each of the officers herein named for advancement in grade in accordance with the rank he would have been entitled to hold had promotion been lineal throughout his arm or corps since the date of his entry into the arm or corps to which he permanently belongs:

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Charles H. Watts, Ninth Cavalry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Frank A. Edwards, Twelfth Cavalry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Hoel S. Bishop, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Edwin P. Andrus, Second Cavalry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Frederick W. Sibley, detailed inspector general, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Homer W. Wheeler, Fifth Cavalry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911.

Maj. Augustus P. Blocksom, Tenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Hugh L. Scott, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Loyd S. McCormick, detailed inspector general, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Jacob G. Galbraith, Fourth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Horatio G. Sickel, Twelfth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Herbert J. Slocum, Seventh Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. William J. Nicholson, Seventh Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Fred W. Foster, Fifth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Edwin P. Brewer, Seventh Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Henry J. Goldman, Twelfth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Eli D. Hoyle, Sixth Field Artillery, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Granger Adams, Fifth Field Artillery, to be colonel from March 11, 1911.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Lieut. Col. William C. Rafferty, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Charles J. Bailey, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from March 11, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Millard F. Harmon, detailed inspector general, to be colonel from March 13, 1911.

Lieut. Col. Charles H. Hunter, Coast Artillery Corps, to be colonel from April 1, 1911.

Maj. Ira A. Haynes, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

Maj. Willoughby Walke, Coast Artillery Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. William C. Buttler, Twenty-second Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.
Lieut. Col. George S. Young, Twenty-first Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.
Lieut. Col. George R. Cecil, Tenth Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.
Lieut. Col. William A. Mann, Third Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.
Lieut. Col. Alexis R. Paxton, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.
Lieut. Col. William Lassiter, Fourth Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.
Lieut. Col. Robert C. Van Vliet, Sixteenth Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1911.
Lieut. Col. William A. Nichols, Thirteenth Infantry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911.
Lieut. Col. Edward H. Plummer, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911.
Lieut. Col. Henry Kirby, Sixth Infantry, to be colonel from March 11, 1911.
Maj. Charles M. Truitt, detailed adjutant general, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.
Maj. John S. Parke, Fourteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.
Maj. Charles R. Noyes, Ninth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.
Maj. Willis T. May, Fifteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.
Maj. Edwin P. Pendleton, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.
Maj. Daniel L. Howell, Eighteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1911.
Maj. William F. Blauvelt, detailed paymaster, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911.
Maj. Walter H. Chatfield, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 11, 1911.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants, with rank from April 24, 1911.

John Bundy Alcorn, of Ohio.
Robert Wesley Andrews, of New York.
Thomas Zopher Ball, of Indiana.
Porter Vernon Ballou, of Kentucky.
William Francis Bernart, of Illinois.
Albert George Bising, of New York.
John Newton Boyce, of New York.
Arthur Irving Boyer, of New York.
John Dosher Brooks, of South Dakota.
Earl Sprague Bullock, of New Mexico.
John Gerald Byrne, of Washington.
Willis Earle Chapman, of Michigan.
Harold Dunbar Corbusier, of New Jersey.
Leighton Randolph Cornman, of New York.
Richard Matthew English, of Connecticut.
Frank Wilbur Foxworthy, of Indiana.
Samuel Friedman, of New York.
Harry Greenberg, of Wisconsin.
Hubert Grieger, of Colorado.
Andy Hall, of Illinois.
Henry Norton Hall, of Georgia.
Stevens Thomas Harris, of Georgia.
Graham Edward Henson, of Florida.
Gustavus Ingomar Hogue, of Wisconsin.
Harry Murray James, of New York.
Frederick Niles Coligny Jerauld, of New York.
De Witt Clinton Jones, of Minnesota.
Wendell Ambrose Jones, of Ohio.
Edward Elmer Lamkin, of Maryland.
Samuel Connell Lindsay, of Iowa.
Charles Herbert Lowell, of California.
Laurence McEvoy, of New York.
Elmer Ellsworth Mansfield, of Georgia.
Clarence Martin, of Missouri.
James Vance May, of New York.
Ben Hicks Metcalf, of Massachusetts.
George Seltzer Mintzer, of Pennsylvania.
Charles Bernhard Julius Mittelstaedt, of New York.
John Lawson Norris, of the District of Columbia.
Clarence Quinan, of California.
Ivah James Ransbottom, of Ohio.
Ernest Charles Schultze, of New York.
Harry Clay Smith, of Montana.
William Hickman Spiller, of New York.
Charles Seymour Stern, of Connecticut.
William Stoutenborough Terriberry, of New York.
James William Thornton, of Iowa.
Clarence Allen Warwick, of Indiana.
Joseph Hall Whiteley, of Iowa.
Roy Alexander Wilson, of Ohio.
Shadworth Oldham Beasley, of California.
Frederick Douglass Branch, of New York.
John Carling, of New York.
Charles Arthur Cattermole, of Colorado.
Frederick Arthur Wellington Conn, of Pennsylvania.
Charles Grant Eicher, of Pennsylvania.
Bruce Ffoulkes, of California.
John Gilbert, of Pennsylvania.
Lewis Theophilus Griffith, of New York.
Howard Albertus Grube, of Michigan.
Vernon Jay Hooper, of Michigan.
Simon Pendleton Kramer, of Ohio.
George Bradford Lawrason, of Louisiana.
William Cooper Le Compte, of Pennsylvania.
Harry Rodgers Lemen, of Illinois.
Peter Duncan MacNaughton, of Michigan.
William Barton Orear, of Georgia.
Palmer Heath Lyon, of New York.
Frank David Pease, of Montana.
Alva Sherman Pinto, of Nebraska.
John Joseph Repetti, of the District of Columbia.
Herman Joseph Schlageter, of California.
Robert Scott Spilman, of Virginia.
Walter Hoepfner Winterberg, of California.

Physicians to be first lieutenants, with rank from April 24, 1911.

Clifford Thomas Sappington, of Maryland.
Alfred Carlyle Prentice, of New York.
Clarence Arthur McWilliams, of New York.
Edmund Dougan Clark, of Indiana.
John Vernon Frazier, of Michigan.
Ernest William Haass, of Michigan.
Haigazoon Kruger Kaprielian, of Connecticut.
Arthur Waller Slee, of New York.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Reed M. Fawell to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.
Midshipman Arnold H. Vanderhoof to be an ensign in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1910, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Sallie M. Aaron to be postmaster at Lyons, Ga., in place of James B. Aaron, deceased.
Charles W. Parker to be postmaster at Elberton, Ga., in place of Charles W. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1910.

IOWA.

Daniel P. Ellsworth to be postmaster at Lohrville, Iowa, in place of Daniel P. Ellsworth. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1910.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Harriet F. Seaverns to be postmaster at North Scituate, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

MICHIGAN.

Charles Gauntlett to be postmaster at Milan, Mich., in place of Charles Gauntlett. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1911.

MINNESOTA.

Fred W. Olson to be postmaster at Raymond, Minn., in place of Eva Frances Fay, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI.

Effie Du Berry to be postmaster at Baldwyn, Miss., in place of Carrie D. Morgan, resigned.
Martha H. Talbert to be postmaster at Pelahatchee, Miss., in place of Martha H. McLaurin, name changed by marriage.

NEBRASKA.

William A. Price to be postmaster at Laurel, Nebr., in place of William A. Price. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1910.

NEVADA.

Callie B. Ferguson to be postmaster at Fallon, Nev., in place of Callie B. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1911.

NEW JERSEY.

George E. Schenck to be postmaster at Haddon Heights, N. J., in place of Lizzie B. Minton, removed.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Clark D. Eckels to be postmaster at Cambridge Springs, Pa., in place of William E. Root. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1911.

Burd R. Linder to be postmaster at Orwigsburg, Pa., in place of Burd R. Linder. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1910.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Peter J. Schroder to be postmaster at Avon, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

TEXAS.

John H. Carson to be postmaster at Dayton, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

William D. McCaslin to be postmaster at Detroit, Tex., in place of William D. McCaslin. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1911.

Rufus H. Windham to be postmaster at Newton, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

WISCONSIN.

Joseph W. Fritz to be postmaster at Ladysmith, Wis., in place of Joseph W. Fritz. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 27, 1911.

MINISTER.

Laurits S. Swenson to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Norway.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Frederick C. Harper to be collector of customs for the district of Puget Sound, Wash.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Jacob L. Parrott to be receiver of public moneys at Timberlake, S. Dak.

Samuel W. Huntington to be receiver of public moneys at Lemmon, S. Dak.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Edwin G. Coleman to be register of the land office at Lemmon, S. Dak.

Paul D. Kribs to be register of the land office at Timberlake, S. Dak.

Albert Kircher to be register of the land office at Miles City, Mont.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander John H. Dayton to be a commander.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters:

Thomas O. Covell and

Caleb Whitford.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

William J. Atwood, Midland.

MINNESOTA.

Nicholas J. Kohn, Fort Snelling.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Frank D. Dickey, Murphy.

OREGON.

Lawrence M. Scholl, Hubbard.

WISCONSIN.

Robert V. Baker, Kenosha.

John F. Shaw, Ellsworth.

Earle S. Welch, Eau Claire.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 27, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, let Thy blessing descend copiously upon us, to broaden our views, quicken our sensibilities, that we may make worthy our acts in whatsoever our hands findeth to do, and thus grow daily into the likeness of our Maker. And honor and glory and praise be Thine forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas and Mr. GALLINGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department.

PRINTING AND BINDING, COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 129.

Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary for the transaction of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I understand this committee is actually taking testimony and working through subcommittees.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Yes. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is offered at the request of members of the committee. This committee is actually at work taking testimony through subcommittees, and it is desirable to have it printed, so that the full committee can have the advantage of their work.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I think there can be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MCMORRAN was granted leave of absence for two weeks on account of important business.

THE APPORTIONMENT BILL.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2983—the apportionment bill—and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be fixed at three hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2983, known as the apportionment bill, and, pending that, he asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana whether he thinks that that will be ample time on this side of the House?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I supposed it would be. But one request has been made to me for time, and that is from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. Probably I will occupy 30 minutes—possibly 40. That would leave a half hour or so that may be distributed. If there is any Member on this side of the House who desires to speak and wants time, and thinks we ought to have more time, I would be glad to have it made known.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want 15 minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman from California wants 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON], I think, have agreed upon the number of Representatives by the apportionment. Whether gentlemen opposed to the number desire to be heard or not to any extent, I am not informed. If any gentleman desires time, now is a very good opportunity to indicate it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It may be that, as a matter of safety, we better have two hours on a side. I presume there will not be so much time required, but I suggest it as a matter of precaution. This is quite an important bill, and there are, perhaps, 125 Members of this body who were not Members of the last Congress, and who were not present at the discussion then,

and, of course, I would like to give everybody an opportunity to express himself on the questions involved in this bill. I do not think the general debate will last over an hour and a half.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] that he make his request for two hours on a side. If the time is not occupied, very well. Five-minute debate would follow that, of course.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, judging from the number of those who have asked me for time in the discussion of this bill, I think that really one hour would be long enough for this side, and an hour and a half would be ample, and the gentleman from Indiana seemed to think that would be satisfactory. Now, of course, we will take up the bill after this general discussion, under the five-minute rule, and that would prolong its consideration for some time, and perhaps we would not get through until very late. It seems to me that three hours, one hour and a half on a side, would be ample time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. I did not quite catch the request. Did it include the statement that the general debate is to be confined to the merits of the bill? If not, I make that suggestion to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HOUSTON. I include in my request that the debate be confined to the discussion of this bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think it ought to be.

The SPEAKER. The rules settle that question. When the House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union considering a bill under general debate, Members are allowed great latitude in discussion. Outside of that, Members are confined to the question, if anybody raises the point.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I have had three requests since the gentleman made his motion for time, aggregating 45 minutes. I will probably occupy half an hour myself. I believe we ought to have two hours on this side, but we will not use it unless there is demand for it, of course. I wish the gentleman would modify his request and make it four hours—two hours on a side.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the request made by the gentleman from Indiana and others on that side, that we have more time for discussion, I agree to the time of two hours on a side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] modifies his request in two respects. He asks that the time be extended to four hours of general debate, one-half to be controlled by himself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], and that the debate be confined to the bill under consideration. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, to consider House bill 2983, for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2983) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

Mr. GARNER took the chair amid applause.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2983. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

House bill 2983, a bill for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census.

Be it enacted, etc.——

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] is recognized.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I understand that both of the gentlemen to whom the control of time is allotted favor the same bill. I wish to ask if time will be apportioned to any Member on the floor who opposes the bill. This question was raised at the time this same bill was discussed at the last session, and a different rule was followed then, and a certain amount of time was allotted to those who opposed the bill. I would like at this time to make this inquiry, whether it is the intention of the gentlemen on either side in control of time to surrender some time to Members who oppose the bill?

Mr. HOUSTON. I will answer, Yes; time will be given to those who oppose it. I am willing to make as much concession as I reasonably can.

Mr. Chairman, according to the provisions of the Constitution and under the laws passed by Congress, the census of 1910 has been taken and certified to Congress by the proper official of the Census Bureau, the Director of the Census. Under the Constitution it is our manifest duty to pass an apportionment bill, and I take it that it is unnecessary to offer any argument or any reason why an apportionment bill should be passed. The only question to be considered by this House is the character of the bill that is to be passed, so that I do not expect to take up more than a few minutes of the time of the House, and that will be occupied in setting forth the provisions of this bill and describing it.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that the membership of this House shall be 433. This involves an increase of 42 Members. It also provides that in the event the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona are admitted to the Union, they will have one Member each. This will be in addition to the 433 already provided for.

In the apportionment of the Representatives among the different States the committee was confronted with the question as to the manner and method of arriving at a just and fair apportionment, and upon this point I must say that there is a very great diversity of opinion. It is rather remarkable that after more than 100 years in the history of our Government there has been no uniform method agreed upon, either by Congress or by the officials of the Census Bureau or by statisticians in general. However, the method adopted in the formation of this bill, to my mind, adopts the simplest and the plainest and as fair a method as is available under the present conditions. The method adopted was the method known as the method of majority fractions. By that method a ratio is ascertained, and that ratio is divided among the population of the different States, each State getting a Member in the House for each full ratio and one for each majority fraction thereof.

Now, there are arguments made pro and con as to other methods—the method of 1850 and the method submitted by Dr. Hill, the chief statistician of the Bureau of the Census, which had features to commend it to the favorable consideration of the Census Committee. However, it is agreed by all that with the present population of the United States and the ratio determined upon by this committee of 211,877, as representing the average constituency of each Member, the same result is reached when you come to divide the membership of the House into the number 433. Therefore, however much any Member might prefer another method under different conditions, yet the same result is reached when you fix the number at 433 and use the method of major fractions, the method used in this bill, with the population of the United States as it now is. The same result is reached by the ratio the committee has determined upon, 211,877, and the number 433, as would be reached by this method suggested by the chief statistician, Dr. Hill. In view of that fact there can be no criticism that this method is not as fair and as just and uniform an apportionment as the later method.

This bill provides, as I have said, for an increase of 42 Members, distributed among the various States of this Union.

Mr. KENDALL. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KENDALL. The plan proposed by the committee allows each State to enjoy the representation that it now has?

Mr. HOUSTON. It does. I was coming to that. The plan proposed by the committee allows each State to retain its present membership. And I will say, in this connection, that the number 433 is the smallest number that will afford to each State the opportunity to retain its present membership without the loss of a single Member.

Objection has been made to the increase. The argument has been made that the House is too large and is getting unwieldy. In view of that, which I shall allude to later, it has been the general desire of the committee and of Members of the House to keep the membership as low as possible and yet prevent any State losing a Member. The bill provides that 21 States shall retain their present membership; 16 will gain 1 Member each; 5 will gain 2 Members each; 2 States, California and Oklahoma, will gain 3 each; Pennsylvania gains 4; and New York gains 6.

In this connection I will state that 25 States get a Member on a major fraction. Of these 25 it will be noticed that 15 gain a Member by virtue of the major fraction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the consideration of the vital question in the passage of this bill, and that is the question of the increase of membership.

The argument is made that the membership ought to be kept as low as possible. To this I fully agree when you couple with it the furnishing of full representation to all the people of the United States and to each and every State. We know that much of the confusion and much of the difficulty in the proceedings of the House with its present membership is due not so much to the fact that there are 391 Members here now, but to the fact that the parliamentary procedure in the House is such as to cause this confusion and make this an unwieldy body. But I want to call attention to the contemplated change in the seating arrangements of this House, by which it is expected that all the Members will be seated closer together and be brought nearer, so that they can hear and understand each other and understand the business of the House better. I verily believe that with this rearrangement an increase of 42 can well be had in the membership and yet the House be much more deliberative, and that we will be much better able to give careful and understanding consideration to measures before the House than we can under present conditions, with the seats arranged as they now are.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is very important that every part of our people should have proper representation. It is unnecessary to say that one man can represent a constituency of 200,000 more fully and more capably than he can a constituency of 400,000. There are diversified interests in different sections of the country. The calls made upon Congressmen are increasing year by year. The scope of the legislation of this House is broadening. We are legislating upon more subjects than formerly. The advancement and development of new agencies and powers call for more legislation and for more work on the part of the individual Member. The best thing that could happen for the welfare of the country would be to have each Representative fully informed by an intimate knowledge of the wants and will of the people, so as to reflect those wants and that will in the legislation of Congress.

There is a feature that I suppose I might as well allude to here, as it will come up for discussion, although it is not embraced in this bill.

An amendment will be offered providing that the apportionment to be made in the future shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I did not appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Tennessee was going away from the part of the measure he has just been discussing—that of the basis for representation. It may be that I did not hear all of his remarks, but he conveyed to my mind the impression that his idea was that in order to have an effective representation the basis of that representation should be smaller than is proposed by the gentlemen who oppose the measure.

Mr. HOUSTON. My position is that increasing the number of Representatives necessarily will cause each Representative to represent a smaller constituency. That being true, he can understand and know the wishes and wants of that constituency much better than he could one double that size.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Then would it not be the wiser thing to have a constituency of 25,000 or 50,000 people, because if the gentleman's argument be sound in that respect there would be a more effective representation than if he represented a constituency of 211,000?

Mr. HOUSTON. That might be true in a sense, but there is a limit.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Where would the gentleman put the limit?

Mr. HOUSTON. It must be controlled by conditions that exist, by the amount of population, by the character of the legislative body that will be chosen.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Where would the gentleman suggest that the line be drawn?

Mr. HOUSTON. I have suggested, and this bill suggests, at the present time that an increase of 42 is what the country needs and demands. I believe that increase will give us a better representation than the present number of 391. There can be no hard and fast rule because it is to be adjusted according to the varying conditions at every census, keeping in mind always that a smaller body can legislate more easily than a larger one, and yet the wants of the people are the first consideration, and the larger body can proceed in a parliamentary way, giving proper consideration to measures if the Members will do their duty, attend to their business, be prompt in their seats, and listen to what is going on.

Mr. SLAYDEN. One further question. If it were necessary to prevent a State from losing a Representative, would the gentleman be in favor of an increase of 82 Members instead of 42 Members?

Mr. HOUSTON. Oh, the gentleman may reduce the proposition to an absurdity by putting abnormal figures to it. These things are to be considered in the light of reason and common sense, keeping in view a fair and proper representation of what the people throughout the country require.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I understood the gentleman to state that a smaller body could be easier controlled through leadership than a larger body.

Mr. HOUSTON. Oh, I did not make that statement. I am very much of the opinion that a much larger body than this, if it would observe the parliamentary law and parliamentary procedure—and they all know what the procedure is—would be much more orderly and deliberative a body than this body sometimes is.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get to the point of the amendment, I say an amendment will be offered to this bill, which I merely allude to to bring before the House and to state my objections to it, that after the next census the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall apportion the Representatives among the States of the Union, taking the number of 430 and dividing the population by that to ascertain the ratio of the average constituency of the different districts.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. SHARP. What effect would such an amendment, carried by this House, have upon a future Congress.

Mr. HOUSTON. I was just coming to that. I do not think it would have any effect. I think it would be very unfortunate if it should have any effect. It is, to my mind, attempting to do something that is not in the power of this Congress or any other Congress to do, and which, if it had the power, to my mind would be very unwise to attempt. I think that each Congress which has the duty of apportioning Representatives should meet that duty in the light of the conditions that exist at that time. It is impossible to do otherwise. I think it is wrong to attempt to forestall the action of future Congresses.

That method was adopted once in the history of our Government. In 1850 there was a similar provision enacted into law. The attempt to put this method into operation failed. The Secretary of the Interior at that time did apportion the Representatives under that statute, making the number, I believe, 233. Congress changed that number. They were not willing to abide by that and increased the number by 8, instead of standing by the apportionment made by the Secretary of the Interior at that time. Now, it is well known to everyone here that extraordinary conditions were the cause of that effort in 1850 to fix a limit upon the Representatives at future apportionments. Those were remarkable, without parallel in this country, and will not exist again.

The emergency or the exigency that was thought then to justify it was extraordinary. It did not accomplish its purpose, because the Congress which was elected 10 years later did not observe it. I think, honestly and candidly, that the proper thing for this House to do is to increase the membership now. I think it is inconsistent with that idea for this Congress to go forward and support an increase now and at the same time attempt to enact a provision that would prevent an increase by a future Congress.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Having in mind the statement just made, is it the gentleman's opinion that 10 years from now, after the next census, that Congress would, under the law, increase the membership of this body by 42 or 62, or something of that kind?

Mr. HOUSTON. I can not give information of that kind, but I hope not.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the number ought to be increased beyond the 433 prescribed by this bill?

Mr. HOUSTON. At this time?

Mr. MILLER. At some future time.

Mr. HOUSTON. That can only be determined in the light of existing conditions at that future time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman's argument, but I take it for granted that he is perhaps nearly through. I would hear, if he can state it briefly, some reason why the membership at this time should be increased by 42, other than to prevent some State from

losing a part of its quota. I have tried to listen to the gentleman. There has been a lot of confusion. I have heard but little of it, but I would like to have that emphatically stated.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think there are many reasons that justify the increase. I think it is a very potent reason that no State shall lose a Member. I think it is a controlling reason. There are other reasons. There has been a very great change in our country in many respects. I mean in the population of the different States and the different sections. Conditions are changed very much, and the condition is such now that I believe the increased membership will better afford representation than to have it remain as it is. I believe the increased membership will put it within the power of the Representative to more properly and capably represent the constituency which he will have than if the membership were kept down to 391.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman permit one further question in that connection? Ten years from now will not the same argument prevail for increasing the membership of the House that we now have here, namely, to prevent any State losing its regular quota? Will not that always be before the Congress?

Mr. HOUSTON. I will answer the question in this way: I think it is possible that there will be reasons for an increased membership at that time. There have been reasons at each Congress that has had the duty of passing an apportionment bill to increase the membership, with one exception. In 1843 there was no increase, otherwise there have been at every apportionment an increase of various numbers. It is quite likely that in the future there will be a demand for an increase, and I should think it more than probable that there will be an increase. It is, I grant you, well to keep that increase as small as possible. When you come to compare the representation of the constituencies in other civilized countries, in the leading nations of the world, it will be found that they have a much smaller constituency to represent than we have. No nation has as large a constituency for each Representative as have the United States.

I here insert a table showing the number represented by each member in legislative bodies of other nations:

Countries.	Census year.	Number of members in lower house.	Ratio of members to population.	Population on which ratio is based.
United Kingdom	1901	670	61,878	41,458,721
English members	1901	495	65,712	32,527,843
Scotch members	1901	72	62,112	4,472,103
Irish members	1901	103	43,289	4,458,775
Austria	1900	516	50,679	26,150,708
Belgium	1900	108	40,322	6,693,548
Denmark	1906	114	22,853	2,605,268
France	1906	584	67,212	39,252,245
Germany	1905	397	155,546	60,641,278
Greece	1907	235	11,198	2,631,952
Hungary	1900	453	42,504	19,254,559
Italy	1901	508	63,927	32,475,253
Netherlands	1908	100	58,252	5,825,198
Norway	1900	123	19,211	2,240,032
Portugal	1900	148	36,507	5,423,132
Spain	1900	406	45,857	18,618,086
Sweden	1908	230	23,606	5,429,600
Switzerland	1908	167	21,313	3,559,349

Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask just one more question, and then I will not bother the gentleman again, for he has been very kind and patient. I understood the gentleman to say that he thought it advisable that each State should maintain as far as possible its present representation. Is it not the theory of our Constitution with reference to the House of Representatives that Members of this body represent the people rather than the States as entities, and should not the first consideration be a proper proportionate representation of the people of the country at large, having reference to certain areas and sections, rather than to the States as geographical subdivisions of the Nation?

Mr. HOUSTON. Without answering the gentleman's question, I can say that in order that the thing may be accomplished that he suggests should be accomplished, it is more easy to accomplish it by Representatives that are thoroughly acquainted with every part and section of the country, and every class of her people, and are for this reason better able to represent her entire citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I wish we could have order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the frequent confusion in the House while it is undertaking to do business like that which now prevails strikes me as the very strongest argument that could possibly be made against an increase in its numerical size. Although I voted in the last Congress for an increase in membership to 433, and will probably vote here to-day for the same increase, it is a matter of great importance to the House and the country that the question of determining the numerical size of its membership be considered with deliberation. The House of Representatives is supposed to be the real representative branch of the Federal Legislature. It is supposed to faithfully reflect the will and the matured convictions of the people of the United States, and the House ought to be large enough in numbers to be a real representative body on the one hand, and on the other hand it ought not to be so large and unwieldy as to be incapable of effectively discharging its constitutional functions. This country is vast in area, diversified in climate and in interests, and from the nature of things the legislative results of the House should be the composite will of all sections of the country in relation to matters of general legislation. The districts ought not to be so large territorially, nor so large in population, that the Representative will be unable to keep in touch with the feeling and thought of his constituents.

If districts are too large, either in area or population, he can not be in the highest sense a real representative of those whose commission he carries to this body. But a man may be a representative in the highest sense in a body that is so large that he is unable and incapable of wielding any considerable influence at all. The Committee on the Census concluded that, in view of the growth of the country in population, a membership of 433 would probably be as near an ideal membership under all the circumstances as could be adopted. The average district in the country on such a basis will contain 17,695 more population than the average district contained when the apportionment was made under the Twelfth Census. It is a sort of compromise. The increase in the House is not in proportion to the increase in population, but it is substantially 50 per cent of the increase in population. A large body, it is said, is more subject to the domination and control of parliamentary cliques and machines, and there is some force in that suggestion, of course. This body is already so large that it is necessary for it to transact its business principally through the agency of committees, which it always will do. If its size is reduced so that every question may be discussed and deliberated upon the floor, it will lose its representative character and will depart from the spirit and purpose of a representative body under the Federal Constitution. We will have to do the business of the House through the agencies of committees, and we ought to do it that way.

If conditions in the House have assumed such an aspect that the independence of the Members may be menaced through the instrumentality of parliamentary machines or cliques, I think the remedy will come in a reform of the parliamentary procedure in the House. In this Congress the majority party has adopted a new method for the appointment of standing committees. That method is on trial. I do not know what it will result in or how efficient it may be to preserve the independence of the individual Members, but in my judgment the effect of the departure will be to convert the control of the House from an autocracy into an oligarchy. My judgment is, Mr. Chairman, that in the course of time it will be discovered that a majority of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means will constitute the parliamentary machine of this body, as arbitrary and as despotic as it is possible for it to be under the old method. The large States in the Union will elect the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and each member of that committee will feel under obligations first to take care of and provide for his colleagues from his own State. I have heard some criticism of the action of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee in making assignments on standing committees in this Congress. It has been pointed out that the party Representatives in every State that has a member on the Committee on Ways and Means have been well provided for in the distribution of good committee assignments, and Representatives in the smaller States who are not fortunate enough to have a member of the great Committee on Ways and Means have to satisfy themselves with what is left. In addition to the power of appointing committees, the Ways and Means Committee is one of great influence in the affairs of the House.

In my judgment, if the majority desired to try a new experiment in the way of taking from the Speaker the power of appointing standing committees, separating the political and the parliamentary power that the rules formerly reposed in the

Speaker of the House, it would have been infinitely better to have selected a committee on selection of two or three members, under limitations providing that no member of the committee on selection should be a member of any standing committee. It should be a device simply to separate or divide the parliamentary power the Speaker must necessarily have and the political power, because it requires a combination of the two to enable the Speaker of the House of Representatives to build up a machine that will dominate House action and caucus action as well. I predict, Mr. Chairman, that the method now on trial, adopted by the majority party, will result in a dismal failure in the course of a comparatively few years. There are a good many ways by which the procedure in the House may be modified and accommodated to large membership without taking from the presiding officer the large parliamentary power that he must have. In a government by political parties the country holds the majority party absolutely responsible for the performance in good faith of the pledges it made to the voters, and the country will receive and accept no apology or excuse for its failure; and the parliamentary machinery of the House must be arbitrary in a large degree. There must be parliamentary machinery enough to enable the majority to keep faith with the country, and it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that under existing conditions there is not one iota more of parliamentry power in the Speaker than is absolutely necessary for him to have.

But the division of the political and parliamentary power, proper, is another proposition. I will not discuss it further to-day.

There is an element that enters into the consideration of this bill, Mr. Chairman, that my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON], said was a controlling one, and that is to provide a House large enough in membership so that no State will lose a Representative. I am free to admit, supporting the 433 membership as I do, that if it were not for that element there would be comparatively little sentiment in the House for the increase in the membership above 391. Ten years ago, before the apportionment was made, the numerical size of the House was 357, and the Committee on the Census reported a bill under the Twelfth Census retaining the old membership of 357, but the sentiment in favor of increasing the number high enough to take care of all the States was strong enough in the House to defeat the committee bill and agree to a substitute fixing the membership at 386.

Now, just analyze that element for a moment. I would like to feel that this increased membership can be supported upon higher grounds than that, and I do feel that there are perhaps adequate reasons why we can stand by a 433 membership above the proposition—simply to take care of the States. As I said, I supported this bill, calling for the 433 membership, in the last Congress. I confess I did it with some degree of misgiving. I did it with the understanding that we would incorporate in the bill, and we did incorporate in the bill, a provision that under subsequent censuses the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, after ascertaining the Representative population of the country, should divide the aggregate population by the arbitrary number of 433, and using the resulting quotient as the ratio of population to membership and then dividing the Representative population of each State by that ratio, and giving each State one Representative for each full ratio of population and an additional one for each major fraction thereof.

The two were coupled together. I had a good deal of misgiving in relation to the future. Following the Eleventh Census the membership of the House was increased so that no State would lose a Representative. Following the Twelfth Census the membership of the House was increased, so that no State would lose a Representative, and now, Mr. Chairman, we are proposing to increase the membership of the House 42, and the distinguished chairman of the committee says that the mere fact that no State will lose a Representative is complete justification for our action. Where, Mr. Chairman, is the increase in membership going to stop?

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman states my position stronger than I stated it. I said that was one of the controlling reasons.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I accept the modification. I did not aim to misstate the gentleman's attitude on the question. In the bill that passed last winter we provided for the future; we made the legislation prospective, just as we make all legislation.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] said he thought that policy was wrong. I can not see anything out of the way in the policy of now providing for the future. We are required by the Constitution to take a census of population every 10 years, and yet each of our census laws is entitled, for instance, "An act to provide for the Twelfth and subsequent censuses" or "to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent censuses." It has been the custom of Congress for a number of decades to provide for the taking of the census not only of the immediate census in contemplation, but all future censuses. The census act that we passed in the last Congress for a decennial enumeration of population provides for future censuses as well. I do not see any objection at all to Congress at this time providing that after the Fourteenth Decennial Census the Secretary of Commerce and Labor shall proceed to apportion Representatives among the States according to the formula that was embodied in the provision of the bill which was passed at the last Congress and for which practically all the Democratic Members voted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that this act, if we pass it as the gentleman suggests, would not be binding upon Congress 10 years afterwards?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Of course I admit that. No act that Congress can pass now will necessarily be binding upon Congress 10 years hence, or 5 years hence, for that matter. Congress has no power to pass irrepealable legislation, like the laws of the Medes and Persians. All our laws are subject, in the future, to modification or repeal when the welfare of the country may seem to require it, and a provision of this kind must of course fall within the same rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then this would simply be a suggestion to the Congress 10 years hence as to what they ought to do?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It would be more than a suggestion. It would require the repeal of a positive law to do otherwise, and if we have that statute on the books 10 years hence and a proposition were made in the Congress to repeal it with a view of enlarging the membership of the House, there would be such an expression of opposition sentiment throughout the length and breadth of the land that no party would dare to undertake it. Its moral influence would be tremendous.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the gentleman believe that the Members of Congress elected 10 years hence would be better judges of what the people would then need than we are now?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The difficulty would be that they would be in the same condition then as we are now. In the making of the law, how many of us are looking at the situation in our own States? That is the question, Mr. Chairman, which I hope Congress will avoid now by making this provision as to the future.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. MANN. The suggestion was just made that if this law were passed now, it would not be binding upon Congress, and the gentleman stated that it would not be binding upon Congress. Is it not a fact that it would be binding upon Congress unless it was repealed, either directly or indirectly?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. As long as it remains in force on the statute books it is binding on Congress.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It would be binding on Congress and upon the country, and that is the impression which I intended to convey when I answered the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL]. It will continue to be a law until it is repealed, and if we embody that amendment in the apportionment made this year by this Congress, when the next census is taken, in the absence of legislation, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor will proceed at once to apportion Representatives among the States in accordance with the formula which the law will contain. It is no surrender of legislative power to the head of a department. We prescribe what the ratio shall be. We prescribe in effect what the membership and what the numerical size of the House shall be under subsequent censuses, and the duty that will be imposed upon the Secretary of Commerce and Labor is not a discretion, but it is just a ministerial duty to make the arithmetical calculations involved in the apportionment.

I say, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is one of great importance, and in my judgment, if it shall be incorporated in this bill, it will stand and continue to be the law of this country for decades and possibly for generations.

The gentleman from Tennessee referred to the act of 1850. That was altogether a different provision. In 1850 Congress fixed the membership of the House at 233, and it provided that the Secretary of the Interior, after the enumeration of population had been made, should proceed to apportion 233 Representa-

tives among the States according to the method outlined in that law.

The difficulty with that law was that it set aside the plain, simple, old-fashioned major-fraction method, the one that the gentleman so heartily approved in opening this debate.

The amendment that I shall propose to the bill retains the major-fraction principle.

The apportionment under the census of 1850 was made by the Secretary of the Interior according to that law, and it continued in force, and the apportionment of 1860 was made in a way in accordance with that law; but under that method of apportioning Representatives it was discovered that five or six States had major fractions unrepresented, and to cure what Congress thought was an injustice a special act was passed which increased the membership by giving those States Representatives for the major fractions.

There will be no such question under the proposition that will be presented to the House for consideration in connection with this bill. It preserves the major-fraction rule. It will give to every State Representatives for the full numerical ratio and a Representative for each major fraction.

In 1870, after the Civil War, when questions were before the country respecting the right of representation on the part of some of the insurrectionary States, the act of 1850 was repealed. Conditions then were exceptional. The probabilities are that if it had not been for the Civil War we would be operating under the act of 1850 to-day. Let me ask Members of this House if it is not true that the almost unanimous sentiment of the country to-day is against an increase in the membership above 391?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not hear the beginning of the gentleman's statement, and I do not know whether he stated what the effect of the act of 1850 was on the apportionment of 1860.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The apportionment of 1860 was made under the act of 1850, but in working out the problem of distribution it left four or five States with major fractions that were without representation, and Congress by a supplemental act gave each of those States a Representative on account of their major fractions.

Mr. SHERLEY. Did it have the effect of reducing the representation of any State?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, yes; you can not have an arbitrary number without reducing the representation of some States. The only way to maintain the representation of the States in each decade is by increasing the total number, because the distribution of population throughout the country is very unequal.

Mr. SHERLEY. It might be that in fixing an arbitrary number a number might be fixed large enough to take care of the increase of the next 10 years. I was not suggesting any argument against the gentleman's proposition, because I favor it very strongly, but I wanted to get at the facts as to how it worked in the one instance when it was tried.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The purpose of the act of 1850 was to fix the membership for the future at 233, and the Constitution requires Representatives to be apportioned among the States according to population. Naturally some States would lose and some States would gain at the expense of others.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman does not touch upon my question. In fixing an arbitrary number, if you fix the ratio small enough and the total large enough it is possible to guarantee that in 10 years no State would lose any of its membership, and I was simply asking what was the fact as to whether there was a loss or not in the apportionment of 1860.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think not in 1860; because the apportionment under the census of 1860 was made in 1861 or 1862 after some six or seven States had withdrawn from the Union and the membership of 233 was apportioned among the rest of the States.

Mr. SHERLEY. So it really never had a trial?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; that is the real truth about it.

Now, I feel that the importance of this proposition can not be overestimated. I feel that legislation upon this line at this time may be depended upon as permanent legislation. Its moral influence will be so strong as to relieve the future from these troublesome problems that confront us, and in a large measure induce our action respecting the numerical size of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I want to ask if the committee has considered the question as to the effect of those States whose legislatures are now in session, whether or not, under the provisions of section 4 of this bill, the legislature can now redistrict the State and put in a proviso that it shall only become operative when Congress enacts and the President approves a measure of this kind? Would that be proper redistricting legislation at this time?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think so. Several States have already done so. The Legislature of Indiana redistricted that State for congressional purposes without any conditions on a basis of 13 Representatives. It will require a House of 433 to enable the State to maintain this membership, but it anticipated the wisdom of Congress in fixing the total membership at 433 and redistricted the State accordingly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I understand that the State of North Dakota passed such an act and the governor vetoed it, did he not?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know. The governor had a right to veto an act of that kind, but if he had not vetoed it, I think it would have been a valid act. Mr. Chairman, there is another amendment that I propose to submit, and that is in section 4 of the bill. In section 4, line 17, the clause "by the legislatures thereof" was not contained in the bill as it passed the House about two months ago.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct the attention of those Members who are apprehensive that a larger House might be beyond control in a parliamentary way that there are not 100 Members now present, and yet the confusion is such that gentlemen can hardly be heard at all.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that it might be very much worse if you had 200 disorderly Members.

Mr. KENDALL. Yes; but the gentleman has a right to presume that a large part of the membership will be absent, as it is now.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the ratio, while it may be the same, will leave a very much larger membership present.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, section 4 of the bill makes provision for a change of membership, and provides that additional Representatives shall be elected from States at large if there is no local provision otherwise, and where there is no change in the representation Members shall be elected from the districts as they are at the present time until the States change the districts. The section provides:

SEC. 4. That in case of an increase in the number of Representatives in any State under this apportionment such additional Representative or Representatives shall be selected by the State at large and the other Representatives by the districts now prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted by the legislature thereof in the manner herein prescribed; and if there be no change in the number of Representatives from a State, the Representatives thereof shall be elected from the districts now prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted as herein prescribed.

Now, the words "by the legislature thereof" were not in the bill as it passed the last Congress. They were put in by the committee, but the House struck them out. They are incorporated in this bill. What is its effect? In the discussion of the campaign publicity bill some days ago, when reference was made to the question of primary elections and things of that kind, gentlemen on the other side said, "Leave those questions to the States." I think under the act of 1901 this clause was in the bill. Up to that time there had been no other method established by any State in the Union for the redistricting, except by the legislature thereof. Since then a number of reforms have been accomplished; a number of States in the Union have established the institution of initiative and referendum. Some States are so equipped with the lawmaking machinery that they can legislate; they can redistrict their territory for congressional purposes without the aid or assistance of the legislature. Vofers may initiate propositions, and they may refer them to the people. This provision, if it has any effect at all, will prevent those States from exercising that great function of redistricting their States for congressional purposes by the initiative and referendum altogether.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Where a legislature is elected under an unfair gerrymander, as is the case in Missouri, would it not be fair for the people to have a chance to vote on a fair and equitable apportionment scheme?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the proposition I am just coming to. There is a temptation in all the States for the party

in power to take a little advantage in constituting congressional districts, a little party advantage. I do not believe, as a rule, any real permanent advantage ever came to a party for doing an unfair thing under the name of redistricting for perpetrating a gerrymander, but it happens sometimes, and we all have faith in the people. Representatives of States that have the initiative and referendum, are you willing to say that the people of your States may have the final determination of all legislation excepting the creation of congressional districts, a class of legislation that is more liable to be biased by party advantage than any other legislation? I stand here, Mr. Chairman, in this respect as the champion of the referendum, in the States that have established that institution [applause], and if politicians in the State legislatures make districts to suit their own particular ambitions or to enable their parties to secure an unfair advantage, should not the people of those States have the right to pass upon those acts of the legislature?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I understood that the gentleman is discussing section 4 of the present bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Now, with the exception of the last paragraph of that section, will the gentleman please tell us what difference there is in that bill, the one now presented, subdivision 4, and the act of January 16, 1901?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I said a moment ago there is absolutely none. The act of 1901 embodied this provision, but I said that up to that time there was not a State in the Union that had the institution of the referendum. There was not a State in the Union that had any other method of doing that business than by the legislature. Take the State of Missouri. Several years ago in the State of Missouri when the distinguished Gov. Folk was in the gubernatorial chair a legislature that I understand was altogether friendly to him made a law providing that if the legislature should fail to redistrict the State of Missouri for legislative and congressional purposes, the governor of the State should have the power to do it. That law is on the statute books to-day. There is a Democratic legislature now and a Republican governor. Has the State of Missouri the right by legislation to say how her districts shall be be made?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to state that it is practically the same with the subdivision as the act of 1901.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is not the same. It is the same in letter, but altogether different in spirit and purpose.

Mr. RAKER. Wherein is it different?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Because, I undertook to explain to the gentleman the difference, that there was not a State in the Union, and never had been up to that time, that had any other method than to make the redistricting acts by the legislature, so that it would not interfere with the right of a single State. Since 1901, the gentleman knows, many States have changed their method, and the proposition now is to say to the States, "You shall not exercise that power as you think wise, but you must exercise it as Congress says you shall."

Mr. RAKER. One more question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, I have answered the gentleman sufficiently, and if he can not see the difference between the provision in 1901 and this provision, considering the conditions and circumstances, I despair of convincing him.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, the gentleman need not despair for me. I have compared the bill, and I am asking a question, Why does the gentleman insert the word "select," in line 14, in this subdivision, instead of electing your Representatives? What is the object of this important change?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know. I did not prepare this bill. This is the Houston bill. This is the bill that the committee reported. The word "select" may have been used before, but it does not make any difference.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct the statement of the gentleman from Indiana, which he undoubtedly made without proper investigation, to the effect that the legislature of Missouri had enacted a law providing for the redistricting or districting of the State into congressional districts by the governor We have no such law, and there is no such law on the statute books.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I, of course, am glad to hear the gentleman's views, but I have heard from a good many men from the State of Missouri who held a different view of the question.

Mr. HAMLIN. Has the gentleman examined the statutes? They are available.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have not, but I just used that as a matter of illustration——

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman is a good lawyer, and if he wants to state a fact why did not he examine the statutes for himself?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I may be a little bit careless in stating things in the way of argument, but I merely used that law for the purpose of illustration. The point I am undertaking to make is that if any State should do in relation to congressional districts what the legislature, as the gentleman has said, has done in relation to legislative districts, this law will prevent them from doing it. You are State-rights people. Are you in favor of giving authority to Congress to interfere with the power of your State legislatures to handle by proper means legislative matters that are purely local? Are you willing to go on record in favor of a proposition of an act of Congress that will limit the power of the State legislatures to redistrict their States for congressional purposes? If Congress has the power to do this, it has the power to say what kind of districts you shall make. That may be the next step in legislation, depending upon exigencies and party conditions.

Mr. HAMLIN. Answering the gentleman's interrogatory, I am willing to let this law contain the same provision in that regard that the law passed by the Republicans in 1872, in 1882, in 1891, and 1901 contained. I am willing to stand by that.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, that is the only argument there is in favor of it—that the provision was in an act of Congress at a time when, by all history and conditions and public sentiment, there was no possibility of its interfering with any legislation of a State. The gentleman says, because it occurred under those circumstances, that he is willing to stand by it now when it will overthrow the cherished institutions of a great many States of the Union. If he is willing to stand by the provision on that kind of an argument, I have no criticism to make.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL], who has been standing on his feet some time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Something was said about the law of Missouri and the question of the governor redistricting the State. I will say to my friend now that I have a copy of the law that has been frequently referred to in this House upon that subject, and it plainly applies to the redistricting of the State for electoral purposes and not for congressional purposes. I have a copy of it here.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I notice this: When this measure was up for consideration in the last Congress this question came up in the committee and the Missouri situation was discussed, and every Member, I think, on the other side of the House stood together; they stood in solid phalanx for this provision. It looked like there was some fear lurking in this little clause. I can not believe that the whole Democratic Party is so hostile to the institution of referendum that they are opposed to submitting to the voters of their several States the right to say whether they are ready to perpetrate an unjust and unfair gerrymander. I can hardly believe that the whole Democratic Party occupies such an attitude as that. Then, what is the reason——

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I frankly say, Mr. Chairman, that I have not looked into this provision, and I never saw the bill until a few moments ago. It has just been reported in. But I represent one of the States where we have the initiative and referendum, adopted last fall, and I am very heartily in favor of it. I would like to ask whether the gentleman has looked into the matter sufficiently to say, in the event that a legislature does enact a reapportionment law that the people of the State look upon as unfair and they determine to refer it to the voters, can not the voters pass upon it and determine whether or not it is a good law, and, if they reject it, let the legislature pass a fair and just law? And the legislature would have to pass a law some time or other in conformity with this, the will of the people. In other words, the initiative would not apply to this matter, but merely to the referendum. The action of the people would be merely a veto on a bad gerrymander.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand it may. The initiative applies to all kinds of legislation where they do not have it in modified form—a mild type of it. When the act of Congress says it shall be done by the legislature thereof, that makes the legislature the supreme power.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. To initiate?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; to make the law. No power shall overthrow that—the referendum or anything else.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me ask you this question: Suppose the constitution of the States provide that all those legislative acts may be referred. Now, would it not have the effect——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That involves the question of whether the Congress has jurisdiction over the subject, and if it has, its laws are supreme.

If it has authority to legislate, its laws are higher than initiatives and acts of the legislatures, and constitutions in the bargain.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not seem to be able to make myself clear. My impression is—or that is my first thought about it—that it would be merely a veto power that the referendum would have.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Let me say to my good friend from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] that there is one easy way out of it, and that is by striking out the provision. Then you will not lose any sleep, and you can square yourself with your constituents when you go home by saying to them that you voted against the provision that it seemed might at least take from them the power to say whether your legislature had done an unfair thing in the dividing of the State into congressional districts.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If I thought the gentleman's construction was correct, I certainly would vote with him.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is danger of it.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana this question: Suppose any State should in its constitution provide for the initiative and referendum, or suppose it would in its constitution provide that the redistricting for congressional purposes should be made by the governor, or by a commission of 3, or 5, or 11, where, in the Constitution of the United States is there anything conferring upon Congress the authority to overturn those State constitutional provisions and dictate to the State the manner in which it shall be redistricted?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is some reference to the right of Congress to provide the manner, and some other things, in which Representatives of the House may be chosen.

Now I want to conclude in a minute.

Mr. OLMSTED. Shall choose the Representatives, but not make the districts in which they are to be chosen. The Constitution does confer upon Congress powers to regulate "the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives." If that gives Congress authority to dictate how districts shall be created it gives Congress itself authority to divide the States into districts.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman has stated that since 1901 several States have adopted the referendum, but has urged that against the reason for the inclusion of these words in section 4, "or by the legislature thereof." I desire to ask the gentleman if he can cite any State which has the referendum in which the question must not originally be referred by the legislature to the people before the people have a right to vote upon it?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know what the State provisions are, but I am simply contending that the States shall have the right to do this if they see fit to do so; and this provision, if it is enforced at all, will prevent the States from doing it. The States may desire to do it, and it may seem desirable. And now, let the States have the right in their own way to do these things and not undertake to control them by congressional legislation.

Mr. SMALL. Now, another question: In those States which have the initiative, is it not up to the legislature finally to confirm or approve it before it shall become a law?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; that is not necessarily so.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. People may initiate in States and have a provision referred, and if it is agreed to by the voters it is a law on proclamation of the governor, and I think it is irrepealable in some States by even the legislature.

Mr. NORRIS. That is right.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The legislature can not even repeal a law made in that way.

Mr. SMALL. And the initiative may be put in force without any subsequent act of the legislature?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, surely. The people can make laws while they are farming and carrying on the various activities of industrial life without going to the expense of having a legislature in session; and I think, if they see fit, they should make legislation fixing the boundaries of congressional districts.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado for a question.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. What is the amendment that the gentleman from Indiana suggests ought to be made?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Just to strike out the language "by the legislature thereof," in line 17, on page 4. That is all.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Now, let me suggest to the gentleman, would it not be better for this amendment to be made by the legislature of the State, and that would include the authority by initiative or referendum, or by the legislature in the States where they do not have initiative and referendum?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, that is a question that we might consider. I am going to support this amendment and give the House an opportunity to vote on it, on a motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; I will yield for a question. Then I must conclude.

Mr. RAKER. Do I understand that in the gentleman's State he has the initiative and referendum now?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, no.

Mr. RAKER. And do I understand that you are afraid in your State that if it is given to the legislature to redistrict your people will not have the opportunity to provide by the initiative and referendum for this apportionment of which you are so heartily in favor? Is that right?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, no. The State of Indiana does not happen to have the initiative and referendum, but I happen to be one of the lawmakers for California and for all the States of the Union. This provision here happens to be one of general legislation, one of general policy.

Mr. RAKER. I understand the gentleman is heartily in favor of the initiative and referendum?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am heartily in favor of allowing the States, under reasonable limitations, to do what they please, and I am against any act of Congress that will take from the States their power over a matter of this importance. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman does not answer the questions.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I expect to move to recommit the bill at the proper time with instructions to amend by incorporating section 3, that one making provision for the future, and the amendment I have just discussed.

Now I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that anything which may be said here and now can prevent the proposed increase in the membership of this House. However, I wish to utter my sincere and earnest protest because I believe that it is bad public economy; that it will prove harmful to the House, decreasing its efficiency as a legislative body, and that it means a loss of rights, privileges, and power to every Member.

PUBLIC ECONOMY.

At the opening of this session of Congress the great party now in power in this Chamber announced to the country that it had voluntarily lopped off useless employees and thus had effected a saving to the taxpayers of the country of $182,000. This announcement, I am convinced, was received by the people of the country with real satisfaction; not so much because of the amount of money saved, but because it suggested the new public spirit that is passing over the land. It suggested that the old sordid, selfish, and narrow practice was a thing of the past, and that the party now in power would move upon the higher basic principle of subordinating private gain and personal advantage to the public good.

THE REAL TEST.

May I remind gentlemen upon that side of the center aisle that it is not the first step that counts most, however important it may be in itself. It is the next and the next and the next, and so on to the end. It is an old proverb and true that it is not safe to praise the day until the night has come. Perhaps it is not safer to praise a political party until its course has been run. Sometimes it happens that when an evil spirit

is driven out it returns accompanied by other evil spirits, and then the last state is worse than the first. No political party can save $1 to-day of the people's money, then waste that dollar to-morrow and throw two good dollars after it, and expect praise for public economy. It was comparatively easy after all to lop off the salaries of employees, but the real test comes to us in this apportionment measure. Are we willing to risk our political lives in the interests of good public service? The real test is the personal test. I fear, however, that we will not stand this test. Personal self-interest is the controlling factor back of this proposed increase of membership. We might as well admit it and be honest with each other and the public.

CONSISTENCY VERSUS SELF-INTEREST.

Gentlemen, you have claimed that you propose to lop off the salaries of needless employees. I call your attention to the fact that this harmful increase of membership involves an increase of salaries to the amount of $315,000, or $33,000 more than the sum you claim you will save in the salaries of employees. If that saving was a virtuous act, why not be consistent and save this larger amount also? Is your self-interest in the way? I call your attention to the further fact that when you reckon the allowances for stationery and the mileage of these 42 additional Members once or twice a session, depending upon the frequency of extra sessions, and also the salaries of secretaries, you have reached a sum over $400,000, or more than twice the amount that you claim to save in lopping off the salaries of employees.

Now, if that was a praiseworthy act, then this is doubly so. Why not be consistent?

But that is not all. When you stop to reckon the cost of printing incident to the RECORD, incident to the circulation of speeches, incident to the circulation of documents; when you count the cost of the extra allowance for seeds and for bulletins for 42 more Members, and the use of the franking privilege; when you reckon the cost of providing for 42 rooms in the Office Building, with fixtures and furniture and supplies, and the extra employees necessary to take care of this increased membership; and, finally, when you estimate the increased appropriations that must be made—for these 42 additional Members will ask for their proportionate share in the public-building bills, in the river and harbor bills, and in many other public bills—you will find that half a million dollars is the minimum of tax burden you have imposed upon the country for all the years to come to meet your own selfish interests. [Applause.]

Again I say to you, if that first saving was a virtuous act, you have now a chance to more than treble it in quality and quantity.

HARM TO THE HOUSE.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a more serious objection than the mere matter of money expense. I believe that it will tend directly to decrease the efficiency of this House as a legislative agency in the public service. [Applause.] Writers upon legislative institutions now claim that the Senate is the superior legislative body in this country. I regret to say I believe that is true. They say it is due to the flexibility of the Senate rules, to the longer tenure of Senators, but especially to the reduced membership of the Senate as compared with the House.

If that be true, it is not the fault of the framers of our Constitution, because that instrument gave equal power to each branch of this Congress. It is the fault of those who have gone before us. They let their self-interest, their political ends, interfere, just as Members now propose to permit their political ends to interfere with doing justice to those who are to come after us.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON. Gladly.

Mr. JAMES. Is it not the experience of the gentleman that the less numerous branch of every legislative body is the one most generally extravagant with the people's money? And is it not further true that the appropriations made by Congress are always swelled by the other branch less numerous than this?

Mr. NELSON. No; that is not quite true. This House initiates appropriation bills and the other branch generally has to swell them in order to get what that body thinks proper and necessary. But we are not discussing that subject. We are discussing the difference between 391 and 433 Members in this body.

Mr. JAMES. I was merely suggesting that as an answer to the gentleman's position on the subject of economy. Is not the truth about it this, that that body which is most numerous and nearest the people always guards more carefully the public money, and that body farthest removed and least frequently elected is most extravagant with the people's money?

Mr. NELSON. That is due not to the number of Members in each body, but to the fact that the Senators are removed from the people by being elected by the State legislatures. [Applause.]

But to return to the point I was about to make when the gentleman from Kentucky interrupted. The amount of power in each legislative branch is equal under the Constitution. For the sake of illustration, let us assume that the power of each branch of the Congress may be represented as 100 legislative units. There are 92 Members of the Senate. It follows that each Senator represents about 1.2 units of legislative power; but with 391 Members in this House now, our power is so subdivided that each Member has less than 25 per cent of the power of a Senator. In other words, the power of each Senator is four times as great as the power of each Representative.

The Senator has, in fact, four times the opportunity of a Member in debate, four times the opportunity for offering amendments, four times the opportunity for service upon important committees, four times the opportunity of taking part in legislation upon the floor, and his vote counts four times as much in the enactment or defeat of legislation. And yet the committee proposes further to subdivide power of representation in this House by increasing its membership by 42, an increase of over 10 per cent. But gentlemen may say that the power remains in the House, however subdivided it may be among a numerous membership. This is technically true, but writers on legislative institutions assert that a legislative body, as a whole, in standing, dignity, power, and influence, is directly proportioned to the standing, dignity, power, and influence of its individual Members. This seems to me to be quite true, because I believe that a great legislative body can no more be constructed out of four or five hundred Lilliputian legislators than you can create a great world power out of a hundred million pigmy men and women. I will state the effect in this exact form: As we increase the membership we decrease the Member.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly I yield.

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of legislation by the initiative and referendum?

Mr. NELSON. I am.

Mr. SIMS. Then, if the gentleman is in favor of legislation by all the people, how does he square that by his argument for a reduced number in the legislative body?

Mr. NELSON. Oh, the claim that increase of membership makes the House more representative is sham, and the gentleman knows it as well as any of us. It is self-interest which is the real controlling motive here. This talk about getting nearer the people by increasing the membership is as meaningless as it is misleading and wholly devoid of real merit. The real purpose and motive that is back of this proposed increase was admitted by the chairman of the Committee on Census [Mr. HOUSTON]. He said it was the controlling motive, and it was also admitted by the ranking Republican member [Mr. CRUMPACKER] when he said that, looking to the future, he proposed to offer an amendment that would make it more difficult hereafter for self-interest to control the action of Members in fixing the membership of the House.

Mr. SIMS. I understood the gentleman to say that an increased number of legislators would reduce the power and dignity of the body and would weaken it.

Mr. NELSON. In the use of the initiative and referendum the gentleman knows that the people will vote only on one or a very few propositions, and that they will have a long time to consider them. The gentleman knows that a reduced membership is more efficient than a great, big, unwieldy body of four or five hundred men.

Mr. SIMS. What does the gentleman mean by "efficiency"?

Mr. NELSON. I mean by that, attending to the business of the country properly. But my objection, Mr. Chairman, goes further. In this increase I see a loss to every Member and to his constituency in representation. I appeal to every Member within the sound of my voice, if he has proper self-interest, if he has a proper self-respect, to vote against this surrender of his rights, powers, and privileges. If he has not, I ask him to consider his constituency and his successors in years to come.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. NELSON. I will yield.

Mr. CARLIN. I understood the gentleman to say that a smaller number of men would constitute a better legislative

body than a large one. If that be true, to carry out the gentleman's argument to the last analysis, would not the gentleman reduce the number below 391?

Mr. NELSON. With great pleasure; I would gladly vote for that proposition.

Mr. CARLIN. The gentleman would vote to reduce it to 191?

Mr. NELSON. I think about 200 or 250 would be a good working House of Representatives.

Mr. CARLIN. If the gentleman's argument is good, that a smaller number is better than a larger number, why not reduce it to 100?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's logic would reduce it to 1.

Mr. CARLIN. The logic of the gentleman from Wisconsin would reduce it to 1, not mine.

Mr. NELSON. To reverse it, if the gentleman's logic is right, a million is preferable to 250. [Applause.]

Mr. CARLIN. Well, do not let us reverse anybody's logic; let us take it as the gentleman stated it, that a smaller number is better than a larger number.

Mr. NELSON. I am talking about a reasonable thing and not something extreme either way. I am opposed to diminishing the number so that it would be lessened in efficiency, and I am opposed to increasing it, for the same reason.

Mr. CARLIN. The gentleman thinks that about 250 would be the proper number?

Mr. NELSON. I would vote for that.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's position is that he is against the number of 433?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; it is a choice between 391 and 433, and I am in favor of 391, and at the proper time I shall offer an amendment at the proper place in the bill to that effect.

Now, I call the attention of the House to this fact, that we have striven for reforms in this body; we have sought to make it a more efficient legislative body; we have sought to restore the rights, privileges, and the prerogatives of the Members of this body——

Mr. CARLIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NELSON. Very well.

Mr. CARLIN. If the gentleman thinks a membership of 250 is about what this House ought to be, why not offer his amendment for that instead of for 391?

Mr. NELSON. Because I am trying to attain that which is possible. I know that an amendment to fix the number at 250 would strike directly at the self-interest of too many Members, and I might possibly get the 391.

Mr. CARLIN. Does the gentleman think it possible to do so?

Mr. NELSON. I fondly hope so.

Mr. CARLIN. That does not answer the question. Does the gentleman think it possible?

Mr. NELSON. Oh, if you upon the Democratic side would rise to the occasion—you are responsible, if anybody shall be responsible, for this increased membership of the House.

Mr. CARLIN. We are going to rise to the occasion. That is what I am trying to tell the gentleman now.

Mr. NELSON. The country will hold the Democratic Party responsible for this increase in the burden of taxation placed upon the people, for the destruction of the efficiency of this House, and for the reduction of the individual rights of Members.

Mr. CARLIN. Does not the gentleman recall that the last House, a Republican House, voted for a membership of 433, and was he not a Member of that body?

Mr. NELSON. Only a fraction of the Republican Party voted in that way.

Mr. CARLIN. But it was a Republican House, and it passed that bill.

Mr. NELSON. Ah, by Democratic votes. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. CARLIN. The gentleman can not put the responsibility upon the minority, although we are glad in this instance to take the responsibility.

Mr. NELSON. But now you are in control, and you will be responsible.

Mr. CARLIN. We expect to be responsible for many years to come.

Mr. MANN. Great expectations!

RIGHTS OF MEMBERS SURRENDERED.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, we have striven to improve the efficiency of this House; we have striven to restore the rights and privileges of Members. Now we are taking a step that tends directly to destroy all of the good that we have accomplished. The present honored Speaker of this House is entitled to great credit, not only for having labored for the efficiency of the House as a legislative body but for restoring the rights and privileges to the membership of this body. With many on this side he labored to change the rules of the House to accomplish these desirable improvements; but now I fear that his eyes are fixed upon Missouri more than upon the United States.

What was our complaint? We complained of too much centralization of power in the hands of the few. An increase of 42 Members must necessarily, if the work of the country is to be done, tend to centralize power in the few or the one. We have complained that the Hall of the House is too large, and we have taken steps to remedy that evil; but if we now increase the membership we destroy our own purpose and we make the House too cramped to accommodate this increased membership.

We have complained of too much speech making in this Chamber, but an addition of 42 Members must necessarily tend to aggravate the talk evil. We have complained of lack of time to do the work of the country. Surely an addition of 42 Members, with increased roll calls and in other ways of wasting time, must directly tend to intensify that evil. We have complained of lack of individual recognition. The increase of membership must further destroy the opportunity of individual recognition in this House. We have complained of lack of committee assignments upon working committees. The increased membership must further tend to diminish every Member's opportunity for good committee assignments. The leaders have complained time and again of a growing lack of interest in the routine business of the House. An increase of membership, lessening each Member's proportion of the work, must directly tend to diminish individual interest in the routine of legislation. Writers in the press and in the magazines say that the great men, the Reeds, the McKinleys, the Clays, the Calhouns, the Websters, are no longer here.

If that be true, will this increase of membership, further diminishing our rights, privileges, and powers, induce Members of great talent and ability to serve in this House? Surely not. I most earnestly protest against this increase as an outrage upon the rights of Members and their privileges. [Applause.]

THE WISCONSIN SPIRIT.

It is not only economically bad, but it can not be defended upon any moral basis. Wisconsin is one of the States that will lose a Member if this proposed increase is not passed. Why should we not vote solidly for it? Self-interest would dictate that we should. We are against it because we know that the Wisconsin spirit would condemn us if we did. We would be sham representatives of old Wisconsin if we voted otherwise. Wisconsin not only preaches the doctrine of subordination of private gain and personal advantage to public good, but Wisconsin puts it into practice, and it is the Wisconsin spirit that is permeating the Nation to-day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NELSON. May I have more time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. NELSON. I thank both gentlemen, but I shall conclude presently. Is this proposition morally right? Gentlemen can easily see that if a "slush fund" was provided by private subscription with which to continue Members in this House it would be reprehensible, but here it is proposed virtually to provide an insurance fund at the public expense to maintain Members in this House. If a private jack pot is wrong is a public jack pot right?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. What is a jack pot?

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman knows; he lives in Missouri, and it was in Missouri that the jack pot was worked off. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has no right to assume that I know. I was asking the question what it is. I asked for the benefit of my friend from Illinois who applauded.

Mr. NELSON. I know the gentleman knows so much that he knows what a jack pot is.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. That is an assumption.

Mr. CARLIN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin know about a jack pot?

Mr. NELSON. We do not have the real jack pot in Wisconsin, but there has been of late too much use of money. I desire to say to the gentleman that if he cares to read the best corrupt-practices act ever enacted anywhere I want him to read the act that is about to be placed upon the statute books of Wisconsin. [Applause.]

Mr. CARLIN. Does the gentleman speak for the State of Wisconsin? Can the gentleman tell what acts they are going to put upon the statute books?

Mr. NELSON. I know their ability, desire, and pledge to do so. I have read the bill drafted, and I speak with knowledge so far as that is concerned.

Mr. CARLIN. I am glad to know the gentleman can do that.

Mr. KOPP. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON. I will.

Mr. KOPP. I am interested in knowing just why 433 was agreed upon. Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. NELSON. I think that everybody knows it was to prevent a loss to some States of Members in this House, and that is the controlling reason why so many now intend to vote for this proposed increase in representation.

But I must move on. I wish to remind gentlemen that we are sworn to faithfully discharge the duties of our office, and I believe that we can not keep that obligation if we permit our private interests or personal advantage to influence us against the public good. I believe that the right spirit can be defined in this way. It is said by the Highest Authority that "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend." May we not paraphrase that by saying, Greater love hath no man for his country than he who risks his life, if need be, for the public good, and may we not reverse it and say, Less love hath no man for his country than he who prostitutes the public service, as proposed in this bill, for private, personal, and political ends?

Mr. Chairman, to my mind it is perfectly clear that economically this proposed increase means an extravagant waste of the public funds; morally it seems a clear violation of our constitutional obligations in spirit if not in letter, and politically it appears to be in veiled form indirect treason to the best interests of our common country. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], a member of the committee.

[Mr. SMALL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] 10 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I will be understood as being entirely sincere in confessing the embarrassment a new Member must feel, exaggerated in my case by the attitude I am compelled, apparently, to take this afternoon. It is not an attitude of opposition to the bill, because it heartily meets my favor, but an attitude which may seem to older Members as rather forward in a gentleman as new as myself—a didactic or schoolmaster attitude. With this sincere apology I trust I shall not be misunderstood.

There are two views evidently manifest here to-day. They are views that must become manifest whenever the subject of the number of the membership of the House comes up. The membership here has two functions. There is the first function of representing the people, which requires numbers. There is again the second, the function of deliberating. It may seem a rash statement to make, but I think that the latter function has been nearly completely lost in this House, lost almost since the time of the war; and I want to suggest that in other countries with parliamentary experience as extensive as ours, a method seems to have been found which reconciles the circumstance of numbers sufficiently large to be representative with the equally important need for deliberative character in parliamentary work. What does deliberation mean? It does not mean oratory. No one, I am sure, will be so indulgent as to suggest that what is taking place this afternoon is "deliberation." It means consultation, not contentious and, perhaps, vainglorious speech. It requires an effective opportunity for each Member, at a time when the legislation is in its plastic state or its formative stages to contribute to its formation such knowledge or suggestion as he may have. That manifestly can not be well done in a body even as large as 100. It can not be done at all in a body as large as 400. Now, when I speak of the method adopted by other parliaments, understand me as speaking of absolutely every important country of Europe, except Great Britain. They have secured there not only the representative function by having a membership sufficiently large to be actually democratic—and I only stop to suggest the relation of large membership to democracy—but have safeguarded the deliberative function as well. At the opening of a session the President of the lower house of the German Parliament puts in a hat 397 names, corresponding to the membership of that body.

The first 40 taken out constitute section 1; the second, section 2; the third, section 3; and so on until the whole membership of the body has been covered. The operations of section 1 may be taken as illustrative of the operations of them all. It repairs to a room of its own, selects a chairman and a secretary. All general bills are referred to the sections in a prescribed order and are considered by all the sections, at the same time, in their different rooms. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is absent, the ladies and our constituents are absent, and so a great deal of "punk" is taken out of the discussion. [Laughter and applause.] The discussion of the measure, therefore, becomes meet and relevant, suggestive and consultative rather than oratorical; and all the points made are taken down by the secretary. When they are through with the consideration of the measure a reporter or spokesman is selected by the section. He is usually the man who has studied and obtained special knowledge of the particular subject, and in a body large enough to be representative there is apt to be a man specially qualified with regard to the particular subject. The spokesman reports to the Speaker of the House the fact that the section has concluded its consideration of the measure. When a majority of the reporters have so reported a meeting of the reporters of all the sections is called by the Speaker, which meeting is known as the central section. The reporters of the central section compare their reports, eliminate the mere chaff, reduce to a common method of expression the many various ways of stating a provision, and make a complete analysis of the arguments in relation to the bill, when a report is made by the reporters in common to the House itself. The measure then goes on the calendar of that body to receive such treatment as the general parliamentary rules may prescribe for its final disposition.

Now, the features of these deliberative divisions are these: Every member in such a parliament has an effectual opportunity at some time during the progress of a measure and while it is plastic and formative to contribute an amendment or suggestion; an effective opportunity to deliberate; for the real deliberation takes place in those sections as they sit coincidentally upon a particular measure. That is one of the virtues.

Another virtue is that the law of the survival of the fittest has an application to the Members without regard to whether they are new Members or old; there is a process of selection securing the talent most apposite to the measure. If it so happens that the new Member belonging to a particular section shows, let us fancy, particular knowledge about parcels post or a compensation bill, that he knows more of that subject than the others and will be best able to handle it in a competent manner, he is selected as the reporter for that measure and submits the report of his section to the central section. If, again, it transpires that in the central section he displays the same superiority, he is selected as the common reporter for the central section, representative of the whole deliberative body. In that way, in utter disregard of the mere accidents of the distribution of committee appointments, the man most competent, the person most representative of the views of the majority of the deliberative body, is selected to steer the measure before the House when it reaches that stage.

A characteristic illustration of its operation may be seen in the instance of a very distinguished man, the late prime minister of France. As every member belongs to some section and has an opportunity to participate in the consideration of every measure referred to it, it eventuated in his case, with regard to a notable measure, that he was considered the most competent master of the subject in his section. He was accordingly selected by his section as the spokesman for it. In the central section again, the same fact developed. He was again the man selected to steer the measure through the turbulent House of Deputies of France. He was next heard of throughout the world as Briand, the prime minister of France, although belonging to an extremely minor party, with very radical feelings and opinions, and in a country that respects property as much as we do here. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COVINGTON. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

Mr. HOUSTON. The time is all promised.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] to give the gentleman half my time, whatever it is.

THE FUNCTION OF DELIBERATION.

Mr. LEWIS. It never could have been intended that the membership of the House should completely delegate to a mere fraction of itself the exclusive power to deliberate on its meas-

ures. That is, however, the fact. When a committee has concluded with a measure and the form it has given it is before the House, that form is commonly too rigid to receive amendment. The amendment proposed may be good, it may be insufficient in form, but capable of being made good, it matters little, it might as well be wholly bad for any real chance it may have for adoption. It is a matter of surprise, often of chagrin, to our constituents to find us voting down amendments on the floor which seem to be along the lines of our known views. There are reasons for such action, which a short experience renders plain enough. First, excluded from participation in the deliberations of the committee on the measure the average Member does not know the measure as thoroughly as he should. Second, under such circumstances he naturally presumes the committee's work to be thorough enough. Third, he feels that the House may not wisely reform the measure, and that the amendment may not consist with the rest of the measure. Added to these reasons are the appeals made in the name of the chairman of the committee—a kind of subparty potentate. One or the other or all of these reasons usually act, and so the measure is usually crystallized in the form it leaves the committee. With rare exceptions its plasticity does not survive its formative life in the committee room, and its reformation in the House becomes impossible for want of a workable deliberative function there.

AYE-AND-NAY VOTERS.

The absence of a real prerogative of deliberation in the Member is a most serious infirmity in any parliamentary body; it reduces the Members to mere aye-and-nay voters on referendums from the committees. But in our system, with a popular House designed to give legislative voice to the demands of the people and a nonrepresentative body to impose vetoes on its work, the loss of real deliberative power is a matter of grave and fundamental concern. Many consequences flow from it, none of them good, and not the least evil or the least certain of the evils, is a radical departure of character in the Member himself. Denied the opportunity to actively participate in the formation and determination of legislation, his energies seek other fields. He can attend to his "fences" if denied occupation in attending to the real needs of his people, and this diversion of character and function as a fact has become so accepted that a "hard-working Representative" is now commonly recognized as the more active seed and pamphlet distributor, the digger for jobs and for favors for his voting friends. The great honor and the great opportunity for public service designed in the Constitution has degenerated into a mere job.

EVOLUTION OF PROCEDURE—REAL FUNCTION OF COMMITTEE.

The rightful purpose of a committee is to investigate and determine particular conditions of facts. It may be likened to a grand jury and has the same inquisitorial talents and efficiency. To ascertain facts and circumstances not within the common knowledge of Members and to report its findings is a highly useful function and one that no one could wish to impair—a function sufficiently extensive and important, even legitimately confined, when we realize that it covers the whole field of "private" legislation, including every measure in which an appropriation is the principal object. This field requires acquaintance with particular facts and unstable conditions, so minute and so multiplied that the aggregate membership can not encompass them and must act in scouting parties rather than as a whole. Of its efficiency as a tribunal for acquiring facts and determining them I have heard of no general complaint. This is its natural function, and it performs it reasonably well. How stands the matter with regard to general lawmaking? I mean by "general lawmaking" those subjects with which the common knowledge of the House and the will of its Members are competent to deal. There are such subjects; they concern the general welfare; opinions upon them are determined by general knowledge, whether of reading or experience. The House, if sufficiently large in numbers to be representative, will have competent knowledge of them and will exercise a judgment broader in its vision and a constructive disposition wiser in its outlines than any mere committee can be expected to do. "In a multitude of counselors there is wisdom" with respect to such subjects, and though not so numerous they are by far the most important coming before this body. What has been the record of the committee system? Diverted from its true function and wrongly applied to general legislation, dethroning the deliberative function of the House, its results may be summarized as—

(*a*) Nonrepresentative knowledge of the subject and a fractional view in forming the measure.

(*b*) Indifference to legislation and insufficient attention.

(*c*) Particular susceptibility to obstructive influence, from its weakness of numbers and dependence on chairman. No journal and insufficient publicity of conduct of its members.

(*d*) "Packed" committees and legislation delayed a generation, and then only partial solutions, and another generation required for adequate solution.

Just as surely as the House has lost the power to deliberate, so has the committee method shown itself to be subversive and ineffectual when wrongly applied to general legislation. Is there a remedy which will relieve the committee of its abnormal duties and restore the proud power of deliberation to the membership of this House?

DELIBERATIVE SECTIONS OR DIVISIONS.

The evolution of parliamentary agencies has been usually twofold. The committee agency has already been discussed. The second agency is the deliberative division, variously called in other countries the sections, bureaus, or groups, and designed to overcome the difficulties of deliberating in bodies sufficiently large to be representative. Both agencies have developed, like the two arms of our bodies, in corresponding degrees in nearly all countries except Great Britain and our own, and are in actual use in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Russia, Spain, and Switzerland, and perhaps others. To prevent packing, the divisions are always constituted by lot. At the opening of the session the presiding officer draws from a box containing identification numbers for the whole membership, say 40 names, which will constitute section 1. The next 40 drawn will constitute section 2, and so forth, until the whole membership has been assigned in sections. Each section selects its chairman and secretary and keeps a journal showing the attendance of members, their votes, and so forth. The sections assemble daily in their rooms for examination and discussion of the subjects of general legislation before the House, in an order determined upon, and minutes are taken of the points discussed and of amendments and suggestions. When a conclusion has been reached a reporter (spokesman) is selected, who makes a printed report to the presiding officer, who, when a majority of the sections have so concluded, calls a meeting of the central section, composed of the reporters of the several sections, which reports the measure to the house, after having fully analyzed it, eliminated the chaff in the reports from the sections, and stated the real points in controversy, appointing a common reporter to present the subject. Rules are provided to facilitate consideration of the measures referred to the sections, and agencies provided for determining the order of precedence of measures before the sections. I append brief, and necessarily incomplete, summaries of the institution as practiced in a number of countries.

FEATURES OF DELIBERATIVE DIVISIONS.

(*a*) Real deliberation of entire membership on general legislation.

(*b*) Effective opportunity in each Member to participate in formation of measure while it is plastic.

(*c*) Full consideration of amendments while measure is in its formative stages.

(*d*) Discussions in sections more relevant, and mental attitude of Members more receptive. Chaff eliminated in central section.

(*e*) Member gets more minute acquaintance with the features of the measure; and resulting discussions in the House are in closer relation to the real controversy.

(*f*) More thorough thrashing out of arguments pro and con in the sections, and a final analysis of all in the reports.

(*g*) The survival, or natural selection, of the fittest, and utilization of the best knowledge and talent in the House, irrespective of the accidents of new membership or committee preferences.

(*h*) Elimination of packing of committees, or obstruction of progressive legislation in committees. Real publicity in sections and journal of its proceedings.

(*i*) Sections fully responsive to intelligent public demands; representative, and therefore, broader views in formation of measures.

ADAPTATION TO UNITED STATES.

There are manifestly some slight differences which would invite modifications of the institution when applied to this body. The most obvious only can be dealt with now. The political constitution of the sections would have to harmonize with the political character of the majority here, and this could be accomplished by the simple device of having two boxes to draw from, representing respectively the major and minor parties. If the membership were 433 and the majority were 83, then each would have, as near as might be, the same relative number in each section. By drawing from the boxes in each section in proportion to ratio of party representation,

both parties would be secured their numerical rights in the constitution of the sections, and the will of the majority be always in a position to act.

JURISDICTION OF SECTIONS.

Broadly speaking, the deliberations of the sections should extend to all matters in which principles and general knowledge are the necessary qualifications for judgment. This embraces nearly all legislative subjects which affect the relations of citizens to each other, and are defined by the law writers as substantive and remedial rights. Their determination make drafts upon the common sentiment and intelligence only, and do not require the inquisitorial and fact-hunting processes of a committee. This policy would refer all private measures and, perhaps, all appropriation bills to the committees, and leave to the sections those much less numerous but much more important mandates of legislation, which determine the rights of the people from age to age. Jurisdictional questions would, of course, arise. It might be a matter of doubt with some whether the question of fortifying the Panama Canal should go to committee as carrying an appropriation or to the sections as determining a serious question of national policy. But these questions arise now, and are even more complex when determining to which committee a bill shall go.

ORDER OF PRIORITY—IN SECTIONS.

Methods for ascertaining the precedence of measures for consideration before the sections are, of course, matters of the first importance, and should be adapted here, as in other countries, to the real conditions of legislative necessity. There are doubtless some subjects which should have a formal or dogmatic precedence, to be defined by rule, though I shall not stop to name them now. Generally speaking, in our system the order of priority of specific measures should be determined by a resolution of the House at the beginning of each Congress. This would mean the party caucus, and its operation ought to result in eradicating the abuses of filibustering of such recent and deleterious occurrence here. There are many ways in which the majority could make its selection of subjects for precedence of treatment, and it is accomplished abroad upon demand from a majority of the sections. The President's message, when the House is of his party, or the party platform when not, would be charts of guidance; and popular demands, acting on the majority, in cases of more recent occasion, would naturally determine the really momentous consideration of the disposition of parliamentary time.

I shall not enter into a discussion of numerous minor matters related to the main proposition—how many should constitute a section; how many a quorum for a section; how long each day the sections should deliberate; whether they ought to be reconstituted each month, as abroad, to secure wider acquaintance of Members and to prevent the development of concentrative control, as in our committees. These are matters of importance, but yet of a detail too extensive for the present state of the discussion. I have introduced a resolution (H. Res. 108) asking the Committee on Rules to investigate the subject in general and report to the next session a plan of organization which will restore to the House a real deliberative character and guarantee each Member his prerogative, an opportunity to participate in the formulation of its bills and resolutions. Its report should give us the desired information on a subject as to which our notions and practices appear to be provincial and at odds with the prevailing examples of the world. The growth and adaptation of the deliberative divisions in so many countries show the need to be universal and the institution the natural means of securing representative numbers and deliberative character, the fundamental essentials of parliamentary government.

CONCLUSIONS.

Deliberation must be restored to the membership. The House of Representatives must become what it was designed to be. It can not longer remain an agency unable to deliberate even when it wants to, under the control of obsolete and misused committees, where standpatism can pigeonhole and strangle, in suffocation rooms, legislation necessary to place the people's Government in effective relation with new and abnormal social conditions.

I know there are those who do not trust the people, do not trust even their Representatives here. Indeed, they do not want legislation at all, and think the Government should have but two functions—police to quell the violence and firemen to extinguish the flames that may imperil their property—and since both of these most useful agencies are already provided, they secretly wish that legislatures and Congress should only meet to appropriate their salaries and then adjourn. There is another class entirely honest, often mere doctrinaires, which gives itself the highly complimentary name of conservative—a conservatism, as has been said, "that is afraid to brush down the cobwebs lest the ceiling may fall."

I know the potency of inertia in public bodies and habit in individuals. I do not denounce either, but I refuse to sacrifice all progress and the future on their altars. They have surely had their day since the war, and now the cords that have bound us to their inertia are breaking from the sheer force of our growing organism. This Government, after all, is not a mere eighteenth century script, incapable of adjusting itself to modern conditions. A great transition has been achieved and will have its own. In the words of one justly celebrated:

THE LIBERAL PLATFORM.

We have come upon a new constructive age, an age of reconstruction [which] calls for high gifts and men of indomitable purpose.

We have begun to get a complete vision of our problems and of the policies that must solve them.

Many of the old formulas of our business and of our politics have been outgrown.

Responsible business and genuine representation of the people in government is our program.

We are cutting away anomalies, not institutions.

We are no longer in the temper of attack. We are ready for remedy and adjustment.

We have ceased to be divided into alarmists and defenders of society and begun to redivide ourselves into workable groups.

There are tories in both parties, but there are also liberals in still greater numbers, and the two kinds are now rapidly shifting themselves about and drawing together.

Parties are re-forming while labels remain unaltered.

Whichever party proves most fit to conceive and put through a wise, progressive program will become the liberal party of the Nation.

The real powers of the Chamber have been taken from its Members, because of the impracticability of their exerting them, acting as an entirety, and have been swallowed up by the committees; the Member as such has been extinguished, and hence the haste and struggle for positions on the committees which have controlled all the potencies of the House.

What do the people think of this, Mr. Chairman? Well, sir, they believe that the old organization and procedure of the House has been subversive of their rights and such as to prevent consideration of popular measures. I do not invent the term "morgue" as applied to the committees. The rule giving exclusive cognizance to the committees over the initiatory and formative stages of legislation has vested them with complete control of the "passes" over the whole territory of public legislation, and it commonly requires something akin to a revolution to lead a popular measure through their defenses. Hence the anomalous condition that the United States, far in advance of other nations in its private enterprises, lags far in the rear in progressive legislation. It is a generation since bills for the establishment of a parcels post have been introduced in the House. So far as I can learn this subject has never been permitted to come before the House for either decisive or deliberative consideration. In the occupation of railroading over 80,000 employees are injured and 4,000 killed each year. Compensation laws have been passed to indemnify them in the countries of Europe from Spain to the Isles of Greece. Yet here no action has been taken, because a committee refused to consider or report on the bill sent it, and a special committee appointed a year ago to investigate the subject has not so far held a meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the logic of the deliberative division sound, but I should not have been bold enough to present it were it not recommended by the whole current of parliamentary procedure of the prominent nations of the world, and I feel that this is the occasion to work a reform of the methods of the House. We have a warrant—yes, even a mandate—from the people. It was their disgust with the old system, with the cliques that had absorbed in themselves the power of legislation and deprived their Representatives of their constitutional prerogatives, that largely produced the recent political revolution. Gentlemen, we are to be judged by what we fail to do as well as by the quality of what we may do. The people want tariff reform, but that is not all they want. They want this House so organized that the wisdom of measures introduced by their Representatives can be considered by this body, so organized as to promote consideration of legislation in their interests and promotive of the common welfare.

APPENDIX.

NOTES FROM "RULES AND PROCEDURE OF FOREIGN PARLIAMENTS," BY DICKINSON, 1890.

AUSTRIA.

[Page 350.]

In the Reichsrath the nine sections are chosen by lot at the beginning of each session in as nearly equal numbers as possible by the bureau of the House, and new members are added in the same way. Each section elects a chairman, vice chairman, and two secretaries.

Committees are formed for previous deliberation on the orders of the day, either by the sections of the House, the whole House, or both

together. In the first case, each section elects one or more members of the Chamber at large, and is not confined in its choice to its own members.

HUNGARY.

[Page 354.]

Besides the judicial committees the House is divided by lot immediately after its constitution into nine sections (p. 355). The sections and committees elect out of their own body, by an absolute majority, a permanent president and secretary. The sections or committees can not refuse to consider any bills which have been laid before them by the Government. As soon as the sections have finished their discussion they nominate a reporter for every subject, hand over to him the minutes relating to it, and give notice thereof to the president of the House through their own president.

[Page 356.]

When this notification has been given on the part of five sections the president of the House informs the reporters to form a central committee, and also informs the remaining section. The chair of this central committee is occupied by the president of the House or one of the vice presidents appointed by him, but without the power of voting.

Having heard the opinions of the various reporters, the central committee appoints a reporter, whose duty it is to support the views of the committee in the House.

The report of the central committee, having been printed and circulated, is placed on the order of the day within at least three days. The House can refer the matter back to the central committee or to the section for a fresh discussion, and in this case the sections can nominate fresh reporters.

BELGIUM.

[Page 359.]

The Assembly is divided by lot into six sections, consisting of 22 members each, which are renewed every month in the same manner.

Each section, after having named its president, vice president, and secretary, examines the proposals and amendments which are sent to it, following the order indicated by the Chamber, and at the conclusion of its labors nominates a reporter, who is elected by an absolute majority of votes.

When two-thirds of the sections have terminated the inquiry, the reporters named by them give notice to the president, who assembles them under his own presidency in a central section, after having warned the sections which are still in arrears. The central section, by an absolute majority, appoints one of its members to make the report to the Assembly. This report contains, in addition to the analysis of the deliberation of the sections and of the central section, the resolutions which have been agreed to. It is printed and circulated at least two days before the discussion in the General Assembly, unless the Chamber decides otherwise. The Chamber chooses for the duration of each section two prominent committees, etc.

[Page 360.]

Every month each section names one of its members to form the committee of petitions.

FRANCE.

[Page 363.]

The 11 sections or bureaus into which the Chamber of Deputies is divided by lot are rechosen every month in the same manner. They regulate their business according to the orders of the day as fixed by the Chamber and choose their own presidents and secretaries by ballot. No vote, however, is valid except at least a third of their members are present.

At the time of the committal of a bill or proposal to the sections for their consideration the Chamber can, on demand of one of its members, decide that the nomination of the members of the committee shall be made by "scrutin de liste," either in the whole House or in the bureaus.

At the commencement of each session the sections nominate for the entire year a committee of 11 members to superintend the accounts of the Chamber. At each renewal of the sections four monthly committees are named, viz, one known by the title of the "commission d'initiative," and consisting of 22 members, to which every bill emanating from a deputy is referred by the Chamber, and which is charged to report as to whether it shall be taken into consideration, etc.

[Page 365.]

The Senate is divided into nine sections, which are chosen every month by lot, and their functions are the same as those of the lower Chamber. Contrary, however, to the rule in that Chamber, the sections of the Senate have no quorum, and they can vote even if a majority of their members is not present.

GERMANY.

[Page 366.]

Besides the permanent election committee, six other committees are chosen from the sections, for the consideration of the business, etc. All the sections choose equal numbers of their members for a committee by written votes, and an absolute majority is necessary. The chancellor must be informed of their meetings (p. 368) and of the questions which are under discussion. The committees and sections issue regulations about their orders of the day, and the president has the right to fix the days for the sitting of the section.

ITALY.

[Page 369.]

The Italian Chamber of Deputies is divided by lot into nine sections or bureaus, which are renewed every two months in the same way. Each section nominates its president, vice president, and secretary by an absolute majority, and to insure the validity of its proceedings at least nine deputies must always be present.

Every section examines the motions and amendments that are sent to it in the order indicated by the president. At the conclusion of the examination it nominates a reporter. When two-thirds of the sections have nominated their reporters, the latter assemble in the central section, state the opinions of each section, and discuss together the proposals to be made to the Chamber. At the termination of the discussion they nominate by an absolute majority a reporter, who makes a report to the House, which must be printed and distributed at least 24 hours before the public debate takes place, unless otherwise ordered by the Chamber, etc.

[Page 370.]

The Chamber also nominates three prominent committees, etc. The nominations of these committees are made by secret ballot, unless the Chamber decides otherwise.

[Page 371.]

After the nomination of its officers, the Senate (a very numerous body) is similarly divided by lot into five bureaus, renewed every two months. Out of these is formed a central bureau, which in its term nominates a reporter to present its reports to the House.

All bills and motions presented to the senate are referred to its sections, or to committees specially chosen for the purpose.

JAPAN.

[Page 371.]

And in order to engage in the examination of matters falling within its province, the several sections from among the members of the House respectively elect an equal number of members to the committee. The term of membership of the standing committee lasts during a single session only.

NETHERLANDS.

[Page 372.]

The upper and lower Chambers of the States-General are each divided by lot into five sections, which are renewed every one or two months in the same manner. The lots are drawn in a public sitting by the president, who, after having called out each member's name separately, draws out of a box a ticket, which indicates the number of the section to which the respective member is to belong. Each section then elects a chairman and vice chairman, and their names are communicated to the president.

The central section is composed of the president of the Chamber and the chairmen of the different sections, sittings being also attended by the reporter. One of their number is especially elected to preside, etc.

All the bills sent by the King to the Chamber, after having been printed and circulated, are forwarded to the section. Those bills the debates on which have not yet begun at the renewal of the section are referred to the new one, and bills which are closely connected with others that were formerly sent to the Chamber may be referred to the same sections which have to deal with the previous one. The central section arranges the order in which the different bills are to be deliberated upon and informs each member, as soon as possible, of its decision, but this does not prevent any member from bringing in a motion for the purpose of amending a resolution of the central body. Should the central section consider a consultation with one or more members necessary respecting the order of the work to be done in the sections, the member or members must be communicated with through the president.

[Page 374.]

Two whole days are usually allowed to elapse between the circulation of a bill and its consideration by the sections, unless the central section is of opinion that the matter is urgent. The chairmen of the sections arrange together, if necessary, the order of debate in the sections so as to give each member an opportunity of explaining his views. Each section appoints one of its own members to act as reporter on the bills, but no member is obliged to report on more than two bills unless a new bill should be in close connection with the former one. Each member is at liberty, provided he is present at the meeting of the section, to bring forward memoranda, written or signed by himself, containing his views on the bill or some amendment of it. These notes are read and then handed to the reporter, who delivers them to the committee of reporters.

As soon as the debate in all the sections is closed, the committee of reporters is assembled, the recorder also being summoned. The committee elects one of its own members or the recorder as its general reporter. The reporters communicate to each other every question which has been discussed in the different sections, and consider also how they can best explain the principle of each bill, so as to frame their report to the House in accordance with these considerations. Should it then appear that in one or several of the sections important points have been discussed, which in others have been passed over, the committee can request the president of the Chamber to assemble these sections in order to deliberate together on these particular points. In this case the deliberations and resolutions of the committee of reporters on these points are suspended until after the further deliberation of the section.

NOTE.—Committees selected by sections.

[Page 375.]

In the case of financial bills the committee of reporters frequently presents a provisional report, and is at liberty to take a similar course with other bills if it should appear necessary to do so.

[Page 376.]

The report of the committee of reporters is laid on the table at the House, and is read by the reporter whenever the Chamber requires it.

SPAIN.

[Page 378.]

Each Chamber is divided into seven sections, which discuss separately the bills or any other subjects which may be presented to them, and decide as to whether or not they shall be further proceeded with in the House. The sections of the Senate are reconstituted every two months, while those of the lower House are nominated for the whole session, but are required to select a fresh president and vice president and two fresh secretaries every month. As soon as a measure has been fully considered by each of the sections, a committee of seven members, one from each section, is chosen to lay their opinion before the Cortes.

RUSSIA.

In the Russian Duma the institution of sections for deliberative purposes obtains, but the particulars are not available.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of this committee for his very great courtesy in allowing me this time, when there are so many others who wish to be heard who champion his side of the argument.

At the outset I wish to say that I am opposed to his position and intend to vote against the bill. I wish also to commend him for his very frank statements at the beginning of his remarks, and I wish to indorse much of what he has said in that argument as it applies to the fairness with which the committee sought to frame this bill. I do not know but that the method is all right. I only object in the main to the size of the House of Representatives as it is to be made under the operations of this bill. He was very frank when he said that the chief actuating cause or motive which fixed the number of

Representatives at 433 was that no State under such a division or representation should lose a single Member. This is borne out by the statement in the report, briefly contained in three or four lines, as follows:

Under this apportionment no State will lose a Member. One of the controlling reasons in fixing the membership of the House at 433 is the fact that this number is the lowest number that will prevent any State from losing a Representative.

I could add to that by quoting the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], whose position at this time is strangely mystifying to me, to say the least, because I remember in the last Congress he was one of the warmest advocates we had on this floor in favor of a bill that was identically, I believe, the same as the present one.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], in his statement, frankly confesses that according to his view there would hardly be any division of sentiment upon this floor if we were to vote according to our own honest convictions. That sentiment would be strongly against the bill. As to the size of representation in the House of Representatives, he said the controlling motive was conceded by all to be that not a single State in the Union should lose any number of its Representatives.

But another thing that rather surprised me was his desire to foist upon a succeeding Congress, 10 years in advance, the checking of any future similar legislation, and that it should be governed or controlled or guided in any way by the precedent that we here to-day are to establish. It seems to me, gentlemen of the House, that we could show our good faith no better to succeeding Congresses in having our intentions now evidenced by our actions than by refusing to pass this bill and limiting the number down to at least 400 Members. It seems to me that, in effect, we are appealing to the country and saying, "Overlook our act to-day. We know it is unwise, but we are going to fix it in such a way that in consequence of an amendment that is to be tacked onto this bill our successors can not enlarge the size of the House any more."

Now, I think that 10 years hence human nature will be very largely what it is to-day. It has been universally acknowledged that no act of Congress to-day can bind our successors 10 years hence so as to restrict their action. And although the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has ventured the statement that it is law, and will be a law until repealed, there are plenty of reasons which can be advanced for repealing such a law by a future Congress that may be guided, and will be guided, I will say, by the same selfish motive that actuates us here to-day.

Where is this going to end if the controlling motive to-day, as we all concede, is that no State shall lose its present number of Representatives? What is going to follow 10 years hence, or 20 years hence, or even 30 years hence? We all know that some of the States of the Union have a less population now than they had 10 years ago. Are the Representatives of States that are going ahead and doubling their population to be required to consent in future decades to a reapportionment which will add to the number of Representatives in this House simply to keep up without diminution the number of Representatives from those States that are falling behind in the procession after we set this precedent? It seems to me that it is an entirely wrong basis on which to act.

I differ with the gentleman who has charge of this bill in his assertion that the people of this country want this bill to be passed, and are only waiting for it to pass. I believe, gentlemen, there is an overwhelming majority of the people of the United States against further increasing the membership in the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Republican side.] I believe if we should submit that question to a vote to-day there is hardly a State in the Union where there would not be a two-thirds majority registered against it, and in some cases a much larger proportion.

To my friends on the Democratic side of the House I wish to say that, starting in with the splendid record we have made for economy by lopping off many useless employees, at an annual saving of some $180,000, and making provison, as I understand, for further economies—I can only suggest that by one act of ours, if we will take that step, we can say to the country that we have saved, not for this year only but for each year of the ensuing decade, at least half a million dollars extra in the expense that will be involved by adding 41 Members to this body.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SHARP. I do.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he has figured out the amount of difference for salaries that will be occasioned by this proposed increase of membership? Will it not be $350,000?

Mr. SHARP. I think so.

Mr. TRIBBLE. And I would also ask the gentleman, Will there not have to be additional office buildings, too?

Mr. SHARP. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. And will it not require the expenditure of millions of dollars to erect and equip those buildings?

Mr. SHARP. I do not think it will be that much, but the amount will be large.

I went into this question somewhat at the last session of Congress, and I hope I will not be as lonesome at this session as I was then, when I happened to be one of only two Members that voted against it.

Mr. GRAHAM. How far would the gentleman follow his logic as to economy? If we are to economize by preventing an increase of the present membership, would he follow that line of argument and reduce the present membership to, say, 300 for the sake of economy?

Mr. SHARP. I do not know but I would be willing to say 300, although it seems to me——

Mr. GRAHAM. Why not 200?

Mr. SHARP. There is an arbitrary line beyond which we should not, with reason, go. We must fix it at some limit; but I will say that it is a remarkable coincidence, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] pointed out awhile ago, that the least possible number was selected that would maintain the same representation that each State now enjoys—that is, by not reducing the representation of any State. That very action shows that in considering this question the committee was largely governed by the desire to make the representation just as small as possible, consistent with keeping, at least, the present representation of every State.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is not this a case where efficiency is so much more desirable than economy that the mere question of economy ought to be subsidiary?

Mr. SHARP. I fully agree with the gentleman, and I have been wondering why so many Members defend a larger representation. It is a question of efficiency. It is a question of quality and not of quantity, and the gentleman's question answers his own argument.

It seems to me, in conclusion, for my time is brief, that the Democratic Party, carrying on its splendid work of economy so well begun, could make a most favorable impression on the country by refusing now to increase the size of this House. Let its action be a landmark in the history of this country that the Democratic Congress that came into power in 1911, the Sixty-second Congress, again turned back to a precedent established 70 years ago, by which in 1840 the number of Representatives was reduced, the work of increasing the membership halted, and that number not increased for 30 years thereafter. I appeal to you, who are familiar with the history of those times, to bear witness to the fact that in those Congresses, 1840, 1850 to 1860, we had some of the ablest men who ever sat in this Chamber. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I seldom agree with gentlemen on the other side of the House, but upon this occasion I heartily concur with the remarks of the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. SHARP].

Were I to consult only selfish interests I would probably be in favor of the bill as it is reported to the House. If the House retains its present number of Representatives, California will gain 2 additional Members. If the membership is increased by 42, as provided in the pending bill, the State of California will be entitled to 3 additional Members. But I feel that this is a question broader than the selfish interest of any State or congressional district. [Applause.] In determining a question of such vital importance, touching as it does the very dignity and reputation of what we are pleased to term the "greatest legislative body in the world," we should be influenced by the highest and most patriotic motives.

I do not believe there is a Member on either side of this Chamber who would contend for one moment that the present House of Representatives should be enlarged, were it not for the fact that by retaining the membership at its present number certain States whose populations are dwindling would lose a part of their representation. I regret that the pending measure does not contain the amendment embodied in the bill reported at the last session by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]. That amendment, which is again to be offered, provided in substance that as soon as the Fourteenth Decennial Census should be completed, 10 years hence, and after

each subsequent census, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor should ascertain the population of all the States and each State separately, which aggregate population should be divided by the number 430, and that the quotient of such division should be the ratio of apportionment of Representatives among the several States.

In other words, although the Census Committee at the last session reported in favor of an increase of 42 Members, by the terms of the amendment just cited an attempt was made, as far as it is possible for one Congress to bind a future Congress, to prevent increases in the future. This was a plain acknowledgment of the unwisdom of increasing the House, but, owing to the keen interest manifested by certain Members in retaining their seats, the committee voted that the reform should commence 10 years hence. The Republican caucus at that time refused to indorse the committee's report and voted to retain the House at its present membership.

For one I am in favor of beginning the reform now, and for that reason shall cast my vote in favor of retaining the present membership.

The chairman of the committee [Mr. HOUSTON] has been very frank in his statements. When he was asked by a Member as to whether he believed the same considerations would govern 10 years from now, he declared that it was his opinion that they would, and that a ratio would be established then that would not deprive any State of any of its representation. By pursuing such a policy the Capitol will eventually have to be enlarged.

I do not believe there has ever been a session of Congress—at least not during the seven years I have been a Member of this House—where there has been as much confusion as has existed during the present session. I am not partisan enough to charge that it is because the House is Democratic, but I have taken at random a number of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of this session for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the confusion that frequently exists and has existed at the present session. I read from the RECORD of April 13, where Mr. MADDEN, of Illinois, said:

> Mr. Speaker, there is nobody over here that can hear a word said by the gentlemen who have the floor.
> The SPEAKER. Gentlemen will cease conversation, so that Members can hear this discussion. The Chair would like to hear it himself.

Even the Chair was unable to hear what was transpiring on the floor.

On the same date my colleague from California [Mr. RAKER], who represents a district in which are located large lumber mills, likewise complained of the confusion. I know that he is accustomed to campaign among these mills, but even he, able to discuss campaign issues amidst the buzzing of saws, is unable to make himself heard and is forced to appeal to the Chair. Let us again read from the RECORD:

> Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether there is any possibility of gentlemen on this side having an opportunity to hear what is going on in this Hall.

He could hear in a sawmill, but he could not hear in the House of Representatives. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any information relating to oratory in a boiler factory?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not, but I am frank to admit that there are times when it would be easier to make oneself heard in a boiler factory than in the House of Representatives.

Mr. AUSTIN. We can all hear the gentleman from California quite well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Well, the gentleman from California has a heavy voice, which everyone has not.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. For a question.

Mr. KENDALL. Does the gentleman know how many Members of the House were present on these occasions when he has read from the RECORD?

Mr. KNOWLAND. This was at the opening of this Congress when a great many new Members were here, and the gentleman knows from past experience that for the first two or three weeks new Members are pretty apt to be present. After that they are not always as anxious.

Mr. KENDALL. I think it is the experience of everybody here that usually the number present is the smallest when the disorder is the greatest.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Why, the gentleman from Iowa himself this morning was compelled to call for order during this discussion. [Applause.]

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I did that to illustrate the fact that there were only a few people present in the House, and yet the disorder was such that it was difficult to hear. The gentleman from California can be heard, because he always has something of interest to say and the House will listen.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now hold in my hand the RECORD of April 14. The ex-Speaker of the House [Mr. CANNON], who now sits at my left, is even moved to complain, as the following colloquy between the present Speaker and himself will show:

> Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there is so much confusion I am unable to hear what the Clerk is reading. It is not the fault of the Clerk. What is he reading?
> The SPEAKER. He is supposed to be reading the Journal. The point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois is sustained, and the House will be in order.

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to confine myself solely to this session, because I might be considered as a partisan, so I want to quote the RECORD of the last session of Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but my time is limited. At the last session of Congress this occurred:

> The SPEAKER. The Sergeant at Arms will tell gentlemen to be seated. The Sergeant at Arms will take the mace and see that gentlemen are seated. The Clerk will call the roll.

This was in the closing days of the last session of Congress. Mr. Chairman, I could quote numerous other examples from the RECORD if time would permit. It is needless to do so in order to illustrate my point, that in enlarging the House you will tend to make it less and less a deliberative body. We should hesitate before we add 42 to the present overlarge membership.

Some gentlemen have referred to other legislative bodies where there is a much larger representation. The British Parliament was cited. It is true that that body has 670 members, but the fact should be borne in mind that the British Parliament only requires 40 members to transact general business and in the transaction of private business only 20 members. There are only seats in the British Parliament for one-quarter of the membership of that body. The members serve without pay, which is another consideration. While the question of expense is an important consideration, it is not by any means the most material.

In that connection I have had occasion to go into this somewhat in detail. As has already been stated, the additional amount for salaries would be $315,000.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the amount of mileage will be $35,000, estimated. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. While the gentleman is in a streak of economy I would suggest it might be well to introduce a bill here to cut down our salaries to, say, $4,000 a year or $3,500 a year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I frankly say I would not do that, and do not believe the country would desire it.

Mr. KENDALL. Oh, let the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] have the credit of introducing that, as he has suggested it first.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, the gentleman from California is speaking of maintaining this body and the cost of it, and one item is the cost of the salaries.

Mr. MADDEN. Why does not the gentleman from Missouri introduce the bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Why does not the gentleman from Illinois introduce such a bill?

Mr. KENDALL. The gentleman from Missouri originated the idea.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I call for order. I can not hear the gentlemen. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer this question of salaries to the Democratic caucus and note the riot it would create.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has no power to refer anything to a Democratic caucus.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Clerk hire would amount to $63,000 and stationery $5,250. The franking privilege, estimated, would cost the Government an additional $250,000. Now, it would require an addition to the House Office Building, and I have asked the Superintendent of the Capitol to give me an estimate as to the cost of adding 42 or 50 rooms, and he tells me that the cost would be about $125,000, which makes a total of about $793,250.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Then there is the question of the distribution of free seeds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Oh, there are many other things that could be added that would easily bring this up to a million dollars. I do not think, however, that this should be the main consideration. It is important, however, and particularly in these times of reform, when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pretending to cut down expenses.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. What would they do to increase the size of the Office Building—raise the building?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In order to enlarge the House Office Building, they would erect new offices above the court, but not on the outside of the building. When the building was originally erected it was constructed so that it could be added to.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It will cost $800 for every room for furniture.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not taken into consideration the furnishing at all. When you go into this matter you will find it has many ramifications that would tend to add materially to the cost.

I want to say in conclusion that I believe for one that the time has come when we should call a halt in increasing the membership of this House. We are all desirous of retaining the good name of this body, we are all anxious that the House of Representatives shall maintain a reputation as a deliberative assembly, but if to-day, and 10 years hence, we increase the membership, this House in time will become so large and unwieldy as to interfere with the proper exercise of its constitutional functions. [Applause.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this bill will pass and that there will be at least 433 Members in this House for the coming 10 years. I shall not discuss whether it is wise to pass the bill or not, because I want to be entirely practical for the 10 minutes that I am going to talk.

When I came into the House I helped fix the membership of the House at 293. That was fixed by an act of 1873, and I recollect the contest at that time. There was a decided sentiment in the House that the increase should not be made, but it required that number to prevent the membership of any State being decreased, and at each succeeding tenth year it has been increased by exactly the same number as would prevent a decrease in the representation from any one State. On one occasion the House refused to make the increase, but the Senate amended the bill, because a little State with two Senators and one Representative has just as much power as a great State with 30 or 37 or 38 Members, with but 2 Senators.

I am not going to discuss as to whether we can amend this bill and hold the membership at 391, the present number. We can not. Now, what can we do; what ought we to do? That leads me to say that never in the history of the country, save alone in 1840, has the membership been decreased. It was at that time decreased from 240 to 233. When 1850 came, with its census, a new piece of legislation was put upon the statute books, namely, that the membership should be in the future fixed at, say, 233, and the apportionment was fixed in 1860 by the Secretary of the Interior dividing 233 into the population; but when 1870 came the Civil War abolished the three-fifths representation as to those who were servile, and from that time to the present, each 10 years, that legislation being obsolete, we have increased, and now we will increase to 433, because it takes that number to give every State its present representation.

Now, I believe that 433 is as large as this House ought ever to be. Gentlemen say we can not bind future Congresses. That is true; but, practically, we do bind future Congresses, because when the population is determined, automatically, from a ministerial standpoint, 430, as our bill proposed, or 433—I do not care which—will be the divisor that will fix the representation from each State. It will be in the power, even after that action was taken by Congress, to increase the representation; but, in the absence of a great public sentiment that would move the Congress to increase it, the legislation would not be enacted, because it must pass the House and Senate and receive the approval of the President. Now, I ask gentlemen to recollect that our Constitution provides that a majority shall be a quorum to do business. That takes half of 433 and one more to do business. In the Committee of the Whole we have provided that 100 shall be a quorum. We could provide 50 or 25 should be a quorum by the rules of the House, but when we legislate it requires a quorum of the whole House, and the larger the number the greater the difficulty in keeping a quorum. Now, when will we stop? Never, so long as we fail to adopt an amendment—which I hope will be offered upon that side of the House—fixing the membership for the future at 430 or 433. I shall not be here 10 years from now. I have no personal interest in this matter. It is only the interest I have for 92,000,000 of people and the greatest good to the people. We have successfully so far, through peace and war, preserved a representative government of the people and by the people. It is useless to talk about what they do in Germany and what they do in France and what the mother country does with her six hundred and odd members and with her quorum of 40 to do business. Our conditions are different. Gentlemen say that we can regulate it by the size of the Hall. I do not believe that. It will not make a particle of difference in the acoustic properties of the Hall, because when the House is quiet, as it is now, the acoustic properties of this Hall are better than any legislative hall, as I am informed, on earth. And when we are not quiet we can not hear ourselves talk. Now, I would keep the body as small as we now have it, if I could, or say that it shall not be beyond 430 or 433, because as you increase the size of a legislative body you decrease the responsibility. You decrease the independence of the average Member; you increase the power of the caucus. That distributes the responsibility and avoids the responsibility. "The Speaker would not let me do so and so; the leader of the House would not let me do so and so; the great committees would not let me do so and so." Oh, I have seen men, whose names I will not mention, of more ability than I, hide time and again. I have seen men in this House who would go to the Speaker of the House and say: "For God's sake! can not you do something to save me from voting on a roll call upon that legislation? Why I will be damned if I vote for it, and I will be damned if I vote against it." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I hope, if I may be indulged for just one sentence, that this amendment may come from that side of the House. None of us know how population may increase or decrease. I do know that in the great Middle West and in the farther West and in the South settlement will increase. The Senate represents the States. Let us keep this body as forceful and strong and powerful as we can keep it, because we touch the people every two years and respond readily to an enduring public sentiment. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat reluctant to immediately follow our distinguished ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON] and take a position opposite to the views he has so forcibly expressed. I only desire, however, to say a few words, and I would not say anything on the bill were it not for the fact that I have somewhat changed my views upon this subject since becoming a Member of this House two years ago; and I believe public sentiment has somewhat changed on the subject during the past few years.

When this bill was before the House at the last session the Republican caucus voted to permanently limit the membership of the House to the present number of 391, and most of you gentlemen on the other side are going to vote against this bill increasing the membership to 433. It was the Democratic vote that passed the bill last February, and it will be our vote that will pass it to-day. Our opposite position upon this bill is to a certain extent illustrative of the opposite principles of the two parties.

This House is, or should be, the popular branch of this Government. Our Government is, or should be, a representative form of government. Representative government has been having some severe tests in this country during the past few years, and the failure of representatives to faithfully represent the will of their constituents has made many good people doubt not the theoretical wisdom or justice, but the practicability of our form of government under modern conditions.

The opponents of this bill say that they are opposed to either increasing the membership of this House or reducing the size of the districts. One gentleman complained that in small districts the Representative would become merely an echo of the sentiment of the people. Well, I would like to know what we are here for, if it is not to echo the sentiment of the people who sent us here? I have always felt and acted upon the assumption that a Representative should represent. In view of the enormous growth of this country in population and development, in wealth and every other way, during the past 10 years, I believe it would be conducive to good government and the enactment of better laws, and that the Members of this House will more accurately reflect the will and welfare of their constituents by increasing the number of Representatives during the next 10 years over the membership of the House during the past 10 years somewhat in proportion to the increase in population. Under the last census the apportionment of population to each Representative was 194,182, while under the proposed membership the ratio for the next 10 years will be 211,877 to each Representative. This will be an increase in population for each Congressman of 17,695 more than he has heretofore represented; that is, the increase of 42 in the membership of the House by this bill is not as much proportionately as the increase in population of this country.

With the vastly increased duties that are imposed upon Members of this House nowadays, and under the existing political and economic conditions in this country at this time, I do not believe the ordinary Representative can properly represent his constituency or suitably look after the interests and personally attend to the requirements of over a quarter of a million people. I am looked upon as a pretty industrious worker, and I know from my own experience that it is utterly impossible to do full justice to the 800,000 people of Colorado whom I have the honor, in part, to represent upon the floor of this House. I believe the people of our State would be much better served by four Congressmen than by three, and that each should have his own district, and that there should not be a Congressman at Large. I confess that my judgment in this matter is probably influenced by local conditions. In fact, I will say that my judgment is always affected by what I think is for the welfare of my constituents. If the number of Representatives in this House is not increased, Colorado will not get another Representative. But it would not be necessary to increase the number of the membership by 42 Members or one-half that number to give Colorado another Congressman. Our State has gained 48 per cent in population during the past 10 years. But I believe the increased membership of the House will be beneficial to the entire country. It will bring the Members in closer contact with their constituents. The safety of the Republic lies in the responsiveness of the Representatives to the will of the people who elect them. And a man will be closer in touch and more responsive and will nearer reflect the sentiment of the present than he would a very much larger constituency. We do not represent the States like the Senators do; we are the immediate representatives of the people themselves. And I have noticed that the people and the press who represent corporate interests—the trusts and big business of this country—both in the Nation and throughout the States, are always opposed to increasing the membership, both in Congress and in the legislatures. They do not want the Representatives nearer to their constituents. The smaller the legislative body they have to deal with the better it suits them. I think that history will bear out the statement that 75 per cent of the extravagant appropriations, nefarious legislation, and obstruction to good legislation is brought about through the smaller branch of the National and State Legislatures. I am in favor of the democratic idea of the rule of the people, and that when a Representative can not represent the will of his constituents he should retire.

Some one has said that in a smaller district a Member can perpetuate himself in office more easily. The only way that can be true would be by faithful service to his constituents. If he betrays them in a small district, they will know it quicker and will turn him out much sooner, while in a larger district he may, through party manipulations, be able to misrepresent the people's best interests for many years.

I believe this bill is in line with the spirit of the times, that Representatives should be brought nearer and more directly accountable to the people and be more readily reached when they cease to reflect the will of those who elect them. It is the failure of Representatives to represent and their brazen defiance of the public welfare that is bringing about the enactment of the initiative and referendum and recall amendments to the State constitutions throughout this country, and I hail the day when every State will enact such constitutional amendments. It seems to me that no one who desires to honestly reflect the consensus of opinion of his constituents should oppose those amendments or be afraid of their operation. When our fathers founded this Government 30,000 constituents were entitled to one Member in this House; while now, with twenty times the amount of work that the Representatives in those days had, even under this enlarged membership, Congressmen will hereafter be required to represent more than seven times as many people and probably a hundred times as much property interests as did the Members of this House in early days.

I realize that there is very great complaint against this House being and becoming more unwieldy. Usually during general debate it is impossible for anyone except those very near the speaker to hear the discussion. But the architects say the change in this room will help some, and I hope and believe the rules and procedure of this body will sometime be so modified that the proceedings may be conducted in a more orderly and deliberate manner. I do not think the confusion is caused so much by the numbers as by the customary methods and practice of the House. I make no pretension of knowing how to do it, but I hope the reform in the rules and customs of the House will preserve the independence of the Members and as far as possible give everyone a reasonable opportunity to be heard and contribute his ideas. Of course most of the work will always have to be performed by committees anyway, but the committees of this House are not and never will be as powerful or dangerous as they are in a smaller body.

I feel that we ought not to unduly increase the membership, and I am in favor of the Crumpacker amendment, which was a part of the bill as this House passed it before and which, I believe, would have a very strong tendency to prevent an undue increase 10 years hence.

While it is not conclusive at all, yet the fact is worthy of consideration, that no civilized nation in the world has as large a constituency for each representative as has this country. In the 15 principal other nations of the earth to-day the representatives in their highest legislative bodies represent an average of from 20,000 to 60,000 people.

Under this apportionment no State will lose a Member. Twenty-one States will retain their present number of Representatives, and the increase of 42 Members will be divided among the remaining 25 States.

A very vigorous objection is made to this increase in membership on account of the increase in the cost to the Government of the additional Members and their clerks and other expenses, and we are taunted with being inconsistent in our efforts to reduce the expenditures of the Government.

I fully appreciate the fact that the increased expense is a very important matter to be considered. But I have thought over that feature a good deal and have come to the conclusion that the people are perfectly willing to pay a fair salary and the necessary official expenses of Representatives, if they honestly represent; but that they are not willing to pay anything for misrepresentation or for a lot of useless jobs and ornamental officials who perform no needed service.

I believe if the increased membership will bring about more direct representation, better-considered legislation, and conduce to better government that the people will not object to the small increase in the cost to the country. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised at some of the arguments put forth here in opposition to this bill. I would rather vote to increase the membership of this House to 500 than to reduce it to 300. There has been but one bill that I know of where the ratio of population to the Member was not increased.

Here is a bill now that not only increases the membership of the House to 433, but also increases the population to the Member, or it will result in having a population in each district so represented about 30,000 larger than it was by the last apportionment. Shall the people not be considered with reference to numbers? Why have we got a representative body here at all unless it is to represent the people according to population? The Senate represents the States, but the representation in this House is based on population. Why should not numbers count, especially considering the fact that the men who framed the Constitution provided a ratio of not exceeding, perhaps, 35,000 or 40,000 population to the Member? Suppose it had been laid down that no increase of population should ever take place per Member. How many Members would we have now?

I call upon Members of this House not to undertake now by any such measure as the Crumpacker amendment to manacle the future. I would much rather vote for an amendment which should provide that no future apportionment should ever increase the number of people represented by a Member. This is not an executive body. In an executive body you need an executive head, a one-man power. This is a council. Wisdom is found in multitudes of counselors.

Now, I am somewhat like the Speaker—I mean the ex-Speaker; I am so used to calling him the Speaker that I have not got out of the habit yet. I am somewhat like him, I feel that I have not long to stay here, in the very nature of things, because I am now serving my eighth consecutive term; but I never want to see the day come when the apportionment of Representatives in this body does not take into consideration the people by numbers. The idea of saying that this great, virile, brainy American people can not devise ways and means by which all the bills that ought to be passed by the body will be passed! Do the Members of this House know that the House of Representatives passed more bills in the last Congress than used to be introduced in a Congress in former years?

My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] talks about "efficiency." I do not know what he means by "efficiency." Have we not got time in which to consider legislation? Of the 24 months that constitute each term, we serve only about 10 months in this House. Usually we serve 7 months in the long session and 3 in the short session, and adjourn for the balance of the time and go home to look after our fences or to the

mountains to cool off or to the seashore to bathe or, perhaps, to Europe. We can have a recess during July and August, when gentlemen can go to the seashore and cool off. We do not use profitably half the time that we have in this House. We can use more time and pass more bills if it is deemed wise to do so. We have the habit of so-called machine-like action. We have the idea that we have got to adjourn before hot weather and before the business that has been intrusted to us has been attended to. I am surprised to hear gentlemen complaining here about the inefficiency of this House. If you want to increase the efficiency of the House, increase its numbers so that more efficient minds can come here to help do the business of the House.

Kentucky has been referred to a time or two. Does not the representation of Kentucky warrant us in the belief that an increase of its members would be both a State and national benefit?

Now, my friends, the population of the great cities is increasing out of all proportion to the increase of population in the country districts; and if you are going to limit the number of Representatives, the day will come when the great cities will have the balance of power in this body, as they have in other countries. Small legislative bodies are more easily controlled wrongfully, either by passion or pelf. It is easier to corruptly control a small body than a larger one.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SIMS. Show me the city to-day that would not increase its representation——

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee undertake to say that the representation from the great cities in this House is not as able and honest as the representation of the country districts?

Mr. SIMS. I did not mean any reflection and would not make any reflection upon the Representatives who come from our great cities. But the gentleman knows, and we all know, that we are constrained by the wishes and desires of those who elect us—who send us here. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask for five minutes more.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. I think the city of Chicago has as able and honest Representatives in this House as have ever been sent here from any country districts.

But you know and I know, my friends, that the foreign element of our population is increasing in greater ratio in the cities than in the country and that the negroes are flocking to the cities. If I had the power to redistrict the States, I would put all the big districts in the cities and the little ones in the country among the agricultural classes, the landowning classes, the classes that have made our institutions what they are and that will have to maintain them if they are to be maintained. Where do revolutions arise? My friends, where does the only Socialist in this House hail from? Does he come from a country district? I mean no reflection on him. He is a man of brains, ability, and patriotism. I know of some people who tremble at the increase of socialism, which is confined largely to the cities.

Let us not reduce the representation of the agricultural sections of this country. If we fix the number in the next House at 391, it will mean to take representation from those States that I think, judged by everything that goes to make good legislators, will average higher than those of the great cities. I hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be voted down. I am surprised that any Democrat should want to vote for such an amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, it is proposed to increase the membership of the House from 391 to 433, and the sole question to be determined is the advisability of such action. I recognize that there are no partisan considerations to govern the membership of the House on this proposition, and I am very glad that that fact is so evident here, because to my mind the question is one of supreme importance and should be considered strictly on its merits and with a full realization of its ultimate effect.

I want to say now that, so far as I am concerned, I am unalterably opposed to the passage of the bill as reported by the committee. [Applause.] I am opposed to a further increase in the membership under any pretext whatsoever. I say that knowing at the same time that the passage of the bill would possibly be to my personal advantage, for I come from the State of Iowa, which, if the present membership were maintained, would lose one Member. In the State of Iowa we have a Republican legislature, and if the present membership should be maintained, or a lower membership established, undoubtedly a Republican legislature would redistrict the State so that I should not have the privilege of further continuing my very pleasant association with you after my present term. It may be that other gentlemen here would be affected in the same way. But I believe, gentlemen, that the question of increasing the membership of this House is so important, so vital, that you men on either side ought to consider it from a broad standpoint. I believe there is only one question that you ought to ask yourselves in deciding upon this bill, and that is, What is the proper number of men to compose this legislative body? Any other consideration must naturally fall back for its support upon the individual self-interest of the Member or party expediency. After you have determined how many men should compose this legislative body, the next question would be to apportion those members among the States according to the number of inhabitants, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. I do not believe it is proper at this time to consider the question whether one State or two States or half a dozen States will lose Members. I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that up to 1890 there have been only two apportionment laws that did not decrease the membership from some of the States. Are we prepared to say now that the membership of this House is less patriotic or less free from bias than the membership of former Congresses? Are we going before the people to say that we are so enamored of our jobs here, so anxious to represent the dear people, and so fearful that some of us will be eliminated politically that we can not look upon this question in a broad way and decide it upon grounds of national welfare? I say this House is too big now. We can not maintain order, and when we stand up and address the Speaker, instead of being recognized and being permitted to present matters concerning our respective constituents and the country, the first question is: "For what purpose does the gentleman rise?" And if it is not in accordance with the program laid down, if it is not in accordance with the very technical rules that have been adopted and must be adopted, we can not gain recognition in this House. Why, you know, and everyone knows, that complaints have been made frequently that the great Senate of the United States has increased its power at the expense of the House of Representatives; and I want to say now that if you increase the membership of the House, you, by that very act, decrease the individual power and effectiveness of every Member of the House. [Applause.]

I have been amused rather than instructed by some of the arguments that have been presented in behalf of this bill. What is their plea? Have they suggested even one good substantial reason for the increase? The fact that the number 433 has been selected as being the least number which will prevent any State from losing a Member discloses the true purpose and object of the bill. And in an attempt to justify such action, some gentlemen have urged that we should have a smaller number of constituents, so that we may keep in closer touch with them; and yet they have increased the number of constituents per Member over 12,000. It has seemed to me that the sponsors of this bill have come on the floor of this House in the frame of mind trying to apologize for their action. Instead of presenting some logical reason, instead of having some views to present to this House why we should increase the membership to 433, they have come here and tried to explain that such action will do no harm.

Mr. Chairman, my idea is that the absence of a good reason for doing a thing is a splendid reason for not doing it. When and where are we going to stop? There always will be inequalities in population among the several States. In the course of events it must be so. I predict that 10 years from now another bill bearing the same earmarks and supported by the same fallacious arguments and providing for a similar increase will be reported to this House. And if such is the case, and if the membership at that time fails to rise above personal or party consideration, we will witness another increase similar to the one now proposed.

Mr. Chairman, this great House of Representatives is, and should be, the citadel of the people's rights. It is not enough that representatives of the people should be here; they should be able to accomplish something after they get here. And we all know that owing to the size of this House at the present time the opportunity for the individual Members to present matters of public importance is limited. Some gentlemen upon the other side have attempted to make of this bill a partisan

matter. I can not hope, nor do I wish, the party to which I belong to escape its full responsibility, should this bill pass; but it is to be observed that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], who has charge of the time on the Republican side, is in favor of the bill, and we know that the House during the last session passed a similar bill. It is not a partisan question, but, upon the other hand, it is a high constitutional question; a question that concerns the powers and capabilities of this great legislative body. To my mind the time has come to pause and consider well a step which may result in rendering less efficient, less democratic, less responsive, this great body of the people's representatives. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, there are two propositions on which we are all agreed. We do not favor too large a House. All agree to that. We do not favor too large constituencies. On that too, we are agreed.

There is a golden mean. What must fix that mean? Why the common sense of the men who deal with the problem, which I may say, is incapable of anything like a mathematical fixation. Gentlemen on one side ask with an air of finality: How large a House do you favor? In reply, we may ask: How small a House would you have? It is impossible for these questions to be answered with anything like precision. Neither the absolute maximum, nor minimum, can be prescribed with any sense of satisfaction. The only answer that can be given is that the bodies which are charged with the solution of this problem must work out that solution in the exercise of that common sense which is such a prime attribute of the American character.

Some gentlemen who have argued the pending proposition seem to think that other gentlemen who favor an increase in the membership of the House can not take a large view of the situation. I have sought to take the large view, and such consideration as I have been able to give to the question suggests an increase in our membership, as a necessary and inevitable incident of our growth.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PEPPER] says that no argument has been advanced in favor of a larger House. May I ask him what argument has been advanced in favor of a smaller House of so sound and logical a character as to drive us to the conclusion that a smaller House is a thing to be desired in the interests of good government? I might ask my friend who advocates the retention of the membership of the House at 433, what magic is there in that particular number, and how it is, and by what process have the gentlemen who hold that view arrived at the conclusion that for all time to come, without reference to the development of our country, and the increase of its population, the number of the popular branch should be irrevocably fixed at 433?

Mr. Chairman, if there was any force in the argument for a small membership, then in the past, the gentlemen who insisted that our membership should be 233, were manifestly right. All the weight of the argument was with them, and to-day the limit of membership for this body should be 233, that being the number fixed upon by our predecessors upon the theory that the cause of good legislation would be promoted by a legislative body of that particular size.

I wish to say that in my own experience, and I think I may add, in the experience of other Members of this body, it has not been observed that the smaller body is to be relied upon for economy, good legislation, and superiority of legislative wisdom. I was a member for a long time of the lower branch of the general assembly of my State, and in a position to compare its work with that of the senate which was a much smaller body. The work of the house of delegates did not suffer in the comparison.

On the contrary, we all know that in the several States the particular branch which has at all times stood in the way of progress, reform, and a really popular government, has been the senate. Some gentlemen have asserted that there is a sentiment to-day in the country that we should not increase our membership. I agree that such a sentiment measurably exists.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Has it not been true always that the small body in all legislative bodies has been the body that stood in the way of progress and reform?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, that was the precise statement that I made. I said that in my observation, and experience, and I believe in the observation, and experience of every Member of this body, it has always been the smaller body that has blocked the way of progress and reform. Is there a Member of this House who is willing to assert that the body at the other end of the Capitol has been in the forefront of progress, of wise and wholesome legislation, of reform and economy, in comparison with the attitude of this body?

As I was in the act of saying, some Members claim that there is a sentiment in the country that we should not increase the membership of this House. I do not deny it. There has always been that reactionary sentiment on the part of a proportion of the public, who fancy that by reducing the size of your representative body, you will enlarge the aggregate of wisdom in that body.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the gentleman think that the manner of electing Senators, their tenure of office, the fact that Members of the Senate are elected for six years and by State legislatures, that only one-third of the body goes out each two years, that all of these make the Senate much more conservative and much more indifferent to public opinion than is the House of Representatives?

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is more than conservative, it is often reactionary in its attitude to public progress. [Applause on Democratic side].

Mr. COOPER. But suppose Senators of the United States were elected for two years only, to go out each two years, and by a direct vote of the people, then would not the Senate be more efficient and responsive to public opinion?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes, more responsive I will admit but merely by reason of its being a smaller body, it would not be more efficient than a larger one. I say that the statement that the smaller body is productive of better results, is contrary to the observation of every man who has watched the practical course of legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. SAUNDERS. No, I have not the time. Of course I mean no discourtesy to my friend in declining to yield further, but my time is too limited to admit of interruptions. I was proceeding to say that we ought to keep prominently before us the fact, that as we enlarge our constituencies, we make it more and more impossible for the individual Representative to come into that personal relationship with his constituents, which is necessary to enable him to be a truly popular and effective Representative.

What was the size of the constituencies of our forefathers, who are so often cited as paragons of wisdom, exemplars of statesmanship, to their degenerate descendants of these latter days? Many of them represented constituencies containing not over thirty, or forty thousand people. Perchance that was the reason why those gentlemen were able to render more efficient legislative service, if such was the case, than the Representative of to-day is able to afford.

They were relieved from those demands upon their time which are imposed upon a Member who represents one of our great modern constituencies. Those gentlemen, therefore, were truly popular Representatives in the popular branch of this Government.

We acclaim ourselves as an exemplar of popular government, and denominate this the popular branch of our Government. Contrast for a moment the size of the constituencies that we represent, with that of the constituencies represented by the Members of the popular branch of the Parliaments of the great countries of Europe. In Great Britain, a Member of Parliament represents a population of something like 60,000. In the other great countries he represents a constituency of much less than that number. Yet we claim that we are the most truly representative popular government in the world, when one Member of our House, not infrequently represents five times as many people as are represented by a Member of the British Parliament. As if that disparity was not sufficient, it is now proposed to increase it, by limiting the size of this body to 433 Members, without regard to the increase of our population in the coming centuries.

It is asserted that if we increase our constituencies, and decrease our membership, the work of this House will become more efficient. I deny, Mr. Chairman, that such a result will follow that action. A word in regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. That is a futile amendment, it is an unnecessary amendment, it is an impotent amendment, it is an arrogant amendment, because we undertake to say to the future Congresses, that we have determined forever what shall be the limit of the size of this body, and that they shall not deal with their problems in their own way, as we are dealing with present problems in our way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee to yield me one minute more.

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It is said that this amendment would be a check upon the future Congress in that it would be necessary for that Congress to repeal the present act, before it enlarged the membership of the House. It would not be necessary, Mr. Chairman, for that body to formally repeal the act.

The mere enactment of an apportionment bill giving a larger apportionment would itself, by implication be a sufficient and efficient repeal of the limiting act. So that as a restriction upon a future Congress the proposed amendment is as futile as it is unnecessary. Such an attempt to control the future body is an assumption on our part of superior wisdom. The intimation of superiority of capacity conveyed in this effort to forestall and limit, the action of a future Congress would be resented by that body, just as we would resent to-day, the effort of some Congress prior to the Civil War to say to us that we should not increase the membership of this body beyond 233, or 333, or any other limit, that in their wisdom they wrought out as the appropriate one for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill without amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much time remains to this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOUSTON. And how much has the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. The other side has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to ask the Chair when this debate began?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that debate began at a quarter past 12.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then the four hours will be up at a quarter past 4.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair will state to the gentleman that a little time is lost as we go along in debate in yielding. We have just lost a minute. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this point to ask leave that all Members who have spoken on this matter be allowed to extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that can not be done in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see this bill pass in a shape which would guarantee to us a smaller House of Representatives. I would be satisfied with the number we now have in order to insure more effective business here. I may add that surely this is an unselfish proposition on my part, for the reason that my own State would be hit harder than any other State in the Union. The States which would lose membership at all would lose but 1 Member if we had 391, while Missouri would lose 2, but I would still favor the proposition in question in order to be sure of a change in the apportionment in my State, which we are not quite certain of, if the number of 16 Representatives from Missouri remains the same. I have the honor of representing a district with a population of 467,000 people; in other words, more than two—in fact, two and a half—congressional districts. That is the result of the action of the legislature controlled by the party which is now in power in this House. They crowded all the Republicans whom they could find in and about St. Louis into one congressional district, so that at the last election my majority reached the enormous total of over 25,000. Now, I am willing to give up about 20,000 of that for the purpose of insuring the election of more Representatives from that State [applause on the Republican side], and also for the purpose of preventing in the future the disfranchisement to which the people of my State are now subjected under Democratic rule in that State. Over 200,000 of the people, Mr. Chairman, are practically disfranchised in my district.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. What does the gentleman mean by their being disfranchised?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Because it takes more than twice the number of people to elect a Representative in my district than it does in the district represented by the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Does not the gentleman represent them? Are you not representing them pretty well?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am not so immodest as to admit that proposition. I would like to have a colleague here to help me represent them.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion? The suggestion the gentleman from Missouri just made to his colleague answers the argument in favor of this bill. He said:

Does not the gentleman represent just as many as two representing the same district?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I did not say that. The gentleman is putting that in my mouth.

Mr. JAMES. He denies it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the words "by the legislature thereof," in line 17, on page 4, of this bill, may be stricken out.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can not yield.

Mr. RAKER. Just one question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can not yield.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is proper——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is out order, as the gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RAKER. Then I will sit down if he declines to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will be seated, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] will proceed.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, when the last apportionment bill was passed, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Indiana, there was no such thing in the United States as an initiative or a referendum. But since that time a large number of States have adopted that method of legislating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Would not the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] yield me a minute, so that I may ask the gentleman from Missouri a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not for that purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] yield for a minute?

Mr. HOUSTON. I can not do so.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to one point which it seems to me has not been very much emphasized in this debate, and that is the concurrent action of the Census Committee of the last and the present Congress on this question. The committee in the last House had exhaustive hearings and thoroughly considered this question, and reported unanimously in favor of increasing the membership to 433. At that time the Republicans controlled the House. Now the Democrats control it, and a new committee has given thorough consideration to the question; and remember that this committee is composed almost entirely of new Members. I believe there are only three or four Members of the present Committee on the Census who were members of it at the last session.

And yet this comparatively new committee, and many of them new Members of Congress, has again brought in a bill with a unanimous report recommending that the membership of the House be increased to 433. In my judgment that is a very material question to be considered in passing upon this bill, and so strongly persuasive that only the very strongest reasons should be permitted to set it aside—certainly stronger reasons than have been offered thus far in this debate. In my experience as a Member of this House, and particularly in the early days of my service here, when I was in some doubt, as I occasionally was, as to whether I should support a bill reported favorably by the committee, I frequently received the fatherly admonition of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the ex-Speaker, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and other leaders on this side of the House that I ought to stand by the committee, and that it was the safest course to follow. And I became so accustomed to receiving and taking that sort of advice that I formed the habit of doing so, and it has become so firmly fixed as a rule of conduct with me that I am loath to depart from it.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Why does not the gentleman stand by the caucus?

Mr. LANGLEY. Why did you not have a caucus this time as you had before? You forced a caucus then; why did you not try it again?

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Because you would not stand for it. There was no use in calling a caucus.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL]?

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not mind yielding if the gentleman will make his question intelligible and material to the issue and loud enough so that I can hear it above the confusion in the vicinity of the gentleman's desk.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I ask you why you did not stand by the caucus? Do you not understand that?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will say to the gentleman, as I have said before in this House in answer to the same question, that I did not think you gentlemen should have called a caucus upon such a question as that, thus seeking to bind some of us to vote

against our views and our pledges. And when you proceeded to consider that question I saw the Republican caucus was seeking to bind me upon a proposition that I fully understood and proposed to exercise my own judgment upon, and with regard to which I was already committed, and so I withdrew from the caucus.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. The gentleman is bragging about his regularity in standing by the committee, and it seems to me he should stand by the caucus.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman should not take my time on an incidental matter like that. But I will say to the gentleman that our committee had already agreed upon a unanimous report before the caucus was called. You permitted us to have extensive hearings and to present a unanimous report to this House recommending an increase to 433, and then you sought to reverse our action and to make us stultify ourselves, and I for one did not propose to be put in such an attitude, by a party caucus, and I would do the same thing again under the same circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN]?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it not a fact that the caucus bolted the action of the Committee on the Census, which brought in a unanimous report? [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. That is unquestionably true, as my friend from Tennessee says. They were the bolters, and I refused to follow their example.

Now, reference has been made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and by others in this debate to the fact that Congress in adopting preceding apportionment laws has increased every time, except one, the membership of the House so as to prevent any State from losing, and the statement has usually been made in criticism of the proposition to again increase the number. It is true that the membership of the House has been increased almost every time, and with the result stated, but I call attention to the fact that in each instance it was merely keeping step with the increase of population in the United States and with the growth of the country generally. As a matter of fact, this bill, although it increases the membership of the House by 42, leaves it so that each Member will represent about 18,000 or 20,000 more people than they now represent.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says that the argument as to the larger number of Representatives in propertion to the population that they have in the most popular branch of the legislature of other countries is not pertinent to the issue, because conditions are entirely different in this country and we can not follow their plan of representation. No one has contended that we ought to do so literally, but while I dislike to take issue with the gentleman, whose age, experience, and ability so greatly overshadow mine, I insist that it is legitimate argument to call attention to the systems in other countries in discussing this bill and that the experience of these countries is worthy of our consideration. The unit of representation in this House is greater than it is in any other country in the world. The German Reichstag comes nearer to our ratio than does any other country, and yet each of us represents now about 38,000 more than does a member of the German body; and in Great Britain the representation in Parliament is very nearly twice the membership of this House, and yet the population represented is less than half of ours. I could give other instances where the difference is equally as pronounced. Conditions in many respects are different, it is true, but it is certainly material to this discussion to show that a much smaller unit of representation has worked satisfactorily in these other countries.

The argument that has been made here, that gentlemen can not get a fair hearing upon this floor because of the size of the House, has already been sufficiently answered. It is not due so much to the size of the House, as has been exhibited here to-day, as it is to the noise that a few Members make, and oftentimes it is because of interruptions such as I have just had here, when gentlemen not entitled to the floor have, in attempting to make themselves heard, prevented the Speaker from being heard. [Laughter.] My observation has been during the time I have served here that there is no difficulty about a gentleman getting a hearing if he has anything worth saying that the House cares to listen to. [Laughter.] In my own experience I have never had any difficulty [laughter] when I was saying anything the House wanted to hear. I have sometimes found, however—and so have most of you—that the House did not care to hear me. For example, the other day when I was undertaking to discuss the question of protection to lumber my voice was drowned by cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" because the majority had already made up their minds to vote down my amendments to the Canadian reciprocity treaty, when I was seeking to protect lumber from Canadian competition, and therefore they did not give me a hearing, or at least only a very brief one. [Laughter.] I want to say, further, that so long as we have the impartial presiding officers that we have now and have had heretofore there is no difficulty about any Member getting a hearing in this House if he wants a hearing and undertakes in the proper way to get it.

Certain gentlemen, and especially the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], have referred to the fact that perhaps some of us who are favoring this increase in the membership of the House are doing so because of some local or personal interest. If the gentlemen mean that a Member ought not to favor something here because his State or his district wants him to do it, and further, if they mean by that that they themselves will favor what the people in the country generally favor, or what some other section of the country favors, rather than something that is of local interest to their own constituents or to the people of their own States, then they have reached a plane of perfection to which but few Members of this House have attained. [Laughter and applause.] I do not mean to say that the gentleman from California would vote for an increase in membership if it so happened that by reason of that increase his tenure of office in his present exalted position would be rendered more secure. [Laughter.] I do not mean to say that because he says that he would not. But, as a matter of curiosity, I would like to see a situation arise where his continuance as a Member of this House might be endangered by no increase just to see how he would vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] favors a deliberative body, and we hope to see him elected as United States Senator from the State of California. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, we in Kentucky are so much concerned about the senatorship from that State just now that we do not bother our minds very much about the senatorship in California. [Laughter.]

I am frank to say, gentlemen, that so far as I am personally concerned, one of the reasons why I am going to vote for the increase of membership in the House is that if the membership were left at 391, the State of Kentucky would lose one Representative in this body and one vote in the electoral college, and I do not wish to see that happen. And another reason is that the State of Virginia would lose one, and other Southern States would lose; and I am not in favor of any legislation, apportionment or otherwise, that will reduce the representation of the great South in the Congress of the United States or in the electoral college. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Just one more word, with the indulgence of the Chair. I want to say further that, barring the question of politics and the very undesirable views that they have on certain questions, I believe that no harm, and perhaps considerable good, would come to the country if we had here a few more of the broad-minded, big-hearted men like those which the South sends to the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has exhausted his time.

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

[Mr. MURRAY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, in coming to close the debate upon this bill I desire to say I have listened attentively to the various arguments made here to-day against the passage of this bill, and they are practically threefold. The first argument made is that the House is large enough; the second one is that it is not a deliberative body, which is practically the first. The third one is that as a matter of reform, to save the people's money, we should hold the representation at what it now is.

Our friend from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], always lucid in discussion, urged economy as a reason why the representation should not be increased, and he pointed to our side and said, "You saved $180,000 by cutting off useless jobs." That is true. That is real Democratic reform, cutting off our serv-

ants; but we are not going to start a reform by cutting off the servants of the American people in this body. [Applause.] When it comes to useless servants to ourselves, useless employees, so far as we are concerned, we can save money to the people, but we are unwilling to depart from that Democratic teaching of a representative government lodged close to the people by pretending that we are going to reform by lessening the rights of the American people to representation upon this floor. [Applause.]

What is your argument about reform? Where does the Treasury get its most deadly blow? In the body most numerous? Oh, no. In the body fresh from the people? No; but where? In that body less numerous and farthest removed from the people. You say that we are not a deliberative body. Why, gentlemen, we passed every bill that even a Republican President wanted in the last session of Congress, and another body to which the bills went was so deliberative that it never passed the bills and forced upon the country the expense of an extra session of Congress, in which we are now assembled. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The truth of it is, the larger the body of men the harder they are to control. Not by the Speaker, no; but by the system, by the trusts, and by the monopolies of the country. [Applause.] I believe that when you have a body large enough, that body in which the people are fairly and truly represented, you have got a body where greed can not place its corroding touch and fasten its iron chains of control. [Applause.]

The idea of saying that a small body is wiser than a large body is an old doctrine upon which thrones have been built and monarchies sustained. It is the argument of the crown and the scepter. [Applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. I always yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania with pleasure.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is not now trying pretty hard to get into a body with a much smaller representation? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. JAMES. That is true; but that only shows that my advocacy of this measure is impartial and unselfish. [Applause.] It shows that I am discussing it from a patriotic and an American standpoint. Now let us see. Where in your State legislatures do the powers that thwart the will of the people take their stand? In the body that is most numerous in membership? No. Why? Because it is harder to handle. Where do they go? They go to the least numerous branch and there they take their stand. Where do men that want to get great appropriations of money go? They go to the least numerous branch of the legislature, and there they make their stand, not only to filch the Treasury but to get laws placed upon the statute book that they want and to oppose laws in favor of the people.

My friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] suggested that if you enlarge the number of this body you decrease the independence of the Member. That may be true, and I pray to God it is, but it increases the independence of the American people to make themselves felt and to make themselves heard. [Applause.]

Now, the argument that this body is too large, upon the basis that a man can not be heard and that he can not get attention, is an assault upon your good order. How can that be remedied? How many Members of Congress have gone over the country and, if you wanted to speak and did not have a larger crowd than you have here, felt mad about it? How many of you have spoken to five and ten thousand and prided yourself upon it, and yet you come here and say you can not be heard by 391 men—men filtered from the 90,000,000 of the American people, men of intelligence, men of honor, and men of good order. Yet you indict yourselves by saying that you can not be heard here upon this floor. I will tell you a remedy for that. Let a rule be made in this House that no Member shall speak to another one upon the floor. That will stop it. Let a rule be made giving the Speaker the right when a Member is guilty of such discourtesy to his fellows to call him by name and put his name in the RECORD, and you will have good order here; but because you have lax rules, because you do not enforce the rules you have, you urge that as a reason why the American people should be denied the right to representation to which they are justly and fairly and honestly entitled. [Applause.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, so far as the expenses of this Government are concerned, in my judgment, if the other end of this Capitol were represented by a body of like numbers with this one, fresh from the people, the result would be that you would save more than Aldrich said ought to be saved per year—$300,000,000 of the people's money. I tell you that when you announce the doctrine that in order to get deliberation you are going to deny the people representation, you announce a doctrine that is un-American. We have had too much deliberation in certain legislative branches of this Government. What the American people demand is proper deliberation and action upon the measures they want written into the laws. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] stated that he was in favor of an amendment limiting the number of Members of Congress, that 10 years from now the number should not be greater than 433. I think we are wise, but I do not think we are quite wise enough to legislate for a decade that has not come. You may claim that you are exceeding wise, but let those men 10 years ahead of you, with the development of our great resources, with the development of our great country, with the increase of our inhabitants, with the myriad of problems which will confront them in the decade of the future, let them go unhampered, unmanacled, unshackled, aye, even unadvised by a Congress that has been dead for 10 long years. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time for general debate is exhausted. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the 3d day of March, 1913, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 433 Members, to be apportioned among the several States as follows:

Alabama, 10.	Nebraska, 6.
Arkansas, 7.	Nevada, 1.
California, 11.	New Hampshire, 2.
Colorado, 4.	New Jersey, 12.
Connecticut, 5.	New York, 43.
Delaware, 1.	North Carolina, 10.
Florida, 4.	North Dakota, 3.
Georgia, 12.	Ohio, 22.
Idaho, 2.	Oklahoma, 8.
Illinois, 27.	Oregon, 3.
Indiana, 13.	Pennsylvania, 36.
Iowa, 11.	Rhode Island, 3.
Kansas, 8.	South Carolina, 7.
Kentucky, 11.	South Dakota, 3.
Louisiana, 8.	Tennessee, 10.
Maine, 4.	Texas, 18.
Maryland, 6.	Utah, 2.
Massachusetts, 16.	Vermont, 2.
Michigan, 13.	Virginia, 10.
Minnesota, 10.	Washington, 5.
Mississippi, 8.	West Virginia, 6.
Missouri, 16.	Wisconsin, 11.
Montana, 2.	Wyoming, 1.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all of section 1 after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That after the 3d day of March, 1913, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 391 Members, to be apportioned among the several States as follows:

"Alabama, 9.	" Nebraska, 5.
"Arkansas, 7.	" Nevada, 1.
" California, 10.	" New Hampshire, 2.
" Colorado, 3.	" New Jersey, 11.
" Connecticut, 5.	" New York, 39.
" Delaware, 1.	" North Carolina, 9.
" Florida, 3.	" North Dakota, 2.
" Georgia, 11.	" Ohio, 20.
" Idaho, 1.	" Oklahoma, 7.
" Illinois, 24.	" Oregon, 3.
" Indiana, 12.	" Pennsylvania, 33.
" Iowa, 10.	" Rhode Island, 2.
" Kansas, 7.	" South Carolina, 7.
" Kentucky, 10.	" South Dakota, 2.
" Louisiana, 7.	" Tennessee, 9.
" Maine, 3.	" Texas, 17.
" Maryland, 6.	" Utah, 2.
" Massachusetts, 14.	" Vermont, 2.
" Michigan, 12.	" Virginia, 9.
" Minnesota, 9.	" Washington, 5.
" Mississippi, 8.	" West Virginia, 5.
" Missouri, 14.	" Wisconsin, 10.
" Montana, 2.	" Wyoming, 1."

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, this simply provides for the retention of the present membership of the House. We have discussed that question pro and con so fully that I do not wish to consume any further time. I trust the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment brings the real issue before the House as to the apportionment of the representation for the next 10 years. I do not desire to make a lengthy argument on this question. The case has been fully presented to the House. There are two sides to it. One is the side as to whether the smaller legislative body can pass legislation better considered and act with more deliberation and wisdom than a larger number of Representatives. The other is the question of economy. Now, I say that if all other things are equal, of course the question of economy is one that the House should carefully consider, and undoubtedly decide the case on the question of economy, but I do not think that that is a material issue here. The real issue is as to whether or not as this great country of ours expands in population this House

shall go on progressing along the lines of the expansion of population in the country, or whether we shall have a fixed unit, limiting the membership of this House and enlarging our constituencies. We all know that there is a very materially increasing sentiment in the United States that is moving away from the idea of a strictly representative Government toward a form of democracy in the way of an initiative and referendum in several of the States. Now, why does that sentiment grow; what is the cause of it? It has not arisen without a cause. The growth of that sentiment has arisen from the fact that the people of the United States do not believe that their present representative bodies are sufficiently responsive to the will of the people of the United States. Can there be any other reason? Now, in the face of that growing sentiment in the country, that growing demand for a more representative body, you propose to say that you will call a halt as the country grows, lessen the representation, and increase the size of the constituency that every man on this floor represents and remove the Member of Congress further and further away from the rank and file of the people whose will he is supposed to enact into law. I believe that if we intend to continue the representative form of government of this country this popular branch of the Congress of the United States must have a constituency sufficiently small to enable a Representative of the people to know the people whom he represents. [Applause.] You know as well as I that to-day, even with the present basis of representation, it is difficult for a Member of Congress to even know the men who are locally prominent in his district much less know all the people of his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama has well said there are two sides to this question. I think, however, he does not state them correctly, and that the real question here, as far as this particular motion is concerned, is whether the House of Representatives can come nearer to performing its constitutional functions if its membership is fixed at 391 than though it were fixed at 433. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, but what we can go to an extreme in either direction. We ought to be representative of the entire people of the country, and no man will deny but what we can increase the size of this body to such an extent that we lose all deliberation and make it absolutely necessary that we should surrender our individual prerogatives and rights and the rights and prerogatives of the body and of the country to some smaller governing body. Is there a man here now who does not really feel that we are already too large to perform the duties that are given to us in the House of Representatives properly and fairly to all the people? I have heard men ever since I have been a Member of this body complain of the fact that the House of Representatives had surrendered its constitutional rights and its constitutional prerogatives. The larger you make the body when you have exceeded a certain limit—and I believe we have passed it now—the more necessary and imperative is it that some body, caucus, committee, Speaker, or some one, or some select body of men, should mark out the course that we must take. We know that right now, on account of the size of the House of Representatives, we are unable here—where individual Members should have the right to be heard and offer amendments and discuss important questions—to give sufficient attention, so that we can turn out of this body well-framed, well-considered, and well-defined legislation in which the entire country is interested. I want to say, if we could eliminate from this discussion the one fact that somebody is afraid his State will lose in representation in this body, there would be no doubt that instead of keeping the number at 391 we would cut it down to a less number. After all, that is a bogy man—this loss of representation. It will be based upon the population of the different States, and there will be in reality no loss. It is just the same in a State like mine, for instance, where if it remains at 391 we would lose one, and if we increase membership to 443 we have no change, that we should retain what we have and allow other States to be increased, as it is to allow the other States to remain as they are and decrease ours. I do not believe, if we could get every man here to vote as he really feels and not as he fears, that there would be any doubt but what the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin would prevail here by a unanimous vote. [Applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words on this amendment. I am opposed to increasing the size of this House. Every Member of the Sixty-first Congress sat day after day and night after night, and every Member who serves during the Sixty-second Congress will spend day after day and night after night in this Hall doing—what? Deliberating? No. Legislating? No. They will be waiting until the Sergeant at Arms can secure and bring in the attendance of a quorum.

It is true that the British House of Commons has 670 members. It is also true that 40 constitute a quorum to do business; but it is still further true that when the point of no quorum is made and there are less than 40 there, they simply lay aside the bill under discussion and take up another one and go right on with their business. Here we must stop all business until we can get in a majority of the entire membership, as required by the Constitution.

Now, it was a very interesting speech which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] made, in which he discussed Germany's parliamentary body. I was sorry that time cut him off. I think he was going to propose that we do here as they do there—divide the body into sections, let each section consider a bill separately, and then the delegates from the sections come in and sit together and pass or defeat a bill. Before you can divide this body into sections, or before you can legislate by delegates from sections in that way, you will have to change the Constitution of the United States, which requires the presence of a majority of all the Members elected to this body in order to do business.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. OLMSTED. I will.

Mr. LEWIS. The gentleman wholly misapprehended me. After the deliberative divisions have concluded considering the measures they go to the calendar for such consideration as they receive from the committees of this House.

Mr. OLMSTED. Very well; that is just the same thing. We send bills to the committees and they consider them and bring them in here, but the difference is that we have to have a quorum. We would have to have 217 Members present under this new bill. The larger the body the greater the difficulty in getting a quorum.

Now, I have heard a gentleman, a very distinguished Member, who recently sat upon that side of the House, say that he hoped the time would come when every Representative of a free people in this the greatest deliberative body on earth could rise in his place without asking permission of anybody, call up a bill in which his people are interested, and put it upon its passage for disposition by this great body. I have sat here and figured it out. There were more than 40,000 bills and resolutions introduced in the last House. If you allowed every Member a minute of free speech on every one of those bills, it would take 88 years to consider them. The more Members you have the more bills you will have, and as all have or are entitled to have an equal opportunity to speak, the more time will there be required for discussion on this floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. OLMSTED. I will.

Mr. MURRAY. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether or not, in his opinion, the matter of the number of bills might not well be regulated by making a limit as to the introduction of bills, as in many of our State legislatures—Massachusetts, for instance?

Mr. OLMSTED. Then you have a restriction of the rights of the Representatives of the people, about which we hear so much.

Mr. MURRAY. But, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OLMSTED. I can not yield unless I get further time.

There is a gentleman sitting at that desk now, an employee, a faithful employee, of this House, who came here when there were 233 Members and has been here ever since. Now, we are proposing to increase the membership to 433. The larger the membership the less of opportunity for discussion, the less the freedom of deliberation, the less the wisdom of the legislation which will be passed here. The larger the membership the fewer the Members that will control and direct the legislation in this body. That is the experience everywhere. It is the experience of every large legislative body anywhere on earth.

Mr. Chairman, this body has wider and freer powers of legislation than any other comparable parliamentary body on earth. In every one of the foreign Governments to which reference has been made legislation is controlled by the Crown. You could not in England introduce a public measure without the consent of the Crown. You could not in the Netherlands, for instance, do so. I was looking that up a little while ago. Your bill would be referred to the Crown before you could even introduce

it in the House. You could not introduce all the private bills over there that come in here. The subjects of legislation are limited, and the powers of the members over legislation are limited. In the interest of free speech, free discussion, deliberation, and wisdom in legislation, I hope—but I know my hope will not come to fruition—that this amendment will prevail.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

This body, in its representative capacity, by a certain practice that has prevailed here for some years, has surrendered a part of its constitutional right and the constitutional rights of the people. It has been the habit and practice to hold caucuses of certain factions of this House—that is, the political parties, and by a majority of those in the dominating political machine to hold caucuses to determine the action of the House of Representatives; and you have in this session, and have had in the session before, the example of the lack of representation of very many districts throughout these United States by that very conduct.

We have now caucuses held by the majority of this House for the purpose of determining, by a majority of the Democratic Members of the House, what the legislation of this entire House of Representatives shall be; and I say that that is in violation of the spirit of the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.] Nay, more, it is in violation of the letter of the Constitution of the United States.

I do not condemn the gentlemen on that side of the House any more than I would those on this side of the House for that same sort of practice. But I say now, while you are discussing the deliberative advantages of this body, that the larger you make it, the less it is representative. And that is shown by the very fact that you are putting through bills here now at this session, and there were bills put through in the last session, simply by a majority of a lesser body than the entire House of Representatives, and whenever you do that, you depart from the privilege of the people being represented by their respective districts.

There is only one way here by which you can determine the will of the people in general, and that is to have the membership of this House enjoy a representation upon this floor individually. I recognize that it is necessary, of course, to have political parties, and necessary to have deliberations of those parties at times by themselves in the nature of conferences. But whenever you undertake to tie down the membership by a lesser body than the entire body of this House you depart from the advantages of the people being represented in Congress. Not only that, you violate both the spirit and the letter of the Constitution.

The people are beginning to realize how the caucuses of the political factions are depriving them of their just representation in this House and in other official bodies. The caucus is simply the system of faction legislation instead of legislation by the Representatives of the people in common. Very many of the Members of this Congress, and also Members of the last Congress, have told me time and time again that they would not have voted the way they did on certain acts of Congress except for the fact that they had been bound by the act of a caucus which they had attended. By that statement they admitted that they violated their oaths of office; by that statement they admitted that they became traitors to their constituencies and to their country; by committing that act they opened the way for special interests to get a foothold in this House and to get control of it as they have on many previous occasions. This caucus domination that makes a minority of the Members of the House its master will not long last, for the people of to-day are intelligent enough to see that it is the real cause of factional legislation and the giving of special privileges. I would no more attend a private caucus—and no caucus is anything more than private, for there is no legal authority for a caucus of a faction of our membership—I repeat that I would no more attend a private or a party caucus of a faction of our membership to betray the people who sent me here to represent them on the floor of the House than I would join an enemy hostile to the country. Now, some who want to be political bosses have said that on account of the present size of the House caucus domination is necessary. If that is true, it will be still more dominated if it is still further increased, and by so doing the people will be less represented than they are now. So the larger you make this body the less representative it becomes. When I hear gentlemen speak of the fact that the increased membership will give additional representation I can not agree with that statement. Therefore I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that we close debate on this section and all amendments to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this section and all amendments to it be closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the vote will be taken upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NELSON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 91, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That if the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico shall become States in the Union before the apportionment of Representatives under the next decennial census they shall have one Representative each, and if one of such Territories shall so become a State, such State shall have one Representative, which Representative or Representatives shall be in addition to the number, 433, as provided in section 1 of this act, and all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this section are to that extent hereby repealed.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 4, after line 2, by inserting as a new section, the following:

"That as soon as the Fourteenth and each subsequent decennial census of the population of the several States, as required by the Constitution, shall have been completed and returned to the Department of Commerce and Labor, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of said department to ascertain the aggregate population of all the States and of each State separately, excluding Indians not taxed; which aggregate population he shall divide by the number 430, and the product of such division, excluding any fraction of a unit that may happen to remain, shall be the ratio of apportionment of Representatives among the several States under such census; and the Secretary of said department shall then proceed to divide the total representative population of each State by the ratio as determined, and each State shall be assigned one Representative for each full ratio of population therein and an additional Representative for any fraction equal to or greater than a moiety of such ratio, but in no case shall a Representative be assigned for a fraction less than a moiety of such ratio; and each State shall have at least one Representative; and the aggregate number of Representatives so assigned to the States shall constitute the total membership of the House of Representatives under such census; and as soon as practicable after the Secretary of said department shall have ascertained the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under any decennial census, in the manner herein provided, he shall make out and transmit to the House of Representatives a certificate of the number of Representatives so apportioned to each State, and he shall likewise make out and transmit without delay to the executive of each State a certificate of the number of Representatives apportioned to such State."

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, before beginning my argument I would like to ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes. I shall probably not use that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] asks unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is in form the same as the law passed in 1850, and the same as the provision that was carried in the bill of last year, and the same as the amendment referred to to-day as the Crumpacker amendment. Its purpose is to provide a method, in the absence of future legislation, for determining the number of the membership of the House in each succeeding Congress.

Before I come to the amendment itself, I may be pardoned for just a word or two on the major proposition of the size of this body. In my humble judgment you do not necessarily make a body responsive to the people by increasing its size, nor do you necessarily make it responsive by decreasing its size. Only long experience and the evolution of legislative history can determine what is the proper size for the popular branch of the Government.

I am not one of those who believe that you are now going to make this body responsive to the people in any greater degree than it now is by increasing its Members. What makes Representatives responsive to their constituency is not the number of them, but their accountability to that constituency. [Applause.] The very fact that Members of this House are required every two years to give an account of their stewardship is what makes us responsive to the people of America and not the fact that we constitute 391 Members instead of ninety-odd Members. [Applause.] If the Senate of the United States be unresponsive, the thing that makes it so is not the fact that it is a small body, but

the fact that it is elected for a long term by an indirect method, and is not directly answerable to the people.

Now, the practical proposition that we are confronted with here to-day is, What size will enable all views of all the people of the country to be here presented in the most orderly, efficient manner? Manifestly, if you have a very small number, you will not have all views presented. Manifestly, if you have a very great number, by virtue of that very size you will not be able to have those views presented. An experience of eight years in this House has taught me that the danger is not in not having this body properly responsive to the people, but in having it and its machinery so cumbersome that it is impossible to do the will of the people. [Applause.]

It has been said, and well said, that when you increase numbers you make it easier for a few men to control. A House of a thousand Members, with our constitutional provision in regard to a majority to constitute a quorum, would put into the hands of a limited number of men infinitely more power than is in the hands of any similar number now.

What has been the history of legislation in this country? Instead of the Committee of the Whole considering matters, instead of the House considering matters involving the details of legislation, you have seen those details more and more determined by the various committees of the House. You will hear, and you have heard, in conversation on the floor during the consideration of this bill, that we ought to follow the committee that has the matter in charge. What is the meaning of it? It means that we have a body so large that of necessity we have had to delegate to the committees the working out of the real details, and we have the power of veto or approval, but practically none of amendment.

Now, there is another fact that is apparent in this debate, and can not be ignored, and that fact is that the number arrived at and reported by the committee—the number 433—was arrived at by determining what number was necessary in order that no State might lose a Member. [Applause.] That is the fact, and no man can deny it. Other considerations may have affected individual men; but if size is what they want, but if the arguments of men who say that the only way to represent the people is to stand for a larger body are true, how do they reconcile themselves to the proposition that by this bill they have increased the number of people that each Member of the House is to represent? If we are to determine our responsibility by the fewness of the number we represent, then we ought to reduce the number of inhabitants to be represented by each Member of this House, and yet you have increased that number over what it has been heretofore, and that has happened every 10 years.

Now, all of us are human; we are no better than those who went before or those who will come after. I have offered this amendment in the hope that we can provide a method whereby the weaknesses of Members and their State pride will not be called so much into play.

Let no man misunderstand me. I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] when he characterized this amendment both as arrogant, foolish, and impotent. In my judgment the characterization was not deserved. I realize, as he said, that it is not possible for this Congress to tie the hands of any other Congress. But that statement can be made as to any general law that we may pass that does not have in its terms a limitation for the life of this Congress. Of course, a subsequent Congress can repeal it. There is not a law of a general character that we pass that, so long as it remains on the statute book, is not both an advice and a limitation on a subsequent Congress. It can be repealed, and when the wisdom of a subsequent Congress determines it will be repealed. So 10 years from now, if the experience of the American people and the honest judgment of Congress determine that the body provided is too small, this amendment will be swept away, and you will have an increase in membership.

But this is what it will do. It will make the people pause; it will make it more difficult to increase the membership of this House. [Applause.] It will remove from the action of the Members the present pressure that comes by virtue of the individual cases and conditions in particular States. Less than 15 minutes ago a colleague said to me, "I would be willing to vote to reduce the representation of the House, but I am not willing to throw two of my colleagues into a fight as to who shall come here to Congress." I am not criticizing him. If I had any feeling, it was one of admiration for the man that he should have that kindly friendship for his colleagues. And yet it is that kind of feeling that necessarily controls us and has controlled this Congress in fixing this number at 433. It is to get away from that that I have offered this amendment.

Let me suggest to you another thing. The chief indictment of the American people brought against Members of Congress has not been that they represent too many people, but that they represent too few. [Applause.] What the people of America are demanding are statesmen that can rise to the magnitude of the entire country and legislate for 90,000,000 of people and not simply for one district. [Applause.] You are not going to make the people believe that you are any more their servant because you have decreased the boundary of your district or the number of your constituents. Much has been said about personal acquaintance. I represent a city of 230,000 people and a county outside with 60,000 people. The man does not live who can know all those people in a personal and individual way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. But, Mr. Chairman, it does not follow because you are unable to know the individual that therefore you are unable to represent the views of that constituency. I beg this House to stop and consider. Every man here knows that personal considerations have controlled us both in fixing the number and in our views on the subject. What now confronts us will confront a Congress 10 years from now unless we provide some other way. The gentleman from Virginia said, "Oh, you do not have to repeal this act; any act passed subsequent to it, inconsistent with it, would repeal it." That is true, but this is perhaps worthy of consideration. In the absence of a general rule for apportionment there comes an insistent and earnest demand for legislation every 10 years, and with that demand comes the exigency of particular localities and particular Members. But with a general rule that will take care of it, with people knowing in advance, they will realize that they must take their lot, whatever it may be, 10 years from now, according to this plan, and there will not be the insistent demand for legislation.

Believing this, I have offered this amendment. I have offered it because I want to see the House of Representatives a great deliberative body. I want to see it such a body that it will be able as a body to consider its business and not be relegated to the position of either approving or vetoing the work of its committees. I hope that the amendment may prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has made a statement that has been repeated several times on the floor of the House to-day to the effect, substantially, that if you increase the numbers of this body and make it larger you will make it easier to dominate and control. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to understand the reason or the philosophy of that statement. I can not see how this House, composed of 400 Members, will be more easily dominated and controlled than it would be if it were composed of 200. I do not understand that this body is more easily influenced and improperly controlled than another legislative body in this country not so large as this.

I take it that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is in favor of 433 Members, for, as I understand, he voted for that number in the last Congress, and, from what he says, he will vote for it again here. Yet he stands here and proposes to fix that number, or a less number, as the limit in the apportionment which shall be made 10 years hence. With what grace or consistency can he or any other man say that comes now advocating, as he must advocate by his vote, an increase of 42 Members, that the Congress chosen 10 years hence shall not know better how to apportion Representatives than we. Why should we arrogate to ourselves a wisdom greater than our day and generation? Can we know better what ought to be done 10 years hence than the Representatives of the people will who will be elected at that time? Can we know better what the wishes of those people will be? [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield at this time. I can not understand why it is that a larger body, one larger than this, can not transact business orderly. I have seen it demonstrated to-day, and I have seen it demonstrated time and again before, as every Member on this floor has, that the best order, the most careful deliberation, the most careful consideration, has been given to measures when every seat in this House was full, when the questions involved and interests at stake were so great that the Members felt it was their duty to come here and attend to business and look after the interests of their people. It is then that we have the most orderly proceeding; it is then that you have been able to hear what has been said by

every man who spoke on the floor. Yet at other times, when there is scarcely a quorum present, in Committee of the Whole, when only 100 are required to constitute a quorum, we have had the greatest disorder, the greatest confusion, and it is most difficult to consider a measure fairly and well.

Mr. Chairman, I object as a matter of principle to this Congress attempting to do something to forestall the action of a Congress elected 10 years from now. We can not tell what the conditions will be then. We do wrong to attempt to do that. The futility of the action, the utter inability to do what we would attempt to do, proves it is unnecessary and useless. Furthermore, I believe as firmly as I believe anything that the framers of the Constitution intended when they provided that Congress should apportion the Representatives among the States after each decennial census that the Congress, the people's Representatives, should make this apportionment. They intended that those men, elected from the people, fresh from the people, fully aware of their wishes and knowing the then existing conditions, should make the apportionment of Representatives, and to attempt to delegate it to another agency or to any other power is an evasion in spirit at least of the Constitution. [Applause.]

[Mr. SMALL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to a distinction to which the gentleman from Kentucky has not adverted. It is perfectly true that the ordinary legislative act of one Congress is as susceptible of repeal by a subsequent Congress, just as this particular effort to forestall the action of a subsequent Congress may be repealed. But there is this very obvious, and manifest distinction, between the ordinary legislative act, and the enactment of the amendment of our friend from Kentucky. When we legislate with reference to existing conditions, it is in discharge of a present duty. It is a mere incident of that legislation that it furnishes a rule of action until it is repealed by a subsequent legislature. It is not enacted with the main intent of binding the future body. Now it is our duty to fix the size of the House for the next 10 years to come. It is not a part of our duty under the Constitution when we pass the apportionment act for the period which it contemplates, to go further and fix the size of this body for all the coming years. When we seek to do this, we exceed our duty, and undertake the discharge of a task which is not imposed upon us. I may illustrate the proposition in this way. We establish rules for the government of this body. This is a part of our present duty. If we undertake to prescribe that the rules of this body, shall be the rules of the next House of Representatives we will undertake to do precisely what is proposed to be done by this amendment, namely to forestall another House, and impose a limit on its action. This has been attempted, and failed, just as the effort has heretofore been made to fix the limit of membership in this body.

The gentleman from Kentucky says, and justly, that what determines the size of a legislative body, is the evolution of thought, the change of conditions, and the present features of the problem when the solution of that problem is approached. That is perfectly true. In the evolution of our Government, and the inevitable change of conditions in the time to come, may we not safely leave to the men of that other day, the determination of the numerical limit of membership of this House?

With respect to the size of the body, I wish to say in response to the gentleman from Kentucky, that I yield to no one, in my desire to see that this House shall continue to be the greatest parliamentary body of the world. But I do not agree to the proposition that when we increase our membership, we will diminish our ability to deliberate. I maintain Mr. Chairman as a result of observation and experience, that from time to time we can increase the membership of this body to keep step with the expanding population of the country without reducing our effective capacity for legislative work. We are to-day a long way from the limit that this body may attain, and still be a workable, deliberate, and efficient Chamber. Look for a moment at the great deliberative bodies of other progressive nations, which enjoy popular government, England, France, Italy, Austria, and Hungary.

The membership in the popular branch of the legislative departments of these Governments, is numerically much in excess of the membership of this House, yet no one has risen to say that those bodies have failed either in representative ability, or capacity to deal in a deliberative way with the problems that confront them. Therefore, I say, we need not excite ourselves, or exert ourselves to forestall the future, and to tie the hands of future Representatives in a future House. We need concern ourselves solely with the discharge of the present duty imposed upon us by the Constitution.

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that looking to the future, the men of that day will be able to discharge their constitutional duty, as well as we are able to discharge ours in the present. Indeed with their heritage of experience, they ought to be able to discharge it, in comparison with us, with greater efficiency.

The gentleman from Kentucky suggests that the personal equation has operated in the construction and support of the present bill. Doubtless that is true, to some extent. But the personal equation in some form is always with us, and in the present instance it has not operated to the prejudice of the public interests. The present bill rests upon sound considerations of public policy apart from, and unrelated to the personal equation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All debate on this amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I beg your indulgence for a few moments. It is known to the membership of this House who have served here for a long time that I seldom trespass upon the patience of this body. I would not do so on this occasion did I not believe that we are, if we should adopt this proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, doing a thing in the nature of an attempt to surrender the rightful power that belongs to the House of Representatives, to delegate the power to apportion the representation in this House to one of the executive branches of the Government. It is true that it is futile to do this in the light of the fact that a future Congress could repeal the law if this amendment was carried in it. But, Mr. Chairman, it is as far as we can go under the Constitution in an attempt to rid this House of that responsibility and of that duty, and to confer that duty and that responsibility upon an executive branch of the Government, which means that a future House of Representatives, dealing with this great constitutional power of apportionment, is sought to be bound by this provision, suggestively, at least, and to surrender that duty and that power to an executive department to be performed by some little expert mathematician or fifteen-hundred-dollar clerk down in the Census Bureau 10 years hence. [Applause.]

The Constitution of the United States intended that the Congress should consider this matter; intended that the Congress should take the conditions that obtain in the country into consideration; that the Congress should make the figures; that the Congress should intelligently comprehend the then existing conditions and make the apportionment according to the best judgment of the Congress.

There is another reason why I am opposed to it. It is a cast-off, worn-out garment; it is a tried and condemned experiment. In 1850 such a provision was inserted in the law. The next Congress, charged with this duty of apportionment, repudiated that suggestion [applause], repudiated any binding force of that law, and increased the House of Representatives by a membership of eight.

And there is another reason why I object to it. It is not only a worn-out, cast-off Democratic garment put into a law in 1850 and afterwards rejected by Congress, but that old worn-out experiment was brought out into the sunlight in the last Congress by a distinguished Republican, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]. And I think it wise enough that this thing, of no real force, of doubtful propriety, and that may subject us to the criticism of really favoring a small House of Representatives, without the manhood to stand up here now and say so, ought, for all these reasons, and for the reasons that have been better and more amply stated than I can state them, to be rejected. [Prolonged applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is much more serious than gentlemen who are opposing it seem to realize. I think if this amendment is adopted we shall be bound absolutely hand and foot, practically, 10 years from now. It will come about in this way: As the law is now, when the census is taken we have got to legislate before Representatives can be apportioned. There is no legislative apportionment until we create it. With this amendment we are not going to repeal it before the census is taken. Nobody will ever think of that, so that there is no probability of repealing it until after the question arises as to apportionment. The census will first have been taken. Then, as soon as the census is taken, the Cabinet officer who is directed in this amendment to do so, certifies the number of Representatives for each State under the law. Then all that the Senate has got to do is not to act; all that the House has got to do is not to act; and thus by simple nonaction we have got it fastened on us for all time to come.

Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is an able man. He saw beyond the moment on that, I think, and——

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to say that I frankly stated to the committee the facts about that. There is no doubt or concealment about that.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman is always frank and able. His idea now is to put it into the hands of a Cabinet officer to apportion the representation and determine the number of presidential electors for each State.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that the idea is to establish a rule, and the Cabinet officer will then be simply a ministerial officer to carry out the rule. He has no discretion.

Mr. SIMS. Yes; but the apportionment will take place by reason of his certificate.

Mr. SHERLEY. We every day give to executive officers infinitely more power than it is proposed to give to this Cabinet officer here. Take, for example, the railroad rate law, where——

Mr. SIMS. Under that law no authority or power comparable to what is proposed here is given to anybody.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SIMS. At the present time the rule of the Senate has been to accept what the House does in this regard. Now, the House by this amendment does something which the Senate will accept for all time, probably, and something which it will perhaps never agree to repeal; so that by passing this amendment we tie our hands fast, and what is enacted now will never be repealed, I very much fear.

Mr. MANN. I am within 20 feet of the gentleman, and yet I can not hear him. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. I can not talk louder. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I knew it. The fault is in the size of the House.

Mr. SIMS. I knew it was not the fault of the size of my mouth. [Laughter, and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. CULLOP. If this amendment were adopted, would it not practically turn over the apportionment of the House of Representatives to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor?

Mr. SIMS. Yes; under the census, as he would find it.

Mr. CULLOP. Because he would have charge of the taking of the census and could make a House as he saw fit?

Mr. SIMS. Yes. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] Mr. Chairman, I demand order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee will suspend until there is order. Gentlemen, you can not force a vote, except under the rules of the committee. The gentleman from Tennessee is entitled to speak for five minutes.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has stated frankly his real object and purpose. Do you gentlemen indorse his purposes? If so, why not vote for the 391 amendment now? If this amendment is adopted, the apportionment will take place and the presidential electors will be apportioned by the Census Office; and without any action to the contrary, this will necessarily take effect, because otherwise the law will have to be repealed, and to that repeal the smaller body will have to consent. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if I held the opinion that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] holds, and the opinion that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] holds, and the opinion that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] holds, that in numbers there is greater security, I would move to increase the 433 Members now to 500 or 600 or 700. [Applause on the Republican side.] By this bill you increase the number to 433, and each Representative will represent 211,000 people, as against less than 200,000 now.

Oh, I am sometimes amused and sometimes surprised to see how gentlemen whom I know to be able take positions that are not defensible because of a fear, perchance, that the bill may not pass at 433.

It is absolutely certain the membership will be fixed at 433. I am not surprised, however, that the gentlemen from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] and from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], as a makeweight, oppose this amendment for fear that an outrage may be committed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor in executing the law if the amendment is adopted.

But when I find the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] is frightened in the premises I feel like climbing a tree. [Laughter.] Now, in every session of Congress, by the enactment of laws, at least 100 times in every session we clothe one of the executive departments, or the President, with power to perform a ministerial act, as in this case. If the Secretary of Commerce and Labor should refuse to perform it, on the one hand, or should attempt to perform it without the authority of law, he would be subject to impeachment. In my judgment there is not a man within the sound of my voice who believes the country would be benefited by a further increase in the number of Representatives. "Oh," said the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON], "I am afraid of the referendum that is coming, because the people have not been represented properly." Then make 25,000 the representative unit and fill up this Hall so full that Members can not get in, like the hall of the British House of Commons, in order that the people may be properly represented. [Applause.] You may say that is expensive. Ah! In a country of 92,000,000 of people the expense would be insignificant, provided it gave us better legislation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], which practically turns over the apportionment of the United States for representation in Congress into the hands of one man, the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. I am not astonished at the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] when he desires to control the apportionment of 10 years hence for legislative purposes in the national Congress. He knows full well the purport and effect of this amendment if it should pass. He knows the benefit to his party and the injury that would ensue to ours. He is fully conscious of it. Pass this amendment and the manipulation that we had in 1910 in the taking of the national census will be a mere bagatelle in comparison with what it would be if this amendment should become a part of the law. Ten years from now it will be manipulated as a machine, so that it will return the right kind of membership to suit the politics of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That would be the effect of it, and let no man deceive himself about its meaning. It will deny representation to portions of the Union which are entitled to it, it will give representation to portions of the Union that are no entiled to it. For such a purpose it had its origin, and for such a purpose it will be enforced.

What does this amendment mean? A curtailment of the representation of the people in the House of Representatives of the national Congress according to the desire of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. One gentleman has said that not enough people get the ear of their Congressman. True that is, and it is further true that sometimes too many of the wrong kind of people get his ear for the good of the whole people, and I fear the adoption of this amendment would augment that number. Increase the number of people upon whom representation is based, and a less number of people will have the ear of their Representative in Congress who ought to have it, and more will have it who ought not to have it. No doubt the special interests would rejoice at its adoption because it would give them a better chance to control legislation in this body, and multiply their opportunities to exploit the people. If this amendment is adopted it will practically turn over the apportionment for this House to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, giving him power, in a large sense, to manipulate representation and control the legislation on the floor of this House. For this reason I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope the membership of this House will vote it down. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. I move that all debate on this amendment be now closed.

The question being taken, the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Division!

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 80, noes 111.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That in each State entitled under this apportionment to more than one Representative, the Representatives to the Sixty-third and each subsequent Congress shall be elected by districts composed of a contiguous and compact territory, and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. The said districts shall be equal to the number of Representatives to which such State may be entitled in Congress, no district electing more than one Representative.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "inhabitants," in line 8, page 4, add the following: "And that there shall not be when formed a difference in population of more than 20,000 inhabitants, based on the most recent United States census, between the congressional districts in any given State."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to charge, and charge advisedly, that no State legislature in any of the 46 States of this Union has more openly and brazenly violated the supreme law of the land or more ruthlessly trampled decency and fairness under foot than did the Democratic legislature in Kentucky in their redistricting law passed on May 26, 1900, aided by the redistricting acts of March, 1898.

Mr. Chairman, section 3 of this apportionment bill under discussion provides:

That in each State entitled under this apportionment to more than one Representative, the Representatives to the Sixty-third and each subsequent Congress shall be elected by districts composed of a contiguous and compact territory, and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. The said districts shall be equal to the number of Representatives to which such State may be entitled in Congress, no district electing more than one Representative.

To this section I have offered the following amendment:

After the word "inhabitants," in line 8, page 4, add the following: "And that there shall not be, when formed, a difference in population of more than 20,000 inhabitants, based on the most recent United States census, between the congressional districts in any given State."

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment I have offered will pass this House. The matter of leaving to the various State legislatures the power to divide each State into congressional districts—

composed of contiguous and compact territory, and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants—

is all right, provided the various State legislatures carry out faithfully and conscientiously that provision of the Federal law.

Away back yonder at the foundation of our Government there was much discussion as to what should be the proper basis of apportioning representatives in political assemblies. Should they be based on social position or wealth or profession, or should population alone be the determining element?

Our forefathers at the beginning of our Government wisely determined that our representation should not be based on wealth or social position. They said, in the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created equal"; so it is not hard to understand that our forefathers, in determining how the first House of Representatives should be organized and what representation each State should have, set it down as the organic law of the land that it should be based on population, and that each State should have as many Members in Congress as its population entitled it to, 30,000 inhabitants being then the basis of representation. They provided also that the census be taken every 10 years that this equality of representation might be maintained.

Our population increased. It soon became evident that if the basis of population was not increased far above 30,000 the House of Representatives would become so large that it would be unwieldy. So by the act of June 25, 1842, it was provided:

That from and after the 3d day of March, 1843, the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members elected agreeably to a ratio of 1 Representative for every 70,680 persons in each State.

And a little later on it was provided that the Members of Congress from each State shall—

be elected by districts composed of a contiguous and compact territory, and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants.

Upon the shoulders of the various State legislatures falls the duty every 10 years of dividing their various States into congressional districts, "composed of contiguous and compact territory," so as to contain "as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants."

As I have said, that provision of the Federal law is all right so far as it goes, and it would be forever all right if the various State legislatures, whose duty it is to divide their State into Representative districts every 10 years, would honestly and faithfully carry out its provisions; but if the various State legislatures, as has been done in the State of Kentucky, refuse to carry out its provision, then it ought to be amended in such a way as to make it obligatory upon the various States to insure, at least, something akin to fair and decent representation, whether the districts be in Kentucky or California or whether they be safely Republican or reliably Democratic. A square deal is what we want. The people have not had that in the various States of this Union. We have not had that in the State of Kentucky.

The Federal law requiring the State Legislature of Kentucky to redistrict, in the year 1900, that State into 11 congressional districts, "composed of a contiguous and compact territory and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants," was reviolated with as much nonchalance and supreme unconcern as though the members of that legislature did not care a fiddler's damn for the law of the land and less for the oath they had taken to faithfully perform their duty.

The basis of representation in 1900 was about 194,000 inhabitants to each congressional district. The population of Kentucky in 1900 was 2,147,174 and entitled us to 11 Representatives.

It was the duty of the Kentucky Legislature to divide that State into 11 congressional districts "containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants." Instead of the Kentucky State Legislature doing that it divided the State into 11 districts with a flagrantly unequal number of inhabitants, the sole purpose apparently being to increase Democratic and decrease Republican representation.

According to the census of 1900 the third congressional district in the State of Kentucky, a Democratic district, contained a population of 179,518 inhabitants, with 10 counties. The sixth congressional district, a Democratic district, contained 179,430 inhabitants and eight counties. The seventh congressional district, a Democratic district, contained a population, according to the census of 1900, of 151,453, with eight counties.

The eighth congressional district, a Democratic district, according to the census of 1900, contained a population of only 143,089, with 10 counties. The tenth district, a Republican district, according to the census of 1900, contained a population of 189,169 inhabitants, with 16 counties. The eleventh congressional district, the one I have the honor to represent, in 1900 had a population of 258,316 inhabitants, with 19 tremendous counties, and we have been so gerrymandered that it casts a Republican majority in presidential years of over 20,000 votes.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, taking the four Democratic districts, their average population, according to the census of 1900, was 163,372 people. My district contained 95,000 more inhabitants than the average population of these four Democratic districts. And it contained 115,000 more population than the eighth congressional district of Kentucky. The census of 1910 shows that the eighth congressional district has a population of only 148,313 and the eleventh district a population of 308,348, more than twice as many inhabitants as are in the eighth district. One Democrat equals more than two Republicans. The 1910 census shows that the seventh congressional district has a population of 151,051. The eleventh congressional district, therefore, has a population of 8,984 more inhabitants than both the seventh and eighth congressional districts combined.

I want to charge, and charge advisedly, that no State legislature in any of the 46 States of this Union has more openly and brazenly violated the supreme law of the land or more ruthlessly trampled decency and fairness under foot than did the Democratic Legislature in Kentucky in their redistricting law passed on May 26, 1890, aided by the redistricting acts of March 11 and 12, 1898, and the year 1900.

The eleventh congressional district, since its creation, has been safely and reliably Republican. In fact, it was the policy of the Democratic legislature that created it to place as many Republican counties in it as possible, so as not to endanger the Democratic districts being contiguous to its territory.

Notwithstanding the fact that in March, 1898, the eleventh congressional district was composed of 17 counties, with a population of 246,289, and the third congressional district was composed of 10 counties, with a population of 167,491, yet in order to make the more or less doubtful third congressional district more safely Democratic, the overwhelmingly Republican counties of Cumberland and Monroe, with a population of 22,615, were taken from the third district and added to the eleventh, and the little Democratic county of Metcalf, with a population of 9,988, was taken from the eleventh district and added to the third.

And just the day before this happened the big Republican county of Jackson, with a population of 10,561, had been taken from the eighth congressional district and added to the eleventh, although the eighth district at that time had a population of less than 143,000 inhabitants and only 11 counties, while the eleventh district already had a population of over 225,000 people and 17 counties. The eighth had been going Republican; something had to be done. And, as I have said, the eleventh district, according to the census of 1910, has more than twice as many inhabitants as the eighth district, and 8,388 inhabitants more than the seventh and eighth congressional districts combined. No one can read this history of the action of the Kentucky State Legislature and doubt its purpose to override the law and thwart the will of the people. And the reprehensible conduct of the Democratic Legislature of Kentucky toward the congressional districts of the State is not the only particular in which it has grievously sinned

Section 33 of the present constitution of Kentucky, which was adopted in 1891, provides that—

The first general assembly after the adoption of this constitution shall divide the State into 38 senatorial districts and 100 representative districts, as nearly equal in population as may be without dividing any county—

And that—

every 10 years thereafter—

It shall—

redistrict the State according to this rule—

And that—

not more than two counties shall be joined together to form a representative district.

What has the Legislature of Kentucky done to carry out these provisions? What say the facts? Let them speak; for they can do it more eloquently than any poor words of mine.

Kentucky now has a population of 2,289,905 people.

If honestly divided, each one of the 38 senatorial districts in the State would have 60,260 inhabitants, while each one of our 100 representative districts would have 22,899 inhabitants.

It would take too much time to take up all the districts in the State, legislative and senatorial, and point out the glaring discrepancies in population in each, but I will call your attention to enough of them to show that the members of the Democratic Legislature of Kentucky, in forming the present senatorial and legislative districts in the State, were not concerned about the law of the land or the oaths they had taken to obey it, but had in view only the increasing of Democratic and the decreasing of Republican representation.

For instance, the twenty-third State senatorial district (Democratic), composed of the counties of Gallatin, Owen, and Boone, has a population of only 28,365, when if fairly and honestly formed, it would have a population of 60,260 inhabitants. The thirty-third State senatorial district (Republican), composed of the counties of Martin, Johnson, Clay, Floyd, Harlan, Perry, Letcher, Pike, Knott, and Leslie, has a population of 145,075, when it ought to contain but 60,260. Why has the Democratic district above mentioned a population of only 28,365 and the Republican district a population of 145,075?

Why has the twenty-sixth State senatorial district (Democratic), composed of the counties of Grant, Pendleton, and Bracken, a population of only 32,874, while the seventeenth State senatorial district (Republican), composed of the counties of Laurel, Jackson, Rockcastle, Pulaski, Bell, Knox, and Whitley, has a population of 163,610, when the law says that all State senatorial districts, whether Democratic or Republican, should contain 60,260 inhabitants. One Democrat, in this apportionment, equals six Republicans.

This Republican State senatorial district I have just called your attention to now has 14,701 inhabitants more than the eighth congressional district and 12,559 inhabitants more than the seventh congressional district, both of which are safely Democratic. How eloquently these figures speak of the wanton abuse of power of those whose duty it is to make and uphold the law and deal out justice rather than violate the law and deal out injustice. But this is not all. If the Democratic Legislature of Kentucky has thrown decency to the winds and fairness to the dogs in dealing with the congressional and senatorial districts in the State, what can be said of its action in regard to the representative districts of the State? Again I call upon the facts to speak for themselves, contenting myself with the citing of a few shining examples. The census figures of 1910 show that Hancock County has a population of only 8,512. It is a Democratic county and is given one representative, while the Republican county of Bell, with a population of 28,447, has no representative at all, but has been thrown with the Republican counties of Harlan, Leslie, and Perry into the ninety-third State representative district (Republican), with a total population of 57,244, and that, too, in open violation of another plain provision of our State constitution to the effect that there can not be more than two counties placed in any representative district.

The thirteenth State representative district (Democratic) is composed of the county of Meade, with a population of only 9,783, while the ninety-eighth representative district (Republican) composed of the counties of Boyd and Lawrence, has a population of 43,511.

The county of Warren (Democratic), with a population of 30,597, has two State representatives, while the county of Whitley (Republican), with a population of 31,982, has no representative at all, but is combined with Knox, another Republican county, with a population of 22,116, to make one representative district, the population of the two Republican counties being 54,098.

I will not continue my remarks further along this line, but will ask leave to print as part of my remarks a list of the congressional, senatorial, and legislative districts of the State of Kentucky, with the counties in each and the population in each, as shown by the census of 1910, as well as a summary prepared and sent me by a friend in Kentucky, tending to show that Kentucky is a Republican State and conclusively showing that the mountain counties of Kentucky are not guilty of padding the election returns, as has been charged by the Democratic Party in the State:

A careful comparison of a few of the Republican counties with a like number of Democratic counties of the State as to their population in the last census and the total vote cast in the last presidential election will prove to all fair-minded men that if the Republican counties will get out their vote as well as the Democratic counties do theirs, the State will go largely Republican. Take, for example, Bell County, which is Republican, with a population of 28,447, and the total vote in the presidential election in 1908 was 3,855, or less than 14 per cent of the population. Henderson County, which is Democratic, with a population of 29,352, or 905 more population than Bell County, and the vote in the presidential election in 1908 was 6,451, or 2,596 more votes than Bell County. Bell County voted less than 14 per cent of her population, while Henderson County voted about 22 per cent of her population.

SUMMARIES OF OTHER COUNTIES.

Knox County (Republican), population 22,116; vote for President in 1908, 3,779.

Franklin County (Democratic), population 21,135; vote for President, 1908, 4,908.

Knox County has 981 more population than Franklin, while Franklin votes 1,129 more votes than Knox County.

Clay County (Republican), population 17,789; votes for President, 1908, 2,717.

Clark County (Democratic), population 17,787; votes for President, 1908, 4,456.

Clay County has 2 more population than Clark, while Clark County voted in presidential election 1,739 more votes than did Clay.

Cumberland County (Republican) has a population of 9,846, and voted in the presidential election, in 1908, 1,804 votes.

Carlisle County (Democratic) with a population of 9,048 cast 2,184 votes in the presidential election in 1908; with a population of 988 less than Cumberland, still they voted 380 more votes than Cumberland did.

Leslie County (Republican) with a population of 8,976 cast 1,501 votes in the 1908 presidential election, while Carroll County with a population of 8,110 cast 2,107 votes in 1908; with a population of 866 less than Leslie, still she casts 607 more votes than Leslie.

Laurel (Republican), population 19,872; total vote 1908, 3,807. Mason (Democratic), population 18,611; total vote 1908, 4,910.

Laurel has 1,261 more population. Mason 1,103 more votes than Laurel.

Jackson (Republican), population 10,734; total vote 1908, 2,090. Grant (Democratic), population 10,581; total vote 1908, 2,790.

Jackson has 153 more population, and Grant votes 700 more votes.

Adair (Republican), population 16,503; total vote 1908, 3,365. Fleming (Democratic), population 16,066; total vote 1908, 4,096.

Adair has 447 more population, while Fleming casts 731 more votes.

Clinton County (Republican), population 8,153; total vote 1908, 1,464. Trimble County (Democratic), population 6,512; total vote 1908, 1,710.

Clinton has 1,841 more population, while Trimble casts 246 more votes.

Monroe County (Republican), population 13,663; total vote 1908, 2,652. Owen County (Democratic), population 14,248; total vote 1908, 3,481.

Monroe has 586 less population; Owen casts 829 more votes.

Letcher County (Republican), population 10,623; total vote 1908, 1,645. Livingston County (Democratic), population 10,627; total vote 1908, 2,274.

Letcher has 4 less population; Livingston casts 629 more votes.

Harlan County (Republican), population 10,566; total votes 1908, 1,662. Boone County (Democratic), population 9,420; total votes 1908, 2,709.

Harlan has 1,146 more population, while Boone casts 1,047 more votes.

Perry County (Republican), population 11,255; total votes 1908, 2,099. Pendleton County (Democratic), population 11,985; total votes 1908, 2,891.

Perry has 730 less population, while Pendleton casts 792 more votes.

Owsley County (Republican), population 7,879; total votes 1908, 1,470. Oldham County (Democratic, population 7,248; total votes 1908, 1,933.

Owsley County has 731 more population; Oldham casts 463 more votes.

Russell County (Republican), population 10,861; total votes 1908, 2,090. Nicholas County (Democratic), population 10,601; total votes 1908, 2,857.

Russell County has 260 more population; Nicholas casts 767 more votes.

Whitley County (Republican), population 31,982; total votes 1908, 5,134. Warren County (Democratic), population 30,579; total votes 1908, 6,788.

Whitley has 1,403 more population, while Warren casts 1,654 more votes.

Casey County (Republican), population 15,479; total votes 1908, 3,102. Harrison County (Democratic), population 16,873; total votes 1908, 4,439.

Casey has 1,394 less population; Harrison casts 1,337 more votes.

The eleventh congressional district is composed of 19 counties which have a population of 308,543 and cast at the presidential election in 1908, 45,490 votes, or about 17.5 per cent of the population; the seventh congressional district is composed of 8 Democratic counties with a population of 151,051, and cast at the presidential election in 1908, 36,385 votes, a little over 24.5 per cent of the population, or a little over 7 per cent more than the eleventh district, which is Republican.

Also, I desire to submit, for further information, a comparison of 16 Democratic legislative districts with 16 Republican legislative districts, and 4 Democratic senatorial districts with 4 Republican senatorial districts. Why such gross inconsistencies in the population of these districts, the people of my

district are demanding of the Democratic Party of Kentucky an explanation.

Why has the Democratic legislature, in open violation of the constitution of the State, put only 132,162 inhabitants in the four following senatorial districts, which are Democratic, and 448,341 inhabitants in the four following State senatorial districts which are Republican?

The following are State senatorial districts (Democratic), with population of each taken from the 1910 census:

Tenth district (Hancock, Breckinridge, and Meade Counties)	39,328
Twenty-third district (Boone, Gallatin, and Owen Counties)	28,363
Thirtieth district (Harrison, Nicholas, and Robertson Counties)	31,595
Sixty-sixth district (Bracken, Grant, and Pendleton Counties)	32,874
Total	132,162

While the following are State senatorial districts (Republican), with population of each taken from the 1910 census:

Seventh district (Butler, Muhlenberg, and Ohio Counties)	72,045
Tenth district (Bell, Jackson, Knox, Laurel, Pulaski, Rockcastle, and Whitley Counties)	163,610
Thirty-third district (Clay, Floyd, Johnson, Knott, Leslie, Letcher, Harlan, Martin, Perry, and Pike Counties)	145,075
Thirty-fifth district (Bath, Carter, Fleming, Menifee, and Rowan Counties)	67,611
Total	448,341

The following are Democratic representative districts, with population taken from the 1910 census:

Eighth district (Trigg County)	14,539
Ninth district (Caldwell County)	14,063
Seventeenth district (McLean County)	13,241
Thirty-second district (Larue County)	10,701
Thirty-ninth district (Hancock County)	8,512
Fifty-seventh district (Anderson County)	10,146
Fifty-ninth district (Woodford County)	12,571
Sixty-third district (Jessamine County)	12,613
Sixty-fourth district (Mercer County)	14,063
Sixty-fifth district (Boyle County)	14,668
Sixty-seventh district (Garrard County)	11,894
Seventy-first district (Simpson County)	11,460
Seventy-seventh district (Grant County)	10,581
Seventy-eighth district (Boone County)	9,420
Seventy-ninth district (Pendleton County)	11,985
Eighty-fifth district (Bracken County)	10,308
Total	190,765

The following are Republican representative districts, with population taken from the 1910 census:

Tenth district (Christian County)	38,845
Seventeenth district (Laurel and Rockcastle Counties)	34,345
Eighteenth district (Muhlenberg County)	28,598
Twenty-fifth district (Butler and Edmonson Counties)	26,274
Thirty-fifth district (Monroe and Metcalfe Counties)	24,116
Thirty-sixth district (Wayne and Clinton Counties)	25,671
Thirty-seventh district (Adair and Cumberland Counties)	26,319
Forty-third district (Casey and Russell Counties)	26,340
Sixty-eighth district (Whitley and Knox Counties)	54,008
Seventy-first district (Clay, Jackson, and Owsley Counties)	36,502
Ninety-second district (Breathitt, Lee, and Magoffin Counties)	40,725
Ninety-third district (Bell, Harlan, and Leslie Counties)	59,244
Ninety-sixth district (Johnson and Martin Counties)	24,773
Ninety-seventh district (Knox, Floyd, and Letcher Counties)	40,037
Ninety-eighth district (Boyd and Lawrence Counties)	43,511
One-hundredth district (Elliott and Carter Counties	31,780
Total	561,208

Why put only 190,765 inhabitants in the 16 Democratic districts and 561,208 inhabitants in the 16 Republican districts—nearly four times as many?

Kentucky congressional districts, 1910 census.

First district (Democratic):	
Ballard	12,690
Caldwell	14,063
Calloway	19,867
Carlisle	9,048
Crittenden	13,296
Fulton	14,114
Graves	33,539
Hickman	11,750
Livingston	10,627
Lyon	9,423
McCracken	35,064
Marshall	15,771
Trigg	14,539
Total	213,791
Second district (Democratic):	
Christian	38,845
Daviess	41,020
Hancock	8,512
Henderson	29,352
Hopkins	34,291
McLean	13,241
Union	19,886
Webster	20,974
Total	206,121
Third district (Democratic):	
Allen	14,882
Butler	15,805
Barren	25,293
Edmonson	10,469
Logan	24,977
Metcalfe	10,453
Muhlenberg	28,598
Simpson	11,460
Todd	16,488
Warren	30,579
Total	189,004
Fourth district (Democratic):	
Breckinridge	21,034
Bullitt	9,487
Grayson	19,958
Green	11,871
Hardin	22,696
Hart	18,173
Larue	10,701
Marion	16,330
Meade	9,783
Nelson	16,830
Ohio	27,642
Taylor	11,961
Washington	13,940
Total	210,406
Fifth district (Democratic):	
Jefferson	262,920
Sixth district (Democratic):	
Boone	9,420
Campbell	59,369
Carroll	8,110
Gallatin	4,697
Grant	10,581
Kenton	70,355
Pendleton	11,985
Trimble	6,512
Total	181,029
Seventh district (Democratic):	
Bourbon	17,462
Fayette	47,715
Franklin	21,135
Henry	13,716
Oldham	7,248
Owen	14,248
Scott	16,956
Woodford	12,571
Total	151,051
Eighth district (Democratic):	
Anderson	10,146
Boyle	14,668
Garrard	11,894
Jessamine	12,613
Lincoln	17,897
Madison	26,951
Mercer	14,063
Rockcastle	14,473
Shelby	18,041
Spencer	7,567
Total	148,313
Ninth district (Democratic):	
Nicholas	10,601
Bracken	10,308
Bath	13,988
Boyd	23,444
Carter	21,966
Fleming	16,066
Greenup	18,475
Harrison	16,873
Total	308,348

Kentucky senatorial districts, 1910 census.

First district (Democratic):	
Fulton	14,114
Graves	33,539
Hickman	11,750
Total	59,403
Second district (Democratic):	
Ballard	12,690
Carlisle	9,048
McCracken	35,064
Marshall	15,771
Total	72,573
Third district (Democratic):	
Calloway	19,867
Livingston	10,627
Lyon	9,423
Trigg	14,539
Total	54,456
Fourth district (Democratic):	
Caldwell	14,063
Crittenden	13,296
Webster	20,974
Total	48,333
Fifth district (Democratic):	
Henderson	29,352
Union	19,886
Total	49,238
Sixth district (Democratic):	
Christian	38,845
Hopkins	34,291
Total	73,136
Seventh district (Republican):	
Butler	15,805
Muhlenberg	28,598
Ohio	27,642
Total	72,045
Ninth district (Democratic)—Continued.	
Lewis	16,887
Lawrence	20,067
Mason	18,611
Robertson	4,121
Rowan	9,438
Total	200,845
Tenth district (Republican):	
Breathitt	17,540
Clark	17,987
Elliott	9,814
Estill	12,273
Floyd	18,623
Johnson	17,482
Knott	10,791
Lee	9,531
Martin	7,291
Magoffin	13,654
Montgomery	12,868
Morgan	16,259
Menefee	6,153
Pike	31,679
Powell	6,268
Wolfe	9,864
Total	218,077
Eleventh district (Republican):	
Adair	16,503
Bell	28,447
Casey	15,479
Clay	17,789
Clinton	8,133
Cumberland	9,846
Harlan	10,566
Jackson	10,734
Knox	22,116
Letcher	10,623
Leslie	8,976
Laurel	19,872
Monroe	13,603
Owsley	7,979
Perry	11,255
Pulaski	35,986
Russell	10,861
Wayne	17,518
Whitley	31,982
Total	308,348
Eighth district (Democratic):	
Daviess	41,020
McLean	13,241
Total	54,261
Ninth district (Democratic):	
Logan	24,977
Simpson	11,460
Todd	16,488
Total	52,925
Tenth district (Democratic):	
Breckinridge	21,034
Hancock	8,512
Meade	9,783
Total	39,329
Eleventh district (Republican):	
Allen	14,882
Edmonson	10,469
Warren	30,579
Total	55,930
Twelfth district (Democratic):	
Bullitt	9,487
Grayson	19,958
Hardin	22,696
Total	52,141
Thirteenth district (Republican):	
Green	11,871
Hart	18,173
Larue	10,701
Total	40,745
Fourteenth district (Democratic):	
Nelson	16,830
Shelby	18,041
Spencer	7,567
Total	42,438

Fifteenth district (Democratic):
- Marion 16,330
- Taylor 11,961
- Washington 13,940
- Total 42,231

Sixteenth district (Republican):
- Adair 16,503
- Clinton 8,153
- Cumberland 9,846
- Russell 10,861
- Wayne 17,518
- Total 62,881

Seventeenth district (Republican):
- Bell 28,447
- Jackson 10,734
- Knox 22,116
- Laurel 19,872
- Pulaski 35,986
- Rockcastle 14,473
- Whitley 31,982
- Total 163,610

Eighteenth district (Democratic):
- Boyle 14,668
- Casey 15,479
- Garrard 11,894
- Lincoln 17,897
- Total 59,938

Nineteenth district (Republican):
- Barren 25,293
- Metcalfe 10,453
- Monroe 13,663
- Total 49,409

Twentieth district (Democratic):
- Anderson 10,146
- Franklin 21,135
- Mercer 14,063
- Total 45,344

Twenty-first district (Democratic):
- Carroll 8,110
- Henry 13,716
- Oldham 7,248
- Trimble 6,512
- Total 35,586

Twenty-second district (Democratic):
- Jessamine 12,613
- Scott 16,956
- Woodford 12,571
- Total 42,140

Twenty-third district (Democratic):
- Boone 9,420
- Gallatin 4,697
- Owen 14,248
- Total 28,365

Twenty-fourth district (Republican):
- Kenton 70,355

Twenty-fifth district (Democratic):
- Campbell 59,369

Twenty-sixth district (Democratic):
- Bracken 10,308
- Grant 10,581
- Pendleton 11,985
- Total 32,874

Twenty-seventh district (Democratic):
- Fayette 47,715

Twenty-eighth district (Democratic):
- Bourbon 17,462
- Clark 17,987
- Montgomery 12,868
- Total 48,317

Twenty-ninth district (Republican):
- Estill 12,273
- Lee 9,531
- Madison 26,951
- Powell 6,268
- Total 55,023

Thirtieth district (Democratic):
- Harrison 16,873
- Nicholas 10,601
- Robertson 4,121
- Total 31,595

Thirty-first district (Republican):
- Lewis 16,887
- Mason 18,611
- Total 35,498

Thirty-second district (Democratic):
- Boyd 23,444
- Elliott 9,814
- Greenup 18,475
- Lawrence 20,067
- Total 71,800

Thirty-third district (Republican):
- Clay 17,789
- Floyd 18,623
- Johnson 17,482
- Knott 10,791
- Leslie 8,976
- Letcher 10,623
- Harlan 10,566
- Martin 7,291
- Perry 11,255
- Pike 31,679
- Total 145,075

Thirty-fourth district (Democratic):
- Breathitt 17,540
- Magoffin 13,654
- Morgan 16,259
- Owsley 7,979
- Wolfe 9,864
- Total 65,296

Thirty-fifth district (Republican):
- Bath 13,988
- Carter 21,966
- Fleming 16,066
- Menefee 6,153
- Rowan 9,438
- Total 67,611

Thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh, and thirty-eighth districts (Democratic):
- Jefferson 262,920

Kentucky legislative districts, 1910 census.

First district (Independent):
- Hickman 11,750
- Fulton 14,114
- Total 25,864

Second district (Democratic):
- Ballard 12,690
- Carlisle 9,048
- Total 21,738

Third district (Democratic):
- Graves 33,539

Fourth district (Democratic):
- McCracken 35,064

Fifth district (Democratic):
- Calloway 19,867

Sixth district (Democratic):
- Lyon 9,423
- Marshall 15,771
- Total 25,194

Seventh district (Democratic):
- Crittenden 13,296
- Livingston 10,627
- Total 23,923

Eighth district (Democratic):
- Trigg 14,539

Ninth district (Democratic):
- Caldwell 14,063

Tenth district (Republican):
- Christian 38,845

Eleventh district (Democratic):
- Hopkins 34,291

Twelfth district (Democratic):
- Webster 20,974

Thirteenth district (Democratic):
- Henderson 29,352

Fourteenth district (Democratic):
- Union 19,886

Fifteenth-sixteenth districts (Democratic):
- Daviess 41,020

Seventeenth district (Democratic):
- McLean 13,241

Eighteenth district (Republican):
- Muhlenberg 28,598

Nineteenth district (Democratic):
- Todd 16,488

Twentieth district (Democratic):
- Logan 24,977

Twenty-first district (Democratic):
- Simpson 11,460

Twenty-second district (Democratic):
- Allen 14,882

Twenty-third and twenty-fourth districts (Democratic):
- Warren 30,579

Twenty-fifth district (Republican):
- Butler 15,805
- Edmonson 10,469
- Total 26,274

Twenty-sixth district (Republican):
- Ohio 27,642

Twenty-seventh district (Republican):
- Grayson 19,958

Twenty-eighth district (Democratic):
- Breckinridge 21,034

Twenty-ninth district (Democratic):
- Hancock 8,512

Thirtieth district (Democratic):
- Meade 9,763

Thirty-first district (Democratic):
- Hardin 22,696

Thirty-second district (Democratic):
- Larue 10,701

Thirty-third district (Democratic):
- Hart 18,173

Thirty-fourth district (Democratic):
- Barren 25,293

Thirty-fifth district (Republican):
- Monroe 13,663
- Metcalfe 10,453
- Total 24,116

Thirty-sixth district (Republican):
- Wayne 17,518
- Clinton 8,153
- Total 25,671

Thirty-seventh district (Republican):
- Adair 16,503
- Cumberland 9,846
- Total 26,349

Thirty-eighth district (Democratic):
- Green 11,871
- Taylor 11,961
- Total 23,832

Thirty-ninth district (Democratic):
- Nelson 16,830

Fortieth district (Democratic):
- Marion 16,330

Forty-first district (Democratic):
- Bullitt 9,487
- Spencer 7,567
- Total 17,054

Forty-second district:
- Washington 13,940

Forty-third district (Republican):
- Casey 15,479
- Russell 10,861
- Total 26,340

Forty-fourth to Fifty-first district (Democratic):
- Jefferson 262,920

Fifty-second district (Democratic):
- Oldham 7,248
- Trimble 6,512
- Total 13,760

Fifty-third district (Democratic):
- Carroll 8,110
- Gallatin 4,697
- Total 12,807

Fifty-fourth district (Democratic):
- Henry 13,716

Fifty-fifth district (Democratic):
- Shelby 18,011

Fifty-sixth district (Democratic):
- Franklin 21,135

Fifty-seventh district (Democratic):
- Anderson 10,146

Fifty-eighth district (Democratic):
- Scott 16,956

Fifty-ninth district (Democratic):
- Woodford 12,571

Sixtieth district (Democratic):
- Owen 14,248

Sixty-first and sixty-second districts (Democratic):
- Fayette 47,715

Sixty-third district (Democratic):
- Jessamine 12,613

Sixty-fourth district (Democratic):
- Mercer 14,063

Sixty-fifth district (Democratic):
- Boyle 14,668

Sixty-sixth district (Democratic):
- Lincoln 17,897

Sixty-seventh district (Democratic):
- Garrard 11,894

Sixty-eighth district (Republican):
- Pulaski 35,986

Sixty-ninth district (Republican):
- Whitley 31,982
- Knox 22,116
- Total 54,098

Seventieth district (Republican):
- Laurel 19,872
- Rockcastle 14,473
- Total 34,345

Seventy-first district (Republican):
- Clay 17,789
- Jackson 10,734
- Owsley 7,979
- Total 36,502

Seventy-second district (Democratic):
- Madison 26,951

Seventy-third district (Republican):
- Estill 12,273
- Powell 6,268
- Total 18,541

Seventy-fourth district (Democratic):	
Clark	17,937
Seventy-fifth district (Democratic):	
Bourbon	17,462
Seventy-sixth district (Democratic):	
Harrison	16,873
Seventy-seventh district (Democratic):	
Grant	10,581
Seventy-eighth district (Democratic):	
Boone	9,420
Seventy-ninth district (Democratic):	
Pendleton	11,985
Eightieth, eighty-first, and eighty-second districts (Republican):	
Kenton	70,355
Eighty-third and eighty-fourth districts (Republican):	
Campbell	59,369
Eighty-fifth district (Democratic):	
Bracken	10,308
Eighty-sixth district (Democratic):	
Nicholas	10,601
Robertson	4,121
Total	14,722
Eighty-seventh district (Democratic):	
Mason	18,611
Eighty-eighth district (Democratic):	
Fleming	16,066
Eighty-ninth district (Republican):	
Lewis	16,887
Ninetieth district (Democratic):	
Montgomery	12,868
Menefee	6,153
Total	19,021
Ninety-first district (Democratic):	
Morgan	16,259
Wolfe	9,864
Total	26,123
Ninety-second district (Republican):	
Breathitt	17,540
Lee	9,531
Magoffin	13,654
Total	40,725
Ninety-third district (Republican):	
Bell	28,447
Harlan	10,566
Leslie	8,976
Perry	11,255
Total	59,244
Ninety-fourth district (Democratic):	
Bath	13,988
Rowan	9,438
Total	23,426
Ninety-fifth district (Republican):	
Pike	31,676
Ninety-sixth district (Republican):	
Johnson	17,482
Martin	7,291
Total	24,773
Ninety-seventh district (Republican):	
Knott	10,791
Floyd	18,623
Letcher	10,623
Total	40,037
Ninety-eighth district (Republican):	
Boyd	23,444
Lawrence	20,067
Total	43,511
Ninety-ninth district (Republican):	
Greenup	18,475
One-hundredth district (Republican):	
Elliott	9,814
Carter	21,966
Total	31,780

Mr. POWERS. A careful examination of the tables I have inserted herewith not only prove the truth of every statement I have made, but show also many other instances where the Legislature of Kentucky has grossly violated the State as well as the Federal statutes, which provides:

That the number of Congressmen to which each State may be entitled in Congress shall be elected by districts composed of contiguous territory and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the court of appeals of Kentucky, speaking through Judge Carroll, in the case of Richardson *v.* McChesney (128 Ky., p. 363), adjudges, that since neither the Constitution of the United States, nor the constitution of the State of Kenucky, contain any direction to the State legislature on the matter of apportionment of the State into congressional districts, that the legislature of the State has the power, beyond the control of the courts, to divide the State into congressional districts in whatever way it chooses, and that it is not legally compelled to have any regard for the number of inhabitants in any given district, when formed, or its size in area. But the Supreme Court of the United States has never as yet said that the State legislatures were not as much bound to obey an act of Congress as they were the Constitution of the United States in matters over which the Federal Government had control, and nobody doubts that the Federal Government can exercise control over the number of its own Representatives, as well as the number of constituents each shall represent and the size of the district represented. But, if, as contended by the court of appeals of Kentucky, there is not sufficient positive direction on the part of the Federal Government to State legislatures to fairly redistrict the States into congressional districts with an equal number of inhabitants, the amendment I have proposed will cure that defect. It provides that the congressional districts, when formed, shall not contain an inequality of population of more than 20,000 inhabitants.

This amendment ought to pass this House and become a law. It is in the interest of justice and fair play. It is nonpartisan, in that it applies with equal force to every State in this Union. And the State of Kentucky is not the only State in this Union that will be benefited and blessed by its provisions. To reject this amendment on a strict party vote, as has been the case with other amendments to this bill presented from the Republican side of this House, will undoubtedly add no credit to the boasted fairness of the Democratic Party of this Nation.

I ask its adoption because it is just and right.

Pass the amendment I have offered, and the tenth congressional district (Republican) of Missouri will no longer contain (1900 census) 265,440 inhabitants, while the eighth congressional district (Democratic) has only 142,254 inhabitants.

Pass this amendment and the second congressional district in the State of Connecticut (1900 census) will no longer have 310,923 inhabitants, and the third congressional district of the same State only 129,619 inhabitants.

Pass it and you will hear nothing more about gerrymandering congressional districts in the State of Pennsylvania.

Pass it and the thirteenth congressional district of that State will no longer have 302,054 inhabitants, as shown by the census of 1900, while the twentieth district of the same State has only 150,909 inhabitants.

Pass this amendment and the various Republican State legislatures will be no longer tempted to gerrymander their States in the interest of the Republican Party.

Pass it and the Democratic legislatures of the various States will no longer let desire for power or greed for office swerve them from the paths of right.

In its political life, this Nation is getting too far from the paths of rectitude.

Old-time honesty in both business and politics is what we need. We ought not to let any political advantage control our actions here to the detriment of our common country. A square deal to every American ought to be our slogan.

Mr. Chairman, I will not detain you or this House further, but thank you both for your indulgence. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWERS) there were—ayes 66, noes 107.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the same amendment, and instead of providing 20,000 inhabitants I make it 50,000 inhabitants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "inhabitants," line 8, page 4, add the following: "and that there shall not be, when formed, a difference in population of more than 50,000 inhabitants, based upon the most recent United States census, between congressional districts in any given State."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWERS) there were—ayes 69, noes 104.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the same amendment, making the difference in population 75,000.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Chair thinks it is an honest effort to test the sense of the House. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "inhabitants," line 8, page 4, add the following: "and there shall not be, when formed, a difference in population of more than 75,000 inhabitants, based on the most recent United States census, between the congressional districts in any given State."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That in case of an increase in the number of Representatives in any State under this apportionment such additional Representative or Representatives shall be selected by the State at large and the other Representatives by the districts now prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted by the legislature thereof in the manner herein prescribed; and if there be no change in the number of Representatives from a State, the Representatives thereof shall be elected from the districts now prescribed by law until such State shall be redistricted as herein prescribed.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Section 4, line 14, strike out the word "selected" and insert the word "elected."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers the amendment which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 4, line 14, strike out the word "selected" and insert the word "elected."

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 4, line 17, by striking out the words "by the legislature thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to detain the House, but I want simply to say that the effect of this amendment, if it goes through, will leave to the several States the power of choosing the manner in which the redistricting shall be made. It will enable the States that have the institution of initiative and referendum to appeal direct to the people upon this question of paramount importance. If the amendment is not adopted, the redistricting must be made by the legislature without the privilege of the referendum. I believe the States ought to settle the question according to their own best judgment. That is all I care to say.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the primary reason for offering this amendment is on account of conditions existing in my State, the State of Missouri. This amendment is offered, as I am informed, at the solicitation and on the initiative of certain Republicans in the State of Missouri who are so infinitesimally small that you must have a magnifying glass to find them.

The statement has been made here upon the floor of this House, and in other places, that there is a statute in Missouri which provides that if the legislature fails to redistrict the State then the governor may lay the State off into congressional districts.

There is no such statute in Missouri. I will insert in my remarks the only provision of our statutes that can be construed to in any manner refer to this matter. Unfortunately for Missouri at the present time it is afflicted with a Republican governor [applause on the Republican side] compensated in a measure by being blessed with a Democratic legislature [applause on the Democratic side], this condition, however, rendering it practically impossible to pass a redistricting bill in the usual way at this time.

It has been stated to me by gentlemen having in charge this amendment, or favoring this amendment, that if Missouri had such a statute they wanted this amendment adopted so that the governor can prevent the legislature from redistricting the State by vetoing any bill which it might pass, and then take advantage of his own veto and redistrict the State himself.

It seems to me that every man upon this floor, either upon this side or that, ought to agree that such conduct would be contemptible petty politics, and I know of no other way to express it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the only sections of the Missouri statutes bearing on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMLIN. The sections are as follows:

SEC. 6616. Electoral districts: Hereafter at all elections held in this State for the office of President and Vice President of the United States the electoral districts shall be the same as the congressional districts into which the State shall be divided, and the same number of electors shall be chosen by the qualified voters, one of whom shall be a resident of each district, and in addition thereto two electors shall be chosen by the State at large.

SEC. 6617. New apportionment—Duty of governor: When any new apportionment shall be made of the Members to be elected to the House of Representatives of the United States whereby the number of electors to which the State may be entitled shall be increased or diminished, it shall be the duty of the governor to lay off the State into as many districts as shall be equal to the number of electors to which this State shall then be entitled, so that the said districts contain as near as may be an equal number of inhabitants.

From a careful reading of this statute it will be seen that section 6616 simply provides that the electoral districts shall be the same as the congressional districts, and there shall be one elector chosen from each district and two electors from the State at large.

Section 6617 simply provides that when an apportionment shall be made of the Members to be elected to the House of Representatives of the United States whereby the number of electors—which, as we all know, must correspond in numbers to the Members of the House of Representatives and United States Senate from each State—are either to be increased or diminished, then in that event the governor shall lay off the State into electoral districts, in compliance with the preceding section, which is to make the electoral districts the same as the congressional districts are. Thus it will be seen there is no authority given to the governor to fix the congressional districts, but only the electoral districts, and in the absence of any legislation by Congress as to how the redistricting shall be done I do not believe that the governor would have any more authority to divide the State up into congressional districts than any other officer of the State government, and no one would contend that any of the other State officers would have any such right.

Mr. Chairman, the friends of this amendment have sought to prejudice Members by contending that in the Democratic States the gerrymander has been grossly unfair, and my State has been cited as a sample of that unfairness. It seems to me if my Republican friends had not lost all shame by the long lease of power which they have enjoyed they would hesitate, in view of their own record, to refer to this matter at all.

I want to give you a sample of the Republican gerrymander, but I want first to especially call the attention of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] to the facts as they relate to our State. He contends that the Democratic Legislature of Missouri that redistricted the State 10 years ago violated the Federal Statutes by making the districts greatly unequal in population, so as to get an advantage. Let us see. The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth districts of Missouri are now represented in this House by Republicans—one of whom is my colleague, Mr. BARTHOLDT—and have an average population per district of 208,426; but the seventh, fourteenth, and fifteenth districts are represented by Democrats, of which I am one, and contains an average population per district of 233,646, being an average of 25,220 more to the Democratic district than to the Republican district. The average population per district for the whole 16 districts of Missouri is 194,166. Thus it will be seen that the charges he makes against his own State is not borne out by the facts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us get back to the record in the Republican States, where the redistricting has been done by the Republican Party, and see what the record is. The following table tells its own tale:

In California the population of the fifth California district is 236,234 and of the sixth is 155,839, difference being 80,395.

In Connecticut the population of the second Connecticut district is 310,923, while that of the third Connecticut is 129,619, the difference in population being 181,304.

In Illinois the eighth district has a population of 286,643, and the fourteenth Illinois has a population of 170,820, the difference in population being 115,823.

In Iowa the first Iowa district has a population of 159,267 and the tenth Iowa 253,350, the difference in population being 94,083.

In Kansas the third district has a population of 284,537 and the fourth Kansas 157,842, a difference in population of 126,695.

In Michigan the ninth Michigan district has a population of 166,124 and the twelfth Michigan 275,525, a difference in population of 109,401.

In Minnesota the fifth Minnesota district has a population of 292,806 and the second Minnesota district 174,856, the difference in population being 117,950.

In Nebraska the second district has a population of 162,756 and the third district has a population of 211,780, the difference in population being 49,024.

In New York, in the city of New York, the fifteenth New York district has a population of 165,701, and the eighteenth New York, in the same city, 450,000, the difference in population being 284,299. In the rural districts of New York, the twenty-second has a population of 169,005, the fifteenth a population of 165,701, the thirteenth a population of 169,378, and the thirty-fourth a population of 220,208.

In Ohio the twelfth Ohio district has a population of 164,460, and the twenty-first Ohio has a population of 255,510, the difference in population being 91,050.

In Oklahoma, where the present districts were created by the enabling act of Congress, the fifth Oklahoma has a population of 315,106, and the first Oklahoma 225,373, the difference being 89,733.

In Pennsylvania the eleventh district has a population of 257,121, and the fourteenth Pennsylvania 146,769, a difference of 110,352.

In the State of Colorado the first Colorado district has a population of 245,979, and the second Colorado 293,721, a difference of 47,742.

This table shows your record in these Republican States.

You Republicans had better get the "beam" out of your own eyes before you try to remove the "mote" out of your neighbors' eyes.

There is another record which, like Banquo's ghost, will not down. When the Republican Party was in control of Congress Oklahoma was admitted into the Union, and notwithstanding the fact that a very large majority of her population was made up of the intelligent, progressive, enterprising citizenship of the older States, thoroughly trained in statecraft, in fact, the very flower of American citizenship, you would not permit them to divide their own State up into congressional districts, but before you would admit this young giant into the Union, you laid your blighting hand upon her and fixed the metes and bounds of her congressional districts so that you thought you had secured three Representatives out of the five from that State.

What does this record show as to the equal distribution of population in these districts provided by you? Let us see:

	Population.
First district (Republican)	225,373
Fifth district (Democratic)	315,106
Second district (Republican)	230,224
Fourth district (Democratic)	303,330

In these four districts, two of which are Republican and two Democratic, and under your benign and just gerrymander there are 162,908 more people in the Democratic districts than there are in the Republican districts.

O! ye Republican pharisees, hypocrites! for pretense you make long prayers, and then, in order to obtain a petty advantage, you do not hesitate to invade the sacred precincts of State rights, but, like the serpent, you leave your trail behind.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these lilliputian Republican politicians in Missouri is very apparent.

They are not willing that our State shall be redistricted in the usual way—by a bill in the legislature, nor by the initiative and referendum—but they want to devise some means whereby one man, the governor, may do this work. They do not want it done fairly.

Their real purpose is disclosed by a remark frequently made by my colleague, Mr. BARTHOLDT, and who represents the governor on this floor, that the best lawyers are divided in opinion as to whether under our statutes the governor might not be authorized to redistrict the State, congressionally, in the event Congress should fail to direct how this work shall be done by the several States.

They are evidently reasoning this way about it: If good lawyers divide in opinion as to the proper construction to be given this statute, may not members of our Supreme Court also reach different conclusions, and if they should divide in opinions may not that division be along political lines, and if along political, then they console themselves with the fact that a majority of the members of our Supreme Court are now Republicans; and in this very dubious, doubtful, and questionable way fix it so that one man, the governor, may redistrict our State. This is their scheme in a nutshell. Of course, they do not dare to admit this in the open. Why, my colleague, Mr. BARTHOLDT, even pretends that he is in favor of letting the redistricting be done by the initiative and referendum. He was never in favor of this system of legislation a moment in his life, and whenever I hear one of these "stand-pat" Republicans talking about letting the people decide anything for themselves I immediately begin to look through the woodpile for the Senegambian, which I am sure is concealed therein, and in this case we do not have to look far to find the "nigger in the woodpile." It is to leave this law so that no particular authority in the State shall be designated by Congress to do this redistricting, so that by a partisan construction of a section of our statute a Republican governor can ignore the wishes of the good people of the State and lay out their congressional districts to suit his own sweet will.

I am opposed to it. I want a "square deal."

Mr. Chairman, practically every apportionment bill that has been passed through this House from the foundation of the Government has provided that the redistricting shall be done by legislatures of the different States. You Republicans passed the apportionment bills of 1872, 1882, 1892, and 1901, each one of which bills provided that the legislatures of the different States should do the work of redistricting. Now, if it was good to do that way then, why is it not good to do that way now?

The lower house of my State is composed of at least one member from each county in the State. The Senate is composed of men elected by districts equal in population as may be. In redistricting the State the representatives from all the people from every county have an equal vote. No man or party desiring to be fair can object to this method. I hope, therefore, that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be voted down.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I can not allow to go unchallenged the statements just made by my colleague from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN]. It is not the intention of either one or more politicians of the Republican faith to have the governor redistrict the State of Missouri.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No; I can not yield. Our proposition is, and the reason for this amendment is, not to tie the hands of the people of Missouri. The Democratic legislature which 10 years ago did the redistricting made districts varying in population by more than 100,000 people; in other words, it violated the Federal statute which said that the districts should contain as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants. And because of that flagrant violation of a Federal law, and for the further reason that the people desire to take this case in their own hands, we ask you Democrats now to be true to your traditions and to your principles and stand up for State rights on this question and not tie the hands of the people of Missouri if they propose by petition to present to the voters of that State a fair and equitable apportionment scheme. By voting these words into the bill, namely, "by the legislature thereof," you will prevent the people of Missouri from doing so. You will tie their hands; you will leave to the legislature again an opportunity to violate the Federal statute without any recourse on our part anywhere, either in the State courts or the Supreme Court of the United States. We ask you to be true to the doctrine which you preach, that the people have a right to make use of the initiative and referendum when they cease to have confidence in the legislature, and legislatures are usually controlled, as we all know, by partisan majorities, and it is probably true that both parties are sinning in that respect.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can not yield. As to the law cited by my colleague [Mr. HAMLIN], I want to state for the information of the House that that law was passed by a Democratic legislature. It was passed at the behest of a Democratic governor and was signed by that governor, but it can not be invoked in this case as another colleague [Mr. RUSSELL] has stated on the floor to-day. There is a doubt in the minds of the people as to whether that law relates to congressional districts or to the selection of electors in a presidential year, and, as I say, the greatest legal minds are in doubt about it. But this is immaterial, because we do not propose to invoke it; we propose to leave the matter of redistricting to the people themselves. Let each party get up by petition a fair scheme, and let the people vote as to which scheme they want, and we Republicans are perfectly willing to trust the people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Members of the House can not sufficiently appreciate the situation unless they understand political conditions in Missouri. A brief explanation will demonstrate to any fair-minded man, be he Republican or Democrat, how thoroughly justifiable is the demand of the people for the right to fix, by their own votes, the boundary lines of the districts, legislative as well as congressional. The State of Missouri is gerrymandered as no other State in the Union is, owing to a frantic effort on the part of Democratic politicians to prop their tottering party. The Democratic legislatures who played the dastardly game at political geometry were concerned, in the language of my friend from Kentucky, neither "about the law of the land nor the oaths they had taken to obey it," but had in view only the increase of Democratic and the decrease of Republican representation. Now, I believe, and my party believes, that the majority of the people of Missouri favor fair play in representation, but how, under the present system, are they going to get it?

Remember that the legislature which is to do the redistricting is itself elected in badly gerrymandered districts. How, then, can you secure pure water when the spring is poisoned? I do not propose to burden the RECORD with figures, but "by their fruits ye shall know them." At the last election, in November, 1910, the Republicans of Missouri elected their supreme court judges and other State officials by about 3,000 majority, and yet the Democrats succeeded in securing a large majority in both the house and the senate. There was no political issue that I know of which could have militated in favor of the State ticket and against the legislative ticket of the Republicans; hence it was the monstrous iniquity of the Democratic State gerrymander which prevented the majority of the people of Missouri from working their will through fair representation in the legislature.

But "the worst is still to come." Look at the result of the congressional elections. While, as I said before, the Republicans carried the State by a small majority, so that under an equitable arrangement they should have carried at least eight of the 16 districts of the State, that same monstrous gerrymander robbed us of five Republicans in Congress and left us but three, but, fortunately, enough, the same as in Kentucky, to tell the tale on this floor. Instead of one-half of the representation—and I should say at least one-half—we are not even accorded one-fifth, and from this you can probably understand why my Democratic colleagues insist on having the State redistricted "by the legislature thereof."

Before proceeding to give facts and figures on the congressional situation, let me throw a side light on Democratic conduct since the election. It seems that the leaders of that party regarded a Republican congressional representation of three out of possible 16 as excessive. So effective did they regard the congressional gerrymander that the election of more than one Republican was a surprise to them. And as all three successful candidates had been elected in the city of St. Louis, these so-called leaders raised the cry of fraud. To-day they wish they had not done it, for events proved that they had cried "Fraud" just once too often. Let me tell you the story. It is too good to withhold from the country. Owing to the prohibition issue, which brought out an exceptionally heavy vote—the citizenship of St. Louis being overwhelmingly opposed to prohibition—the Republicans carried that city by an unprecedented majority. A heavy vote in St. Louis always means a big Republican majority, but the Democratic leaders professed not to know that,

nor were they aware, apparently, that the Republican governor, Herbert S. Hadley, had staked his honor and reputation on an honest election in the three large cities of the State, and had instructed the State boards of election, appointed and controlled by him, to exhaust their official powers for the purpose of preventing fraud. He felt, as did every one of his party friends, that the Republican State administration was on trial in the conduct of that election, and it was his purpose to demonstrate that the people had made no mistake when they intrusted the affairs of the State in Republican hands. We knew we had had an honest election, and consequently courted the fullest investigation. Now, if our Democratic friends had stopped then and there they might have probably gained some party advantage, as the people of the State, unfamiliar with the facts, might have believed some of the wild statements made by the Democratic State chairman and other leaders. Instead, they walked, with open eyes, into their own trap, and instituted contests in all three of the congressional districts. And what was the result of these contests? A recount of all the ballots cast and a most careful comparison of the ballots with the poll books revealed a difference between the original count and the recount hardly sufficient to change the result in a single precinct, even if all clerical mistakes and technical errors were added together. To repeat a common expression, the wonder of it all was that so remarkably clean an election and so correct a count was technically possible, considering the tremendous task which the judges and clerks had to perform in so short a time.

It is admitted now by all that the last election in St. Louis was the fairest and squarest ever held, and as this is largely due to a Republican governor the people of Missouri, irrespective of party, regard his elevation to that high office on that account alone as a blessing rather than an "affliction," which is the word thoughtlessly used by my colleague [Mr. HAMLIN]. A partisan committee of the legislature also made investigations upon the strength of contests against St. Louis Members, and they, too, were forced to report in favor of the Republican contestees. So, we have the anomalous situation of the Democratic Party certifying to and proving the honesty of an election which it had denounced in unmeasured terms as fraudulent and corrupt, and in my judgment it will be many years before that party will get over the effect of the boomerang.

To return to the congressional gerrymander for which the Democratic Party is responsible let me cite but one example. The tenth district, which I have the honor to represent, had a population 10 years ago of 265,440. The adjoining twelfth district was given only 152,424 people, a difference of 113,016 people. It would have been an easy matter to comply with the Federal statute by making the three St. Louis districts equal in population, but that did not suit our Democratic gerrymanderers who hoped, by crowding all the Republican territory into one district, to make both the others Democratic. The tenth district now has a population of over 400,000, and its Republican majority of 25,600 alone, if fairly apportioned, would insure to the Republicans the representation to which they are entitled on this floor.

But why is it that of all the Missouri Democrats my colleague [Mr. HAMLIN] is so particularly anxious to save the Missouri gerrymander or to have a new one just as iniquitous made by the Missouri Legislature? I let the St. Louis Globe-Democrat answer this question. It says under the caption "A Specimen Missouri District":

> In the debate on the congressional apportionment bill, which passed the House last week, one of Missouri's Democratic Representatives, Mr. HAMLIN, made a special attack on the Republicans of Missouri and the idea of submitting the question of districting to all the voters of the State by referendum. Mr. HAMLIN's anxiety on the subject of saving the gerrymander can be understood when the peculiar make-up of his own district, the seventh, is examined. It begins not far from the southern boundary of the State, runs north in a single string of counties until it reaches the Missouri River, where it suddenly bulges east and west, jumping the river to take in the heavily Democratic county of Howard, without which the district would be strongly Republican. The seven counties south of the river, including the city of Springfield, give a Republican majority of 1,000, but the acrobatic feat at the river to get in Howard County, the Bourbon Gibraltar, Democratic by 1,600, sufficed to elect Mr. HAMLIN last year by the scanty plurality of 482.
>
> It is not surprising, in view of the geographical eccentricity of his district, that Mr. HAMLIN should be a champion of the gerrymander and scorn the use by the people of the referendum to obtain equal representation for themselves. The southernmost county of his district rests on a district, the fourteenth, that is another example of the art of the Missouri gerrymander contortionists. It takes almost the entire width of the State to render the fourteenth district "compact and contiguous." It is a spindling succession of counties east and west, and would be Republican but for its inclusion of a bunch of Democratic counties in the southeastern corner of the State. These two districts alone cover, in a narrow strip, two-thirds of the State east and west, and also north and south. Mr. HAMLIN refers to Missouri's election of a Republican governor as "unfortunate." The fact is due to allowing equal representation in filling the office. By a vote of 355,000 to 340,000, the voters of Missouri preferred the Republican candidate. No doubt the failure to apply a juggle to the choice of State officers also is the "unfortunate" part of it in Mr. HAMLIN's estimation.

The gentleman from the seventh district [Mr. HAMLIN] charges the Republicans of Missouri with an attempt to take advantage of a certain State law, which he quotes, in order to have the Republican governor perform the work of redistricting the State, and almost in the same breath he asserts that that law does not apply to congressional districts at all. Will he kindly tell me what would be the use of our invoking a law which does not apply? It seems his partisan feeling has carried him to an illogical and untenable position. Furthermore, in order to justify the Missouri gerrymander, he points to a number of States where, he says, the Republicans were guilty of the same offense. Well, we all know that two wrongs do not make a right; but, supposing his statements as to gerrymanders in other States were correct, would they not constitute the strongest possible argument in favor of my position that partisan legislatures can not be trusted as well as the people themselves? He argues that all former apportionment bills passed by Congress contained the words "by the legislature," so that heretofore the States had always been redistricted by the legislature; but he forgets that even 10 years ago, when Congress passed the last apportionment bill, such an institution as the initiative and referendum was unknown, or had not been adopted by a single State in the Union. Now, this new system of direct legislation by the people is in vogue in a large number of States, and whatever we may think of its value and usefulness in other respects a moment's reflection will satisfy us that it is exceptionally well adapted as an instrument to secure a fair apportionment of legislative, senatorial, and congressional districts. And the Republicans of Missouri, far from intending to take a partisan advantage which the law, above referred to, might or might not give us, intend to make use of the referendum by presenting to the people, for their approval at the ballot box, a fair and equitable apportionment plan. If Congress would refuse to invade the sovereign rights of the State to the extent of prescribing that the redistricting must be done by the legislature, all the States having the initiative and referendum could resort to it for the same purpose. In such an event both parties could prepare their redistricting schemes and submit them to the people, who, always solicitous of fair play, would put their stamp of approval upon what will seem to them to be the best. And it would probably not make much difference whether the Republican or the Democratic scheme is adopted, as the mere knowledge of its being subject to the approval of the people would insure fair and reasonable propositions.

How much superior, from the standpoint of justice and impartiality, such a system would be to the present plan of permitting partisan legislative majorities to arrange the districts for representation in legislative bodies is shown by another most recent example furnished by two Democratic State officials in Missouri. According to the constitution of my State the districting of State senatorial districts, when the legislature fails to act, must be performed by the governor, secretary of state, and attorney general. It so happens that the governor is a Republican, and the last-named two officials are Democrats. Now, instead of acting in a nonpartisan spirit and a judicial capacity, those two Democratic officials, being the majority of the board, eliminated the governor entirely and proceeded to do the work in the sole and exclusive interest of the Democratic Party. The refusal of the governor to sign the partisan plan will alone save the people of the State from a gerrymander unequaled in unfairness in political history.

The Republicans of Missouri are willing to trust the people rather than partisan bodies or officials, and I am free to say that Congress would lend its hand to the continuance of partisan outrages in Missouri and other States if it denied to the people of the several States the right to choose their own methods of securing fair representation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will allow me five minutes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Very well; I make the motion, then, Mr. Chairman, that all debate upon the paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate upon the paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that under the law in the State of Missouri that you have the initiative?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. You have it now by law?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. It reminds me of a boy who had a dog to sell. [Laughter.] He met a lady and said, "I have a dog; do you want to buy a dog?" Said the lady, "What is his name?" "Well, ma'am, I call him 'Initiative,'" said the boy. "That is a nice name," said the lady. "Is he a fierce dog?" "Oh," says he, "he is the d—— d—— d—— fiercest dog you ever saw." "Well," she said, "I do not want a fierce dog." The boy, equal to the occasion, said, "He is not such a d—— d—— d—— fierce dog as he might be." [Laughter.] That law, the initiative, was enacted under the leadership of the Democratic Party in the State of Missouri. Now that you want to perpetrate an outrage in congressional apportionment, or perchance in State apportionment, you rush, under the desire, in my judgment, to nullify the will of a majority in your State and repudiate that law. [Applause on the Republican side.] And great is Democracy! My judgment is not in favor of initiative legislation, but if it is enacted, even against my will, I will abide it. You do not seem willing to abide it. Missouri, in my judgment, is perhaps the most hopeful Republican State in the swing of 20 years of all the States in the Union. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And when you repudiate the law which your party led in enacting, while I am not a prophet or a son of a prophet, I believe the good people of the State of Missouri—of the Anglo-American race—will repudiate you, and the rocks and the mountains, if they do not fall on you, ought to fall on you. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 82, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

On line 17, section 4, after the word "legislature," insert "pursuant to the laws of the State under the constitution of said State."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the Clerk report the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "legislature," line 17, in section 4, insert "pursuant to the laws of said State under the constitution of said State."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendment to the House, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2983, and had instructed him to report the same to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. BROUSSARD, a Representative elect from the State of Louisiana, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

APPORTIONMENT.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that those who spoke on the bill in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] asks unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask some gentleman on that side of the House if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is present? If this meets with his approval, I shall not object. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill as amended to its final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill with the following instructions, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to recommit the bill with instructions, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after section 2 of the bill, as a new section, the following:

"SEC. 3. That as soon as the Fourteenth and each subsequent decennial census of the population of the several States, as required by the Constitution, shall have been completed and returned to the Department of Commerce and Labor, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of said department to ascertain the aggregate population of all the States and of each State separately, excluding Indians not taxed; which aggregate population he shall divide by the number 430, and the product of such division, excluding any fraction of a unit that may happen to remain, shall be the ratio of apportionment of Representatives among the several States under such census; and the Secretary of said department shall then proceed to divide the total representative population of each State by the ratio so determined, and each State shall be assigned one Representative for each full ratio of population therein and an additional Representative for any fraction equal to or greater than a moiety of such ratio, but in no case shall a Representative be assigned for a fraction less than a moiety of such ratio, and each State shall have at least one Representative; and the aggregate number of Representatives so assigned to the States shall constitute the total membership of the House of Representatives under such census. And as soon as practicable after the Secretary of said department shall have ascertained the number of Representatives to which each State is entitled under any decennial census, in the manner herein provided, he shall make out and transmit to the House of Representatives a certificate of the number of Representatives so apportioned to each State; and he shall likewise make out and transmit without delay to the executive of each State a certificate of the number of Representatives apportioned to such State."

And in section 4 of the bill, page 4, line 17, strike out the words "by the legislature thereof."

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk did not read the motion. The Clerk should also have read the introductory part.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the introduction.

The Clerk read as follows:

I move to recommit the bill (H. R. 2983) to the Committee on the Census, with directions to report said bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] moves the previous question on the motion to recommit the bill with instructions. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the motion to recommit the bill will answer "yea"; those opposed, "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 99, nays 177, answered "present" 7, not voting 105, as follows:

YEAS—99.

Anderson, Minn.	Draper	Higgins	Lindbergh
Anthony	Driscoll, M. E.	Hill	McCreary
Austin	Dwight	Hinds	McKinney
Bartholdt	Dyer	Howell	McLaughlin
Bathrick	Esch	Hubbard	Madden
Bowman	Farr	Humphrey, Wash.	Madison
Buchanan	Focht	Kahn	Mann
Burke, S. Dak.	Foss	Kennedy	Martin, S. Dak
Cannon	French	Kent	Miller
Catlin	Fuller	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Moore, Pa.
Cooper	Gardner, Mass.	Knowland	Morgan
Crumpacker	Gardner, N. J.	Kopp	Mott
Currier	Gillett	Lafferty	Murdock
Danforth	Good	La Follette	Needham
Davis, Minn.	Hanna	Langley	Nelson
De Forest	Harris	Lawrence	Norris
Dodds	Helgesen	Lenroot	Nye

Olmsted	Simmons	Sulloway	Vreeland
Parran	Sloan	Sweet	Warburton
Pickett	Smith, J. M. C.	Talcott, N. Y.	Wedemeyer
Powers	Smith, Saml. W.	Taylor, Ohio	Wilder
Prince	Speer	Thistlewood	Willis
Rees	Steenerson	Tilson	Young, Kans.
Roberts, Mass.	Stephens, Cal.	Utter	Young, Mich.
Rodenberg	Sterling	Volstead	

NAYS—177.

Aiken, S. C.	Dupre	Jacoway	Richardson
Akin, N. Y.	Ellerbe	James	Robinson
Alexander	Estopinal	Johnson, Ky.	Roddenbery
Allen	Evans	Johnson, S. C.	Rothermel
Anderson, Ohio	Faison	Jones	Rouse
Ansberry	Ferris	Kendall	Rubey
Ashbrook	Fields	Kinkead, N. J.	Rucker, Colo.
Ayers	Finley	Kitchin	Rucker, Mo.
Barnhart	Flood, Va.	Konig	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Floyd, Ark.	Konop	Sabath
Bell, Ga.	Foster, Ill.	Korbly	Saunders
Blackmon	Fowler	Lamb	Shackleford
Booher	Francis	Lee, Ga.	Sharp
Borland	Gallagher	Legare	Sheppard
Broussard	Garner	Lever	Sherley
Bulkley	Garrett	Linthicum	Sherwood
Burke, Wis.	George	Littlepage	Sims
Burleson	Glass	Lloyd	Sisson
Burnett	Goeke	Lobeck	Small
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	McCoy	Smith, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gordon	McDermott	Sparkman
Callaway	Gould	McGillicuddy	Stack
Candler	Graham	McHenry	Stanley
Cantrill	Gray	Macon	Stedman
Carlin	Gregg, Pa.	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Miss.
Carter	Gregg, Tex.	Maher	Stephens, Tex.
Clark, Fla.	Gudger	Martin, Colo.	Stone
Claypool	Guernsey	Mays	Taylor, Colo.
Clayton	Hamilton, W. Va.	Moon, Tenn.	Towner
Cline	Hamlin	Moore, Tex.	Townsend
Connell	Hammond	Morrison	Tribble
Conry	Hardwick	Moss, Ind.	Turnbull
Covington	Hardy	Murray	Tuttle
Cox, Ind.	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Underwood
Cullop	Harrison, N. Y.	Padgett	Watkins
Curley	Hay	Page	Webb
Daugherty	Heflin	Pepper	Whitacre
Davenport	Helm	Plumley	White
Davis, W. Va.	Hensley	Post	Wickliffe
Dickinson	Holland	Pou	Wilson, Pa.
Dies	Houston	Prouty	Witherspoon
Difenderfer	Hughes, Ga.	Rainey	Young, Tex.
Dixon, Ind.	Hughes, N. J.	Raker	
Doremus	Hull	Rauch	
Driscoll, D. A.	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Bartlett	Donohoe	Kipp	Woods, Iowa
Brantley	Haugen	Randell, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—105.

Adair	Doughton	Latta	Pray
Adamson	Edwards	Lee, Pa.	Pujo
Ames	Fairchild	Levy	Ransdell, La.
Andrus	Fitzgerald	Lewis	Redfield
Barchfeld	Fordney	Lindsay	Riordan
Bates	Fornes	Littleton	Roberts, Nev.
Berger	Foster, Vt.	Longworth	Scully
Bingham	Godwin, N. C.	Loud	Sells
Boehne	Goldfogle	Loudenslager	Slayden
Bradley	Greene	McCall	Slemp
Brown	Griest	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Cal.
Burgess	Hamill	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	McKinley	Stevens, Minn.
Butler	Hartman	McMorran	Sulzer
Calder	Hawley	Malby	Switzer
Campbell	Hayes	Matthews	Talbott, Md.
Cary	Heald	Mitchell	Taylor, Ala.
Collier	Henry, Conn.	Mondell	Thayer
Copley	Henry, Tex.	Moon, Pa.	Thomas
Cox, Ohio	Hobson	Morse, Wis.	Underhill
Crago	Howard	O'Shaunessy	Weeks
Cravens	Howland	Palmer	Wilson, Ill.
Dalzell	Hughes, W. Va.	Patten, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Davidson	Jackson	Patton, Pa.	Wood, N. J.
Dent	Kindred	Payne	
Denver	Lafean	Peters	
Dickson, Miss.	Langham	Porter	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. WOODS of Iowa (transferable).

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. MCMORRAN (transferable).

Until further notice:

Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. BATES.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD (transferable).

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. KIPP with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. KINDRED with Mr. HOWLAND.

Mr. DENVER with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas with Mr. GREENE.

Mr. SULZER with Mr. HARTMAN.

Mr. DENT with Mr. FOSTER of Vermont.

Mr. LEWIS with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas with Mr. MCCALL.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana with Mr. LAFEAN.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. MALBY.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. WEEKS.

Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. CRAVEN with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. HAWLEY.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina (against) with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania (in favor).

Mr. SLAYDEN (in favor) with Mr. HAUGEN (against).

Mr. PALMER (against) with Mr. HOWARD (in favor).

Mr. EDWARDS (against) with Mr. THAYER (in favor).

On this vote:

Mr. LEVY (against) with Mr. HEALD (in favor).

Mr. LITTLETON (against) with Mr. MCKINLEY (in favor).

Mr. BRANTLEY (against) with Mr. DALZELL (in favor).

Mr. SCULLY (against) with Mr. BROWN (in favor).

From the 27th to Monday noon:

Mr. DONOHOE with Mr. CALDER.

Until April 28 at noon:

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania (against) with Mr. PRAY (in favor).

From to-day for three weeks.

Mr. LATTA with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

From April 27 at noon until May 1 at noon.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question being taken, the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON, the motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HEALD, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. ADAMSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 28, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Kitty and Maria*, John Logan, master (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Alciope*, Robert Rice, master (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the ship *Golden Age*, Caleb Earl, master (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the brig *Eliza*, John Miller, master (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the

French spoliation cases relating to the ship *Nancy*, Joseph Dill, master (H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the ship *Goddess of Plenty*, Thomas Chirnside, master (H. Doc. No. 36); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FINLEY, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the concurrent resolution of the House (H. Con. Res. 3) providing for the printing of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Baron von Steuben, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 14), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 7690) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Snake River at the town of Nyssa, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TURNBULL: A bill (H. R. 7691) to provide for a survey of the Roanoke River from the town of Clarksville in the county of Mecklenburg, State of Virginia, to the head of steamboat navigation in said river below Weldon, in the county of Halifax, State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 7692) to define the hours of labor of letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 7693) to authorize the town of Logan, Aitkin County, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Aitkin County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 7694) to give effect to the fifth article of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, signed January 11, 1909; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 7695) to extend the time for the completion of the Alaska Northern Railway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 7696) to provide for enlarging the United States building at Houlton, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7697) to provide for the erection of a public building at Caribou, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7698) changing the name of Maine Avenue and providing for a new location for Maine Avenue, District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7699) to increase the compensation of pressmen in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7700) to provide against the purchase of goods manufactured by convict labor on behalf of the United States, the Territories, and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7701) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Newton, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7702) providing for the issuance of a charter to the Veteran Reserve Corps of America, a corporate military organization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 7703) to authorize the enlargement of the public building at Akron, Summit County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7704) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Barberton, Summit County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7705) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Cuyahoga Falls, Summit County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7706) to authorize the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ravenna, Portage County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7707) to authorize the erection of a public building at Niles, Trumbull County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7708) to authorize the erection of a public building at Conneaut, Ashtabula County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 7709) making appropriations and providing for a continuing contract for the construction, repair, and preservation of public work on the Missouri River between Kansas City and the mouth; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7710) to amend section 4916 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7711) to amend section 4889 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7712) to amend section 839 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 7713) to decrease the expense and increase the efficiency of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 7714) making an appropriation for the improvement of the Tombigbee River in the State of Mississippi and in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7715) to require all street railroad companies in the District of Columbia to issue free transfers, interchangeable from the lines of one company to those of another, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7716) to regulate the rates to be charged and collected by the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and any other firm or corporation, for telephones, telephone service, and telephone connections in the District of Columbia for business purposes, and prescribing a penalty for its violation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7717) for the erection of a public building at Union Springs, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7718) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Alabama; the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7719) for the maintenance and improvement of the Choctawhatchee River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 7720) to establish a national highway from Washington, D. C., by way of Mount Vernon to Fredericksburg, Va., to be known as the Mother Washington Memorial Highway, in memory and honor of the mother of the Father of his Country; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 7721) to amend and reenact section 3224 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Resolution (H. Res. 130) authorizing and directing the Committee on Invalid Pensions to inquire and report why the pension granted to David L. McDermott by act of July 6, 1886, is withheld, and what action, if any, should be taken in the premises; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLACKMON: Resolution (H. Res. 131) requesting certain information of the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 132) instructing and authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia to make an examination into the rates charged for the telephone service in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolution (H. Res. 133) requesting certain information of the Secretary of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 134) requesting certain information of the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 135) to reprint House Document No. 27, Sixty-first Congress, first session; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BLACKMON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) directing the Attorney General to make investigations and begin prosecutions of persons unlawfully conspiring together to reduce the price of cotton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) directing the Attorney General to make investigations and begin prosecutions of persons unlawfully conspiring together to increase the price of wheat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) to secure the neutralization of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) authorizing the appointment of a committee of Senators and Representatives to confer with the commission of the State of Pennsylvania in regard to the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 7722) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7723) granting an increase of pension to George K. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7724) for the relief of Mathias Meyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7725) granting an increase of pension to David W. Brandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 7726) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7727) for the relief of Charles J. Callahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7728) for the relief of John W. Walsh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 7729) granting a pension to William F. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 7730) granting a pension to William Lanier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7731) granting a pension to Thomas I. Durham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7732) granting a pension to Mettie Blackwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7733) granting a pension to Zachariah Cassedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7734) granting a pension to Martha Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7735) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Webb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7736) for the relief of the representatives of the estate of Henry C. Sills, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7737) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Samuel J. Maund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7738) granting an increase of pension to Jerry A. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 7739) for the relief of Henry Parks, alias Nathaniel Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) for the relief of Mrs. William C. Lucas; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: A bill (H. R. 7741) granting a pension to John H. Bunting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7742) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Meyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) granting an increase of pension to William H. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7744) granting an increase of pension to Andreas Wirth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7745) granting an increase of pension to Leander C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7746) granting an increase of pension to B. M. Laur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7747) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Kilburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7748) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7749) granting an increase of pension to J. P. Tanne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7750) granting an increase of pension to W. V. Cronk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7751) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Dare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7752) granting an increase of pension to William T. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7753) granting an increase of pension to C. K. Elliott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7754) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Ley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7755) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George R. Spore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7756) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John D. Woods; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 7757) granting an increase of pension to John H. Kohr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 7758) granting an increase of pension to Elias McQuay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7759) for the relief of Henry S. Call; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7760) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Hezekiah R. Hubbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 7761) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Edmonds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 7762) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Grass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 7763) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. R. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7764) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Layton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7765) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mardle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7766) granting an increase of pension to E. Clarkson Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7767) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Orlando L. Wieting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7768) granting a pension to John J. Schreiber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7769) granting a pension to Georgia L. Burnand; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7770) granting a pension to William Haley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7771) granting a pension to William R. Claxton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7772) for the relief of John McKeon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 7773) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Bigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7774) granting an increase of pension to A. V. Kendrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7775) granting an increase of pension to John M. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 7776) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7777) granting an increase of pension to James W. Cowan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7778) granting a pension to Martha I. Reynolds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 7779) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Havens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7780) granting an increase of pension to Amasa David; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7781) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Tiffany; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7782) granting an increase of pension to John M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7783) granting a pension to Margret Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 7784) granting an increase of pension to John C. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7785) granting an increase of pension to Josephus P. Eckler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7786) granting a pension to James M. Hanshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7787) granting a pension to John W. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7788) granting a pension to William F. Harrold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7789) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 7790) granting an increase of pension to Charles Gammon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7791) granting an increase of pension to Allen Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7792) granting an increase of pension to Henry Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7793) granting an increase of pension to William Greer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7794) granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Casteel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7795) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7796) granting an honorable discharge to William Alexander; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7797) granting a pension to William T. Bogert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 7798) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Lenhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 7799) for the relief of Peter Van Valer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7800) for the relief of John Wesley Young; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7801) for the relief of the estate of Vicente Gomez, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 7802) granting an increase of pension to John S. Lander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 7803) granting an increase of pension to Peter K. Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7804) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Witmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7805) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wetzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7806) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Wertz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7807) granting an increase of pension to John A. Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7808) granting an increase of pension to John Trout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7809) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill H. R. 7810) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann E. Sperry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7811) granting an increase of pension to David Sornberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7812) granting an increase of pension to Arnold B. Spink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7813) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7814) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7815) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Sipe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7816) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Sheets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7817) granting an increase of pension to James L. Seebold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7818) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Reuter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7819) granting an increase of pension to Eliphas W. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7820) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7821) granting an increase of pension to William Presley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7822) granting an increase of pension to John Person; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7823) granting an increase of pension to George W. Parthemore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7824) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Morrisey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7825) granting an increase of pension to David H. Mumma; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7826) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca M. Missemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7827) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Franklin Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7828) granting an increase of pension to Philip M. Messner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7829) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Meredith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7830) granting an increase of pension to John R. Meredith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7831) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Meily; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7832) granting an increase of pension to James F. Maben; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7833) granting an increase of pension to Milton T. Maguire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7834) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Layser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7835) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kimmel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7836) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Jordan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7837) granting an increase of pension to William F. Hummelbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7838) granting an increase of pension to John H. Houtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7839) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Hess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7840) granting an increase of pension to William Hampton, sr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7841) granting an increase of pension to Martha Groner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7842) granting an increase of pension to Frank C. Gratz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7843) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Huntt Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7844) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Garland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7845) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Eisenhauer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7846) granting an increase of pension to Joanna R. Forster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7847) granting an increase of pension to Henry Breslin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7848) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Billig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7849) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Benner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7850) granting an increase of pension to William Bodley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7851) granting an increase of pension to John H. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7852) granting a pension to Caroline S. Mindil; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7853) granting a pension to Rebecca Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7854) granting a pension to Isaac E. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7855) granting a pension to Annetta Vale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7856) granting a pension to William H. Swoveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7857) granting a pension to Charles E. Stock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7858) granting a pension to Richard M. Steckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7859) granting a pension to Harriet Stees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7860) granting a pension to John S. Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7861) granting a pension to Elizabeth Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7862) granting a pension to Mary M. Shambaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7863) granting a pension to Martin P. Schaffner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7864) granting a pension to Charles C. Rumpf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7865) granting a pension to Silas W. Rank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7866) granting a pension to Stephen W. Pomeroy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7867) granting a pension to Catherine B. Pelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7868) granting a pension to Margaret Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7869) granting a pension to Martha J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7870) granting a pension to Henry S. Matter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7871) granting a pension to George W. Lehman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7872) granting a pension to Emma E. Kipple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7873) granting a pension to Katherine E. Kemble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7874) granting a pension to Kate E. Keiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7875) granting a pension to Mary Idle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7876) granting a pension to Eliza Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7877) granting a pension to Emma Handshaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7878) granting a pension to John P. M. Haas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7879) granting a pension to John W. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7880) granting a pension to Lucetta C. Graffius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7881) granting a pension to Pricilla C. Givler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7882) granting a pension to George W. Emery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7883) granting a pension to John W. Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7884) granting a pension to John D. Deihl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7885) granting a pension to Sarah Culp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7886) granting a pension to J. Caroline FitzGerald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7887) granting a pension to Catherine B. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7888) granting a pension to Charles William Bowman; to the Commitee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7889) granting a pension to Jacob Ambrose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7890) granting a pension to Grace Backenstoss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7891) granting a pension to Mrs. George Armour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7892) for the relief of J. H. Mease, postmaster at Mount Gretna, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7893) for the relief of John C. Colwell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7894) for the relief of James E. Cann, paymaster, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7895) to correct the military record of Joseph Spangler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7896) to correct the military record of David Polm; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7897) to correct the military record of Charles Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7898) to correct the military record of Phillip K. Meloy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7899) to corrct the military record of Alexander C. Landis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7900) to correct the military record of William Irving; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7901) to correct the military record of John F. Geist; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7902) to correct the military record of Lieut. John W. Geiger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7903) to correct the military record of Philip D. Beidel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7904) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Francis Tomlinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7905) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Snyder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7906) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Levi Sheetz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7907) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Reuben Seiler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7908) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7909) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Keys; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7910) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John F. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7911) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Frederick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7912) for the removal of the charge of desertion standing against the name of John Brininger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7913) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John P. Leitzel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7914) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Samuel Lindsey Graham, now on the retired list, to be commander on the retired list; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7915) to authorize the appointment of Alexander D. B. Smead as a captain of cavalry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7916) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph Windowmaker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 7917) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Larkin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 7918) granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7919) granting an increase of pension to John F. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7920) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7921) granting an increase of pension to Oscar L. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7922) granting an increase of pension to David Bolles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7923) granting an increase of pension to Wayland A. Strong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7924) granting an increase of pension to Caleb P. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7925) granting an increase of pension to Charles Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7926) granting a pension to Alfred E. Ames; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7927) granting a pension to Carl H. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 7928) for the relief of Fannie E. Gardner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7929) for the erection of a statue in memory of President Andrew Johnson; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7930) for the relief of heirs of Wiley Holt, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 7931) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7932) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Hannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 7933) granting a pension to Catherine T. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 7934) granting a pension to Charles Baumann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7935) granting an increase of pension to Walter L. Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7936) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 7937) granting an increase of pension to Silas Dewey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 7938) granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7939) for the relief of the heirs of John A. Turner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 7940) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURNBULL: A bill (H. R. 7941) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the cases herein enumerated; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 7942) granting a pension to Rosalia A. Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 7943) granting an increase of pension to John M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7944) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7945) granting an increase of pension to John W. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7946) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Wakely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7947) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Toombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7948) granting an increase of pension to George Marker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7949) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7950) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Leonhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7951) granting an increase of pension to George F. Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7952) granting a pension to Charlotte L. Kizer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7953) granting a pension to Amanda Neufer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7954) for the relief of Jacob M. Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7955) for the relief of John T. Watson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7956) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Brice Prater; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7957) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jubal Grant and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Resolutions of Stereotypers' Union No. 5, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the New England Shoe & Leather Association, against putting leather, boots, and shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of Carolina Bagging Co., against jute being admitted free on farmers' free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New England Shoe & Leather Co., protesting against placing leather, boots, and shoes on free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of John H. Kohr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the New England Shoe & Leather Association, opposing the placing of leather, boots, and shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions of Central Council, Irish County Clubs, of Boston, Mass., against any arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Cape Ann Branch, The Granite Cutters' International Association of America, of Rockport, Mass., favoring a repeal of the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, favoring nonpartisan tariff board or commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petitions of citizens of North Dakota, favoring the Hanna bill providing for additional compensation to the rural free-delivery carriers; J. B. Sessions, Fargo, N. Dak., against parcels post; and citizens of Brooklyn Township, Williams County, N. Dak., favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of North Dakota, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of citizens of Richland and Keota, Iowa, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Thomas J. Goodman, of Providence, and numerous other citizens of Rhode Island, favoring the department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Caleb P. Nash, Wayland A. Strong, David Bolles, Fredrick A. Fish, John F. Abbott, Charles E. Shepard, Carl H. Ellis, Oscar L. Pike, Alfred E. Ames, and Charles Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of citizens of Waldheim, Mont., in favor of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of City Council of Helena, Mont., and F. J. Edwards, mayor, and J. A. Mattson, city clerk, for abrogation of treaty with Russia of 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Typographical Union No. 255, Anaconda, Mont., for reduction of duty on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petitions of Carolina Bagging Co., against admitting jute into this country free; New England Shoe and Leather Association, protesting against placing leather, boots, and shoes on the free list; and New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, Boston, Mass., favoring a permanent, independent tariff commission or board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of the Spaulding Chapter of the American Woman's League, Compton, Cal., numbering 63, favoring a speedy hearing of the Bartholdt indemnity bill; American Woman's League of Huntington Park, Long Branch, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino, and Los Angeles Chapter, Los Angeles, all in the State of California, in favor of the Bartholdt indemnity bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Resolutions of Sterling Camp, No. 11, Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging passage of illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: Petition of citizens of the Northwest against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of W. J. McLaughlin and F. O. Lozier, of Trenton, N. J., urging the repeal of the duty on lemons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *April 28, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2983. An act for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census.

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911;

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress;

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the president of the Woman's Home Missionary Auxiliary of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bristol, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict the sale and traffic in opium, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Minisink Grange, No. 907, Patrons of Husbandry, of Unionville, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Des Moines and Polk County, in the State of Iowa, praying that Italian lemons be placed on the free list, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Lyon Township Agricultural Club, of Inwood, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Naugatuck, New Britain, Union City, and Torrington, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WATSON. I present a petition signed by a large number of woolgrowers of Marshall County, W. Va., relative to the tariff on wool. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD, omitting the names, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, omitting the names, as follows:

Hon. C. W. WATSON,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned woolgrowers of Marshall County, W. Va., petition you, as our Representative in Congress from the State of West Virginia, to do all in your power to retain the present tariff rate of 11 cents on wool, for the following reasons:

That on our hills and mountains we can not grow grain, cattle, and hogs to compete with the farmers of the Western States, which leaves us practically with the sheep and woolgrowing as the principal farming industry.

That we have got to feed our sheep grain and hay six months in the year, which figured at the present market prices makes our quality of wool cost us about 33 cents per pound, which is more than we can realize for our wool at the present time; and only once in the past five years have we been able to market our wool for this figure, that being in the year 1909. So to reduce the present tariff as we view it would reduce the price of our wool to the amount of tariff reduction, which would drive us out of the woolgrowing business—the only farming industry left for this section.

To substantiate our claim of cost of woolgrowing in this section, we herewith reproduce the figures of the Tristate Woolgrowers' Association, held at Wheeling on February 23, 1911, which are as follows:

Interest on investment of 100 ewes, at $4.50 per head	$27.00
Taxes, $1; annual loss, 3 per cent, $13.50	14.50
Depreciation	45.00
Labor	62.00
Grain	85.00
Roughage, $1.50 per head	150.00
Pasture ewes and lambs	85.00
Ram service	20.00
Shearing and marketing	15.00
	503.50
Estimated to raise 80 lambs, at $3 per head	240.00
Estimating the largest possible average per head of 8 pounds (800)	263.50
Net cost per pound to produce	.33

In view of these facts and figures, we earnestly solicit your support and influence in our behalf and assure you in advance that we will appreciate very highly anything you can do for us now or at any future time when Congress is considering the tariff schedule on wool.

Mr. BRIGGS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Hoboken; Washington Camp, No. 188, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Cedarville; of Dr. J. H. Rosenkrans, of Hoboken; of Otto Fuchs, of Hoboken; and of sundry citizens of Readington, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of Lacktown Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Flemington, and Rancocas Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mount Holly, in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of William J. Sewell Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, of Elizabeth, N. J., praying that pensions be granted to the widows and children of the veterans of the Spanish War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Burlington County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Columbus, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WARREN presented resolutions adopted at a joint meeting of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, and of the International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, held at Ticonderoga, N. Y.; also resolutions adopted at a meeting of Local Union No. 25, Ancient Order of Hibernians, held at Ballston Spa, N. Y., and the memorial of Patrick J. McCarthy, district secretary treasurer, Order of Knights of Labor, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Federation of Churches and Christian Workers in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Federation of Churches and Christian Workers in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of the Presbytery of the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the interstate transmission of race gambling bets, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCUMBER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fort Ransom, Westfield, Griggs County, Monango, Cando, Milnor, Velva, Granville, Voltaire, Bottineau County, and of Orr, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CURTIS presented memorials of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Osage City; of Local Union No. 21, Brotherhood of Railway Conductors of America, of Pittsburg; of Local Union No. 483, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Jennings; and of Local Union No. 308, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Reading, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Woodston and Stockton, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of Washington Camp, No. 17, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a petition of the Fortnightly Club, of Oconomowoc, Wis., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Pine Valley Butter Co., of Neillsville, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present the memorial of Mr. Wharton Barker, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of certain financial legislation. I move that the memorial be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 1697) granting 2 acres of land to school district No. 44, Chelan County, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1698) to correct the military record of Thomas Miller; and

A bill (S. 1699) to correct the military record of John C. Barrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1700) granting an increase of pension to Peter Schaddle;

A bill (S. 1701) granting an increase of pension to Henry Yost;

A bill (S. 1702) granting an increase of pension to William Bessinger; and

A bill (S. 1703) granting a pension to Amelia Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1704) for the relief of Percy Harrison Moore; and

A bill (S. 1705) to authorize the construction of a municipal asphalt plant in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN:
A bill (S. 1706) granting an increase of pension to Byron Bathrick (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1707) granting an increase of pension to Jerome Schamp (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1708) granting a pension to Sarah C. Mansfield; and
A bill (S. 1709) granting an increase of pension to A. B. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DU PONT:
A bill (S. 1710) to organize a Service Corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:
A bill (S. 1711) to authorize the acquisition of lands by the Reclamation Service by exchange, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. HEYBURN. If I am not misinformed, it is to provide for the surrender of title to lands by the United States in exchange, and I think it ought to go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. For the information of the Senator from Idaho I should like to state that the bill is an exact copy of a bill which was before the Irrigation Committee in the last Congress and was reported on favorably and passed by the Senate. It went to the House in the last days of the session. Its object is to enable the Reclamation Service to exchange private holdings of proposed reclamation projects for lands outside of the reservation.

Mr. HEYBURN. It does not include State lands?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No, sir; not at all.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then I have no objection to the reference proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reference will be as before indicated.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:
A bill (S. 1712) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Oregon City, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURTON:
A bill (S. 1713) to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by and under the auspices of benevolent and fraternal societies and trades-unions; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:
A bill (S. 1714) granting an increase of pension to Reuben F. King (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1715) granting a pension to Elizabeth Weissmiller (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1716) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Tolfree (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1717) granting a pension to Anna Rosche; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:
A bill (S. 1718) for the relief of Clara D. Miller;
A bill (S. 1719) for the relief of Lucy L. Bane; and
A bill (S. 1720) for the relief of Scott P. Stewart and Andrew J. Stewart, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCUMBER:
A bill (S. 1721) granting a pension to Phillippina Healy (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1722) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Jenner (with accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 1723) granting an increase of pension to Alma J. Parkin (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:
A bill (S. 1724) to amend section 14 of "An act to promote the administration of justice in the Navy," approved February 16, 1909, and to provide for the destruction of records of deck courts in United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WORKS:
A bill (S. 1725) granting an increase of pension to William E. Ross (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 1726) granting an increase of pension to William Patterson (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 1727) granting an increase of pension to John H. Fairbanks (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:
A bill (S. 1728) granting an increase of pension to Martin Ouderkirk; and
A bill (S. 1729) granting a pension to Sarah A. Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:
A bill (S. 1730) to increase the compensation of pressmen in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.
A bill (S. 1731) for the relief of the Methodist Protestant Church;
A bill (S. 1732) for the relief of the estate of Ella P. Williams;
A bill (S. 1733) for the relief of C. A. Sprinkel;
A bill (S. 1734) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Lee, deceased;
A bill (S. 1735) for the relief of Emma C. Franner, George W. Seaton, Hiram K. Seaton, Howard Seaton, Mary Seaton, Blanche Seaton, George W. Taylor, Edward Taylor, and Catharine Pomeroy;
A bill (S. 1736) for the relief of the estate of Peter Sheets, deceased;
A bill (S. 1737) for the relief of the heirs of John Wescott;
A bill (S. 1738) for the relief of the estate of Maurice T. Smith;
A bill (S. 1739) for the relief of the estate of William Benton, deceased;
A bill (S. 1740) for the relief of the heirs of John D. Rawlings, deceased;
A bill (S. 1741) for the relief of the estate of Richard Wiseman, deceased;
A bill (S. 1742) for the relief of James W. Nickens;
A bill (S. 1743) for the relief of Mason Shipman;
A bill (S. 1744) for the relief of the heirs of Amanda M. James, deceased;
A bill (S. 1745) for the relief of the estate of John Ivy, deceased;
A bill (S. 1746) for the relief of the estate of Mary G. Temple, deceased;
A bill (S. 1747) for the relief of the estate of William J. Conner, deceased;
A bill (S. 1748) for the relief of the estate of Murray Mason, deceased;
A bill (S. 1749) for the relief of the estate of John Anderson, deceased; and
A bill (S. 1750) for the relief of Mary Eliza Woodhouse; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1751) for the relief of John F. Wingfield; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMOOT:
A bill (S. 1752) to provide for the erection of a public building at Eureka, Utah; and
A bill (S. 1753) to provide for the erection of a public building at Vernal, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRADLEY:
A bill (S. 1754) to correct the military record of William F. McKim; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
A bill (S. 1755) for the relief of the heirs or estates of William McClure and Margaret McClure, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1756) granting an increase of pension to Richard Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:
A bill (S. 1757) granting an increase of pension to Charles Way (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1758) granting an increase of pension to Fieldon S. Snodgrass;
A bill (S. 1759) granting an increase of pension to Edgar W. Lauck;
A bill (S. 1760) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Hall;
A bill (S. 1761) granting an increase of pension to James McConnell;
A bill (S. 1762) to pension Army teamsters;
A bill (S. 1763) granting an increase of pension to Ellwood A. Collins;
A bill (S. 1764) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Black;
A bill (S. 1765) granting an increase of pension to James Barr; and
A bill (S. 1766) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Camp; to the Committee on Pensions.
A bill (S. 1767) for the relief of Oakley Randall; and
A bill (S. 1768) for the relief of the heirs of Abraham Parsons, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1769) to amend the military record of Asa S. Hugill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:
A bill (S. 1770) for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in the Fort Crawford military tract at Prairie du Chien, State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1771) providing for the valuation of the segregated coal and asphalt lands and the surplus lands in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations and of the surplus lands in the Creek Nation, in the State of Oklahoma, and for the sale of the surface and the disposition of the mineral rights therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 1772) to amend section 839 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 1773) to create a Commission on National Historical Publications; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 1774) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to erect a suitable monument over the remains of Rear Admiral Charles Wilkes, United States Navy, in the national cemetery at Arlington, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 1775) granting an increase of pension to Soll P. Merrill (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1776) granting a pension to Ella M. Mosher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1777) granting an increase of pension to Albert Whitehead (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1778) granting a pension to Adeline Conway (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1779) granting a pension to James Lewis (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1780) granting an increase of pension to W. K. Best (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1781) granting a pension to Lucinda P. Fayette (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1782) granting a pension to Maria C. Haney; and

A bill (S. 1783) granting a pension to Jane Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

DRAINAGE SURVEY OF LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. CLAPP. I offer a resolution for reading and reference to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution (S. Res. 26) was read and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That 500 copies of House Document No. 27, Sixty-first Congress, first session, entitled "Drainage Survey of Certain Lands in Minnesota," be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. ROOT. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 27) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Industrial Expositions be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at a salary of $1,800 per annum.

COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution (S. Res. 25) coming over from a former day.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. GALLINGER, as follows:

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Sixty-second Congress, effective May 1, 1911:

On Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.—Messrs. Bailey (chairman), Stone, Cullom, Nelson, and Poindexter.

On Agriculture and Forestry.—Messrs. Burnham (chairman), Warren, Perkins, Guggenheim, Page, Crawford, Bradley, Lorimer, Gronna, Bankhead, Gore, Chamberlain, Smith of South Carolina, Percy, Terrell, and Lea.

On Appropriations.—Messrs. Warren (chairman), Perkins, Gallinger, Curtis, Gamble, Smoot, Nixon, Dixon, Bourne, Wetmore, Tillman, Foster, Culberson, Martin of Virginia, Overman, Owen, and Smith of Maryland.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.—Messrs. Briggs (chairman), Dillingham, Bristow, Clarke of Arkansas, and Williams.

On Canadian Relations.—Messrs. Oliver (chairman), Cummins, Burton, Root, McLean, Tillman, Foster, Gore, and Smith of Maryland.

On the Census.—Messrs. La Follette (chairman), Guggenheim, Cummins, du Pont, McLean, Townsend, Lippitt, Bailey, Shively, Thornton, Chilton, and Pomerene.

On Civil Service and Retrenchment.—Messrs. Cummins (chairman), La Follette, Lodge, Smoot, Borah, Dixon, Gallinger, Clarke of Arkansas, Rayner, Owen, Johnston of Alabama, and Myers.

On Claims.—Messrs. Crawford (chairman), Smoot, Bristow, Oliver, Bradley, Page, Jones, McLean, Townsend, Martin of Virginia, Overman, Davis, Paynter, Bryan, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Coast and Insular Survey.—Messrs. Townsend (chairman), Richardson, Frye, Cullom, Works, Culberson, Davis, Bankhead, and Terrell.

On Coast Defenses.—Messrs. Curtis (chairman), Nixon, du Pont, Crane, Root, Works, Simmons, Foster, Smith of Maryland, Terrell, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Commerce.—Messrs. Frye (chairman), Nelson, Perkins, Smith of Michigan, Bourne, Burton, Burnham, Stephenson, Crawford, Oliver, Martin of Virginia, Simmons, Newlands, Bankhead, Fletcher, Percy, and Reed.

On Conservation of National Resources.—Messrs. Dixon (chairman), Clark of Wyoming, Dillingham, Briggs, Guggenheim, Jones, Richardson, Gronna, Townsend, Newlands, Overman, Bankhead, Smith of South Carolina, Watson, and Lea.

On Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Newlands (chairman), Shively, Brown, La Follette, and Lippitt.

On Cuban Relations.—Messrs. Page (chairman), Burnham, Clapp, Curtis, Crane, Kenyon, Simmons, Stone, Watson, and O'Gorman.

On Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.—Messrs. Clarke of Arkansas (chairman), Kern, and Burnham.

On the District of Columbia.—Messrs. Gallinger (chairman), Dillingham, Curtis, Jones, Oliver, Lorimer, Works, Kenyon, Martin of Virginia, Paynter, Johnston of Alabama, Smith of Maryland, Pomerene, and Lea.

On Education and Labor.—Messrs. Borah (chairman), Penrose, du Pont, Page, McLean, Kenyon, Rayner, Bankhead, Shively, Swanson, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Engrossed Bills.—Messrs. Simmons (chairman), Lodge, and Burton.

On Enrolled Bills.—Messrs. Stephenson (chairman), Gronna, and Foster.

To Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.—Messrs. Paynter (chairman), Culberson, Simmons, Richardson, Crawford, Perkins, and Townsend.

On Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.—Messrs. Lippitt (chairman), Stephenson, Gronna, Simmons, and Gore.

On Expenditures in the Interior Department.—Messrs. Poindexter (chairman), McCumber, Frye, Davis, and Chamberlain.

On Expenditures in the Department of Justice.—Messrs. Bradley (chairman), Burnham, Borah, Bailey, and Rayner.

On Expenditures in the Navy Department.—Messrs. Gronna (chairman), Dillingham, Bradley, Martin of Virginia, and Tillman.

On Expenditures in the Post Office Department.—Messrs. Bristow (chairman), Smith of Michigan, Penrose, Bacon, and Chilton.

On Expenditures in the Department of State.—Messrs. Kenyon (chairman), Warren, La Follette, Stone, and Percy.

On Expenditures in the Treasury Department.—Messrs. Burton (chairman), Briggs, Works, Smith of Maryland, and Lea.

On Expenditures in the War Department.—Messrs. Works (chairman), du Pont, Cullom, Foster, and Johnson of Maine.

On Finance.—Messrs. Penrose (chairman), Cullom, Lodge, McCumber, Smoot, Gallinger, Clark of Wyoming, Heyburn, La Follette, Bailey, Simmons, Stone, Williams, Kern, and Johnson of Maine.

On Fisheries.—Messrs. Jones (chairman), Bourne, Perkins, Briggs, Curtis, Bailey, Overman, Fletcher, and Thornton.

On the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.—Messrs. Tillman (chairman), Fletcher, Clapp, Nixon, and Smith of Michigan.

On Foreign Relations.—Messrs. Cullom (chairman), Frye, Lodge, Smith of Michigan, Root, McCumber, Sutherland, Borah, Burton, Bacon, Stone, Shively, Clarke of Arkansas, Rayner, and Hitchcock.

On Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.—Messrs. McLean (chairman), Perkins, Burnham, Lodge, Poindexter, Tillman, Overman, Taylor, and Hitchcock.

On the Geological Survey.—Messrs. Taylor (chairman), Rayner, Smith of South Carolina, Briggs, Wetmore, Page, and Kenyon.

On Immigration.—Messrs. Lodge (chairman), Dillingham, Penrose, Brown, Richardson, Burton, Gronna, Davis, Gore, Smith of South Carolina, Percy, Kern, and O'Gorman.

On Indian Affairs.—Messrs. Gamble (chairman), Clapp, McCumber, Sutherland, La Follette, Curtis, Brown, Dixon, Page, Stone, Davis, Owen, Chamberlain, Watson, and Myers.

On Indian Depredations.—Messrs. Rayner (chairman), Davis, Johnston of Alabama, Owen, Percy, Curtis, Dixon, Stephenson, Crawford, Brandegee, and Lippitt.

On Industrial Expositions.—Messrs. Root (chairman), Jones, Crane, Stephenson, Oliver, Gronna, Works, Rayner, Overman, Taylor, Paynter, Swanson, and Newlands.

On Interoceanic Canals.—Messrs. Brandegee (chairman), Borah, Crawford, Bristow, Perkins, Page, Jones, Townsend, Simmons, Johnston of Alabama, Percy, Thornton, Chilton, and O'Gorman.

On Interstate Commerce.—Messrs. Clapp (chairman), Cullom, Crane, Nixon, Cummins, Brandegee, Oliver, Lippitt, Townsend, Tillman, Foster, Newlands, Clarke of Arkansas, Gore, Watson, and Pomerene.

To Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.—Messrs. Smith of Maryland (chairman), Bryan, Bradley, Richardson, and Poindexter.

On Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.—Messrs. Nixon (chairman), Warren, Sutherland, Borah, Jones, Brandegee, Works, Bailey, Newlands, Gore, Smith of Maryland, Chamberlain, and Myers.

Joint Committee on the Revision of the Laws of the United States.—Messrs. Heyburn (chairman), Sutherland, Clarke of Arkansas, and Percy.

On the Judiciary.—Messrs. Clark of Wyoming (chairman), Nelson, Dillingham, Sutherland, Brandegee, Borah, Brown, Cummins, Root, Bacon, Culberson, Overman, Rayner, Paynter, Chilton, and O'Gorman.

On the Library.—Messrs. Wetmore (chairman), Briggs, Cummins, Root, Burton, Newlands, Shively, and Swanson.

On Manufactures.—Messrs. Heyburn (chairman), Oliver, Lorimer, La Follette, Cummins, McLean, Smith of South Carolina, Terrell, Reed, Pomerene, and O'Gorman.

On Military Affairs.—Messrs. du Pont (chairman), Warren, Dixon, Briggs, Brown, Guggenheim, Bristow, Jones, Lorimer, Foster, Johnston of Alabama, Clarke of Arkansas, Taylor, Chamberlain, Hitchcock, and Williams.

On Mines and Mining.—Messrs. Lorimer (chairman), Heyburn, Nixon, Sutherland, Guggenheim, Poindexter, Tillman, Johnston of Alabama, Watson, and Myers.

On the Mississippi River and its Tributaries.—Messrs. Davis (chairman), Owen, Thornton, Brown, Burton, Stephenson, and Wetmore.

On Naval Affairs.—Messrs. Perkins (chairman), Penrose, Wetmore, Clapp, Lodge, Smith of Michigan, Page, Poindexter, Tillman, Smith of Maryland, Thornton, Swanson, Bryan, and Johnson of Maine.

On Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.—Messrs. Richardson (chairman), Clapp, Lorimer, Nelson, Burnham, Brandegee, Poindexter, Clarke of Arkansas, Owen, Fletcher, Watson, and Kern.

On Pacific Railroads.—Messrs. Owen (chairman), Chamberlain, Shively, Reed, Frye, Smith of Michigan, Stephenson, McCumber, and Brown.

On Patents.—Messrs. Brown (chairman), Brandegee, Kenyon, Works, Shively, Smith of South Carolina, and Gore.

On Pensions.—Messrs. McCumber (chairman), Burnham, Smoot, Curtis, du Pont, Brown, Bradley, Poindexter, Taylor, Gore, Shively, Bryan, Johnson of Maine, and Pomerene.

On the Philippines.—Messrs. Guggenheim (chairman), Lodge, Nixon, Heyburn, Bristow, Crawford, McLean, Lippitt, Johnston of Alabama, Paynter, Chamberlain, Fletcher, Hitchcock, and Reed.

On Post Offices and Post Roads.—Messrs. Bourne (chairman), Penrose, Crane, Guggenheim, Briggs, Richardson, Bradley, Bristow, Lorimer, Bankhead, Taylor, Terrell, Smith of South Carolina, Swanson, Bryan, and Martine of New Jersey.

On Printing.—Messrs. Smoot (chairman), Gallinger, Richardson, Page, Kenyon, Smith of Maryland, Fletcher, and Chilton.

On Private Land Claims.—Messrs. Bacon (chairman), Davis, Thornton, Smith of Michigan, Oliver, Lorimer, and Gronna.

On Privileges and Elections.—Messrs. Dillingham (chairman), Gamble, Heyburn, Clapp, Sutherland, Bradley, Jones, Oliver, Kenyon, Bailey, Paynter, Johnston of Alabama, Fletcher, Kern, and Lea.

On Public Buildings and Grounds.—Messrs. Sutherland (chairman), Warren, Heyburn, Wetmore, Gamble, du Pont, Stephenson, Bourne, Poindexter, Culberson, Taylor, Swanson, Owen, Watson, Martine of New Jersey, and Reed.

On Public Health and National Quarantine.—Messrs. Culberson (chairman), Fletcher, Thornton, Owen, Williams, Smoot, Crawford, Crane, Gronna, Lippitt, and Works.

On Public Lands.—Messrs. Nelson (chairman), Clark of Wyoming, Gamble, Smoot, Heyburn, Dixon, Jones, Guggenheim, Works, Newlands, Davis, Chamberlain, Thornton, Bryan, and Myers.

On Railroads.—Messrs. Gore (chairman), Bacon, Taylor, Watson, Reed, Clark of Wyoming, Nelson, Bourne, Bristow, Penrose, and McCumber.

On Revolutionary Claims.—Messrs. Stone (chairman), Chilton, Bradley, Root, and Borah.

On Rules.—Messrs. Crane (chairman), Warren, Gallinger, Nelson, Cummins, Bacon, Bailey, and Overman.

On Standards, Weights, and Measures.—Messrs Bankhead (chairman), Bacon, Borah, Clapp, and Gamble.

On Territories.—Messrs. Smith of Michigan (chairman), Nelson, Burnham, Brown, Bristow, McLean, Lippitt, Owen, Chamberlain, Shively, Johnson of Maine, and Hitchcock.

On Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.—Messrs. Smith of South Carolina (chairman), Rayner, Gore, Bankhead, Clark of Wyoming, McCumber, Brandegee, Bourne, and Burton.

On Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.—Messrs. Foster (chairman), Watson, Clark of Wyoming, Nixon, and Townsend.

On the University of the United States.—Messrs. Johnston of Alabama (chairman), Foster, Overman, Terrell, Williams, Frye, Dillingham, Curtis, Wetmore, Dixon, and Cummins.

On Woman Suffrage.—Messrs. Overman (chairman), Johnston of Alabama, Wetmore, du Pont, and Bourne.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, speaking for 13 Republican Members of the Senate, I submit on their behalf the following statement:

For several years marked differences have been developing within the Republican Party in many States. These differences have been along clearly defined lines of legislative action designed to meet the demands resulting from changed economic conditions affecting the industrial life of the Nation.

The statutes so enacted have become generally known as progressive statutes, and that element of the Republican Party which has secured the enactment of such legislation has become generally known as the progressive element of the Republican Party.

In the logic of events it was inevitable that the rapidly growing progressive sentiment of the progressive States should find expression in the Senate of the United States, and for several years the proceedings of the Senate have from day to day recorded marked and well-defined differences in the Republican membership of this body.

Out of the total Republican vote of the Senate more than one-fourth is to-day emphatically progressive Republican. This is a settled and established fact in political history. The country knows it. The Senate can not ignore it.

The differences which create division in the Republican Party are not upon matters of party policy, but relate to the most important subjects of legislation and the gravest problems which confront the American people. These differences represent not merely conflicting personal opinions of individual Senators. They represent fundamental differences in convictions involving the welfare of 90,000,000 people. If the progressive Republican Senators should fail to represent the progressive public opinion of their States, they would be swept aside and their places filled with men who would faithfully represent that public opinion. If they failed to protest against the denial of representation upon the most important committees in the Senate, they would be remiss in their public duties.

Their protest is not made to advance the personal ambition of any Senator. It is made because we who make it can not permit to pass unchallenged a resolution denying to millions of people their right to be fairly represented upon the committees which frame the most important legislation passed by the United States Senate.

Under the organization of the Senate the committees have a potential influence in shaping legislation. All bills first go to a committee before being considered. The committee has power to amend any bill in any way, or substitute another bill for it, or refuse to report the bill back to the Senate for consideration. In that event it dies, never having reached the calendar of the Senate.

Having this great power and influence over legislation, it is of the highest importance that the committees should represent in their membership as nearly as possible the controlling economic and political opinion of the people of the several States. In the framing of the Committees on Finance and Interstate Commerce this policy has not been followed. Legislation most vital to the welfare of the American people as a whole comes before the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The committee practically controls legislation affecting transportation, trusts and combinations, overcapitalization, and almost every phase of the great industrial controversies that

are agitating the country. We believe that the membership of that committee, as proposed in the resolution, would place the control of legislation in the hands of those opposed to a thoroughgoing regulation of railway rates and services.

First we call attention to the geographical location of members. The four new members are Mr. BRANDEGEE, of Connecticut; Mr. OLIVER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. TOWNSEND, of Michigan; and Mr. LIPPITT, of Rhode Island. The present membership consists of Mr. CLAPP, of Minnesota; Mr. CULLOM, of Illinois; Mr. CRANE, of Massachusetts; Mr. NIXON, of Nevada; and Mr. CUMMINS, of Iowa. It will be observed that of the nine Republican members, three, or one-third, are located in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, States of comparatively insignificant railway mileage, while the other six members are scattered over the vast territory west of the Hudson River, where the problems that grow out of interstate commerce are of such vital consequence to the people. A glance at the map will show the absurdity of this geographical distribution. The division existing in the membership of the committee is well known, and from our standpoint the four new members added can not be reckoned as advocates of strong and effectual regulation of transportation companies, trusts, combinations, and monopolies. We hereby most earnestly protest against this action on the part of the majority of the committee on committees.

We also protest against the proposed organization of the Committee on Finance. The progressive Republicans have more than 25 per cent of the Republican membership of the Senate. This increased progressive membership is the result of the direct expression of the will of the people of the various States. Senators representing these States have a right to the one-fourth of the Republican membership of this important committee. That representation has been denied them by a majority of the committee. We believe this is a violation of the very fundamental principles of representative government and is indefensible from every standpoint of justice and equity. The progressive Republicans have the right to ask that they shall be given two of the nine Republican members of the Committee on Finance. To do less is to deliberately place in the hands of the ultrahigh-tariff Republicans the absolute control of revenue legislation during the Congress.

Mr. President, we have no desire to delay the organization of the committees of the Senate, and content ourselves with presenting the foregoing protest, which represents the views of the 13 progressive Republican Members of the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am gratified to know that the Senator from Wisconsin, representing his associates, has no desire to postpone the organization of the Senate, and I join with him in the hope that it will be speedily organized, so that the public business may be proceeded with.

I had thought, Mr. President, of saying something in defense of the committee on committees, but I am quite content to have the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin go to the country, accompanied by the list of committees as agreed upon by a majority of the committee on committees. If we had gone into mathematics, Mr. President, the so-called progressives, in proportion to their number, would have been entitled to 100 places on the committees, and if they will examine the list they will find that they have been given 114 places. There was a difference as to the membership on two or three committees, and it was solved in a way that a majority of the committee on committees believe to be equitable and just, and we stand by it as it is reported. I wish that the report may now be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted after the list of committees as passed upon to-day a list of assignments to the individual Senators, showing precisely the committees to which each Senator has been assigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The list referred to is as follows:

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS OF SENATORS, SIXTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

Mr. BACON	Private Land Claims, chairman.
	Expenditures in the Post Office Department.
	Foreign Relations.
	Judiciary.
	Railroads.
	Rules.
	Standards, Weights, and Measures.
Mr. BAILEY	Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, chairman.
	Census.
	Expenditures in the Department of Justice
	Finance.
	Fisheries.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Rules.
Mr. BANKHEAD	Standards, Weights, and Measures, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Commerce.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Education and Labor.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
Mr. BORAH	Education and Labor, chairman.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Expenditures in the Department of Justice.
	Foreign Relations.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Judiciary.
	Revolutionary Claims.
	Standards, Weights, and Measures.
Mr. BOURNE	Post Offices and Post Roads, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Commerce.
	Fisheries.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Railroads.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
	Woman Suffrage.
Mr. BRADLEY	Expenditures in the Department of Justice, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Claims.
	Expenditures in the Navy Department.
	Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.
	Pensions.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Revolutionary Claims.
Mr. BRANDEGEE	Interoceanic Canals, chairman.
	Indian Depredations.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Judiciary.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Patents.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
Mr. BRIGGS	Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, chairman.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Expenditures in the Treasury Department.
	Fisheries.
	Geological Survey.
	Library.
	Military Affairs.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
Mr. BRISTOW	Expenditures in the Post Office Department, chairman.
	Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.
	Claims.
	Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. BRISTOW (continued)	Military Affairs.
	Philippines.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Railroads.
	Territories.
Mr. BROWN	Patents, chairman.
	Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.
	Immigration.
	Indian Affairs.
	Judiciary.
	Military Affairs.
	Mississippi River and its Tributaries.
	Pacific Railroads.
	Pensions.
	Territories.
Mr. BRYAN	Claims.
	Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.
	Naval Affairs.
	Pensions.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Public Lands.
Mr. BURNHAM	Agriculture and Forestry, chairman.
	Commerce.
	Cuban Relations.
	Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.
	Expenditures in the Department of Justice.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Pensions.
	Territories.
Mr. BURTON	Expenditures in the Treasury Department, chairman.
	Canadian Relations.
	Commerce.
	Engrossed Bills.
	Foreign Relations.
	Immigration.
	Library.
	Mississippi River and its Tributaries.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Expenditures in the Interior Department.
	Indian Affairs.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Military Affairs.
	Pacific Railroads.
	Philippines.
	Public Lands.
	Territories.
Mr. CHILTON	Census.
	Expenditures in the Post Office Department.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Judiciary.
	Printing.
	Revolutionary Claims.
Mr. CLAPP	Interstate Commerce, chairman.
	Cuban Relations.
	Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.
	Indian Affairs.
	Naval Affairs.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Standards, Weights, and Measures.
Mr. CLARK of Wyoming	Judiciary, chairman.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Finance.
	Public Lands.
	Railroads.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
	Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.
Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas	Disposition of Useless Papers in Executive Departments, chairman.
	Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Foreign Relations.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Joint Committee on Revision of the Laws of the United States.
	Military Affairs.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
Mr. CRANE	Rules, chairman.
	Coast Defenses.
	Cuban Relations.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
Mr. CRAWFORD	Claims, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Commerce.
	Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.
	Indian Depredations.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Philippines.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
Mr. CULBERSON	Public Health and National Quarantine, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.
	Judiciary.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
Mr. CULLOM	Foreign Relations, chairman.
	Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Expenditures in the War Department.
	Finance.
	Interstate Commerce.
Mr. CUMMINS	Civil Service and Retrenchment, chairman.
	Canadian Relations.
	Census.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Judiciary.
	Library.
	Manufactures.
	Rules.
	University of the United States.
Mr. CURTIS	Coast Defenses, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Cuban Relations.
	District of Columbia.
	Fisheries.
	Indian Affairs.
	Indian Depredations.
	Pensions.
	University of the United States.
Mr. DAVIS	Mississippi River and its Tributaries, chairman.
	Claims.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Expenditures in the Interior Department.
	Immigration.
	Indian Affairs.
	Indian Depredations.
	Private Land Claims.
	Public Lands.
Mr. DILLINGHAM	Privileges and Elections, chairman.
	Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	District of Columbia.
	Expenditures in the Navy Department.
	Immigration.
	Judiciary.
	University of the United States.

Mr. DIXON	Conservation of National Resources, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Indian Affairs.
	Indian Depredations.
	Military Affairs.
	Public Lands.
	University of the United States.
Mr. DU PONT	Military Affairs, chairman.
	Census.
	Coast Defenses.
	Education and Labor.
	Expenditures in the War Department.
	Pensions.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Woman Suffrage.
Mr. FLETCHER	Commerce.
	Fisheries.
	Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Philippines.
	Printing.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
Mr. FOSTER	Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Canadian Relations.
	Coast Defenses.
	Enrolled Bills.
	Expenditures in the War Department.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Military Affairs.
	University of the United States.
Mr. FRYE	Commerce, chairman.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Expenditures in the Interior Department.
	Foreign Relations.
	Pacific Railroads.
	University of the United States.
Mr. GALLINGER	District of Columbia, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Finance.
	Printing.
	Rules.
Mr. GAMBLE	Indian Affairs, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Public Lands.
	Standards, Weights, and Measures.
Mr. GORE	Railroads, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Canadian Relations.
	Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.
	Immigration.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Patents.
	Pensions.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
Mr. GRONNA	Expenditures in the Navy Department, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Enrolled Bills.
	Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.
	Immigration.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Private Land Claims.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
Mr. GUGGENHEIM	Philippines, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Census.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Military Affairs.
	Mines and Mining.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Public Lands.
Mr. HEYBURN	Manufactures, chairman.
	Finance.
	Joint Committee on Revision of the Laws of the United States, chairman.
	Mines and Mining.
	Philippines.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Public Lands.
Mr. HITCHCOCK	Foreign Relations.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Military Affairs.
	Philippines.
	Territories.
Mr. JOHNSON of Maine	Expenditures in the War Department.
	Finance.
	Naval Affairs.
	Pensions.
	Territories.
Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama	University of the United States, chairman.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	District of Columbia.
	Indian Depredations.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Military Affairs.
	Mines and Mining.
	Philippines.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Woman Suffrage.
Mr. JONES	Fisheries, chairman.
	Claims.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	District of Columbia.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Military Affairs.
	Privileges and Elections.
	Public Lands.
Mr. KENYON	Expenditures in the Department of State, chairman.
	Cuban Relations.
	District of Columbia.
	Education and Labor.
	Geological Survey.
	Patents.
	Printing.
	Privileges and Elections.
Mr. KERN	Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.
	Finance.
	Immigration.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Privileges and Elections.
Mr. LA FOLLETTE	Census, chairman.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.
	Expenditures in the Department of State.
	Finance.
	Indian Affairs.
	Manufactures.
Mr. LEA	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	District of Columbia.
	Expenditures in the Treasury Department.
	Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LIPPITT	Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, chairman.
	Census.
	Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.
	Indian Depredations.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Philippines.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
	Territories.
Mr. LODGE	Immigration, chairman.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Engrossed Bills.
	Finance.
	Foreign Relations.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Naval Affairs.
	Philippines.
Mr. LORIMER	Mines and Mining, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	District of Columbia.
	Manufactures.
	Military Affairs.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Private Land Claims.
Mr. MCCUMBER	Pensions, chairman.
	Expenditures in the Interior Department.
	Finance.
	Foreign Relations.
	Indian Affairs.
	Pacific Railroads.
	Railroads.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
Mr. MCLEAN	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game, chairman.
	Canadian Relations.
	Census.
	Claims.
	Education and Labor.
	Manufactures.
	Philippines.
	Territories.
Mr. MARTIN of Virginia	Appropriations.
	Claims.
	Commerce.
	District of Columbia.
	Expenditures in the Navy Department.
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey	Claims.
	Coast Defenses.
	Education and Labor.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
Mr. MYERS	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Indian Affairs.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Mines and Mining.
	Public Lands.
Mr. NELSON	Public Lands, chairman.
	Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.
	Commerce.
	Judiciary.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Railroads.
	Rules.
	Territories.
Mr. NEWLANDS	Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia, chairman.
	Commerce.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Library.
	Public Lands.
Mr. NIXON	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Coast Defenses.
	Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Mines and Mining.
	Philippines.
	Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.
Mr. O'GORMAN	Cuban Relations.
	Immigration.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Judiciary.
	Manufactures.
Mr. OLIVER	Canadian Relations, chairman.
	Claims.
	Commerce.
	District of Columbia.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Manufactures.
	Private Land Claims.
	Privileges and Elections.
Mr. OVERMAN	Woman Suffrage, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Claims.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Fisheries.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Judiciary.
	Rules.
	University of the United States.
Mr. OWEN	Pacific Railroads, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Indian Affairs.
	Indian Depredations.
	Mississippi River and its Tributaries.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
	Territories.
Mr. PAGE	Cuban Relations, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Claims.
	Education and Labor.
	Geological Survey.
	Indian Affairs.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Naval Affairs.
	Printing.
Mr. PAYNTER	Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, chairman.
	Claims.
	District of Columbia.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Judiciary.
	Philippines.
	Privileges and Elections.
Mr. PENROSE	Finance, chairman.
	Education and Labor.
	Expenditures in the Post Office Department.
	Immigration.
	Naval Affairs.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Railroads.
Mr. PERCY	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Commerce.
	Expenditures in the Department of State.
	Immigration.
	Indian Depredations.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Joint Committee on Revision of the Laws of the United States.

Mr. PERKINS	Naval Affairs, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Appropriations.
	Commerce.
	Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.
	Fisheries.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Interoceanic Canals.
Mr. POINDEXTER	Expenditures in the Interior Department, chairman.
	Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.
	Mines and Mining.
	Naval Affairs.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Pensions.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
Mr. POMERENE	Census.
	District of Columbia.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Manufactures.
	Pensions.
Mr. RAYNER	Indian Depredations, chairman.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Education and Labor.
	Expenditures in the Department of Justice.
	Foreign Relations.
	Geological Survey.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Judiciary.
	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.
Mr. REED	Commerce.
	Manufactures.
	Pacific Railroads.
	Philippines.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Railroads.
Mr. RICHARDSON	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, chairman.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.
	Immigration.
	Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Printing.
Mr. ROOT	Industrial Expositions, chairman.
	Canadian Relations.
	Coast Defenses.
	Foreign Relations.
	Judiciary.
	Library.
	Revolutionary Claims.
Mr. SHIVELY	Census.
	Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia.
	Education and Labor.
	Foreign Relations.
	Library.
	Pacific Railroads.
	Patents.
	Pensions.
	Territories.
Mr. SIMMONS	Engrossed Bills, chairman.
	Coast Defenses.
	Commerce.
	Cuban Relations.
	Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.
	Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.
	Finance.
	Interoceanic Canals.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland	Investigate Trespassers upon Indian Lands, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Canadian Relations.
	Coast Defenses
	District of Columbia.
	Expenditures in the Treasury Department.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Naval Affairs.
	Printing.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan	Territories, chairman.
	Commerce.
	Expenditures in the Post Office Department.
	Five Civilized Tribes of Indians.
	Foreign Relations.
	Naval Affairs.
	Pacific Railroads.
	Private Land Claims.
Mr. SMITH of South Carolina	Transportation Routes to the Seaboard, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Geological Survey.
	Immigration.
	Manufactures.
	Patents.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
Mr. SMOOT	Printing, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Civil Service and Retrenchment.
	Claims.
	Finance.
	Pensions.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
	Public Lands.
Mr. STEPHENSON	Enrolled Bills, chairman.
	Commerce.
	Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.
	Indian Depredations.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Mississippi River and its Tributaries.
	Pacific Railroads.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
Mr. STONE	Revolutionary Claims, chairman.
	Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress.
	Cuban Relations.
	Expenditures in the Department of State.
	Finance.
	Foreign Relations.
	Indian Affairs.
Mr. SUTHERLAND	Public Buildings and Grounds, chairman.
	Foreign Relations.
	Indian Affairs.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Joint Committee on Revision of the Laws of the United States.
	Judiciary.
	Mines and Mining.
	Privileges and Elections.
Mr. SWANSON	Education and Labor.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Library.
	Naval Affairs.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
Mr. TAYLOR	Geological Survey, chairman.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Industrial Expositions.
	Military Affairs.
	Pensions.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Railroads.

Mr. TERRELL	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Coast Defenses.
	Manufactures.
	Post Offices and Post Roads.
	University of the United States.
Mr. THORNTON	Census.
	Fisheries.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Mississippi River and its Tributaries.
	Naval Affairs.
	Private Land Claims.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
	Public Lands.
Mr. TILLMAN	Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Canadian Relations.
	Expenditures in the Navy Department.
	Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Mines and Mining.
	Naval Affairs.
Mr. TOWNSEND	Coast and Insular Survey, chairman.
	Census.
	Claims.
	Conservation of National Resources.
	Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.
	Interoceanic Canals.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.
Mr. WARREN	Appropriations, chairman.
	Agriculture and Forestry.
	Expenditures in the Department of State.
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Military Affairs.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Rules.
Mr. WATSON	Conservation of National Resources.
	Cuban Relations.
	Indian Affairs.
	Interstate Commerce.
	Mines and Mining.
	Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	Railroads.
	Transportation and Sale of Meat Products.
Mr. WETMORE	Library, chairman.
	Appropriations.
	Geological Survey.
	Mississippi River and its Tributaries.
	Naval Affairs.
	Public Buildings and Grounds.
	University of the United States.
	Woman Suffrage.
Mr. WILLIAMS	Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.
	Finance.
	Military Affairs.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
	University of the United States.
Mr. WORKS	Expenditures in the War Department, chairman.
	Coast and Insular Survey.
	Coast Defenses.
	District of Columbia.
	Expenditures in the Treasury Department.
	Industrial Expositions.
Mr. WORKS (continued)	Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.
	Patents.
	Public Health and National Quarantine.
	Public Lands.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read by title.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911, was read the first time by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state to the Senate in reference to the joint resolution that it is entitled a joint resolution "to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts," one coming from the Committee on Appropriations, another from the Post Office Committee, and a third from the Committee on Naval Affairs. The joint resolution in fact repeals certain provisions of those acts and in part modifies others. It seemed to the Chair, inasmuch as by title it is proposed to correct enrollments, the joint resolution should go to the Committee on Enrolled Bills, but the Chair did not wish to make such a reference without calling to the attention of the Senate the provisions of the joint resolution.

Mr. HEYBURN obtained the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho has been recognized.

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have only one observation to make. To prove the errors in enrollment it will be necessary to consult the original bills that were before the conferees, to examine the markings upon their margins, and the conference reports to the Senate. Therefore the proper reference for the joint resolution is to the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of checking up such of the bills as may come within their jurisdiction, and, if necessary, it can then go to some other committee.

Mr. BAILEY. As I understand, this is an effort to correct a bill passed in the last Congress.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Several bills, of which bills different committees had jurisdiction, and it is in effect a repealing resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. That is all it can be. There can be no such thing as the correction by one Congress——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly not.

Mr. BAILEY. Of a mistake made by a previous Congress or its committees except by way of affirmative legislation. These are the laws, and it would not be competent in a court of law to come down into the committee room and examine the bill there and contradict it by the bill in the State Department. All we can do is simply to amend the law as it now stands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is what the joint resolution proposes to do.

Mr. WARREN. Just a word——

Mr. BAILEY. I thought it merely proposed to correct a mistake.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In its title it assumes to do something else, but in effect, when the joint resolution is read, it will be seen that it is a repealing resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. Then that is the way it ought to be framed.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

Mr. WARREN. Just a word.

Mr. HEYBURN. Very well.

Mr. WARREN. It would seem rather peculiar under ordinary circumstances to undertake to repeal legislation passed in the last Congress without, in reporting the joint resolution, giving some good reason for such repeal.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to repeal a good deal of it.

Mr. WARREN. The reason for that repeal, if there be one, will, of course, appear when the bills are examined and it is shown that the enrollment was in error, being different legislation from what was intended by the Senate itself.

Mr. BAILEY. That would be a good reason for passing the joint resolution, but as it is now the law, you have to deal with it as you would with any other existing law.

Mr. HEYBURN. We confronted this question at the last Congress under circumstances that enabled us to fully realize the effect of this class of attempt. It is an attempt to do by indirection what under the law can and should only be done by

direct action. If this legislation, which is as much law as anything upon the statute books, is to be repealed, let it be done by a measure that purports to repeal it, not by a measure that purports to apologize for it and ask forgiveness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it does that, except in the title.

Mr. HEYBURN. The joint resolution is not entitled to be received by the Senate, and it is not a measure known to legislative procedure—to correct a measure that became final at a Congress that has terminated. It is not a proceeding known to legislation—or, rather, I might say, that should be known to it. It went through at the last session.

I happen to be interested, as a Member of this body, in some of the measures that are proposed to be advocated by this measure—a resolution that we did not mean to do that which we have been certified to the country as having done—and I shall take such steps as are within my power, within the rules of legislation, to have rejected, without any recognition as a correct method of legislating, all such measures.

If any part of the legislative branch of the Government desires to propose the repeal of a measure, let it come in the shape of a bill to repeal it, and let it go to the committee with the notice and opportunity implied by such procedure, and come in here and go on the calendar as any other measure.

I am not in the habit of serving notice as to what I shall do, but I certainly will do what can be done to prevent summary action upon this class of proposed legislation.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BACON. The Senator from Idaho is through, as I understand. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. HEYBURN. No; but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator, then, I will say what I have to say in his time.

I think the discussion is proceeding on the part of the Senator from Idaho upon a misapprehension of what is contained in the joint resolution. It is a joint resolution which, I need not say, has the same effect as a statute when it has been agreed to by each House and approved, and the direct purpose of it, as stated, is to amend existing law. I will read it to the Senator. The Senator shakes his head. I happen to have the document before me.

Mr. HEYBURN. I read a statement of it in the morning paper. I have not seen the document.

Mr. BACON. I have in my hand the document which comes from the House of Representatives. It reads this way:

Resolved, etc., That the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, is amended as follows.

There is a distinct proposition to amend an existing law. It is doing exactly what the Senator from Idaho very properly says is the proper and correct method of procedure to correct what was an error. It is true that there is an unfortunate expression in the preamble.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think that is the unfortunate——

Mr. BACON. But that does not affect it.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator will pardon an interruption, it is the unfortunate statement in the preamble that caused me to take the floor on this occasion.

Mr. BACON. Very well. That is a matter with which the Senate can very easily and readily deal by a minor correction when the joint resolution comes before a proper committee for consideration. But the joint resolution itself purports to amend existing laws, the purpose being to correct what was in the enactment of those laws the commission of an unintentional error. But the direct method of procedure is the correct one, to wit, it proposes to amend the law as it now exists. The language is as I have read it, and I will proceed to read, not the entire joint resolution, but its provisions in that particular. Now, for instance, as to the Post Office bill, on the next page. I read what referred to the sundry civil bill. When it comes to the Post Office appropriation bill, line 13, on page 2, it says:

The Post Office appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, is amended as follows.

When it comes to the naval appropriation bill it says:

The naval appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, is amended as follows.

So the joint resolution does proceed regularly with the purpose and intent to amend existing law.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator kindly allow me to use the joint resolution, if he is through with it?

Mr. BAILEY. It is right in the body of the joint resolution. The only mistake is in the preamble.

Mr. BACON. In the preamble. It is a matter very easy of correction.

Mr. HEYBURN. This is a matter of great importance, not only as to the items included, but as to the establishing of a precedent. This comes to us in the shape of a joint resolution which, when it is passed and signed, becomes a law with just the same binding force as any other law. I am perfectly aware of that. But, Mr. President, this recites that "the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, is amended as follows," immediately following a declaration of the purpose of the proposed act, of the nature of the legislation, which is "whereas certain errors were made in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911." I do not admit it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Idaho will recall the fact that it is almost the universal practice in the Senate to strike out preambles.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. And, of course, the committee can do that——

Mr. BACON. Of course.

Mr. GALLINGER. And simply report back the joint resolution as it would appear after the preamble had been stricken out.

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator from Idaho, I wish to make a suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BACON. It is that the joint resolution ought to be referred in succession to the various committees which had charge of the particular bills that are sought to be amended.

There is no doubt about it that it would be very much better if we had had three joint resolutions sent to us instead of one. But as the whole matter has been embodied in one joint resolution, it occurs to me that the better plan is that it should be referred to each of the committees, so far as it relates to the particular subject matter within the control of the several committees.

Mr. CULLOM. Beginning with the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BACON. It is true this is somewhat an awkward procedure, but it is the practical way in which to deal with it, and if there is anything wrong in the matter of form or style or expression each of those committees can make proper recommendations for its correction.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is wrong in morals. If this were the Congress that enacted the laws, there might be some excuse for this action. But this is not the Congress that enacted the laws. It is a subsequent Congress, and if we can go back to one we can go back to any, and if we have votes enough we can declare it was not the intention in the sundry civil appropriation bill of 1906 that certain items should be included. It is lax legislation.

As long as a Congress exists, which is for the period of two years, it should be competent for it to correct errors which it has committed, but it should not be competent for another Congress to make changes in the law on the pretense that a Congress which has passed into history and is responsible for its own action did that which this Congress does not approve of.

Take these items, for instance. In the first place, I referred to one, which was the cause of my rising to discuss this question:

So much of the general deficiency appropriation act approved March 4, 1911, as appropriates the sum of $500 to reimburse the State board of regents of the University of Idaho for the premium paid on an indemnity bond is repealed.

Mr. President, that matter was pending before this body for a long time, and it received the approval of this body. It was agreed to, so far as history tells us, in the conference and has become a law, a law enacted not by this Congress, but by another Congress. If we can do it as to the last Congress, we can do it as to the first Congress, and we can go back of the ultimate record of the measures that were enacted and certified to the Department of State and after men and the memory of men have passed away, we can open up these questions upon the lead-pencil marks upon an appropriation bill or the memory of some one who is no longer a Member of the body. I think the principle is sufficiently important to justify any one or all the Members of the Senate in taking this up at this time.

Let me call attention to another feature of it. The joint resolution undertakes in one measure to repeal provisions in the general deficiency bill, the Post Office appropriation bill, the urgent deficiency bill, and the naval appropriation bill. The change in the personnel of the committees that represented the two legislative bodies of the Government in conference in itself would constitute a warning against anything like such action. Those committees to whom this joint resolution would go are in at least two instances almost entirely composed of new Members. Are they to sit in judgment upon the action of the committees of the last Congress or upon the action of the Congress itself? If we establish a practice like this, the old principle of the stability and certainty of the law when it is written and recorded would be very much diminished in its value as a rule of legal and legislative procedure.

I will ask Senators to investigate the personnel of the committees from which that which is now the law came and to which this joint resolution would go and see whether they want the work of the last Congress criticized, whether they want to take up those who may have been clerks to the committees of the last Congress and not connected with the present and inquire of them, What does that little mark mean on the margin of that manuscript? or, Do you remember that in conference there was a failure to agree upon this measure? Does any Senator want legislation based upon such loose methods as that? And that is just what we are proposing to do.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. This joint resolution came from the Committee on Appropriations in the House. I have not examined all of the records, but I have examined sufficiently to know that as to repeals that are sought in bills that were before the Senate Committee on Appropriations the return from the committee of conference, which is a matter of record, will show that the bill itself as enrolled does not correspond with the report of the conference committee.

It is in my judgment proper to send the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations that the committee may examine and be able to ascertain and lay before the Senate its conclusion as to whether this legislation proceeded regularly and in which the conferees were in agreement, or whether they legislated one way and their legislation was written through the enrolling clerks in another.

I make no point of judgment whether the joint resolution should pass or not. All I ask is that it may go, in the first instance, to the proper committee, and, if it is necessary, then it can go to the Committee on Naval Affairs and to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming conclusively demonstrate the unsoundness of this action. He confesses that the procedure will be one of investigation to determine whether or not Congress made a mistake. There is the whole thing in a nutshell. Shall one Congress undertake to review the action of another?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that will be a matter for the Senate itself to settle. But all committees are committees of investigation. The committees may return a report that this bill should not pass, but at least they may accumulate the facts relating to the matter and give the benefit of those facts to the Senate.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the committee should not be invested with any such power, nor should such a duty be undertaken by it. The committees of this Congress should not undertake such a thing. Where would it end? What limitation would you put upon the power to inquire as to whether or not the laws written, sent out, and published to the people and acted upon, accepted as laws, are laws? How often can it be done? Perhaps again and again.

No, Mr. President, if this Congress doubts the wisdom of any other Congress it is appropriate to introduce a bill to repeal a law, recognizing it as the law, not as a mistake. If you are going to nullify it, recognize its status as a law, not as a mistake to be corrected.

I felt when on a former occasion Congress took a similar step in regard to the legislation of that Congress that it was going beyond any possible rule that should govern. But this goes a step further and proposes to correct as a mistake the action of another Congress. I merely appeal to Senators not to drop into a mistake as a method of legislation. Otherwise they will cast doubt upon the stability of any law upon the statute books, because of a fear that some committee or some person who disagrees with the act of Congress may go back and find that by the lead pencil notes upon the margin of a conference report some mistake was made.

Now, that will not do as a method of legislation. I know that in one case, and I think in more, action has been taken upon such a matter based upon it as legislation, and I was astounded when I read in the paper that the first session of the Sixty-second Congress was going to inquire into the accuracy and intelligence of the preceding Congress. The great committee which Senators seem sometimes to overlook passed upon this matter, and passed upon it deliberately.

This condition of affairs illustrates the laxity of the rule and procedure under which a report from a conference committee is stated by numbers and not by names. When a conference report is made it says, "The Senate recedes from amendments numbered 12, 19, 32, and 75," and no Senator can keep up with it; and the House recedes from numbers, stating them rapidly. Unless you have an opportunity to place the bill before you and hunt up those numbers you do not know what the result of the conference has been.

I hope some Senator will propose such a reformation in regard to the manner of making conference reports as will make this kind of a proceeding forever impossible. Had the conference report come to this Chamber conveying the information that those items had not been included, then there would have been a motion to send it back to the conference for further consideration. No such opportunity was given. It was stated that the conference had agreed to the measure as it is written in the statute. A disagreement to the conference report would perhaps have elicited more wisdom than would be shown by the refusal of the conference to include those items, some of them I know. I may say that had the conference report conveyed the information to this body that they had not included that item and one other, I think I should have asked that the conference consider it further.

Now, see the condition in which we are left. A Senator introduces a measure. It is passed through this body. He is advised at the door or on the floor that the conference with the other House has agreed to the measure, and he rests in security and waives the opportunity which he has under the rules of this body to ask for a further consideration of the measure. He accepts the conference report as it comes to this body and as it is printed and as it is signed by the Presiding Officer. It is written in the law, and those who are the beneficiaries or the responsible people who are controlled by the legislation act upon it. Then he is told at some subsequent Congress that a mistake was made, and it matters not whether it is 1 year, 1 month, or 50 years afterwards. There is no right to correct the record of the last Congress that is not equally applicable to the correction of the record of a Congress of 50 years ago. There is no statute of limitations.

I object, as I objected on the former occasion, to the practice; and I object to this particular case because it represents legislation that in the wisdom and in the justice of this body—and I believe in the wisdom of the conferees—should have been enacted into law.

Mr. President, I have been thinking just what action should be taken. The joint resolution comes from the House. Of course the House has sent it to us with a preamble. So we are fully advised as to the nature and character and purpose of the legislation. There is no rule under which we can send it back to the House. It is ours to act upon. We can amend it. If we strike out the declaration in the preamble, the venom still remains in the text of the bill.

Mr. President, I will inquire what is the status of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a message from the House of Representatives laid before the Senate for reading and reference.

Mr. HEYBURN. For a first reading?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. I object to a second reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On a single objection it must go over.

Mr. HEYBURN. I object to the second reading of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution goes over under the rule.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 2983. An act for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Census was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

The following joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress; and

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives.

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C., was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, suggests that all matters relating to the Red Cross go to that committee for consideration, and I ask that the reference of House joint resolution 38 be changed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reference will be changed from the Committee on the District of Columbia to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF TARIFF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire Senate proceedings with reference to the tariff act of 1842, including the act itself, be printed as a Senate document. (S. Doc. No. 21.)

I also ask that the entire Senate proceedings with reference to the tariff act of 1846 be printed as another and separate Senate document, including the act of 1846 and the report of the Secretary of the Treasury made to Congress in December, 1845, known as the Walker report.

Mr. HEYBURN. If I may interrupt the Senator from Texas, would it not be well to include also in the document the Canadian reciprocity act of 1854?

Mr. BAILEY. That is now a public document.

Mr. HEYBURN. But does it contain all the Senate proceedings? It contains selected proceedings.

Mr. BAILEY. The Finance Committee, when the reciprocity agreement came to the Senate, ordered printed the document relating to the proposition now before us and also the documents relating to the old reciprocal trade agreement, including the agreement itself, the report of Mr. Mason, and the Ward report, as well as others made by some experts of the Treasury Department.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will say I have a copy of that document, as every Senator doubtless has, but it seemed to me that it contains only selected portions of the proceedings in the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I do not recall at this moment, perhaps the Senator from Texas will know, whether the Elgin treaty was debated in open session or not. If it was debated, as treaties almost universally are, in secret session, naturally there would be no report of the debate. So very little of it could be given in that case.

Mr. HEYBURN. My recollection is that it was not considered in secret session, because the discussion between Mr. Morrill and certain other Senators is contained in this document, and I assume that it must have been in open session.

Mr. BAILEY. I think, however, that may have been upon the abrogation of the treaty, but I would not be positive about that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. There was a very extensive debate on the Elgin treaty, which came on the question to abrogate or repeal it, which really ought to be included in any document that is published concerning the reciprocal trade agreement.

Mr. BAILEY. I myself would be very glad to see that done, but my purpose was to get these documents printed, assuming that as the Senate will at once take up the trade agreement it could have what additional printing it might desire done. I am rather inclined, Mr. President, to believe that the Finance Committee, under the standing rule, might have this printing done, but I wanted to have no question about it; and if the committee could have it done this order of the Senate could do no harm.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator intends to include the debates?

Mr. BAILEY. Undoubtedly. I said all the proceedings; and in order that whoever compiles it may know what I mean by the request to which I hope the Senate will give its consent, I would begin with the bill to the Senate from the House. For instance, the act of 1846 was never reported to the Senate from a committee. It was one of the few great measures debated at length, attracting universal attention, with the consideration of which the Senate proceeded without having it referred to a committee. There was an absentee, and as the means of coming and going were not so good then as they are now, it was by no means certain that the absent member of the Finance Committee would be able to attend its sessions, and his absence left that committee a tie. The Democratic leaders of the Senate very frankly avowed that they did not want to send the bill to the committee, because they did not want it kept there by this tie.

There was one speech of great interest aside from the question discussed. I think probably one of the most eloquent tributes ever paid by one Senator to another was paid by the Senator from Missouri, Mr. Benton, to the Senator from North Carolina, who resigned his seat as a Member of this body rather than to vote for that bill, although he was a Democrat.

The administration paper then published in Washington assailed him with such ferocity that Mr. Benton, though friendly to the administration, felt called upon to protest on the floor of the Senate. It was one of the interesting episodes of that most remarkable discussion. I should want that included; in fact, Mr. President, I want everything relating to that bill from the time it came to the Senate from the House until the time it passed the Senate included.

There have been a good many mistakes made about that bill. The other night I picked up a recent edition of Clay's writings, and the last volume contained a history of the tariff question written by the lamented President McKinley. He states in that book that the famous tariff act of 1846 passed this body by the casting vote of the Vice President. I have seen that statement repeatedly made, and at one time I made the mistake of repeating it; but it is a mistake. The casting vote of the Vice President was not on the passage of the bill; it was on the third reading of the bill. That bill passed the Senate by a majority of 1 vote, and that 1 vote was cast by a Whig Senator under the instruction of the legislature of his State.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the Walker report is already printed as a public document.

Mr. BAILEY. I know. I understand that the Senator from Georgia very wisely had it so printed during the last tariff discussion; but I should like to have everything relating to that particular bill included in the document.

Mr. BACON. The Senator wants it all printed together as one document?

Mr. BAILEY. As one document. And, Mr. President, I want also the document embracing the act of 1842 to include the veto messages of President Tyler, who vetoed that bill twice. Congress finally passed it after eliminating a provision that related to certain public lands. One of the remarkable episodes in connection with that was that after the bill had been twice vetoed by the President and the House was about to yield to the position of the President a new Member, as I recall, from the State of Pennsylvania, made a remarkable speech, and concluded with moving, as an amendment to the bill, the former bill with the provision relating to public lands eliminated. He so charmed and convinced the House that they adopted his motion, and that bill, thus slightly amended, was finally sent to the President for a third time, and received his approval. I should like to have both of those veto messages included in that document. I doubt if we have had a document printed by either House since we printed the messages and papers of the Presidents which would be more interesting and more instructive than the document I propose; and I hope unanimous consent will be given for its printing.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I take it that everyone is in accord with the request of the Senator from Texas; but his request makes no provision as to how this proposed document shall be compiled or who shall compile it. I would suggest that the matter be referred to the Committee on Finance and taken up in detail there. The Senator will then have an opportunity to indicate just what he wants and how he wants the work compiled, and it would, of course, be part of the numerous records which that committee will have to report for publication during the discussion of the subject.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I meet the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania by requesting that the Committee on Finance be requested to have the documents referred to printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wish to inquire whether the request includes the debates and the proceedings with reference to the former reciprocity treaty with Canada?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Texas desires to include in his request all that he has stated, and that the printing shall be done under the direction of the Committee on Finance. That is as the Chair understands it.

Mr. BAILEY. It will include the debates, the votes, the amendments, and the motions.

Mr. BORAH. I understand what the Senator desires to include with reference to the acts of 1842 and 1846; but I was inquiring if provision was being made for printing the proceedings and debates with reference to the former reciprocity treaty with Canada.

Mr. BAILEY. I had not, Mr. President, included that in the request.

Mr. BORAH. I should like to have that included in the request.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe the debates in relation to the Canadian reciprocity treaty referred to by the Senator from Idaho have already been printed.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me a moment, I think the only debate that has been printed in document form is the debate that occurred when the bill to repeal the reciprocity agreement was up for consideration, but neither the debate when the treaty in the first instance was under consideration nor when the tariff bill made in pursuance of that treaty was under consideration have been printed. However, some of the debates—whether all are included or not I do not know—that took place when the former Canadian reciprocity treaty was repealed have been printed.

Mr. BAILEY. I ought to know, but I must admit that I do not know, whether the debates on the treaty have ever been made public—I mean on the original proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. I know many of them have been made public and many of them have been printed.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me further, I join with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] in asking that all the proceedings in connection with the reciprocity treaty of 1854, the act passed in pursuance thereof, and also the repealing act—everything in connection with those matters—be printed as a document in connection with the other matters referred to, under the direction of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to that, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, on the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY], who sits near me, I want also to say that I shall ask the Finance Committee to include the act of 1857, modifying, as it did, the act of 1846. If I could have my way with the committee, taking the responsibility for it back to the Senate, I should like to see both those documents printed in a volume of convenient size. In my opinion, all that relates to the acts of 1842 and 1846 can be printed in a volume not wider nor longer than the book which I hold in my hand [exhibiting] and only a little thicker, because it will contain nothing except the Senate proceedings.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator that my recollection, from an examination very recently made of the condition of the record, is that the treaty was not considered in open session, and that, therefore, there is no report of the debate. In those days Canada was not so important as now, and the treaty was made with England. It was discussed in secret session, and there is no record of what anybody said.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I will say there was an act immediately passed to carry out the provisions of the treaty, and there was debate in connection with that act.

Mr. HEYBURN. The debate on that act reveals merely the discussion of the items, but I think my colleague [Mr. BORAH] will find no record of the proceedings when the treaty was ratified.

Mr. BORAH. What I was most concerned about was the debate with reference to the abrogation of the treaty, which I think is very instructive.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; that is all right. We have that.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. SHIVELY. I think the record will disclose that the proposition for reciprocity with Canada was pending for four or five years before it was eventually adopted.

There is quite an elaborate debate in the Congressional Globe of 1849 on that proposition, participated in by Stephen A. Douglas and other distinguished Members of the Senate at that time.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may understand my desire, if it is found that to incorporate all the proceedings with reference to these bills will make a volume of inconvenient size then I am going to ask the committee to make two volumes of it, so that every Senator may have them for convenient reference.

Mr. SMOOT. No doubt, Mr. President, that would be done at all events.

Mr. BACON. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the committee will comply with the request of the Senate in regard to this matter, but I think, in the interest of orderly procedure, the Senate should direct the committee and not request it. That was the form in which it was put—that the committee be requested. I think the committee should be, as is universally done, directed to comply with these requests.

Mr. BAILEY. That is an entirely proper suggestion. I preferred the request to the Senate, and then, to meet the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], I simply added that the work should be done under the direction of the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], supplemented by the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, my recollection is that a letter on the subject of reciprocity was written by Robert J. Walker on or about May 1, 1848, and I would suggest to the Senator from Texas that he include that letter in his request.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I will state that my recollection corresponds with the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], that there is in the document room an executive document, including a message from President Taylor in 1850, and a letter from the former Secretary of the Treasury, Robert J. Walker, in 1848, approved by him but not signed by him, advocating freer trade relations with Canada. The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury relates to a House bill, not to a treaty. In that document there is also included a remarkable speech by Gen. Dix, of New York, then a Member of the Senate, in favor of a bill for reciprocal free-trade relations between the United States and Canada. These, of course, ought to be included in the proposed publication.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As the Chair understands, the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] is broad enough to cover it. As the Chair understands, the request of the Senator from Texas covered everything which appeared in the record of debates during the period of years relating to this subject.

Mr. CULBERSON. That was not included. My colleague simply asked for the printing of the Senate proceedings—and he named some of the proceedings—but he did not include the matter to which the Senator from Oklahoma has called attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It may be that the Chair misunderstood the request.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, my colleague will permit me to say that my own request was confined to proceedings respecting the two tariff acts of 1842 and 1846. Then the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] supplemented that with a suggestion about the reciprocity proceedings in 1854, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] then added his request. As I understand, all matters relating to that reciprocity agreement are to be printed under their requests, which, with my consent, became a part of what I had requested. Under that the documents to which my colleague refers will, as I understand, be printed.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed as a Senate document the document to which I have just called attention. It is House document 64, Thirty-first Congress, first session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Aside from the other request?

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes; aside from the other request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]?

Mr. CULBERSON. It is not on a reciprocity treaty between the United States and Canada, but it is upon a bill which passed the House of Representatives, according to my recollection, but did not pass the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the request of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] will first be disposed of. The Chair hears no objection to the request. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] as modified by the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am of course very much in favor of the order made by the Senate to publish the proceedings of the Senate with regard to the acts referred to and also the reciprocity agreement between this country and England with respect to Canada, also referred to; but I am now more inter-

ested in the pending reciprocity agreement than in the old one. A great many egregious misstatements have been sent broadcast in the country and scattered particularly among the farmers. I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate on Monday next, after the routine morning business has been disposed of, to address the Senate for a short time, in the hope of being able to correct some of the misstatements of fact which certain people have been so busy in spreading broadcast over the country.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1911.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Samuel Adams to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Elliot Marshal to be surveyor of customs at St. Joseph, Mo.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Adolphus E. Watson to be a lieutenant commander.
The following-named machinists to be chief machinists:
Herbert E. Fish and
Barnett B. Bowie.
Machinist Bernhard Christensen to be a chief machinist.
The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters:
Charles J. Kerr and
Ernest L. Bass.

POSTMASTERS.

MONTANA.

William Cowgill, Chouteau.

NEW JERSEY.

George E. Schenck, Haddon Heights.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John G. Brown, Red Springs.
Moses L. Buchanan, Concord.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Horace S. Carpenter, East Downington.
Samuel J. Gundry, Lattimer Mines.
Frank Merle Altland, Dillsburg.
Charles Seger, Emporium.
W. A. Terrill, Clairton.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Edward O. Harwood, Moorefield.
Albert S. Winter, Moundsville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *April 28, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for all the seasons of the year, since each contributes its share to the wants and necessities of mankind; but when the winter is over and gone and the life currents are freed from its icy fingers, the grass springs beneath our feet; the trees take on their garments of green; the flowers bud, blossom, and exhale their fragrance; the birds sing; and the heart of man rejoices in the beauty and promise of it all, and our faith is enlarged in Thy goodness and Thy promises unto Thy children.

It is written, *"For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and blossom that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth; it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."* So may we be faithful and profitable servants unto Thee, O God, our Father. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. ESCH, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Charles O. Baker, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. PETERS, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Mary A. Fearing, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BERGER, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for one week on account of important business.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, to put agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SIMS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask what time has been used on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has used 4 hours and 53 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania 5 hours and 11 minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I would like to yield 15 minutes at this time, as the gentleman desires to go away.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE].

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, on April 4, 1911, page 7 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the distinguished Speaker of the House made use of these words:

After 16 years of exclusion from power in the House and 14 years of exclusion from power in every department of government, we are restored to power in the House of Representatives and in that alone. We are this day put upon trial, and the duty devolves upon us to demonstrate, not so much by fine phrases as by good works, that we are worthy of the confidence imposed in us by the voters of the land, and that we are also worthy of their wider confidence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We could not if we would, and we would not if we could, escape this severe test. We will not shirk our duty. We shrink not from the responsibility.

What has this Democratic House done up to this time? It passed a bill to authorize the election of Senators by direct vote of the people. A Republican House passed that bill on more than one occasion. The Democratic Party of this House, true to its history, is trailing along after the Republican Party. The Republican Party passed a bill——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. The House is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the House will be in order.

Mr. PRINCE. The next bill passed was one that refers to campaign expenses. A similar bill was passed by a Republican Congress. The bill that was passed here did not go to the root of the evil, which was the primary election. We tried to amend it. That was denied to us, and the bill in a very improper and ineffective form passed this House. Much flourish of trumpets was made about the economy of this House. How many have been discharged; how many positions have been discontinued? Who can tell? One hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars of salaries and useless expenses on the part of this House to be put aside and saved to the country, and yet what gentleman in the House can tell what saving has been done thus far? I pause for answer. I heard my distinguished colleague [Mr. MANN] show that you are seeking to have committee clerks and janitors and messengers appointed for committees that you said you had discontinued.

By the report of committee assignments those committees have been discontinued, and yet you are asking for clerks. What condition are we in to-day? Resolution after resolution of investigation is offered. This Congress ought not to be called an extra session of Congress, but ought to be called a Congress for special resolutions to investigate somebody. Commissions are to be appointed to investigate commissions, circling around one after another, and for what purpose? To increase the force of your employees, to seek to obtain some

information that you have in all of the reports that have been given to you by the different departments. Unless you do more legislation for the good of the people you will be driven from the seat of power.

So much for that. Now, you have reached another bill—the Canadian reciprocity measure. That has passed this House. For the life of me I do not know what kind of a measure it is. Gentlemen on the other side say that it is a Democratic measure. The majority of the Republicans who voted on this side—78 against and 64 for—said it was not a Republican measure, and I was one of those that so voted. Nowhere do I find in the history of my party, in the speeches that I have made for 20 years or more to the farmers, nowhere do I find anywhere, from platform or speech, anything which says that the farmers shall be stricken down for the benefit of some other country, for the benefit of some other people who do not pay our taxes, who do not defend our flag, who do not care for the interests of this country as our own citizens have to care for them. Let us take the reciprocity bill that was passed. Why was it passed? I do not know. Is it a good bill? Some say yes. The President of the United States only last night said this:

> We tendered to the Canadian commissioners absolute free trade in all products of either country, manufactured or natural, but the Canadian commissioners did not feel justified in going so far.

Why? Why did they not? They made a bargain with us—the most unconscionable bargain that was ever entered into by this country with any other country, the most one-sided. What do we get? Free products of the Canadian farmer; all that he raises and produces in the form of natural products are made free. What benefit does the American farmer get in exchange? None. What is the expression of the President of the United States last night in that same speech?

> The effect is not going, in my judgment, to lower the specific prices of agricultural products in our country.

To lower the specific prices! The word "specific" is used, pointing out definitely that it will not lower the prices in this country. How can he square that with the statement that this measure is passed to relieve the ultimate consumer in his high cost of living in this country? If this bill does not reduce the prices to the farmer, why are we seeking to pass it? What is the purpose of this extra session if this measure gives no relief? Does it leave the price of the farmer's product exactly as it is? Oh, no; it does not. The Canadian commissioners knew it did not. They declined to let in manufactured products on the free list, and why? Because it was not to their interests to do so. What have we done? We have given to Canada the free market of the United States, with its over $20,000,000,000 of trade within its own limits. The combined trades of all of the waters of the world outside of the United States are not equal to the free trade that exists beween our States. We invite them to come into our market. We say to the farmer, "You shall not have any protection—this protection that we have preached all of our life, that the farm and the factory should be side by side, the one producing and the other consuming, thus making the home market." Yet with one fell swoop we have destroyed the arguments of a lifetime and said there is nothing in it for the farmer, that his competitor's products must come in free. What does the manufacturer get in exchange for all this? Let us see.

If he happens to be a maker of biscuits, cakes, combined with chocolate, under the present law he pays 35 per cent, and under the new proposed law he will pay 32½ per cent. In other words, the farmer is sold out to give the candy fellow 2½ per cent of reduction. What else? Plows, farm wagons, under the present law 25 per cent, reduced 2½ per cent. There is a reduction of 2½ per cent in favor of the manufacturer on one side and free trade to the farmer on the other—to 9,000,000 of men who are just beginning to get some profits. You take from them the profits of their farms, you take from them the products of their labor and give it over to the other fellow, if you please, in the face of his getting 2½ per cent. Take plows, 20 per cent under the present law, 15 per cent under the proposed agreement. I say to you, read this bill from start to finish and you will see it is the most unconscionable, the most unwise and onesided bargain that was ever driven by any nation with another. There is nothing like it. Read it, and I challenge any man in favor of it to read it and see how he will make it out. Oh, but you say, it does not affect the farmer. What do you want the bill for? It does not help the ultimate consumer. What do you want the bill for? If you read it carefully you will see there is a little kinky-headed fellow in the bill. The real purpose of the bill is to enlarge the field of exploitation in favor of the trusts, in favor of the combinations, in favor of the manufacturing interests of this country at the expense of the farmer, at the expense of the ultimate consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.] So much for that. Now, let us go a little further with this other bill you are now presenting to the people. You call it a farmers' free-list bill. We are calling it the farmers' "fake" bill. That is what it is. You have stricken him down, you have cut off both of his legs, and there he is bleeding, and then you say, "Here, I will let you buy plows a little cheaper somewhere else." Where can he buy them? Can you tell me?

My distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] put in the RECORD from the International Harvester Co. that they were selling reapers, mowers, binders, and different kinds of implements cheaper in this country than in any country in the world. Where are you going to get these cheaper products for the farmer? Where are they? Nowhere. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, let us go a little further. Your theory, my Democratic friends, is that when the tariff is added to the cost of an article the consumer pays it, and to that extent it is a burden. According to the statement of Mr. UNDERWOOD, agricultural implements pay a tariff of $12,189. Twelve thousand one hundred and eighty-nine dollars is the tariff tax added to the farmer of this country for buying agricultural implements! Now you propose to give him free trade with all the world. Oh, but you do take care of your own friends, you do, my Democratic friends on the other side, and most of them are south of Mason and Dixon line. You are in the saddle politically, you are dominating the policies of your party, and you ought to; you have been loyal and devoted to the party and you believe in its principles; why should not you? When it comes to your side you find cotton bagging, sacks, and burlap amount to $6,877,677. In other words, it is a sectional bill. Ten millions of dollars to be taken away from the Treasury and $8,000,000 given to the Southern States as a result of that, and yet we are all receiving petitions and communications from your cotton interests asking us and begging us to stand up against it. But we find there is a loss of revenue. Mr. UNDERWOOD stated that the loss by reason of Canadian reciprocity was $5,000,000 from the Treasury. The President says it means no damage to the producer; that the producer loses nothing and the consumer loses nothing. It is all beautiful and altruistic, and yet it loses to the Treasury of the United States $5,000,000 on account of Canadian reciprocity and $10,000,000 by this fake bill; in all, $15,000,000 taken out of the Treasury. What is the condition to-day? April 26, 1911, statement of the Treasury—and here is the dark shadow of Democratic tariff agitation, the shadow that will grow to the gloom it did under the Wilson-Gorman bill, and it may be that the Treasury will be depleted and the time may be, if you get in complete control, that you will have to issue bonds to pay the running expenses of the Government. Here is the statement of April 26, 1911. The excess of expenditures over receipts was $5,658,015.26. Read the statements in the public press, and you will find the receipts are going off in internal revenue and customs receipts. Men are working upon part time.

They are beginning to curtail and reduce their forces, and you are starting out with the conditions along the line of free trade. But, to your credit, you are honest in your views——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PRINCE. I have not the time to yield in five minutes. The President in his speech—and I am most kindly disposed toward him, and I only differ with him on this proposition—states that in the other countries they are talking about annexation. What is the history of the American people? We might as well be frank and honest. Americans went into Texas, Americanized it, and it was annexed as a part of this great Union. Americans went into Hawaii, Americanized it, and annexed it. And if these bright young men that the President speaks of in his speech—these clever, active, virile, vigorous young men from the farms of Illinois and northern States, the thousands and hundreds of thousands of them—go up into that northland, 92 or 100 and more on this side, as against 7 on the other, what do you think will be the effect of it? Have I not a right to say that is the first step toward annexation? Have they not a right to believe it? Why have they not? The present Speaker of this House in the last session of Congress said that he was in favor of taking Canada as a part of the United States. And this was the first step toward annexation. He is a plain, blunt, honest man, whom I admire for his frankness. [Applause.] He has never denied that statement. I say to my neighbors on the north: Be not deceived. When we

go into a country and get control of it, we take it. It is our history and it is right we should take it if we want it, and you might as well understand it. The Speaker has so said; the party back of him has so said. You are in control. You have never denied it on the floor of this House, and you can not deny it.

Now, let us see if they believe it in the other country. Let us see if the people of Canada believe in reciprocity and annexation.

That reciprocity involves a national menace is the widespread opinion in Canada. A procession of McGill students, on the occasion of a vast antireciprocity mass meeting carried mottoes reading: "This is a time of national peril"; "No bartering of our birthright"; "First step, reciprocity; second step, commercial union; third step, annexation"; "Keep off the annexation wolves."

That is their view of us, and it is idle to say it is not being discussed.

I want to say to you, my countrymen, in my judgment the reciprocity bill is the worst bill that was ever presented to this House, next to this fake bill which we are now considering. You now have a worse one.

I am a Republican. While I felt keenly the fact that a great body of my party, 64 of them, representing manufacturing interests, should assault the interests of my district, and strike them down so that they could get cheaper raw material in order to deal with somebody else, yet I now rise above little petty prejudice. I remember, in the language of a distinguished former Speaker of this House, that I am a representative of 92,000,000 people; that I am standing here for the best interests of all the people, and so I will vote on this occasion. I voted because I thought it was for the interest of the manufacturer, for the interest of the laborer, for the interest of the professional man, for the interest of the farmer, that the Canadian pact be defeated, and likewise I will vote against this measure, because I believe it to the interest of all of our people that this "farmers' fake bill" be defeated. And if you pass it, as pass it you will, the people will discriminate next November, and they will read the ticket from top to bottom, and they will say: "This is reciprocity; this is a ratification of your views," and in my judgment you can not afford to strike down or offer false allurement to 9,000,000 of the intelligent people in this country and think that they will believe in any such doctrine. For that reason I hope this measure will fail to pass. But, if it does pass, I hope it will fail in another branch. And I will continue to pray that our President will right up and go no further along this line of free trade and will veto this bill if it ever comes to him. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP]. [Applause.]

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, the House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, a large latitude is granted in debate, and for this reason I wish to avail myself of the opportunity to discuss a question which is to-day of vast importance not only to the National Congress, but to the entire people of the United States.

On the 21st day of December, 1910, the Senate adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 312):

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to furnish to the Senate for its use, if he does not deem it incompatible with public interest, the following information, with departmental classifications of the same:

First. The total number of appointments which are made by the President upon nomination to and confirmation by the Senate.

Second. The total number of appointments which are made by the President, but which do not require nomination to and confirmation by the Senate.

Third. The total number of officers and employees of the Government subject to civil-service regulations, specifying classification and number of postmasters.

Fourth. The total number of officers and employees subject to removal by the President without action on the part of Congress.

Fifth. Total number of officers and employees of the United States Government, exclusive of enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy.

To this resolution the President responded on the 24th day of February, 1911, a summary of which is hereto appended.

Appointments made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Department:	
State	441
Treasury	736
War (exclusive of Army)	6
Justice	383
Post Office	7,953
Navy (exclusive of naval officers)	11
Interior	272
Agriculture	3
Commerce and Labor (exclusive of Census)	28
Civil Service Commission	4
Government Printing Office	1
Interstate Commerce Commission	7
Library of Congress	1
Total	9,846

Appointments made by the President without confirmation by the Senate.

Department:	
State	94
Treasury	0
War	0
Justice (approximately)	846
Post Office	0
Navy	0
Interior	44
Agriculture	0
Commerce and Labor	8
Civil Service Commission	1
Total (approximately)	993

Officers and employees under civil-service regulations.

Department:	
State	177
Treasury	27,093
War	12,989
Justice	625
Post Office	147,727
Navy (approximately)	29,000
Interior	13,938
Agriculture	11,438
Commerce and Labor	14,797
Civil Service Commission	204
Government Printing Office	3,610
Interstate Commerce Commission (approximately)	586
Smithsonian Institution	424
Total	262,608

Officers and employees of the United States Government, exclusive of enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy.

Department:		
State		712
Treasury		27,829
War		17,102
Additional under War Department estimated—		
Engineer Department	9,000	
Quartermaster's Department	2,000	
		11,000
Justice		5,700
Post Office		272,813
Navy (approximately)		29,000
Interior		14,262
Agriculture		12,519
Commerce and Labor		14,883
Government Printing Office		3,925
Interstate Commerce Commission		614
Civil Service Commission		209
Smithsonian Institution		424
Library of Congress		330
Total		411,322

It will be observed that exclusive of the enlisted men and officers of the Army and Navy the patronage under the control of the President amounts to 411,322 persons. This power is too enormous to be given any man in a free country where "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," a power which, if exercised for selfish and ambitious purposes, would be sufficient to perpetuate an administration or dictate its succession; a power greater than the founders of the Government contemplated would be vested in the hands of any man. We have grown beyond the optimistic dreams of the most ardent of the architects who drafted the plans of our Government, and are now occupying a station where this power may become a menace to the growth and development of our liberties. It is a power too dangerous to be confided to any one man. Ambition is not prone to relinquish power, and selfishness always craves it as an asset to win greater position and to retain all that has been won.

It is not only the 411,322 persons, but employees and appointees made by them and directly under their control, which almost doubles the number. This great appointive power once under the command of an ambitious, selfish, and designing man, would be a menace to the perpetuity of the Republic. This power would be ample to perpetuate a line of succession in office holding that might turn the purposes of our Government from what its original founders intended and divert them from republican to monarchial tendencies. It could mold legislation to suit the whims and caprices of a selfish Executive and special interests, if in favor with the appointing power, could secure such legislative favors as their greed might prompt.

How potential would be this power vested in the Chief Executive if he should attempt to secure legislation by the National Congress by withholding from the Members of that body the patronage to which the members of the party in power are entitled? It might transfer legislation from the National Congress to the Executive and result in the overthrow of constitutional requirements.

This vast office-holding army is in complete control of the President, their tenure of office is due to him, and he is vested with the power to promote, demote, and dismiss as he desires. He is Commander in Chief of the Federal office-holding force, and no power can revoke his orders. They are supreme. Does any man doubt the magnitude of this power and how its abuse might do serious and irreparable injury to the Republic? Of

all the vast army of officeholders in this country the people elect but 391, the membership of this House. No other Federal officeholders are elected by a direct vote of the people. Each voter of the United States votes for only one Federal officeholder, the Member of Congress from his district. The voter, therefore, has but little to say about who shall hold the Federal offices. Does anyone doubt the intelligence and ability of the people to elect the officeholders of this country? If he does, he admits the incapacity of the people for self-government, and if this admission be true, then the end of the Republic must be conceded to be at hand. But upon what basis is such an admission predicated? Are not the great majority of the people in private life as intelligent, honest, and capable as those in public life, as well fitted for the responsibilities of citizenship? If not, why not? Is it true that by accident the people, not qualified for office, elect the qualified persons to administer the offices? The people are abundantly able to elect every man who holds a public office. They know what they want and know how to get it; know better than anyone else.

The civil-service law was enacted to prevent the abuse of the appointing power and worked well for years, but has now fallen victim to political abuse and is the "Trojan horse" for political knavery. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Under it 262,608 persons hold office, secure from removal, ready when their political services are required, a reserve for every political emergency. Every man knows that this vast army is not immune from party service, is not idle in party campaigns, and not independent on party questions. Freedom from political and pernicious activity under civil service as administered to-day is a mockery and a sham. If it was desired to make it an office-holding class of nonpartisan or bipartisan character, why not amend the law so that the appointees under it shall be prorated according to the respective strength of the leading political parties in the locality, State, or Union? This would make it of bipartisan character and secure fair partisan representation. Its administration is and for years has been a slander on political independence and bipartisanship in office holding. This is true from the lowest to the highest in the civil-service class. It serves as a mask behind which party service is rendered and deserves the severest condemnation.

The most aggravated and offensive partisanship exercised in any of the departments is in the Post Office Department. This department is a political machine and is openly administered as such. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Its membership is 272,813 strong, reaching to every neighborhood and coming into direct personal contact with all the people. Of this vast army, 147,727 are under the civil-service control, but as a rule their pernicious political activity goes bravely and constantly on. They are daily on their jobs, both in and out of campaigns. It is the greatest political machine ever constructed in this or any other country.

The Postmaster General is to-day the commanding general of the Republican Party; he is at the head of the national organization. If not the real head, he is the quasi head of the same. Too much of his time is given to politics and not enough to public service. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If more time of the Postmaster General was devoted to looking after the public business and less after politics, complaints against the public service would not be so numerous from every quarter of the Republic. [Applause.] It is a notorious fact that rumors are in circulation in many quarters of the Union that officials under the civil-service branches of the Government, and more especially in the postal service, are assessed every campaign for the Republican campaign fund from the highest to the lowest position; even the rural-route man in the country, with his paltry wage, and the letter carrier on the streets of the cities, who can barely subsist on his meager pay, does not escape the gatherer of campaign funds.

All must pay campaign assessments, or off go their official heads. If not for this, the real reason, ostensibly for some other. Such a flagrant abuse of the law, it is charged, exists all over the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In this connection it would be interesting to know how many, if any, of these officials are assessed, and for what amount, for the Republican campaign fund at each national election. It would be interesting to know how many, if any, in every campaign are reminded that it would be to their advantage to make a contribution to the Republican campaign fund. It would be interesting to know how many, if any, lose their jobs or are demoted because of their failure to pay the assessment or make a liberal contribution to the Republican campaign fund. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It would be interesting to know how many, if any, have their positions abolished and are thus let out of the public service, and new places are created in lieu of the ones abolished, with a new man in charge, for failure to pay compaign contributions to the Republican campaign fund and render political services. [Applause on Democratic side.] It would be interesting to know how many, if any, are transferred from lucrative positions to others not so remunerative for failure or refusal to organize and do political work for the Republican Party in campaigns. It would be interesting to know what orders, directions, or requests, if any, in the last decade have been made by the heads of departments to their subordinates over the country to secure delegations or instructions for any candidate to any convention or conventions and the consequences resulting for failure to respond. Last, but not least, it would be interesting to know how many, if any, Members of either branch of Congress in the last 10 years have been called upon by the dispensers of public patronage to support measures pending in Congress, and a failure to comply would cost them the disposal of the patronage to which they were entitled. [Applause on Democratic side.]

In the answers to these inquiries the people of the entire country are deeply interested and should be correctly informed. It would also be interesting to know how many, if any, in the last few years, of the public positions, high or low, have been given, or what legislation enacted, if any, as a consideration because of liberal contributions to the Republican campaign fund. [Applause on Democratic side.]

What a "slush fund" this creates. If the 411,322 appointees under the President were assessed only $10 each annually for campaign purposes, it would raise yearly a sum of $4,113,220, and this would create for the national campaign fund every four years the enormous sum of $16,452,880. Does any man doubt the danger of this organized political machine with such a fund? Is it not too dangerous to be permitted to exist? [Applause on Democratic side.] Again, it is a reasonable estimate to say that the average pay of this vast army of public servants amounts to $1,000 per year each, aggregating $411,322,000 as the annual value of the patronage at the disposal of one man. Is this not too much power to be vested in any man, however good, great, and patriotic? Is not the temptation too great? It is time the temptation should be removed, the opportunity eliminated, and the power restored to the people where it properly belongs. [Applause on Democratic side.]

The Constitution provides in reference to the appointing power of the President as follows:

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The power to appoint Federal officials by this provision of the Constitution is vested in the President, and as to all superior officers such appointments are to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, but as to subordinate officers Congress by law may vest the appointment in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments. The Constitution, therefore, points out a way whereby the President may be divested in part of this enormous and dangerous power of patronage. He could issue an Executive order calling upon the patrons of various Federal offices to select by ballot at the quadrennial national elections the officials for the Federal positions and nominate for confirmation such as by law were required to be confirmed, and appoint and commission all who were not so required. This procedure would enable the people of the respective localities to advise properly the President of their choice for such places and enable him to act intelligently and wisely in his appointments. Against such a procedure as this there is no constitutional inhibition, and no precedent will be found which declares it an innovation of Executive authority. Such an order by any Chief Executive would meet with the commendation of the people everywhere and inspire confidence among the entire people, irrespective of class or condition.

Why should not the President issue an Executive order for the selection by ballot at every presidential election of the Federal marshals, the clerks of Federal courts, collectors of internal revenues; surveyors of customs, and postmasters? Such a plan is not only feasible, but is practical, and would assure a proper and equitable distribution of the patronage and would inspire a higher standard of public service.

If the people are qualified to elect the appointing power they are equally qualified to select the subordinate officials. It would be a wise and prudent method and one which would be satisfactory to the people.

In the Post Office Department alone there are 272,813 appointees who should be elected in order to break down a great

Federal machine and give the people an efficient service. It costs the people of the country about $245,000,000 annually to run it, and yet the service is deplorable. It is the only $245,000,000 business in the world run at a loss every year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why so? Too little attention to business and too much to politics. It manifests more interest in Republican politics than it does in public business. If managed properly in the interest of public welfare, employing good business methods, it would be a great revenue producer instead of a great revenue loser, as it now is and has been for years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is the great Republican incubator operated on all occasions from the ward primary to the national conventions and at all Federal elections. Its cohorts, booted and spurred, are in the forefront of every political contest, both in season and out, every day in the year. In fact, it is the great Republican clearing house, through which all party debts are paid, from the ward heelers up to the operators of the steam roller. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What tenable objection can be urged against the plan for the people electing their postmaster? Can any sound, logical reason be given? If so, we would like to hear it. Formerly by spoilsmen this doctrine was assailed as a "populistic heresy." What if it was advocated by some Populist, that does not prove it is without merit. That is no argument against it. Denunciation is not argument, and it will not frighten intelligent people from advocating this reform, from adopting and carrying it into effect.

We are a progressive people, and our legislation should be such. The reactionary should no longer be permitted to restrain the wheels of progress or retard the onward march of 90,000,000 people in the solution of the great problems with which they daily come in contact. The election of these subordinate officials will destroy the Federal political machine, eliminate all scandals concerning the barter and sale of these Federal positions, restore confidence among the people in official conduct, inspire greater faith in our institutions, and curtail the power which now menaces the liberties of the mightiest people of all the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A life tenure of office, high or low, great or small, is inimical to the welfare of the people and the perpetuity of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It creates despotic tendencies in the administration, carelessness in the execution of duty, and tyrannical conduct in the officeholder. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No man should be selected for any official position for life, because he feels no longer responsive to the people he is to serve and will not keep step with the progress of the times. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

All positions should be selected for a term of years, so that the officeholder will bear in mind that he is but a temporary servant and must answer to the people for his official conduct. Ambition for power throughout all the ages of the world has been the inveterate foe of human liberty and independence. It has been the exponent of extravagance and the opponent of economy, the handmaiden of corruption, the subordinator of pure and honest administration, and the arch enemy of liberty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The pathway of civilization is strewn with the wrecks of liberty, which avarice for power has created.

When our Constitution was constructed its framers recognized on account of existing conditions the necessity for a strong Executive and so builded, yet when their work was completed many of them were astonished at the extensive powers vested in that office. In spite of the checks, restraints, and limitations which were placed upon the Executive it was openly asserted by some that a monarchy, in fact, if not in name, had been created. Both opponents of the system and its warmest advocates recurred to this again and again, and its defenders found it difficult to refute the charge. In our day it is difficult to frame a definition for monarchy that excludes the President of a Republic more powerful than most of the monarchs of the world.

What monarchs of the world to-day have the appointment in the civil list, either directly or indirectly, of more than 400,000 officials, and through their appointment of subordinates as many more, amounting to nearly a million men? Add to this the power of appointment of the military force of the Government, and you have a President clothed with more power than is bestowed on any monarch in the world; a force so powerful that it could direct the course of legislation, perpetuate administration after administration, formulate and enact policies, and mold and shape the destinies of the Republic.

When John Randolph said "The people would behold in the President the form, at least, of a little monarch," he expressed a witticism which under present conditions is changed so that the people may behold in the power of the President, if he so desired, not only the form but the substance of not a little but one of the greatest monarchs of the world. The power is present; it is vested; all it needs is ambition to make it real, to call it into execution. Grant that the ambition is dormant, yet it is true that power will intoxicate the best hearts and strongest minds. The power vested in the President is almost unlimited, and no man, it matters not how wise, patriotic, or good and great, is wise enough, good enough, and great enough to be intrusted with such unlimited and extensive power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Officials clothed with extensive powers become impatient under restraint, is the experience of all the world, as recorded history conclusively shows.

Power takes precedence over talent, subservience over qualification, pollutes whatever it touches, brooks no opposition, and tolerates no rival. Sooner or later ambition, the concomitant of power, will rise and, like a mighty torrent, rush forward to autocracy, never looking back, but ever forward to greater conquests. Ambition is but the avaricious product of power, the evil shadow of aspiration.

The French Parliament possessed rights which restrained kings for a time, but with the advent of Louis XIV, the greatest of French tyrants, the power of Parliament was suspended, and with it died the liberty of the French people. Charles V of Spain could never have become the heartless tyrant he was had it not been for the power lodged in his more conscientious and humane predecessors by a confiding and trustful people. For centuries the advocates of freedom throughout the world pointed with exultant pride to the liberties of the Roman people; the glories of their rule were exploited throughout the confines of civilization; but ambition coveted power, and power was confided by the many to the few, and the Roman Senate Chamber, the ancient arena of freedom, became the battle ground of contending tyrants in their conflict for power.

History may repeat itself, and it is safer to eliminate the evil than to permit its presence, encourage its growth, and take the chances of escaping its ever-present dangers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This power as it is now lodged in the hands of the Executive is too great to be confided to any man; the security of government is endangered, the freedom of legislation is imperiled, the economy of administration jeopardized, and the liberties of the people menaced.

Transfer to the people the patronage now vested in the President and posterity to the remotest generation, as it basks in the beneficence and wisdom of a never-dying Republic, will shout our praise and acclaim our deed. Then will the Republic be in truth a government for the people, of the people, and by the people, and the petty men who do now bestride our paths as appointees of power will be known no more forever. The power of the people must expand and grow, as the power of rulers must dwindle and die, for the voice of the people is the voice of God. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, the minority of this House has, very early in the action, assumed the rôle of critic. Of course, we expect your criticism. I believe the distinguished ex-Speaker of the House stated that it was the function of the minority to criticize the majority. It is the function of the minority, if possible, to prevent the passage of bad legislation by the majority, but in all legislative bodies, where each and every man is endeavoring to do his full duty, criticism should be just, criticism should be fair, and the criticism should be wise and should be made with a full and complete knowledge of the subject criticized. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] in his criticism of the statement of the Democrats that they had reduced the expenses of this House, said that, as a matter of fact, the names were still upon the roll. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that if he will bide his time and be patient the people who are now, and have been for sometime, filling these places created by his own party, will be removed, and when the committee comes to make its final report with full knowledge of the facts the Democratic Party of this House will carry out to the letter what it said it would do and reduce the expenses $182,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] stated, and I am glad he is now in the Chamber, in a speech which he made on April 25, that these expenses have been reduced only in the Democratic caucus and not on the pay rolls of the House. The gentleman, I think, spoke then a little too early. It is utterly impossible for a new administration at once, without serious injury to the efficiency of the House, to immediately carry into effect a complete change in the employees of the House. And even if we did not intend to cut off any useless employee or

in any way reform the service of the House, it would be impossible absolutely to change every employee of the House in one day or in one week or in one month.

If the Members of that side of the House will only be patient for awhile we will show them whether or not we will make good our pledges. If we do not, then we ought to be criticized, and I will help do it; but if we do make our promises good, then that side of the House should be fair enough to give us credit for what we have done. When I first came to Congress I made a fight on this very question. I fought the extra month's pay for employees of the House and Senate, and I am pleased with the action of my party when it cuts off these useless employees and this extra month's pay. Both are petty graft and a useless squandering of the people's money.

Mr. Chairman, the rôle of critic has been the chief part played by the Republican minority since this special session was called. They have not only criticized the Democratic majority of the House when it acted on its own initiative, but they have even criticized it for passing a bill proposed by a Republican President. What sort of a party have you gentlemen, anyway? There is a little bunch of you over there under the control of the distinguished ex-Speaker, who are as bitter toward the other little bunch who voted with the Democrats and the Republican President as you are toward the Democrats. What has become of the insurgents? Absolutely gone over to Mr. CANNON. When he was Speaker, you abused him and his policies. Now you are following wherever he leads. He has become in fact your leader. The man you elected minority leader is not your leader except in name.

Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the House and the country to the character of leadership the minority would have if he were really the leader in fact as he is in name. From the very first he began to use such adjectives as "silly" and "foolish," idiotic," and such phrases as "stupid ignorance" and "I did not expect any better from that side of the House." He at the very beginning seemed to think that great leadership could be accomplished by such denunciation and by the use of adjectives and not by argument and ideas. He at once assumed the rôle of critic and of Sir Oracle of the House. He should investigate more and talk less.

Let us now examine some of his criticisms of the Democratic free-list bill and see whether his criticism was just or unjust.

On April 26 the elected leader of the Republican minority made a speech in which, as shown on page 603 of the RECORD, he used this language:

> What are agricultural implements? I await the answer of any of the distinguished gentlemen in this House who claim to be the farmer's friend. What are agricultural implements? [Applause on the Republican side.] The bill says "All other agricultural implements, of any kind or description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts."
>
> What are agricultural implements? Do they include horticultural implements? Do they include market-garden implements? I suppose every one believes that a mowing machine is an agricultural implement; but is a wheelbarrow?

Then again he says:

> I can not run my farm without an ax. Can you? Are axes agricultural implements? Are they to come free?

Then this colloquy occurs:

> Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman——
>
> Mr. MANN. I will yield to the gentleman for information.
>
> Mr. STANLEY. I am not surprised that the agriculturist from Chicago is pining to know what an agricultural implement is.
>
> Mr. MANN. I am.
>
> Mr. STANLEY. I do not think it a matter of satire. I think it is a demonstration of candid ignorance.
>
> Mr. MANN. That is right. Why does not the gentleman give me the information?
>
> Mr. STANLEY. An agricultural implement, generally speaking, is an implement used in tilling the soil, whether you are raising a potato or raising an ear of corn. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, if this criticism is just and wise, then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] should have indulged in it. If it is a fact, as he states, that this is loose language and will let in vastly more than was intended, then the Democratic Ways and Means Committee have made an error in using such language, because it may impair the revenue of the Government and bring about a condition not contemplated by the Ways and Means Committee. If such is the case, then the gentleman is a wise legislator. If such is not the case, then the gentleman from Illinois, to use his own expression, is "unwise" and "does not know what he is talking about"; and as stated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] "it is a demonstration of candid ignorance." This is a charitable construction to place upon the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois, for if he knew better and then took such a position, he is, to say the least of it, very unfair.

The gentleman from Illinois shows a complete ignorance of the authorities in the construction of tariff statutes. A little investigation on his part would have saved him from such error. Pope, in his essay on criticism, says:

> 'Tis hard to say, if greater want of skill
> Appear in writing or in judging ill.
> But of the two, less dangerous is the offense
> To weary our patience than mislead our sense.

It is pardonable for the gentleman from Illinois, as he often does, to weary our patience, but how can we pardon him for attempting to mislead our sense. He seems to have misled his own party, for they applauded his criticism very loudly.

This is the language which he so harshly criticizes:

> And all other agricultural implements, of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned or not.

This language seems very broad in terms, and a careless critic like the gentleman from Illinois is likely to be misled into the belief that saws, pumps, chains, wheelbarrows, and so forth, ad infinitum, might come in free of duty. I will say that I would like to see all of these implements free, but let us examine the decisions a moment to see whether this is true or not.

I call the attention of the committee to a cardinal rule of construction. It was laid down for the first time by Judge Marshall, when he was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, for the construction of statutes generally, and the courts, following this rule in construing statutes of this character, have construed them against the contention of the gentleman from Illinois. The general rule laid down by Judge Marshall was that where two statutes were apparently in conflict the statute that mentions a matter eo nomine should prevail over a statute that refers to the same matter in general terms, although broad enough to cover the matter in the statute which mentions the matter eo nomine. The gentleman from Illinois, in his criticism of this bill, certainly had not investigated the decisions of the Supreme Court and the late decisions of the other courts. If he had, he could not have made this statement. He asks this question:

> What are agricultural implements? I await the answer of any distinguished gentlemen in this House who claim to be the farmers' friends. What are agricultural implements?

And then he says:

> Every day the Customs Court is now deciding questions of great importance with reference to the meaning of a law which endeavors to be very technical and very particular, but under the provisions of this bill, if it becomes a law, there will be an army of lawyers and importers and agents endeavoring to ascertain what it means.

I thought at first that perhaps the Ways and Means Committee had made a mistake in writing in this bill the language:

> Of any kind and description.

But in investigating the question, I find that my confidence in the ability of the gentleman from Illinois is greatly on the wane. He was simply talking, and, to use an expression of the late Judge De Armond, of Missouri, he was "simply ranting, and not reasoning."

Now, we are all familiar with the fact that the general rule is laid down that in the importation of articles the statute is always construed favorably for the importer and against the Government. But the first well-considered case directly in point, to which I want to call your attention, is Movius *v.* Arthur (95 U. S., p. 154). The court, in discussing the construction of revenue statutes apparently in conflict, held that the general term shall yield to the specific, and this is the language of the court:

> It is a general rule in the construction of revenue statutes that specific provisions for duties on a particular article are not repealed or affected by the general words of subsequent statutes, although the language is sufficiently broad to cover the article.

That is a cardinal rule of construction, namely, that though the general provisions of the statute may be broad enough to cover the article, if the article is mentioned by name anywhere else in the tariff bill, the succeeding statute does not affect that article by name, although the subsequent provisions might be broad enough to cover it.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], if he had been aware of these decisions, could not have made that statement unless he was willing to willfully deceive the House, and I do not intend to say that the gentleman would willfully deceive anybody. So we must attribute it to the fact that it was ignorance on his part of the law and not the fact that he intended to willfully mislead us.

Now, let us see what else he says about it. In speaking of saws, he wanted to know if a saw was an agricultural implement. Why, gentlemen of the committee, it is immaterial whether it is or whether it is not. It can not come in under this farmers' free-list bill, even though one of its uses might be that of an agricultural implement. As a matter of fact, if saws were not mentioned eo nomine in the Payne bill, but a general clause for carpenters' tools instead had been adopted placing a duty upon them, saws would be classified as carpenters' tools, because this is their principal use.

But it is not material to this discussion to determine to which class a saw properly belongs, because in another section in the Payne-Aldrich bill saws of all kinds are mentioned by name, and under all the decisions this fixes the status of saws. You can not repeal a clause of the Payne-Aldrich bill or change the status of an article mentioned therein unless you mention it by name or mention in the amendment the article whose status is to be changed; so the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is not a just one against the Ways and Means Committee, because the law and the decisions of the courts, without a single dissenting opinion, are at variance with the statement of the gentleman from Illinois. [Applause on the Democratic side.] His quarrel, then, is with the Supreme Court and with the other courts of the country, and is not with the Democratic Ways and Means Committee.

Why, he wanted to know about trace chains and wheelbarrows and various and sundry other articles, and asked whether they were agricultural implements or not. He wanted to know whether a pruning knife was an agricultural implement, and he wanted to know whether horticultural tools were agricultural implements or not. It is immaterial whether they are classed as agricultural implements or not because in other sections of the Payne-Aldrich bill all of these articles are mentioned by name, and it is utterly impossible for any man to reach the conclusion that he reaches, under the decisions of the courts that they might come in free, unless for the purpose of deliberately trying to deceive the country and place the Democratic Party in a false light.

I am not going to read all of these decisions, but this is a general rule laid down in Morgan's Digest of the United States Tariff and Customs Laws, published in 1895, eighth edition, on page 326:

It is a well-settled rule that general legislation must give way to special legislation on the same subject, whether the provisions are found in the same statute or in different statutes; and general provisions must be interpreted so as to embrace only cases to which the special provisions are not applicable, although the general provisions may be sufficiently broad to comprehend articles under the special provisions. And the rule applies as well to statutes reducing duties as to those increasing them.

Now, in support of that proposition of law I want to invite the attention of the committee briefly to the case of Arthur *v.* Labey (96 U. S., p. 112), where the court construes a clause similar to this—a clause exactly like this. This is the rule laid down by the court in that decision:

The rule, that for the purpose of the tariff laws, the commercial designation of an article among traders and importers when clearly established fixes its character and that when Congress has designated an article by a specific name and imposed a duty upon it, general terms in a subsequent act or a later part of the same act, although sufficiently broad to comprehend such article, are not applicable to it and are not deprived of their application by the expression "not otherwise provided for." * * * A specific designation eo nomine must prevail over the general words and a commercial designation is the standard by which the dutiable character of the article is fixed.

And on page 117 of this case the court specifically affirms the doctrine in Movius *v.* Arthur.

Every article that the gentleman from Illinois criticises the bill for is mentioned by name in some other clause in the Payne-Aldrich bill and can not be affected by this farmers' free-list bill. And yet he would have the country believe that it was carelessly prepared.

Then you may ask, Why should you put it in? It is necessary, as you will conclude if you read the decisions of the court on this question. It is necessary that you have some sort of a shotgun clause, because in the rapidly developing inventions in machinery for certain specific purposes frequently a machine that is doing a certain work to-day will be completely replaced by a different one to-morrow. Therefore, in order that the revenues of the Government may not be impaired they have put these clauses in for the purpose of embracing articles of a certain specific kind that do a specific thing.

In addition to that, if you intend to put on the free list articles to be used by a certain class of people, and if some invention or some great addition to an agricultural implement should be made it would be necessary, if it might be classed as belonging in some other schedule in the bill, and if you desire to be sure to include it in the free-list bill, that you have a general clause in order that the agricultural implements may be sure to come in free—that is to say, every agricultural implement not specifically mentioned in some other clause in the Payne-Aldrich bill—would fall under this general provision of the farmers' free-list bill and not under any other general provision of some other clause of the Payne-Aldrich bill, although broad enough to cover it. This is the reason for this general clause in this free-list bill, and is the reason why the Democratic Ways and Means Committee put it in.

Now, without reading them, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a few decisions of the Supreme Court on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without reading them, certain decisions of the court. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The decisions referred to are as follows:

The rule that an article, dutiable by its specific designation, will not be affected by the general words of the same or another statute, which would otherwise embrace it, applies as well to statutes reducing duties as to those increasing them. This rule applies both to statutes reducing and to statutes increasing duties. (Arthur *v.* Rheims, 96 U. S., 143.)

When an article is designated in a tariff act by a specific name, and a duty imposed upon it by such name, general terms in a later part of the same act, although sufficiently broad to comprehend such article, are not applicable to it. (Robertson *v.* Glendenning, 132 U. S., 158, Chief Justice Fuller delivering the opinion.)

Under the principles laid down in Arthur *v.* Morrison, Arthur *v.* Labey, and Arthur *v.* Unkart, the specific designation should prevail, and the judgment in favor of the plaintiff for the excess of duties paid by him was right and must be affirmed. (Arthur *v.* Zimmerman, 96 U. S., 124.)

In cases of doubt in the construction of a customs act courts resolve the doubt in favor of the importer. * * * Where a customs act imposes a duty upon an article by a specific name, general terms in the act, though sufficiently broad to cover it, are not applicable to it. * * * The article will be classified by its specific designation rather than under a general description. (American Net & Twine Co. *v.* Worthington, 141 U. S., 468; Brown, Justice.)

The settled rule of statutory construction is that general legislation must give way to special legislation on the same subject whether the provisions are found in the same statute or in different statutes, and general provisions must be interpreted so as to embrace only cases to which special provisions are not applicable.

Where a duty is imposed upon an article by a specific name this will determine its classification, although the article may be included in other words of general description in another part of the same act. (Arnold *v.* U. S., p. 495, vol. 147, 51 Fed. Rep.; Magone, collector, *v.* King et al., p. 525.)

The case falls within the general rule that, where a tariff act imposes a duty on an article by a specific name or description, general terms in the act, though embracing it broadly, are not applicable to it; the general must give way to the particular. (Brister et al. *v.* U. S., 59 Fed. Rep., 452.)

Mr. SISSON. All of these decisions are perfectly clear, and there is a line of decisions too numerous to quote or to even cite, which are at complete variance with the position, argument, and conclusions of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] states that this bill is sectional. I regret that anybody should say anything in this country about sections. I do not believe that the people of this country are thinking now so much about the sections from which people come as about an effort to serve the whole people regardless of section. [Applause.] The gentleman was not fair in his statement to this committee when he said that the southern cotton farmer was benefited to the amount of $6,877,667, whereas the people of the North got practically nothing.

Why did not my friend state that only about one-third, or a little less than one-third of the farmers of the United States live in the South? Does he understand that only about one-third of the corn and grain is produced in the South? Did he not know that all of the sacks in which corn and wheat are sacked go into the great Middle West and the mighty West beyond? Did he not know that burlaps and sackings and articles of that kind and character were put on the free list in order that the northern and western farmer might be compensated for the fact that some of his articles were placed upon the free list? Why did not the gentleman state that in his speech? Because I presume he expects to make some political capital out of it without stating the truth in it. Why did not the gentleman tell the whole truth when he was making his speech, and why did he not tell you that the Treasury Department's statement shows—he claimed to be reading from a statement of the Treasury Department—that cotton bagging only paid duties amounting to $99,033, while on sacks the duty was $970,715.

Now, as to burlaps, I want to tell you that very little, if indeed any, cotton bagging is made out of burlap of the kind and character mentioned here; but burlaps, which are used by the western farmers and by the farmers of the Middle West, paid duties to the amount of $5,807,919, and we gave up that amount to the western and middle western farmers and the farmers of the North. Why did he not state that when he was stating the facts to you? [Applause on the Democratic side.] If he wanted to be fair, why did he not tell you that the smallest item, less than $100,000, was the item on bagging and ties. Yet he was unfair enough to state that the Ways and Means Committee was bringing in a sectional bill. If I were disposed to be of the kind that my distinguished friend is, I could in turn say that it is a sectional bill, because you are giving the

northern and the western farmers the largest proportion and the biggest end of the proposition. I would not mention Mason and Dixon's line if my friend from Illinois had not done so, but two-thirds of the farmers of the country live north of Mason and Dixon's line, and they get seven or eight times as much of the benefit of this $6,000,000 as the farmers of the South do. So, I say, there is no sectionalism in the bill favorable to the South. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is evident that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE], if he intended to be truthful and fair, did not know what he was talking about. He confuses "jute bagging" with "burlap." Everyone will concede that free "bagging" will be to the advantage of the southern cotton farmer. But free admission of "burlap" will not only be of no help to the southern cotton farmer, but if anything will be to his disadvantage.

Burlap is not used by the cotton farmer. It is used for making burlap bags and for baling manufactured fabrics. Jute "bagging," used for baling cotton, is a much coarser article than "burlap." Burlap is used for sacking cement and grain and by manufacturers to cover different kinds of bales of cloth. Nearly all of this is used in the North by northern manufacturers and by northern and western farmers. None is used or manufactured in the South. Therefore, the South is not interested in "burlap," but in "jute bagging."

I may say to the gentleman, however, that if the South were disposed to complain, that this would be a just ground for complaint. It is estimated that about 350,000 bales of cotton are made up in this country into a very coarse cotton goods known as osnaburgs. One of the principal uses of osnaburg is for sacking grain and cement, so free burlap is brought into direct competition with osnaburg, a southern product. This will not help the southern farmer. It will not hurt him, but it will tend to hurt our southern cotton mills that are making osnaburgs.

In sacking cement osnaburg is now chiefly used, but free burlap means that cement will be sacked in burlap. This is only one of many ways in which burlap may take the place of cotton.

If this bill had been prepared with a view to southern interests, it would not have made burlaps free. If you want to benefit the South, put the duty so high on burlap that no American can afford to import burlap, and we will force the price of osnaburg up and at the same time increase the price of cotton. An examination of the figures showing the importations will show how utterly the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] is in error. In 1910 there was imported into the United States $699,940 worth of jute bagging for covering cotton.

In 1910 there was imported into the United States $20,351,810.46 worth of burlap for sacking grain, corn, wheat, oats, flour, salt, coal, cement, and for oilcloth, upholstering, and other purposes. Twenty millions for the North and West and less than $700,000 for the South, and yet the gentleman says it is sectional.

The tariff tax paid on bagging for covering cotton in 1910 was $99,033.28. The tariff tax on burlap for the same year for sacking corn, wheat, oats, coal, and so forth, was $5,371,427.80. The North and West get about 50 times as much out of this item in this bill as the South gets. Brother PRINCE, how is this for sectionalism? The South gets one dollar and you get fifty, and yet you complain about the amount the South gets out of the bill. You are hard to please; you are too selfish. It was not intended to be a sectional bill. It was intended to give the western farmer cheap sacks and cheap binding twine. It was intended to give to the farmer of the South cheap bagging and cheap ties and to deal with the farmers all over this country exactly alike; and it would have been a sectional bill if the Ways and Means Committee had not done exactly what they did do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has also been stated that these articles are produced or manufactured, the majority of them, in the North. That is true. I do not believe I overstate the case when I say that four-fifths of all our manufactured articles come from the North. You of the North are a manufacturing people. You are peculiarly fortunate in that sense; but in this instance it just happens, gentlemen of the committee, that there are a number of bagging factories in the South. There are manufactories engaged in the business of making cotton ties. They make over $1,000,000 worth of bagging, and I am not able to state the exact number of ties, but a great many ties are manufactured in the South by southern manufacturers. As a matter of fact, the greater portion of bagging and ties are manufactured in the North, and so is the greater portion of nearly all the manufactures that enter into every southern home manufactured in the North. We are your patrons and your customers; but this bill, in giving to the southern cotton farmer free bagging and ties, is only doing that simple justice that ought to be done if you give free sacks and free binding twine and free wire for the farmers out West.

For over 100 years the southern people have been engaged in raising cotton. Cotton is the one commodity produced in the United States which always brings into our banks and into our Treasury pure gold. It has been the enormous production of the cotton fields of the South that has made the balance of trade in our favor for over 50 years.

If you take away from our international trade that vast crop which this last year with the seed amounted to something like a billion dollars—over $800,000,000 worth of raw cotton, and of that $800,000,000 over $400,000,000 of it was sold to one country alone—if you were to take out of the business of the United States this great gold producer for the Treasury and banks of this country, it would be a terrible calamity on the American people.

Notwithstanding this fact, these toiling and patient farmers in the South without complaint have had no protection from any source. They have not asked any protection; they only ask a fair, square deal at the hands of the Government, and thank God the time is coming when the people of Maine, of New Hampshire, of Vermont, of Rhode Island, of Connecticut, of Illinois, and all the great States will be willing to deal with these questions irrespective of what State is affected, whatever may be the temper of some of the northern and southern politicians. The business interests of this country have got tired of this talk of sectionalism, and we ought to begin to legislate irrespective of congressional districts. [Applause.]

But it is also said, and was said on the floor of the House, that the southern cotton farmer got pay for his bagging and ties, that the cotton was weighed on the scales, and that the farmer was paid for the gross weight. That was formerly true, that the cotton was weighed and they would deduct the tare; but it created so much trouble before the war that the result was that the business men throughout the country figured a certain amount of tare on a bale of cotton, and then made the quotations less the tare.

I shall not discuss the history of the matter nor how it came to be adopted, but state as a fact that the Liverpool Exchange, the New York Exchange, and the Cotton Exchange in New Orleans, which makes the price of all cotton, deducts 6 per cent, or 30 pounds, from the gross weight of every bale of cotton, a standard bale being 500 pounds. Every cotton producer will tell you that the bagging and ties on a bale of cotton will only weigh from 19 to 22 pounds. Therefore when you take the tare off you will defraud the farmer, if he has a 500-pound bale, of 9 to 11 pounds of cotton.

Now, it may be curious to some people to know how it is done. In making up the quotation they send out for cotton they figure about 60 points for tare; for example, if cotton was worth 12.60 the quotations for cotton would be 12 cents, because net cotton only is paid for. A net price is given for the cotton so that the bagging and the ties are not included. It is only necessary for gentlemen who doubt this statement to look at the rules of the cotton exchanges, and they will find that they specifically provide for the 6 per cent tare. It is perfectly apparent that the tare is figured out and the farmer himself loses the weight of the bagging and ties and does not receive pay for them. So, if gentlemen understand thoroughly the proposition, the statement would not be made here that the southern farmer gets pay for his bagging and ties when he sells his cotton and therefore makes a profit, and that for this reason he did not pay the tariff and the duty should remain.

There was a learned Senator in the other Chamber last year who asserted the proposition on the floor of the Senate, and it took a great deal of discussion to convince him that it was not true. It is just like this tariff business. The farmer pays it without knowing when or how.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a good deal said about the source of revenue, if you lost practically $10,000,000 by this farmers' free-list bill. Of course the first thing that every government ought to do, or that those connected with the Government and having charge of legislation ought to do, is to run the Government at the very lowest figure possible to obtain efficient government. They ought to destroy every useless office. They ought to get the Government down as nearly as possible to a business basis, and then, when that is done, raise only just enough revenue to run the Government on this basis.

The present condition is a peculiar one because, to a large extent, the expenses of this Government have been fixed by a party that has gone out of power. It was fixed by a House—and that is one of the evils of the Federal Constitution which ought to be remedied—that was repudiated at the polls last November and which came back here in December and for three months legislated for a constituency that has repudiated it.

This is said in no partisan sense, because as the political wheels of fortune turn it may roll around that this side of the House may be repudiated; but it would be equally wrong for this side of the House to legislate after they had been repudiated at the polls. However, the last House, or a large part of them, having no responsibility to a constituency, were permitted and did vote on these bills and did fix the expenses of the Government, so that it is almost impossible for this Democratic House to reduce the expenses of the Government, because so many fixed charges have been created by the last Republican House and Senate which must be paid out of the Treasury. It is now incumbent on the majority in the House to be sure that in dealing with the tariff and the revenues it gets enough money to run the Government. That is our highest duty, because as Democrats we believe in levying a tariff only for revenue, but we believe in levying enough tariff to get enough revenue. The Government must meet promptly her every obligation. Therefore it is necessary that a good deal of care be used in changing these schedules. I say this not because I have any sort of patience with this infamous doctrine of protection, which is so hateful to me, but with the necessities of the Government as they are to-day the Democrats must raise enough revenue, though they are compelled to permit an evil which has done more to corrupt public men and done more to send vicious men to this Capitol looking to their special interests, and more to induce capital to buy voters to send men to Congress, than all of the other influences combined. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If a man has built up his business behind certain protection, he says that he must have his protection or his business is destroyed, and Republicans levy tribute then upon his business, stating that he may have it protected and cared for through them.

You need not endeavor to frighten me by calling me a free trader. I am not frightened with the term, but I am dealing with a condition and not with a theory. If I had the making of the law, I certainly would not write the Constitution as it is now written with reference to revenue, but the fathers who made this Republic were afraid that they would not get Members to come to Congress; they were afraid it would not be ratified and held together, and they devised this iniquitous system of raising revenue, so that the people would not know when they paid it. I would not be so much opposed to this tariff if, as a matter of fact, the increased price, because of the duties on articles on the dutiable list, went into the Treasury. I would not say a word, because the Government would then get the benefit of it, but the thing that is so iniquitous is that during the Dingley tariff—and I have not had the opportunity to investigate the question so far as the Payne bill is concerned, but it is even worse under it—I found that the tax was small compared to the enormous tribute which we pay the protected industries. When during the debate on the Payne bill I stated the amount of tribute, some of my Democratic colleagues said that I had overstated it. However, a distinguished Senator at the other end of the Capitol, the late lamented Senator Dolliver, in one of the best tariff speeches that I heard during the last session of Congress, arrived at the same conclusion. I do not think that the distinguished Senator ever saw the speech that I made on the question, but I was very much gratified to see that I was confirmed by one so learned as the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Let me state the facts again for your consideration in order that you may see how wicked and iniquitous this present tariff system is. We got, in 1905, the last official statistics that I have examined, about three hundred and odd millions of dollars from impost or tariff taxes. During that year the total consumption was something like $14,000,000,000. The average duty was about 45 cents and a fraction, so that if the Dingley tariff was a scientific bill, if the Dingley tariff was a tariff which was made in accordance with scientific rules and gave the protection which its friends say was needed, and if the men on this side of the tariff wall took advantage of that protection, the people paid over and above what they ought to have paid to the manufacturers who are engaged in producing the four thousand and odd articles on the dutiable list the enormous sum of something like $4,000,000,000 over and above the world's price for these articles as a net profit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When I made this statement here my friends said I was mistaken, and yet Senator Dolliver made that statement on the floor of the Senate, that it amounted to about $4,000,000,000 more than the 90,000,000 American people ought to pay. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This is the enormous profit which you put into private hands through the arm of the Government. To that we object seriously. Mr. Gladstone, when he made an assault upon the protected interests of England, at first had a terrible struggle, because the protected industries in England claimed that a low duty or free trade would destroy them; that there would be smokeless factories; that there would be men out of employment; and that all of the English people would be put in a condition of dire distress. Yet he went before the people with the simple statement:

I will not with my vote and with my consent give one Englishman an advantage over another Englishman. I will not permit one Englishman by right of a special privilege from the Government to extract from the pockets of another Englishman a tribute not for the Government, but as a private profit.

Therefore he advocated a tariff which would only tax the noncompetitive articles, so that the increased price would go into the treasury of England. It was only a short time after this policy went into effect until the English fleet was in every sea, until the mighty leviathans of the deep bore the products of the English factories to all the world and brought back the raw materials which has made England to-day the strong and powerful nation that she is, and terrorizes the Republicans when they begin to think about being put in competition with her. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But since we have a condition and not a theory to deal with, it is absolutely necessary that we raise the revenue to run this Government. The Republicans want to know where we are going to get the revenue. Under the present régime you tax beer, whisky, and playing cards. I introduced a bill in the last session of Congress, but for a reason which I will not state now that bill did not get out of the Committee on Ways and Means. I have introduced the same bill this session. It is a bill to put an internal-revenue tax upon the manufacture and sale of all pistols, dirk knives, sword canes, and cartridges of all kinds and character. Now, you tax whisky and playing cards. Do not pistols, cards, and whisky go together? Ought not they to be dealt with in the same manner? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The number of pistols sold in the United States is something like 500,000 annually. I would like to ask this question: Why should we not place a tax upon these articles? Will some gentleman rise in his seat and tell for what good purpose a pistol is made?

Why should not the men engaged in the infamous business of manufacturing deadly weapons and inducing our boys to purchase them pay some of the expense of running the Government? The man who manufactures liquor is denounced in pulpit and press because of the business he is engaged in. The retailer of intoxicating liquors is denounced as an outcast. They are both required to pay an internal-revenue tax because their business tends to evil and not good. When men buy liquor they are buying that which causes them harm, not good. Yet a saloon would rarely be stained with human blood if the man drinking intoxicating liquor did not have in his pocket a concealed weapon. The liquor, in the absence of the deadly weapon, might cause men to get into broils and fisticuffs, but rarely would there be blood shed. But the liquor fires up men's blood and causes the quarrel, and then, armed with a deadly weapon, the quarrel ends in a tragedy.

If all the tears that these manufacturers of deadly weapons have been directly the cause of could be collected together, they would produce a mighty river of sorrow. If all the groans they have caused could be concentrated into one sound, it would shake the universe with agony. If the blood they have caused to be shed could be seen together, it would make a crimson ocean. If the widows and orphans which they have made could be gathered together, it would make an army that no man could number. If all the felons that they have caused could be gathered into one place of confinement, it would convert the earth into one vast prison. If every gallows they have caused to be erected could be seen together, it would make a mighty monument of horror. If all they have cost the people of the earth could be converted into food and clothing, there would be no more want, hunger, or poverty.

These men engaged in the manufacture of these deadly weapons ought to be looked upon with more disrespect than men engaged in almost any other business. Why should it be legalized? This is a civilized country. No savage red man now roams our fields nor lurks in the alleys of our cities. No wild beasts infest our fair country. There is no reason why this business should be fostered. They supply the means which cause murderous men of civilization to be more dreaded than the savage red man or wild beast. These manufacturers of pistols, dirks, and stilettos are exercising their ingenuity to make customers for their deadly wares. They fill our newspapers and magazines with attractive advertisements to induce our boys to buy pistols that produce murderers.

Why not tax them? What good reason can we give why they should not be taxed? Whisky, cards, and pistols go together. Why not tax them together? Whisky and cards would be less

harmful if there were no concealed weapons. Whisky now bears its burden of internal revenue; playing cards are also taxed. Whisky can be put to good uses. Cards may be used in innocent social amusements, but to what good use can a pistol or a dirk or a stiletto be put? They are made to kill human beings; not in the open, not to give a fair chance and equal opportunity, but to cowardly take your fellow man unawares and deprive him of his life. Why should men carry them except for this reason? There can be no other.

Let us tax pistols, not plows. [Applause.]

Let us tax dirk knives, not disk harrows. [Applause.]

Let us tax pistol cartridges, not corn planters. [Applause.]

If men will engage in manufacturing pistols, dirks, stilettos, and other such weapons for sale, let them be compelled to pay the Government something when they do it. It is not the province of the United States Government to prevent their manufacture, but it is her right to levy a tax upon them to help pay the expenses of the Government, and it should be exercised at this time. Our Treasury needs the revenue. Let us get at least $2,000,000 by taxing this evil. It can not produce any evil, but a great good.

Too many of the great daily newspapers are owned and supported by the protected interests of the country, and they discourage any movement to raise revenue except through the tariff, which enables their masters to support them, to rob the people of more than $10 where the Government gets $1 in taxes. So to raise $2,000,000 by a tax upon deadly weapons and cartridges would cost the protected manufacturer $10,000,000 in profits, because you could then put a few necessities on the free list. They would rather let these men who manufacture deadly weapons and put them into the hands of the lawless for the express purpose of murdering American citizens continue in their aiding and abetting in all the homicides in the country than to give up the protection afforded by the collection of $2,000,000 of import duties. That is, when Congress assumes this attitude, it seems that they would make it cheap for men engaged in manufacturing deadly weapons by leaving the burden upon honest consumers, the men, women, children, widows, and orphans who toil, rather than tax these men who are engaged in manufacturing these deadly weapons.

The only people who are consulted, the only advice that comes to Congress, is from the rich. Congress is too far away from the people and too close to the interests. If all the good men in America who believe in placing a tax upon deadly weapons would write to their Congressmen and Senators the mail would be loaded down. Let every minister of the Gospel, of whatever faith or persuasion, every college professor, every schoolteacher, every banker, merchant, farmer, and all law-abiding people who love life and not death, who would dispense sunshine and not shadow, who would have the wine of joy and not the blood of sorrow to flow in our land, who would remove from the human eye a tear and from the heart a pang of pain be heard from in this land in the matter of taxing these deadly weapons manufactured and sold by these men engaged in this hellish business and there will be a unanimous voice in favor of it.

My own people are sometimes charged with being "pistol toters." [Applause and laughter.] We are also charged with putting too cheap a valuation on human life. Well, why do you make these things and sell them to us? Either stop making them or stop lecturing us. [Laughter.] If you are going to continue to manufacture them, then tax them along with cards and whisky and compel those who indulge the luxury to pay for it. You can get $2,500,000 or $3,000,000 of revenue from this source.

My distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] suggests another remedy. There is now a tax of 2 cents a pack on playing cards. Why not make it 10 cents? This would tax another business to an extent that the Government would derive some real benefit from.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. What would be the effect of your tax on pistols on marksmanship? Would that tend to discourage the practice of the noble art?

Mr. SISSON. I think so; and if the mark was a human being it would be well to stop the training. Our boys shoot too true now.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I hope the gentleman is not going to put me in the position of opposing his effort to tax pistols. There is a great deal being said in the various civilized countries of the world as to making the citizen soldiery capable of handling firearms and hitting the marks at which they aim. Would it have a tendency to discourage that?

Mr. SISSON. I am glad to know that my good friend is not opposed to my bill. Let us furnish them with rifles and not with pistols. Battles are won with rifles, not pistols.

Mr. SIMS. And if you are dealing with deadly weapons, do you not think you ought to do something with automobiles in the way of tax?

Mr. SISSON. I am glad my distinguished friend suggests automobiles in connection with deadly weapons. I am a country boy, and am now living in a small town, and I have done more dodging and ducking to keep out of the way of those things than all other dangers combined since I have been in Washington. I think the gentleman from Tennessee properly classes them as deadly weapons. They, too, would be a splendid subject for an internal-revenue tax.

AGRICULTURE.

Now, gentlemen, I shall not detain the committee longer. I want to say, in concluding my remarks, that whatever injures or tends to injure agriculture, whatever tends to destroy the prosperity of the farm, will absolutely destroy the prosperity of this country. No man questions that statement. This is why I am supporting this bill. Let us give farmers free tools to work with.

The great cities can not thrive, they can not live a single month, without the produce of the farm that is carried there to feed them. The great factories can not run without that produce. There is one business that always adds to the wealth of the world, and it is the only business that adds absolutely to the wealth of the world something that did not exist before. You may take, if you please, the iron in the bowels of the earth, and you may convert it into different shapes and into usable forms, but you have produced no more iron. You may go into the gold mines and into the silver mines and you can dig out the last ounce, but there is one business that men engage in by which they always, every year, add something to the wealth of the world without taking anything from it. You plant and you reap ten, twenty, yea one hundred fold of new wealth, wealth that did not exist before, and the world is richer thereby and no wealth has been used up. The farmer is the basis of all our civilization. Upon his broad shoulders rest all the balance of the human family. It is the duty of Congress to remove from these shoulders every burden that it can. Whether we live in the country or in the city our general prosperity will be advanced by advancing the interest of agriculture.

The farmer needs more education and training than any other class of people. It requires the highest degree of intellectual development to make a successful farmer. It is necessary that he understand how to improve his land by building it up with proper cultivation. To do this requires some scientific knowledge. Farm management, to be successful, requires good business training.

In order to bring about this result the Government should furnish him with all available information that it can secure from experiment and observation. Every effort should be made to make country life desirable. People have been deserting their farms because life has not been attractive to their boys and girls. They long for better social opportunities and more lucrative avocations. To prevent our farms being deserted we must bring about a condition different from the past. The country boy and girl must be given equal opportunities with those of the towns and cities. This can only be done by giving them good roads, good schools, and good churches. This will enable the farmer not only to get the products of his farm quickly and with less cost to market, but it will enable his family to enjoy the better opportunities to worship and his children better schools to attend. The successful management of the farm, the improvement of the farm, making country life desirable, filling the country with good schools and good churches, building good roads, so that the farmers may not only get their produce cheaply to market, but that they may also enjoy the opportunities of worship, that their children may attend school, and that they may come in larger numbers and increase the efficiency of the schools—in order that you may maintain this strong foundation of all life it is absolutely essential that every acre of land be made to produce the greatest amount during each given year. In addition to this, you must remove from his shoulders every unfair and unnecessary burden, so that farm life may be made as profitable as possible.

But under the system that has been in vogue under the system of taxation which has prevailed for 50 years the farmer has been the one man who has received no benefit, but all the burden from the system of taxation which you have put in operation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is utterly impossible to devise a plan—human ingenuity can not devise a plan—where you may enable men to get enormous prices for food products unless you make somebody else suffer. I believe the farmer is entitled to a fair and full remuneration for every day's labor that he puts on the farm. But he does not get that, for under this system of protection which you have instituted, under the special privileges which have grown up under your protective system, a few men have been able to get together and control the great food markets and fix the price to the farmer and then fix the price to the consumer, and thus hurt both.

Who is there that does not believe that the price of both cattle and meat to-day in the great cities is not absolutely fixed by the Beef Trust? Who does not know that in the fixing of the price of nearly all the necessities of life they are fixed either by monopolies or by trade agreements? I have sometimes had my doubts whether the Sherman Antitrust Act was a blessing. It has proven a complete failure, because it has not been enforced. It has been a mockery. Illegal combinations have gone merrily along with full knowledge of those who should prevent it. Even Presidents have condoned its violation. Law officers and courts stand dumb and silent before their masters and decline to prosecute. If the Federal courts of the country had been in hearty sympathy with the law, if the administrations had been heartily in sympathy with the prosecutions at the very beginning of the illegal combination of capital, they might have prevented that condition which to-day confronts us and which is gradually growing to be world-wide. In other words, they have so much power to-day by the vast combination of capital that it is extremely doubtful whether, if any party that comes into power should endeavor to lay a restraining hand upon their methods, it could prevent them by a single meeting of a single board of directors of one institution from deciding to close down an industry for the sole purpose of bringing about a condition that will place the laboring man out of employment; and then, when he is helpless, appeal to his hunger and to his wants, and by this method he is coerced and forced to go with the party which will restore trust control. Whether it be a Republican Party that endeavors to deal with the situation, or whether it be the Democratic Party that deals with the situation, whatever may be the party that may attempt to regulate and control them in that business, the question is whether the trusts will not be able to drive any party out of power that will endeavor to regulate them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is one of the great problems which the people of this age have to solve. It must be solved, of course, and I believe it will be. But it is no boy's task, it is no small day's work, that has to be done. We must not invade property rights. I do not believe, however, that property rights should prevail over the rights of man. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But we must have a safe preservation of property rights, because, as Mr. Calhoun has said, men who have the acquisitive desire will exercise that desire so long as they are safe in their property under the law. Therefore we must preserve property rights, but money should yield to man, and property should yield to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Because property, business, machinery, all the marvelous and mighty mechanism of the industrial world, if properly used and conducted, and if their products are not controlled by selfish men, are a great and everlasting blessing to mankind; but there are many of these great institutions whose titanic power is equal to the ceaseless labor of a million slaves; and if the owners of these mighty machines, the owners of the great factories and industrial enterprises, the owners of the great transportation companies, if they are selfish and are unwilling to give to labor that opportunity, that right, that fair and just division of earnings, then it is absolutely necessary to the preservation of free government and to the happiness of mankind that the strong arm of the law be laid upon these great engines of oppression and that they be compelled to do right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is not a particle of socialism in my make-up. I am just as far from socialism as I am from anarchy, but when these people with all their power are capable of producing so much misery and woe some means must be devised for their control, and whatever that may be, whatever the wisdom of man may devise to that end, I pledge my hand and my heart to the support of that measure. [Applause.] I hope this bill will pass the House. I hope it will pass the Senate. I trust it will be but the beginning of the solution of this great problem. I do not want to wait until the power of these oppressors becomes so strong and world-wide that one nation can not deal with them. If it gets to be an international affair, then God help the people! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, when I was a boy I read the story of the Riddle of the Sphinx. The King of Thebes had been annoyed for a long time by the sphinx that lived in the rocks near one of the roads through a mountain pass that his subjects were compelled to travel in getting into and out of his kingdom. The sphinx would ask each passer-by a riddle, and if he failed to answer it the sphinx would devour him. This caused great terror to the people and great distress to the king. At last the King of Thebes heard of Œdipus, a wise and good man, and he sent for him and asked him, "Can you deliver us from the terrible sphinx?" Œdipus said he would try. So he went out, and as usual the sphinx came and asked him a question. Those of you who are familiar with the story will recall the question:

What is it that in the morning walks on four legs, at noon walks on two, and in the evening walks on three?

Œdipus very promptly replied:

Man; when he is a child he walks on all fours, when he is a man he stands upright and walks on two legs, and when he is old and decrepit with age he walks with a stick, which makes the three legs.

With a terrible cry of agony, the sphinx threw herself over the precipice on the rocks beneath, and so the Thebans were relieved of the scourge.

Now, the sphinx in this country that has been feeding upon the American people is this gigantic Republican organization. For 50 years they have been juggling with the American farmer and the American laboring man, and at the elections the farmer and the laboring man have failed to answer the question aright, because you gentlemen on the other side have been able to deceive them. But education, training, and learning on the part of the people will finally enable them through their Representatives to answer correctly this riddle of the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When they do that, the mighty sphinx, the Republican Party, will cry aloud as it is cast from the precipice of power down upon the rocks of destruction below. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.] My friend from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] has just given a perfect description of how this sphinx is organized and how dangerous it is to the liberty and welfare of the American people. I commend his remarks to all patriotic Americans who do not believe in the growing despotism of this trust-controlled Republican sphinx. May the Lord deliver us from this terrible monster. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, when the Canadian reciprocity bill made its appearance at the last session of Congress I believed it to be an entering wedge for the destruction of the policy of protection to American industry and voted against it. When it returned to the present session of Congress, under Democratic auspices, my original estimate of its ultimate effect was not changed, and I again voted against it. While its purpose appeared to have been benevolent, I believed it to be wrong in policy and calculated to harm both the farmer and the industrialist of this country. If annexation were coupled with reciprocity, the situation would be different, but without annexation reciprocity with Canada means a deflection of the population of the United States, unnecessary concessions to Canada and Europe, and a reduction in the wage-earning power in the United States. That undue concessions are being made to Canada would appear from the failure of anyone advocating reciprocity to propose similar terms to Mexico, which, being along our southern border, would seem to be entitled to as much consideration at our generous hands as "the fair sister to the north." While we are throwing bouquets at Canada and are preaching the uplift, it is well to remember that we are maintaining an entirely different and wholly unaltruistic attitude to a sister country along the southern border.

GIVING SOMETHING FOR NOTHING.

In the reciprocity bill we have actually given away in an exchange of revenue approximately $5,000,000 per annum, which would be just as serviceable to industry in the United States as it will be to Canada or to England, with which Canada is in sympathetic touch. And there is no apparent reason upon the Republican side for this outburst of generosity save that of altruism and the possible desire to obtain free wood pulp for the United States, a desideratum which the Canadian ministers in their letter to the Secretary of State, expressly if not emphatically, reserved to the Canadian Provinces.

Assuming the reciprocity bill passes, carrying with it the loss of trade and Federal revenue, the Democratic Party now proposes to further reduce the revenue and yet run the Government by giving effect to reciprocity in a free-trade bill presumed to be in the interest of the farmer, but especially and directly designed to benefit cotton planters, since more than half the $10,000,000 of revenue which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr.

UNDERWOOD] says is to be saved the farmer in duty upon imports, is levied against bagging for cotton, sacks, burlaps, and so forth, and cotton ties. I can not agree that either measure is in the interest of the farmer or the cotton planter, or the industrialist, and I shall vote against this properly labeled free-trade wedge with the same sincerity and earnestness that I voted against the entering wedge of reciprocity.

MAKING A CAT'S-PAW OF THE FARMER.

Throughout this whole discussion it has been apparent that the American farmer was to be made the cat's-paw of the Democratic propaganda. He has been held aloof from his co-worker in the mill and his best customer in the city, and has been made to believe he would be the sole victim of reciprocity, as the attempt is now being made to have him believe he will be a beneficiary of the so-called farmers' free list. The oft-heard cry of monopoly and exorbitant profits in the mills has been repeated in this discussion to a fulsome degree, and nowhere have our Democratic orators taken into account the wages involved in the recent wonderful progress of the Nation under the protective system, which it now seems to be the business of every competitive nation, aided by the Democratic Party, to destroy.

Democrats have taken the reins in this House and they tell us they propose to improve upon the protective system, not by razing customhouses as of old, nor even by taxing incomes quite so vigorously as hitherto proposed, but by "going gently," keeping the customhouses, cutting down the expenses as well as the revenues, and placing a reduced tax upon incomes. And all of this is to be done in the interest of the American farmer, who is expected to continue as prosperous as ever and to secure the same high prices from wage earners out of work, as he was able to obtain from wage earners employed under a protective system. Well, we have had two instances of Democratic effort to run the Government. The first was under James Buchanan, when they bonded the Government for $40,000,000, and the second and crucial test was under Grover Cleveland, when, subsequent to 1894, they were forced to issue bonds to the extent of $262,000,000 to pull the country out of the financial hole into which they had plunged it. They may be wiser now than they were then. The proof of the pudding lies in the eating of it.

REMINDER OF DEMOCRATIC TIMES.

If the American farmer would be as wise to his true interests, as I believe he will be after reciprocity and free trade have been imposed upon him by a Democratic House, he will make a few comparisons now, as those of us who have good memories and are not over-educated in populistic theories are making them in the great cities, as between that interesting former period of Democratic control and the interesting period which is now promised under the new system for which the Democratic Party will be responsible.

There is no essential difference in the problems and pretenses of the Democratic Party of 1893 and those of the present, so that it is fair to recall some of the disasters that were wrought upon the entire country—business man, farmer, and workingman alike—by the experiments put into effect in 1894. I have before me now, prepared by one of the great mercantile agencies of the country—Dun & Co.—a comparative list of mercantile and banking failures and of railroad receiverships for a long period of years. In 1893, when the Democrats in their last attempt to materialize their professions, were changing from a protective to a partial free-trade policy, the mercantile failures in the United States aggregated $346,779,889. There has been no such record in all the years before or since, and even in the financial flurry of 1907 the failures of this class did not equal one-third of the amount of that disastrous Democratic year. In the same Democratic year the banking failures in the United States amounted to $210,998,809, which was more than all the failures in the eight years from 1895 to 1902, inclusive, and was never approached by any one year, save that of 1907, a "bank-panic year," having nothing to do with the tariff, when the liabilities of failing institutions exceeded those of the Cleveland year by twenty-three millions. But the climax was capped in the railroad receiverships in 1893, when the total amount of capital involved was in excess of $1,781,000,000, an amount equal to the total involved in all railroad receiverships for the 14 subsequent years from 1894 to 1907, inclusive. In the light of these staggering figures, carrying with them a story of idleness and distress in city and country such as we never want to see again, it is fair to presume that the American farmer, who has listened complacently to stories of monopoly and outrage, will realize the meaning of that true reciprocity which some of us upon the Republican side have been preaching—the reciprocity that begins at home in a square deal between the tiller of the soil and the worker in the mill, without the interference of any foreign nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

ALTRUISM AND BREADWINNING.

Since reciprocity, as it has been communicated to us by the Democratic leaders, is now synonymous with free trade, what will it profit us as a people? Are we so prosperous that we can give away our substance without inviting the shadow? Are we not pursuing the course of him who "is worse than an infidel" if he provideth not for his own house? Or have we become so powerful, so benevolent and so altruistic, that we can take all nations to our bosom and still retain our industrial strength and fiber? And if we dared to do this, what assurance have we that any one of the great nations would do unto us as we seem willing to do unto them? Out of the Treasury of the country we spent hundreds of millions upon Cuba and the Philippines, and we are still spending lavishly for the uplift of the civilized and half-savage natives of the latter. Surely it will not be denied that we are taking of our substance for this benevolent purpose and that we are not receiving any return, either in profit or appreciation, such as we might derive if we were to put our own money amongst our own people, where it would strengthen the American fireside and give less cause for complaint as to the increase in the cost of living.

It is estimated that we shall spend four hundred millions upon the Panama Canal, and that we shall spend from forty to fifty millions per year fortifying it against the possibility of some other nation refusing to reciprocate with us in that spirit of good fellowship we now profess to entertain for other nations. Would it not seem from this mere incident, to say nothing of our precautionary measures along the border of Mexico, that although we have been generous in constructing the canal for the benefit of the world, we have not yet full faith in the amiability of one or any of the other nations that might find the canal worth taking from us?

CAN NOT DISASSOCIATE THE FARMER.

From no point of view, Mr. Chairman, have I been able to disassociate the farmer from the mechanic, or the clerk, or the industrialist of the city, so far as they will be affected by either the reciprocity or the free-trade bills. Many of those who have spoken for the farmer endeavored to make it appear that the man in the city was doing him great wrong. The truth is to the contrary, since man for man, the American farmer of to-day has every advantage in health, in domestic comfort, and in financial returns over the average urbanite. He has more of life's real comforts and by all odds is surer of his daily bread; he gets his food, whether he gets his wages or not. I have deeply regretted the efforts to show that either of these bills would mean an advantage to the dweller in the city over the dweller upon the farm, or vice versa. I am the Representative of a great industrial and mercantile district, and deem it a duty to deny that the workingman or the working woman of the city desires a reduction of the farmers' wage, and I confidently express the belief that the farmer does not desire a reduction in the wage of the workingman. We have been taught in the cities, as you have been taught in the country, that protection to a nation against unfair foreign labor and its product, is as natural as the protection of the individual or the family against the storm or the intruder. It is only when we prosper in the cities that we are enabled to buy from the farmer and pay him a fair price, and if the farmer prospers we look for a fair interchange of the commodities which we manufacture and sell to him. We understand the interests of these two great bread-winning factors of our country to be identical. That the farmer would knowingly strike down the industrialist who buys his products, or that the industrialist would knowingly strike down the farmer who buys his manufactures, is a preposterous proposition. Even though abuses may have crept into the protective system, it is equally unthinkable that because of an occasional fungus growth upon the giant oak of prosperity, we should abandon the law of our country which affords us a pruning knife and invoke the baneful aid of foreign competition to debase our home labor and lower our standard of life. [Applause on the Republican side.]

FARMERS RESPONSIBLE FOR CITIES GROWTH.

If the effect of all this legislation be to cheapen commodities, and incidentally labor, carrying with it uncertainty and distress in the business world, wherein does it advantage the industrialist more than the farmer or the farmer more than the industrialist? We were all farmers originally, but we strove for better conditions than prevailed in the hostile fields and log cabins of our forefathers. It was the farmer's boy striving to

improve upon "Dad's" way that built up the cities and turned his industry and ingenuity to profit. What fault is to be found with him if he labored in new fields of industry and made labor profitable so that more money might be put into the pocket of the farmer to give him a chance to come out of the backwoods? It was the farmer's boy, for there was none other to do it, who improved the old earthen roads and made transportation possible. He saw the advantages of reaching out beyond the narrow limits of the eastern settlements, and it was he who penetrated the West with railroads that now make the farmer and the city dweller akin. He created the intermediate occupations engaged in the carrying trade between the farm and the city. It was through him that new industries, new factories, and new forges were established, and it was he, who, from the first act of the American Congress, insisted upon protection—not tariff for revenue—but protection for the industries of this country against the superior advantages in material prices, and labor conditions, in foreign lands. The farmer of the United States to-day is indebted to the farmer's boy of yesterday for the Department of Agriculture; for the advantages which have made rough farming scientific; for the advantages of this very tariff system which has relieved the farmer and the city dweller alike of direct taxes, while it has given us an opportunity to install telephones and build automobiles, which are now more in proportion a convenience to the dweller upon the farm than they are to the dweller in the city. It is due to the brains and industry of this farmer's boy who came to the city that we have been able to advance the standard of living, and it is that standard we want to see maintained.

FARM WAGES LOWER IN CANADA.

During this discussion I have been amazed at the willingness of our Democratic friends to accept Canada and her products on equal terms with those of the United States. It has been admitted that the wage of the farm laborer in Canada is less than that of the farm laborer in the United States, and it follows, if that be true, that the wages of the Canadian farmer, with cheaper lands, must be advanced to our standard, or ours must be reduced to his. I have had an inquiry made as to the building trades—which are all skilled labor—and find in nearly every instance that the hours of labor are longer and the scale of wages is lower in Canada than in the United States. Is this to the advantage of the American laborer or producer? Will the dweller in the city, brought into competition with a lower foreign wage scale, be enabled to reduce the cost of living if his own purchasing power be reduced?

Statistics furnished in the President's message of February 28, last, giving a comparison of farm wages paid in Canadian Provinces and States of the United States, along the border, become extremely interesting now in view of the Democratic proposition to follow up reciprocity with free trade. On page 85 of the President's message on "Reciprocity with Canada" the average wages of the farm laborer in the United States along the border in 1909 were $29 per month. The average Canadian wages along the border were $22.50 per month.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

CONGESTION AND ACREAGE.

Mr. SIMS. In view of the small number of laborers in Canada compared with the number in the United States, does not the gentleman think that wages in Canada will increase rather than bring ours down to the present Canadian scale?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have observed that many of our farmers are going to Canada, and if enough of them go there they may induce higher wages, but that, the gentleman should understand, would be sapping our own life and strength, and taking away the rich blood of this country and giving it to a country that refuses to come under our banner.

Mr. SIMS. But if we congest our country with labor, it must go somewhere.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no fear of congestion in our country except in the large cities. I have no fear of the prophecies of Malthus here, for we have plenty of room. Within a radius of 25 miles of my home city of Philadelphia you can secure plenty of good land with good buildings upon it, if you want to engage in farming, for as low as $60 per acre. Why should our people go to Canada, increasing in transportation rates the cost of what they would produce for the United States, when that cost must be charged up to the consumers of this country?

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. If the Canadians can buy as great a quantity of the necessaries of life for $22 in Canada as ours can for $29, how is he hurt?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is proposing to transfer the pure red blood of the American farmer into a foreign country and depopulate his own country. That is what I object to. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If the gentleman wants to ask a question concerning the manufacturer, because there is a bone of contention, I will say that the fear I have is that the bill which the gentleman advocates means that men who have capital, who have enterprise, who can find more favorable conditions of manufacture in foreign countries where the labor is cheaper, will leave the United States and thus deprive the American farmer of the market he now acquires from the wage earner who gets his wage in the existing American factory.

THE MANUFACTURER AND HIS MONEY.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman not think that it is the highest evidence of an avaricious, dollar-loving spirit to live in this country and make money out of high protection, and then the very moment the manufacturer gets the money that he wants, to go off and use it in a country where money is worth more than it is here? The manufacturer has been made rich by protection, and yet he deserts the country the moment that he has the money to go with.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman has asked that, because I am a protectionist, and I want to keep American money here. I would far rather the people in the little town the gentleman represents in Tennessee and the large farming constituency thereabouts were able to make $3 a day in a factory than to make $1 a day upon the farm. [Applause on Republican side.] I believe their standard of living would be improved, and I believe the gentleman would find that by reason of the increasing industry and activity of his own people, his duties here would be so increased that he would find little time for debate in the House.

Mr. SIMS. That does not answer my question as to why your protected manufacturer deserts this country after he has made his millions from protection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman that this country was sought out by our forefathers. They came here and lived for a long time in the back woods. I listened to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] a short time ago, and observed he spoke of the splendid conditions that prevailed in the days of the Washingtons and the Jeffersons.

I would say to the gentleman that in those days the men who did the labor in this country were not the aristocrats; they wore the apron as a badge of servility. There were aristocrats in those days, but popular education and the incoming of capital and the encouragement of enterprise and the incentive and genius of the American spirit have induced us to go on and become a world power. We have come out of the backwoods and the swamps where some of our forefathers lived. But since the gentleman desires an answer as to the manufacturer who makes his money and leaves the country, I will say to him that I have no sympathy with such a practice and would not encourage it by the passage of a free-trade measure. The gentleman can not go further than I do in condemning the man who makes his money here and then distributes it to the detriment of our own people, but he may find this necessary under a free-trade system.

LOSING OUT TO CANADA.

The difference in favor of the Canadian employer over the American employer of farm labor, as shown by the President's message, is, on the average, about one-fourth of the entire wage. Wherein would this reduction benefit anyone in the United States? That it is an inducement for employing farmers and of great advantage to Canada is shown in the announcement from Ottawa, immediately after the passage of the reciprocity bill by the House, that 45,000 American farmers were preparing to cross the Canadian border to get cheap land and, incidentally, cheap labor, thus depressing land and labor in the United States and transferring to Canadian Provinces no less than $30,000,000. The dispatch relating to this is taken from the Philadelphia Record, the leading Democratic newspaper of Pennsylvania, and is so significant that I present it here in full:

AMERICANS RUSH TO CANADA—45,000 FARMERS, WITH $30,000,000, CROSS BORDER.

[Special to the Record.]

Ottawa, April 22.—Reports from the Canadian west, recieved at the immigration department here, indicate that the prairie Provinces are now experiencing the greatest rush of immigration in western history. Figures compiled by the immigration authorities show that the daily average of new arrivals for four weeks show that 50,000 newcomers have entered western Canada as settlers within that time. At least 280 new towns will be put on the map of the Canadian west this year.

Information supplied the passenger department of the Canadian Pacific Railway is that already upward of 45,000 American farmers are preparing to cross over the border and settle in the Canadian west. It is estimated that they will bring in at least $30,000,000 in property and cash. The rush is nearly as great on other lines, while almost a stampede of settlers, principally Scots, has set in from the mother country.

Was it good policy to let these farmers go, and will it be good policy to send American manufactories after them, as suggested by the inquiry of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows how many men of the best in this country and how much money has gone to Canada during the last 20 or 25 years to aid and encourage the industries of that country—if he has any statistics upon that subject?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have some data that I will put in the RECORD. I wrote this part of my address so that I would not have to deal with statistics offhand, but I will say to the gentleman, if he is interested, that I do know of certain concerns that have left the United States and have gone into Canada, taking over money to build enterprises there as they did to get cheap labor in England, and who did it because they could not get over the tariff barriers reared by Canada, which Canada still maintains.

Mr. BOWMAN. I would also like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, I have only an hour.

CANADA WILL NOT YIELD.

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Go ahead.

Mr. BOWMAN. Is it not better, in view of the fact that some of the best have gone over that lane of darkness, that a wall which is being built between these countries be taken down, so that they will be a part of this country rather than foreigners and strangers and enemies to this country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will answer the gentleman, who, I think, has some interests in Canada.

Mr. BOWMAN. Not a dollar.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think he has some customers in Canada.

Mr. BOWMAN. I have some of the best friends, and I desire them to be better.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are the friends of the gentleman, who are now in Canada, prepared to say that they will connect with this country and do business under our laws? Or do they still say they want the barrier reared as against certain American products, while they want our barriers lowered in order that their goods may come into the United States free?

Mr. BOWMAN. My friends in that country will make as good Americans as any that live in this country.

"MISS CANADA" AND MEXICO.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will agree with the gentleman that the Canadian is a fair brother, and that the pictures we see in the newspapers of "Miss Canada" are fair pictures, but I point out to the gentleman the country below us, where the bayonets of the United States are supplanting the bouquets we are throwing at Canada. I point to Mexico, which may be just as fair as Canada, to whom we will give no concessions and against whom we shut the door.

Mr. BOWMAN. And I would ask the gentleman if he desires the bayonets to be turned from that country toward this country, as they surely will, if you continue building this wall.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If I had time, I would be glad to go on with the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say just one word, from my personal knowledge, that I know of men and women who have left this country and gone to the Canadian Northwest, and who have taken hundreds of millions of dollars with them for investment into that country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for that statement, which confirms what I have said. My information goes much further than the Canadian country, and I will say something about it a little later on. My information goes back to the days when under a Democratic tariff capital left the United States, mills were constructed in England, and we got their goods and they got our money; but I recall, too, that after we had put into effect a Republican tariff the investors came back to the United States, built mills, spent their money, and while we got their goods we also got their money. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the reciprocity bill will drive away annually five millions of revenue and assist in depopulating our western country. The farmers' free-list bill will depress the wages of those who manufacture the articles that are used by the farmer, and must necessarily decrease the farmer's profit. It should be remembered, even by the farmer himself, that the wage earner in the streets and alleys of the great cities can not purchase at fair prices, the eggs and the butter and the beef and the potatoes that come from the farm, unless a fair price is obtained for the harrows and the plows and the textiles and the bagging and the cotton ties that go from the cities. Whether a manufacturer makes too much or too little, is a small part of the question. The manufacturer is only one man. The workers in the mills are thousands. What the manufacturer eats is trifling. It is what the workman eats and what the workman has to pay for what he eats that most concerns us. The farmer buys from the city occasionally, but the dweller in the city must buy from the farmer day by day, and the wage must be in hand to pay or the worker will go hungry.

WHEN THE FARMER COMES TO TOWN.

I would like to stop, if I had the time, and tell you how much the farmer buys when he comes to town. How much does he take away from one of my textile factories where you propose to reduce the wages of the men and women who are making hosiery? How many pairs of hosiery will he buy in a year? Six, a dozen, fifteen? Well, the whole bill could be settled for $2 or $3; maybe $1.50. He can get socks to-day for 10 cents. He can get two pairs for 15 cents, and they will last him for months. We have to spend vast sums of money in overhead charges, we have to rear great plants, we have to pay for rentals and advertising, we have to pay labor in order to make these socks at that price. Not even a Democrat would want them cheaper; and yet we have to pay for our eggs and potatoes and meat every day in the year. We have to go to the farmer every day. Sometimes the farmer does not visit us for six months.

How can the farmer expect to maintain the standard he now holds or to secure a continuance of fair prices if he declines to pay to the American wage-earner a fair price for manufactured articles? If he buys them from Europe on a free-list basis he puts out of employment the American worker in the mill and in the factory, and thus puts himself beyond the power of the mill worker to buy. The farmer's best market is not in Europe, but in the United States. He can not depress the wage-earning power in the city and still expect a profit upon the farm. Far better for the man in the city that the farmer should prosper, and far better for the man upon the farm that the man in the city should prosper.

NO WEALTH WITHOUT LABOR.

There are no articles upon the so-called farmers' free list which did not originally spring from the soil—metals or textiles or manufactured products. They all originated in the ground, and in their original condition were worth nothing. It was the hand of the laborer and the artificer that gave them value. Once, a long time back, in my own great State of Pennsylvania, the farms were ripe with grain, but it fell worthless in the field. The farmer had no market, except in his own environment. No protective system had aided him in building up industries and means of transportation. It cost him $10 a hundred pounds to send his products from Pittsburg to Philadelphia. The farmer was charged from 15 to 20 cents a pound for metal; he paid $5 for a bushel of salt. His grain was all he had, and the only value he could get out of it was by converting it into whisky.

He needed a market; he needed a railroad or a waterway to get to the market. He needed the city consumer to make his labor worth something. He began to get it when the engineer and the mechanic came. What thoughtful farmer will deny the value of the architect and the laborer and the textile worker who build for him and who buy from him? The story of our wonderful Western development centers in the spread of the industrial influence. Until it came there was no money value to the wealth of the farm nor to the labor employed in farm production. If we are to pay well for the products of the farm it follows that we must earn well in the cities, and if we are to continue to profitably interchange as between the cities and the farm, we must not withdraw from each other, nor permit ourselves to be alienated.

DEMOCRATS MUST RECKON WITH LABOR.

In my judgment the Democrats who are now menacing the business of the country by their insistence upon free trade, will have to account to the mechanic and wage earner of the land as well as to the farmer. They can not put him upon the plane of his competitor in England, in Germany, in France, or in Italy without hearing from him in no uncertain way.

Table 2 in the President's message gives the "Average wages of agricultural labor, with board, in specified States, eastern Canada, and British Columbia," for 1909, as follows:

	By the month.		In harvest.
	Hiring by the season.	Hiring by the year.	
United States:			
Maine	$27.60	$23.17	$1.63
New York	26.00	22.08	1.77
Michigan	25.10	21.57	1.75
Minnesota	29.25	23.98	2.23
Wisconsin	28.57	24.39	1.79
North Dakota	33.34	27.01	2.58
Iowa	28.93	25.63	2.08
Ohio	22.11	19.19	1.67
Vermont	26.86	24.03	1.73
Montana	39.29	35.00	2.23
Washington	36.39	31.32	2.34
Missouri	21.10	18.85	1.50
Canada:			
Prince Edward Island	17.25	10.87	
Nova Scotia	21.20	15.90	.40 / .50
New Brunswick	22.59	9.96	
Quebec	23.33	17.58	.30 / .35
Ontario	21.52	17.63	.20 / .35
British Columbia	30.50	20.69	.35 / .50

WAGE COMPETITION WITH EUROPE.

If these differences in the wages of farm labor are calculated to stir the interest of the farmer, what shall we say of the mill workers whom the free-trade bill proposes to put in competition with the factory labor of Europe? In the textile industry the wages in Great Britain are one-half those paid in the United States. You Democrats propose to put their goods against ours and their wage scale against ours. The wages in the textile industries in Germany and in France are little more than one-third the wages in the United States. You propose to put our working men and women on a par with the workers of those countries. When you had control of this Government in 1894 you compelled American capital to leave the United States and rear factories in Germany and in England and in Canada. You propose now to enact a measure that will bring like results, and this, upon the pretense that you will reduce the cost of living. But stop a while! I want you to look before you leap. It has profited certain manufacturers to conduct establishments on both sides of the water to meet conditions arising from frequent tariff changes. They go to Europe to get cheap labor and they build here to keep within the tariff wall. They would prefer to stay here if you would let them, because the market is here. Hosiery, in particular, is manufactured in Germany for the American trade.

Against what do our American wage earners have to compete in this trade? Here is a statement now officially before the Ways and Means Committee which invites our sympathetic consideration:

The average rate of wages paid to skilled women sewing-machine operators in the United States varies from $1.50 to $2 per day. The same class of labor in France, Germany, and Switzerland receives from 30 cents to 50 cents per day.

Wages paid winders or spoolers in the United States varies from $1.50 to $1.75 per day. The same class of labor in the countries named receives from 35 cents to 40 cents per day.

Wages paid knitters in the United States varies from $1.25 to $2 per day. The same class of labor in the countries named receives from 35 cents to 75 cents per day.

The items of labor entering into the manufacture of cotton knitted underwear, over and above the actual cost of the staple, represents fully 75 per cent of the total.

In lieu of lengthy and confirmatory statistics showing the cheapness of wages in Europe as compared with better conditions in the United States I submit a letter recently published in the Protectionist. There is so much of human interest and such food for thought in this statement that a reading of it may help to a better understanding of the value of a fair American wage.

COST OF LIVING HERE AND THERE.

Intended for circulation in the British elections, this illuminating letter of Mr. Harrison Benn, of England and America, must be of intense interest to the American tariff tinker of free-trade proclivities. The statement, dated Beckside Mills, Great Norton, Bradford, follows:

In order to put before the public a correct statement of the comparative cost of living, together with the wages paid in England and America, it is advisable to have as near as possible the same conditions both as to locality and the quality of work. As chairman of a company with mills in Clayton and Bradford and president of a corporation with mills in Greystone, near Providence, R. I., America, I am in a practical position to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of free trade and protection.

The English and American mills comb, spin, and weave exactly the same classes of wool, alpaca, and mohair, and the same qualities of yarns and cloth are interchangeable. The machinery in all the mills are identically the same. Many of the work people at Greystone worked in our Bradford mills. At Clayton and Greystone are cooperative stores managed entirely by the workingmen, and it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain fairer conditions for comparing the cost of living in the two countries.

A great amount of discussion is now being carried on regarding the prices of the "food of the people," and in order that every family can ascertain the difference in the cost of living between free-trade England and protectionist America, I give below a list of prices of some "everyday necessary articles of food." The Greystone price list is dated December 10, 1909, and signed by the secretary of the cooperative stores, and the Clayton price list is of a more recent date. For convenience and simplicity I have translated the American "cent" as being equal to one halfpenny.

	Clayton cooperative prices.	Greystone cooperative prices.
	s. d.	s. d.
Best flour, per stone of 14 pounds	2 1	2 3
Best butter, per pound (Danish)	1 5	[1] 1 4
Best lard, per pound	0 9	0 7½
Best cheese, per pound	0 10	0 10
Sugar	0 2½	0 2½
Currants	0 5	0 6½
Raisins	0 7	0 7½
Ceylon tea	1 11	1 10
Coffee	1 8	1 2
Onions	0 1½	0 2½
Ham	1 1	1 ½
Bacon (Irish)	1 0	0 10
Apples	0 2½	0 1½
Rice	0 3½	0 4½
Milk, per quart	0 3	0 3
Vinegar, per quart	0 4	0 3½
Nestle's Swiss milk, per tin	0 5½	0 3½
Potatoes, per stone of 14 pounds	0 8	12 5
Bananas, per dozen	0 8	0 6½

[1] American.

ENGLAND AND RHODE ISLAND COMPARED.

A Bradford butcher employed by the Greystone cooperative states the joints are not cut the same, but the prices realized for the whole animal are just about the same as in England.

Although coal is dearer, I question if the fuel cost per family for 12 months is as much as in England, owing to the general use of slow-combustion stoves.

I have ascertained the quantities of the above-named "everyday necessary articles of food" consumed by families, ranging from 2 to 13 persons, and find the average cost to each Greystonian is 3¾d. per week more than the Claytonian. A family of 5 persons will jointly have to earn 1s. 6¾d. more per week to be equal to a Claytonian.

Having arrived at the cost of living as shown above, I give below the wages paid at Clayton and Bradford for 55½ hours per week and at Greystone for 56 hours:

	Clayton and Bradford.	Greystone.
	s. d.	s. d.
Woolsorters (day work), per week	32 0	66 8
Men box minders	17 6	33 4
Noble comb minders	20 0	39 7
Can gill minders	12 6	29 2
Drawers	12 6	29 2
Rovers	11 0	29 2
Spinning overlookers	30 0	62 6
Girl spinners (according to number of spindles)	11 3	25 6
Doffers	9 0	18 9
Girl twisters	11 0	29 2
Girl warpers	13 0	33 4
Weavers	15 10	46 9
Weaving overlookers	36 0	66 8
Joiners	31 10	62 6
Mechanics	30 0	62 6
Stokers	25 0	50 0

WHICH IS BEST FOR THE TOILER?

When the extra cost of living is taken into consideration with the high wages received can the Greystone workmen's oft-repeated assertions be questioned, viz, that they "can save more in America than they could earn in England"? The "dear-loaf" bogy does not frighten the American workman. I ask the British workman whether he would not rather pay a trifle more for "everyday necessary articles of food," as the Greystonian does, and have a substantial sum to put away at the end of every week, or have a "cheap loaf," low wages, and irregular work, and, as one Yorkshire housewife put it, "a scrattin' on."

I know it is most difficult for anyone who has not visited the States to realize how well off the working classes are out there. A family who lived in very straitened circumstances in Bradford went to America and at Greystone Mills earned £17 9s. 4d. per week. I have never known a workman return to live in England, excepting for family reasons, poor health, homesickness, or through being a wastrel. Even then I doubt if 2 per cent return. The statements I have made are not based on conclusions drawn from reading either free-trade or protectionist literature. They are based on actual daily practical experience.

I say to the electors, think for yourselves, and if you desire to improve your position, receive higher wages, and have more constant employment, like hundreds who have emigrated from the Bradford district to the United States of America, then vote for the tariff-reform candidate.

I am, etc., HARRISON BENN.

AGRICULTURE IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. Chairman, so often is Pennsylvania referred to as a beneficiary of the tariff that I feel it due to the misinformed farmers of the country to say a word about that State. It is true that Pennsylvania has profited by protection, but it is equally true that every other State in this Union has advanced in proportion. Witness the energetic and hustling West and the hopeful and rapidly developing South. We do not envy you, nor do we believe you can go back upon your own industries. You of the South, especially, because of your climate and resources, will some day be rivals in the great American market for manufactures. And for one I hope the day will come speedily, for I believe it will mean the regeneration of the South and a removal of those alleged barriers that sometimes seem to prevail as between us.

But Pennsylvania—she has had certain natural advantages, being the greatest anthracite coal producer of the country; she has fought her way to her present prominence by industry and thrift, so commendable and conspicuous as to make mockery of the political assaults that are often directed against her. She is small in area, one of the smallest of all the States of the Union, yet her population is equal to that of the great Canadian country about which we have given ourselves so much concern. Pennsylvania came into the Union second in population and importance, and, while yielding then to Virginia and yielding now to New York, she has maintained second place from the beginning of American history. She held first place in the production of coal, iron, steel, petroleum, and textiles, and in the output of these has contributed to the wealth and happiness of the world. She has more than that to commend her. Pennsylvania is out of debt. She spends thirty-four millions annually upon public education.

GOOD FARMS IN THE KEYSTONE STATE.

But it is to the Pennsylvania farmer that I direct your attention. We have 19,000,000 acres of farm land in Pennsylvania, and according to the census of 1900—that of 1910 not being sufficiently advanced to give complete statistics for the State—68.2 per cent of that land was improved. And I will state that very much of the unimproved land has gone into a great forest reserve of nearly a million acres, which the State maintains without regard to the Government's generosity in supporting State forest reserves in other sections of the country, where now and then the unthinking inveigh against the "great corporations" and the "grasping tendencies of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman permit a question? I understood the gentleman to say the land was worth $60 an acre.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I said you could get land at $60 an acre within 25 miles of the city of Philadelphia, just as fertile and much nearer the market than some of that for which our friends are going to Canada.

Mr. SIMS. It is good land?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very good land. There has been an extraordinary development in the western country, that great Middle West the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] so frequently and so proudly speaks about, but during the past 10 years that country has grown so rapidly that perhaps the average prosperous farmer has overlooked a little the staid and steady Quakers, who are still going on with their business enterprises and their agricultural pursuits in Pennsylvania and the East. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We wish them well. We have always wished them well. They have taken from us much of the best bone and fiber of our Commonwealth. They represent the native Americanism, and we rejoice in their prosperity. But sometimes it seems a question whether they remember all, and whether, in their youth and in their earnestness and their ability to do things, they do not forget that we are still in existence, doing the best we can and contributing our share to the progress of this Nation and to its fame throughout the world.

DESERVE WELL OF THE COUNTRY.

Think of this, my friends of the Middle West and the South! Pennsylvania, an industrial State, rich in coal and iron and steel, was tenth in the production of wheat, about which you have been telling us so much in your disputes as to whether the price was fixed at Liverpool, or Winnipeg, or Halifax. We have hardly thought of wheat in Pennsylvania, except as we have wanted to see you protected in your industry in raising wheat. We have paid the same old price per loaf of bread through all your fluctuations in the price of wheat from 60 cents to $1.25 per bushel. We have had other things to do in that State, and so many of them that wheat has been incidental, except as we have been buying it from you and feeding it to our people, proud of the knowledge that we were able to spend the money that we were making, in building you up in the Middle West and South, and taking your product rather than to have you ship it into foreign markets. [Applause.]

Our farm property in 1900 was valued at more than $1,051,000,000. That figure was exceeded then only by Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, and New York in the order named, and it represented one-twentieth of all the farm property of the country. Owing to the growth of the Middle West in the last 10 years, we may not hold that position now. But in 1909 we produced 48,000,000 bushels of corn. We were fifth in 1909 in the production of hay. The State turned out more than 3,742,000 tons, and was exceeded only by Iowa, New York; Illinois, and Ohio. The Tennessee tobacco crop for 1909 was 53,000,000 pounds. Pennsylvania produced 30,000,000 pounds. Surely we have some interest in agricultural development if we can approach so closely the output of Tennessee in her great staple. But even here I am reminded, when you talk of monopolies in the manufacturing world and shake your fists at "hydra-headed trusts and combinations," that you do not hesitate even from the agrarian point of view to limit your output of tobacco so that good prices may be obtained; nor do you hesitate farther South to pass resolutions limiting the area in which cotton shall be grown, for no other purpose in the world than to obtain not cheaper but higher prices. [Applause on the Republican side.]

GOOD PRICES VERSUS CHEAPNESS.

But I believe in fair prices for all American commodities that are the product of our labor, including cotton. Potatoes are imported through the port of Philadelphia from foreign countries. They are produced abroad in certain seasons cheaper than they are produced here. I am glad a duty is levied on these potatoes sufficient to bring the foreign price up to the American price. If we are able to make the wages to pay the American price, we would rather pay well than to grind down the grower. This question comes home to every section of the country, as it does to Pennsylvania, for in that State in 1909 we produced 24,000,000 bushels, the crop being exceeded only by those of New York, Michigan, Maine, and Wisconsin. There is another product of Pennsylvania worth mentioning. I have not the most recent census figures as to dairy products and butter and cheese, but in 1900 we produced 74,000,000 pounds of butter and cheese, yielding only to the supremacy of Ohio and New York. In fact, Pennsylvania produced about one-fourteenth of all the butter and cheese made in the United States in 1900, and during the same year only six States exceeded Pennsylvania in the production of eggs and poultry.

Now, it would seem, Mr. Chairman, that these figures would entitle any Representative of the State to speak out for Pennsylvania as an agricultural State.

WEALTH IN MANUFACTURES.

We are certainly able to discuss agriculture with the best of the Middle West or Southern States, and have no reason to be ashamed of our progress as tillers of the soil; but much of this State's substantial growth has been overlooked because of our prominent position in the industrial world. And what is our industrial status? In 1905 the census showed a wealth production in manufactures for the Nation of $15,000,000,000. In Pennsylvania alone we produced about $2,000,000,000 of that wealth, or one-seventh of the entire wealth production of this great country.

And it is this great wealth production in the factory, on the farm, and from the mine that has gone out to enrich the country through the wages and earnings we were able to make for the purchase of the products of the soil. It is idle under these circumstances to attempt to array the farmer against the industrialist in Pennsylvania, as it would be futile to attempt to line up class against class or trade against trade throughout the country. There may be evils in Pennsylvania, as there are in every other State, but we do not seek destruction of our wealth and property to remedy our defects. You and I are sent into this great House to enact laws for the government of the people and the control of lawlessness, whether it appears in the individual or in the corporate form, and we are ourselves lax if we fail to provide for the correction of abuses by law, as is the administrative arm of the Government if enacted law falls of enforcement.

KEEP THE WAGE EARNER EMPLOYED.

Oh, it is most important, Mr. Chairman, if we are to have social and domestic peace and progress, that we keep the wage earner profitably employed. Good wages and an ability to buy free and generously is far more to be preferred than cheapness and stagnation. But before we leave the farmer I want to remind him again of his duty to himself with regard to this free-trade measure. No matter what his feeling may be con-

cerning reciprocity, no matter what the differences, aggravated by demagogy and unwisdom, may have been in the past, the farmer can not now afford, even if he would, to be inconsiderate of the industrialist, lest he "spite his own face." We have heard so much of wheat and the effect of Canadian reciprocity upon this product that I am impelled to submit a simple statement, compiled from Bradstreet's Journal, giving the average prices of bread and wheat for a period of years:

	New York.	
	Bread per loaf.	Wheat per bushel.
	Cents.	
July 1, 1896	4	$0.64⅜
Feb. 1, 1900	4	.64⅜
Mar. 1, 1907	4	.83
Nov. 1, 1908	4	1.08½
Nov. 1, 1909	4	1.23½
Nov. 1, 1910	4	.96

By this simple statement is the dependence of the farmer upon the city dweller clearly shown. Wheat went up, and wheat went down; but the price of bread was just the same. It mattered not to us in the cities whether you were getting 64 cents or $1.25 a bushel for wheat, we had to have the loaf and we had to pay the bill. It is beside the question to complain of the cost of transportation or the profits of the middleman. They may have been justly or unjustly earned; we had to have our daily bread, and we had to pay the same old price. I have never known the industrialist to be unreasonable when he knew the truth, and I do not believe the farmer will be. Why should he rail against the man in the city? He is better off to-day than he was yesterday; there are fewer mortgages on the farms and greater comforts and conveniences abound. Surely the farmer has been getting his share along with the man in town, but lest there be some doubting Thomas still, let me draw upon the statistics of the Bureau of Labor for a few concrete examples of the manner in which we mutually progress.

OBJECT LESSONS IN VALUES.

In 1896, 10 bushels of corn would buy 59 pounds of granulated sugar. In 1910 that same 10 bushels of corn would buy 131 pounds of granulated sugar, or more than twice as much.

In 1896, 20 bushels of rye would buy 142 yards of gingham. In 1910 that same 20 bushels of rye would buy 226 yards of gingham.

We make gingham in my city, and the question is whether we are getting as much for our gingham as we ought to get. The moment the duty is lowered, either upon gingham or hosiery, there is an influx of foreign manufactures, made at a lower wage abroad, and in the case of hosiery it has happened that, notwithstanding we obtained some additional protection in the last tariff bill, the price of production in Germany has been reduced to such an extent that they are still able to send over here large invoices of foreign-made hosiery, thus preventing the American workingman and manufacturer from getting the full measure of the protection it was intended he should have.

But here is another illustration that should have weight: In 1896, according to these same statistics of the Bureau of Labor, one hog weighing 1,300 pounds would buy 180 yards of cotton flannel. In 1910 that same hog would buy 353 yards of cotton flannel, or about twice as much. It is evident that the price of cotton flannel has gone down, due to a protective tariff, or that the price of the American hog has gone up. That the tariff is in any way responsible for the increase in prices is a proposition that will not bear scrutiny.

"THATCHED-COTTAGE" SPEECHES AND COLD FACTS.

I trust the farmer who has been listening to the "thatched-cottage" speeches of some of our Democratic friends will note from these examples, the interdependence of the two great wealth-producing factors of our country—the farmer and the man who feeds upon the products of the farm. No specious argument nor any quibbling upon constitutional questions can appease these two breadwinners when it comes to the potato bin, the smokehouse, or the family market basket. And if the actual producer in either direction permits himself to be deceived it will not take long for him to realize his error.

But some one says "What about tea and coffee and sugar and oil which the farmer uses?" Well, let us discuss them all for a moment.

We impose no duty upon tea or coffee. Wherein, therefore, is the tariff responsible for the high price of tea and coffee? Coffee comes into the United States at about 8 cents a pound. What do you pay for it? Tea comes in as low as 11 cents a pound. How much do you pay for tea? There is no tariff upon either article.

Or let us take sugar and oil, which are supposed to be controlled by the very worst kind of trusts. There is a duty upon sugar and it produces a great deal of revenue, but notwithstanding the great sums of money that have gone into the construction of sugar and oil refineries, necessitating the employment of hundreds of thousands of men and women, the making of machinery, and the construction of ships, the price of both these commodities has been enormously reduced.

When I was a boy we bought brown sugar, in brown bags, and went after it ourselves, for 13 and 14 cents a pound. Much of it was refined through the bare feet of the natives of Jamaica and the West Indies. To-day, notwithstanding the existence of large corporations, the average housewife can order sugar from the grocer over the telephone, have it sent in a highly ornamented delivery wagon, refined and purified by the most scientific processes, all wrapped up in white paper and tied with a string of white and gold, for 5½ cents a pound.

SOMETHING ABOUT SUGAR AND OIL.

Would you go back to the old method of obtaining sugar at the old price, merely to get even with the refiners who have systematized the sugar business? I guess not. And if we were to take the duty off sugar, who would be benefited? Do you think for a moment the farmer pays the $60,000,000 revenue when he buys sugar for 5 and 5½ cents a pound? If you do, be assured that the sugar importer is your best friend and the great middlemen of New York are with you in the desire to give you relief? In common with other Members of the House I have received the most pitiful appeals "in behalf of the American farmer" from the great importing warehouses, and I am persuaded that if the duty is removed there will be no reduction in the price of sugar to the consumer, but $60,000,000, which is now taken from the importer, will be transplanted from the Treasury of the United States into the capacious pockets of the combination which is now appealing so valiantly in the farmers' behalf. Would you rather the importer should pay the $60,000,000, or would you rather have it made up in some other way, yet to be devised by the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means?

But let us not forget oil. Petroleum was an unknown commodity in this country until discovered in Pennsylvania. Of what value to the owner or the tiller of the soil was the oil underneath, until the mechanic came with his drills and his pumps? And of what value was the gritty, dirty product, until the refiner came with his hundreds of thousands and millions of capital to refine and purify and market it? Oil became valuable only as it was treated by those who were not the original owners of the soil.

But the owner participated in the development, and profits and royalties followed, and farmers' sons were lifted from mediocrity and drudgery to new and laudable ambitions and occupations, which aided in our common expansion.

Punish the great corporation that violates the law, or that plays unfair in its dealings with the public, but bear in mind our modest beginnings, and the need we had for the man of genius and broad ideas to fashion the crude material into a finished product, and make it serviceable to a world in which it had hitherto been useless.

Merely for information, and to bring us back to a reasonable basis of discussion upon the question of oil, I refer to this simple incident:

Some time ago, in Troy, Pa., I met a gentleman who told me he started in business in that town 44 years ago that day. I asked him what line he pursued. He said he started to sell oil. I asked him what he got for oil 44 years ago, for that was close to the sperm-oil days. He answered that he put the oil upon the station platform and the farmer came and got it for 60 cents a gallon. That oil was not purified and refined and delivered as it is to-day, and yet that oil, under existing conditions, can be had now for 12 cents a gallon retail. Evidently our friends who are charging the tariff with the responsibility for high prices, have slipped a cog in the matter of sugar and oil and tea and coffee.

RAILROAD MONEY IN CIRCULATION.

Why, Mr. Chairman, regardless of all you say against them, when a Rogers or a Rockefeller dies the world goes on the same. Their money goes not with them. If it did, great corporations would go out of business, railroads would disband, and thousands upon thousands of men would be thrown back upon their own resources. The money of these men, whether rightfully made or wrongfully made, remains in public use. It is kept in circulation and does the whole community good. It enters

directly into the wage account and establishes the farmers' market. I have often heard from this floor assaults upon such concerns as the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. No matter whether it offends in some particular or not, it is still the accumulator and the distributer of vast capital, which after all, it should be remembered, is the real inspiration of labor. If Edison had not invented the electric light we might still be without that great boon, regardless of the fact that a thousand, yea a hundred thousand, envious Edisons, now fully informed as to the value of electricity, declare they would have worked out the problem, if Edison had not. So we may account for some of the critics who can better manage railroads and corporations than they are now managed, and so it may be with those who assail the Pennsylvania Railroad. But where does the capital come from that makes the Pennsylvania Railroad? I have sent for a report, and find there are 65,000 shareholders, who have faith enough in the company to risk their money with it. They are dependent for the return of every dollar they advance, upon the developing power of the railroad to bring the factory and the farm together.

And these 65,000 shareholders are not all rich men, nor are they centered in any one State or country. More than 30,000 of them are women, and many others are executors of estates and trustees or guardians for children. You do not, when you unjustly agitate against a railroad, do it so much injury as you tend to destroy the security of the savings of tens of thousands, and the wages of hundreds of thousands of employees.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I very much regret that I can not. I would like to yield, but I have not the time. If I could be given a little more time, I would be very glad to do so.

A REMARKABLE SAVING FUND.

There is another side to this story, Mr. Chairman, which I should like to introduce. In the wage-earning, food-consuming city of Philadelphia we have 350,000 separate homes. Not apartment houses, but separate dwellings, where each man stands with his family, the sovereign of his home. These separate dwellings alone are equal to the total population of the District of Columbia. Many of them have been acquired by their occupants through the building associations and many of them through savings which they have been able to lay away.

But there is an institution in my city to which I must refer. It provides not the story of the rich man, but the story of the thrifty poor. I know of no society so unique in financial history as the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society. It is one of several of the same kind which we encourage in the city of Philadelphia and to which we refer with pride. An organization intended to encourage savings, it was incorporated in 1824, and from that time to this has accepted deposits from the working people, receiving no more than $500 from any one depositor in any one year. On the 1st of January last there were 273,320 depositors in this institution, and that number has since been increased to more than 276,000. These men, women, and children, who have no telephones or automobiles, are the owners of $111,000,000. Almost every nationality is represented by these depositors, the major number, of course, being natives of the United States. Wage earners predominate, and women and children are conspicuous amongst those who have adopted this method of saving against a rainy day.

SMALL INVESTORS BUILD RAILROADS.

I have here a table showing the occupations of the depositors who opened accounts with the society during 1910:

Males:	
Wage earners	11,980
Salaried employees	6,825
Agriculturists	570
Professional men	345
Business men	1,939
Minors	484
No occupation	1,001
Total	23,144
Females:	
Wage earners	3,856
Wives of wage earners	6,344
Wives of salaried employees	3,684
Business women	16
Professional women	46
Domestic servants	2,826
Salaried employees	1,562
Minors	244
No occupation	4,618
Total	23,196
Males	23,144
Females	23,196
Total	46,340

When wage earners and their wives, whose deposits are necessarily small, appear in such large numbers in one institution in one year it speaks well for the faith and stability of the breadwinners of the country; but if we look deeper into the subject we will again find that, after all, it is this same breadwinner who stands behind the great undertakings which give play to the activities of the captains of industry. Where do the deposits of the wage earners of this single institution go? There must be some earning power to those deposits, for interest is regularly paid upon them to the depositor, and he, in turn, has become the investor. The District of Columbia has $500,000 of that money. It was employed in improving and beautifying the Capital City. Sixty-five other States, cities, and boroughs throughout the country—not in Pennsylvania alone, but in all sections of the United States—have borrowed more than $25,000,000 of those savings to build schoolhouses and highways and sewers and needed public improvements. And every man who worked in any one of those communities was a consumer of the products of the farm.

But this is not all. The money of these Philadelphia savings-fund depositors—these wage earners of my city—has gone into the development of the Middle West and the South in the construction and maintenance of railroads that have made the farm profitable.

It is this substantial and unseen interest of the working people of this country in its general development that I would draw to the attention of the House. The poor man is as deeply interested in legislation affecting our national prosperity as is the man of wealth. Whatever injures one as a body will affect the other, and if by reciprocity or free trade we transfer to other countries that which we have mutually built up for ourselves we injure neither class alone—we injure all. [Applause on the Republican side.]

CONSTRUCTIVE INFLUENCE OF WAGES.

Numerous railroads enjoy the confidence of these workingmen of my city, and they are paying upon the bonds they have issued, the interest they promised to pay, which affords a return to the wage-earning depositors. That it may be understood how far-reaching and beneficial is the effect upon the whole country of the wage-earning power in a small part of a single city, I insert, without reading, a list of the railroads gridironing the country which are indirectly encouraged and promoted by the workmen depositors of the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society:

Alabama Central Railroad Co. (Southern).
Alabama Great Southern Railroad Co. (Southern).
Allegheny Valley Railway Co.
Allegheny & Western Railway Co.
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. of South Carolina.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.
Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co. (main line).
Baltimore & Potomac Railroad Co. (tunnel).
Beech Creek Railroad Co. (New York Central).
Brooklyn & Montauk Railroad Co. (Long Island).
Camden & Atlantic Railroad Co.
Canada Southern Railway Co.
Catawissa Railroad Co.
Central of Georgia Railway Co. (Mobile division).
Central Pacific Railway Co.
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (Illinois division).
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co.
Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.
Cleveland & Pittsburg Railroad Co.
Columbus & Toledo Railroad Co. (Hocking Valley).
Continental Passenger Railway Co.
Delaware River Railroad & Bridge Co. (Pennsylvania).
Easton & Amboy Railroad Co.
Elmira, Cortland & Northern Railroad Co. (Lehigh Valley).
Harrisburg, Portsmouth, Mount Joy & Lancaster Railroad Co. (Pennsylvania).
Jefferson Railroad Co. (Erie).
Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway Co.
Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.
Lehigh Valley Railway Co. of New York.
Long Island Railroad Co.
New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co.
New York & Erie Railroad Co.
New York, Lackawanna & Western Railway Co.
Norfolk & Western Railway Co.
Northern Central Railway Co.
Northern Pacific Railway Co.
North Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
Ohio Connecting Railway Co. (Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis).
Pennsylvania Co.
Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
Pennsylvania & New York Canal & Railroad Co.
Perkiomen Railroad Co. (Reading).
Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co.
Philadelphia & Erie Railroad Co.
Philadelphia & Reading Railroad Co.
Philadelphia, Wilmington & Baltimore Railroad Co.
Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Co.
Pittsburg, Virginia & Charleston Railway Co. (Pennsylvania).
St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railway Co.
Schuylkill River East Side Railroad Co.

South Carolina & Georgia Railroad Co. (Southern).
Southern Pacific Railroad Co. of California.
Southern Pacific Railroad Co. of New Mexico.
Steubenville & Indiana Railroad Co. (Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis).
Union Pacific Railroad Co.
United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co.
Virginia Midland Railway Co. (Southern).
Wabash Railroad Co. (Detroit & Chicago extension).
Washington Terminal Co.
Western North Carolina Railroad Co. (Southern).
Western Pennsylvania Railroad Co.
West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Co.
West Shore Railroad Co.

WHAT FREE TRADE MEANS TO THE HOME.

And now, Mr. Chairman, in the short time I have remaining I want to show what this so-called farmers' free-trade bill means to the wage earner, as well as to the farmer. The excuse for this bill, as explained by the Democratic leaders, is that it will "relieve the farmer of taxation" at the customhouse. This is familiar but discredited Democratic doctrine. During the last fiscal year we collected at the customhouses a tariff upon imports from foreign countries from importers and jobbers who were well able to pay, a total approximating $330,000,000. This represented one-third of all our revenue, and the importer who felt the necessity of going abroad to spend his money paid it. In the collection of that tariff we avoided internal or direct taxation upon the people for one thing, and, for another thing, kept our mills running and our workmen employed. Now the Democrats propose to change this condition and lop off $10,000,000 of that revenue, which must be replaced in some other way, upon the pretense that farm implements and other commodities used by the farmer may be admitted free. Well, we can get at this whole question very quickly by a rough and ready calculation. If we concede the Democratic contention that the tariff is a tax, what does the whole thing amount to so far as the masses of the people are concerned? Divide the entire $330,000,000 by our 90,000,000 of population and you will find that the "great burden" upon the people of this land amounts to about $3.70 apiece per annum. Total abstinence from one hour's ride in an automobile or from one theater party in one year would wipe out that score if applied directly to the individual. Yes; one good Democratic dinner once a year in one first-class hotel in Washington would pay the bill. Or, if we were to calculate "the great economy" which reciprocity and free trade are to bring us through Democratic auspices, regardless of the direct loss to all the people in capital and labor, it would, if amounting in the aggregate to $15,000,000, represent a saving to the individual of the price of three cheap cigars in one whole year.

WHERE THE SHOE PINCHES.

But let us take up the bill which now bears the name of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and see where it leads us. It puts upon the free list, first of all, "agricultural implements." And what was the duty collected at the customhouses on these important articles during the last fiscal year, 1905, for which we are given comparative figures? Why just exactly $2,775. That was all the Government received from the importer, and that is the amount which our Democratic friends propose to save to the American farmer. Why, Mr. Chairman, if the Democratic Party which is now in control of this House would put up at public vendue the automobile which former Speaker CANNON has turned over to Speaker CLARK, and which the gentleman from Missouri thus far declines to use, the American farmer, as well as the entire country, would be immediately relieved of this awful tax. [Laughter.]

And where does the workingman come in on this proposition? Let the farmer reason this out for himself. There were 648 establishments in the United States engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements in 1905, and the total capital invested was $196,741,000. The total number of wage earners employed in these establishments was 47,394. They were all consumers in the sense that they purchased the products of the farm. You propose now to jeopardize these American manufactories and the wages of the men employed in them to save $2,775 at the customhouses.

CALCUTTA CAN MAKE CHEAP BAGGING.

But when it comes to bagging for cotton, sacks, burlaps, and so forth, which are used by the cotton planter exclusively, what are the facts? The duties here amounted to $4,879,870; on cotton ties, $2,576. Here is a full half of the entire ten millions to be saved, and I ask where the American farmer, outside of the cotton belt, comes in? I can not now give the figures showing the number of hoop and band iron workers engaged in the manufacture of cotton ties, but I shall submit a statement prepared at the Census Office bearing upon this subject.

I am able, however, to state that the census of 1905 showed that we had 16 establishments in the United States manufacturing jute and jute goods; that they had invested upward of $11,000,000, and that they employed at American wages more than 6,000 men and women. Since that census was made other establishments have been reared nearer to the cotton fields, employing labor in that vicinity, which is now distressed, because the removal of the duty upon these commodities used by the cotton planter means the elimination of the American manufactures and the introduction into this country of the output of the cheap and miserable labor of Calcutta.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One minute more.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one more minute to the gentleman.

THE INDUSTRIES TO BE HIT.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In this last minute I propose to introduce a statement prepared by the Census Bureau at my instance, showing, paragraph by paragraph, so far as possible, the tremendous importance to industry of this free-trade "entering wedge":

Total for the United States for certain selected industries.

[Census of 1905 (calendar year 1904).]

Industry.	Number of establishments.	Capital.	Average number of wage earners.	Value of product.
Total	63,994	$2,178,109,000	1,079,052	$3,707,234,000
Agricultural implements	648	196,741,000	47,394	112,007,000
Carriages and wagons	5,588	152,345,000	77,882	155,869,000
Jute and jute goods	16	11,019,000	6,083	9,066,000
Leather, tanned, curried, and finished	1,049	242,584,000	57,239	252,621,000
Boots and shoes	1,316	122,526,000	149,924	320,107,000
Saddlery and harness	1,076	29,264,000	15,032	42,055,000
Slaughtering and meat packing, wholesale	929	237,715,000	74,134	913,914,000
Flour and grist mill products	10,051	265,117,000	39,110	713,033,000
Food preparations	766	51,784,000	11,333	61,180,000
Bread and other bakery products	18,227	122,363,000	81,284	209,609,000
Lumber and timber products	24,136	694,370,000	502,300	827,465,000
Sewing machines and attachments	46	26,695,000	12,671	20,870,000
Salt	146	25,586,000	4,666	9,438,000

Hoop and band iron and similar products are manufactured very largely in rolling mills and steel works, and it is impossible to compile statistics of capital, employees, and total value of products as distinct from other branches of work carried on in the same establishments; however, hoops, bands, and cotton ties were reported in 1904 from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Alabama; Pennsylvania produced 200,461 tons; Ohio, 102,823 tons; and the other 4 States, the remaining 33,939 tons. Skelp was produced by Pennsylvania to the extent of 1,058,588 tons, or two-thirds of the product of the country. Ohio made 211,624 tons; West Virginia, 192,644 tons; and Illinois, Connecticut, and New York produced the remaining 94,834 tons.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, etc., are manufactured very largely in rolling mills and steel works under the same conditions as hoop iron. The total value of wire and wire products for these mills and for other establishments manufacturing wire and wire products independently of rolling mills, was, for the year 1904, approximately $83,354,000.

MORE THAN A MILLION MEN INVOLVED.

These figures are based upon the census of 1905 and will doubtless be vastly increased when the new census is completed. They are significant, and I commend them to the careful attention of every Member of this House, and to every citizen who may hereafter be called upon to vote upon these questions at the polls. In this mere free-trade "entering wedge" you strike at 63,994 establishments, capitalized at more than $2,000,000,000, with an annual product in 1905 of more than $3,700,000,000. And the number of wage earners employed—and this, from my point of view, is the most serious aspect of the entire controversy—was in excess of 1,079,000. Why, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, 1,000,000 wage earners means 1,000,000 families of 5 persons each. You are striking not only the wages of 1,000,000 men, but the consuming capacity of 5,000,000 souls, and this is only the beginning!

It is no time for the man in the West or the man in the South to stand against his brother in the East. If he grieves at abuses, let him look to the law and the administration of the law. To invoke the foreign corrective of free trade will be but to hurl the deadly boomerang, which recoils upon the thrower. We can not compete against the foreign manufacturer and yet maintain the American wage. And if we can not maintain that wage, we surely can not sustain the purchasing power which has afforded prosperity to the tiller of the soil. We want to continue to buy your eggs and your beef and your flour, and we want to continue to sell to you our textiles, our machinery, and our farming implements. We have been interdependent in our industrial and agricultural relations, and it is to be hoped that

the pressure of Democratic oratory may not divide us, nor prompt us, in theory or in practice, to "kill the goose that lays the golden egg." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, as a farmer I rejoice in the great interest that has been manifested in this debate in behalf of the farmers of the United States.

This safeguarding of the farmers' interests is due in large measure to the fact that the farmers of the country are organized, and it is not amiss to say that they are organized for the sole purpose of securing a square deal, which has long been denied them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I hope the day will soon come when the farmers of the Nation will come into the full possession of all the benefits which are justly due them from all branches of one great government.

As a farmer, one among the few farmers in this House, I favored Canadian reciprocity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As a Democrat I could figure no other course consistent with the declarations of my party in national council and in caucus in this House.

As a farmer I heartily indorse the bill now pending before this body, for the main reason that the farmers of this country will receive untold benefits from its passage.

As a Democrat I favor its enactment into law, because it is the redemption of one more pledge to the people by our party. So far as this House is concerned—which is the only branch of the Government we now control—I think I can safely predict the absolute fulfillment of every promise, which, when accomplished, will give us next year absolute control of all branches of this great Government. Our record so far justifies this belief and this hope. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Canadian-reciprocity agreement, of course, only applies to Canada. This bill applies to the whole world. Should any harm come from the first, the good of the second will largely predominate.

No harm will come from the first to the farmer, but great blessings will flow to him from the second.

Canadian reciprocity will prove a blessing; this free list will prove a godsend to the American farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I favored Canadian reciprocity because in agricultural products the balance of trade between Canada and the United States was largely in our favor. I will vote for this bill because in great measure it weakens the power of many great trusts which have plundered the farmer.

I favored Canadian reciprocity because it was the beginning of the end of the protective-tariff system. I favor this measure because it means the prosperity of the farmer and because it shows that the Democratic Party is the only sincere friend the farmer has in this country in national legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

With no financial investment of any character save in farming operations, with no knowlege of any profession save farming—and it is one of man's noblest professions—I am willing to risk my destiny on the policies outlined by my party. If failure comes, it will not be because of Democratic policies.

I have labored hard for the welfare of the farmer. I have given my time and means for his advancement. I am here because the farmers of my district trusted me. That trust is sacred to me. Their interest and their welfare is always uppermost in my mind; and as God has given me the light to see, I will advance their interest by my vote for this measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The tariff-protected interests of this country have met defeat because of their greed to oppress the people upon the necessities of life. The farmers of this country produce the main sustenance of human life—bread and meat. Any policy which demands more than a reasonable price for these two great foods must bring disaster to the farmer, because he is but one-third of our population, and our form of government is majority rule. It has never been the policy of the organized farmers of this country to ask anything save a reasonable price for their products. There is nothing in this bill to prevent a reasonable and profitable price for farm products, but there are many items which insure a reasonable price for what the farmer consumes, and this will prove profitable as well as novel to the American farmer.

The protective tariff on farm products is admitted a myth by Republican leaders; the taking away of the protective tariff from farm consumption of manufactured articles is but simple justice and true reciprocity as between the farmer and other classes.

Levy no tax save for revenue only.

As the farmer receives no benefit from the nominal tax on his production, he should not be burdened with a real tax upon his consumption.

To secure profits by legislation for any class means that other classes must be oppressed. It should never be the policy of our Government to grant special favors to special classes. This bill grants no special favor to the farmer in giving him many articles on the free list for his consumption, because his production has been on the free list, in effect, at all times.

This bill perfects the Democratic idea that as the farmer has always sold in the free markets of the world he should have the right to buy in the free markets of the world.

Considering the investment in money, the uncertainty of crop maturity, the great mental and physical labor involved, the farmers as a class have reaped but small benefit compared with other lines of business in the Nation.

The main reason for this condition of affairs is due in large measure to the fact that the farmer in his consumption paid heavy tribute to all other lines of business, which under the protective tariff have organized great trusts to plunder him in nearly every article he consumes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This bill is a "trust buster" of the first magnitude, and every Member of this House who is sincere in his professions to curb or break down the trusts should support it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill not only secures benefit to the farmers, but to millions of people in other walks of life, and it must be considered upon a broader plane than affecting only one class of our citizens.

Boots, shoes, harness, beef, veal, mutton, pork, lard, flour, corn meal, biscuit, bread, timber, shingles, sawed boards, sewing machines, salt, and numbers of other articles which are used by every citizen of our great country are put on the free list.

Though commonly called an agricultural free-list bill, its benefits directly reach every person in our cities as well as those upon the farms.

This bill helps to break down the barrier between the city and the farm, because it means increased trade among our people at home. The farmer will know that the value of what he buys is set by the natural law of supply and demand and that he is no longer the prey of his city brother, who has had the advantage over him by the legislation of a protective tariff.

I can not impress the fact too strongly upon the farmers of this country that, in large measure, the prices of their products depends upon their own action. I am a strong believer in farmers' organizations whose object is to secure reasonable prices for farm products. I commend every organization which tries to teach the farmer intelligent methods of marketing his produce. Distribution is a prime factor in the price of farm products.

No one can complain when the farmer, under the law of the land, by legal and honorable methods, by and through his own organizations, secures a reasonable price for his labor and his product.

I will always demand for the farmer a reasonable profit for his product, but to have that profit to come by his own effort and the use of his own sense in the sale of his crop and not by some law which must oppress others to help him.

As I would tear down the legal wall of the protective tariff that oppresses the farmer, so would I vote to wipe out any law which seeks to prevent the farmers from organizing to protect their interests or the laboring man to secure good wages. [Applause on the Democratic side.)

The farmers could by organization bring the balance of the world to their feet, because they have the power to starve by organizing a great trust of meat and bread.

You can not starve the farmer. He can live by himself. He can produce his bread, his meat, his shelter, and his clothes if necessary. Let the farmers of this country issue the order that for 60 days no wheat, no cattle, no hogs, no corn should go to the market and millions of people would face starvation.

The farmer has no desire to use his great power to oppress other people, but he does demand, and rightfully so, a reasonable price for his product and the right to buy unrestricted by arbitrary laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The bill now pending before this House gives him this right. The Democratic Party is responsible for it, and to our party the farmer owes this freedom.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in laying before this House certain legislation which has been enacted in my own State for the benefit of our farmers. I have copies here of State laws which I will print in the RECORD as a guide to other States, and I ask the membership of this House to give them careful consideration. I trust you will have

them adopted in your States. They have rendered untold benefit to Kentucky farmers, and will bring great relief to your farmers if you will adopt them. They have been upheld by the highest court in Kentucky as constitutional. I am glad to say that I had some part in their enactment, and the gentleman from the fourth Kentucky district [Mr. JOHNSON] was largely responsible for the passage of some of these acts.

An act to amend section 3 of an act of the General Assembly of Commonwealth of Kentucky, approved March 21, 1906, entitled "An act permitting persons to combine or pool their crops of wheat, tobacco, and other products and sell same as a whole, and making contracts in pursuance thereof valid," being chapter 117 of the acts of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the year 1906.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That section 3 of an act entitled "An act permitting persons to combine or pool their crops of wheat, tobacco, and other products and sell same as a whole, and making contracts in pursuance thereof valid," approved March 21, 1906, being chapter 117 of the acts of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the year 1906, be, and the same is hereby, amended and reenacted so as to read as follows:

Such persons so entering into such an agreement or contract as is set out in the foregoing section are hereby permitted to select an agent or agents through or by or with whom said parties so entering into such agreement may classify, grade, store, hold, sell, or dispose of said crop, or any of them, and said agent or agents shall have the right to take, receive, hold, store, classify, grade, sell, or dispose of said crop so placed in said agreement for the purpose of accomplishing the object of such combination or agreement between such principals; and contracts and agreements entered into by such agent or agents for the purpose of classifying, grading, storing, holding, selling, or disposing of said crop so combined, united, or pooled, either in parcel or as a whole, are hereby permitted, and shall not, because of any such combination or purpose of such original agreement of such principals so entering into said combination, or of such agent or agents, be declared illegal or invalid. All contracts heretofore made by any person or persons for the purposes set out in the foregoing sections are hereby declared valid, if otherwise legally binding on the parties.

To prevent any breach or violation of any contract made for the purposes set out in the foregoing sections a restraining order and writ of injunction may be written by a proper officer, as prescribed in the Civil Code of Practice.

For any breach or violation of any contract entered into for the purposes set out in the foregoing sections the injured party may recover the damages sustained by him by reason of such violation of such contracts of the person violating the same, and also of any person who shall induce or persuade another to violate such contract, which damages shall include the reasonable expense and attorney's fees incurred by the injured party in prosecuting an action to recover such damages or to prevent a violation of such contract, if the party complaining shall succeed in doing so, which may be recovered in the same action or original proceeding. Said agent, when so selected as herein provided, shall have the sole right to sell said crop so pooled or combined, and it shall be unlawful for any owner of such crop to sell or dispose of same and for any person knowingly to purchase the same without the written consent of such agent, and upon conviction thereof he or they shall be fined in any sum or amount not exceeding $250 for each offense, to be fixed by the jury in their discretion.

SEC. 2. Whereas many crops of tobacco and other products have been combined and pooled in this State under contract and agreement entered into for the purposes set out in the above section an emergency is now declared to exist which requires that this act shall take effect from and after its passage and approval by the governor.

(Approved Mar. 13, 1908.)

An act to prevent the sale or transfer of personal property where the possession is in one person and the title thereto is vested in another.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful for any person having the possession of personal property, the title to which is vested in another, to sell or otherwise dispose of such property without the written consent of the person in whom the title is vested. Any person guilty of such offense shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $500 for each offense. Any person having notice of the manner in which such property is held, who shall purchase it of the person having the possession thereof, or of any other person without the written consent of the person in whom the title is vested, shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $1,000 for each offense.

SEC. 2. An emergency exists for the immediate operation of this law, therefore the same shall be in force from and after its enactment.

(Approved, Mar. 24, 1908.)

An act to amend an act entitled "An act permitting warehousemen to commingle tobacco of like grades," approved March 25, 1908.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That section 3 of an act entitled "An act permitting warehousemen to commingle tobacco of like grades," approved March 25, 1908, be, and the same is, amended, and the said act is amended by adding at the end of section 3 thereof the following words: "And it is provided that any of such warehousemen may in such receipts agree and bind themselves to pay the person rightfully holding same and entitled thereto the value of the property described therein, in the event of loss or damage from any cause while in the possession of such warehousemen."

So that said section when amended will read as follows:

"SEC. 3. All warehouse receipts so issued by any corporation, company, partnership, or individual engaged in the business as above set forth shall be negotiable and transferrable by indorsement in blank or by special indorsement and with like liability as bills of exchange now are and with like remedy thereon. And it is provided that any of such warehousemen may in such receipts agree and bind themselves to pay the person rightfully holding the same and entitled thereto the value of the property described therein, in the event of loss or damage from any cause while in the possession of such warehousemen."

SEC. 2. Inasmuch as the tobacco crop in this Commonwealth is now being delivered to warehousemen, and the growers can not otherwise secure the benefit of this act, an emergency is declared to exist, and this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Approved, Mar. 4, 1910.)

An act to authorize and regulate the recordation of agreements for pooling farm products.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. It shall be lawful for any person or corporation to whom or to which any article of farm products has been pooled or pledged for any purpose to record a list of the persons pooling or pledging same, together with a general description of the land upon which same was grown, or proposed to be grown, in the office of the clerk of the county court of the county in which said land is situated.

SEC. 2. Such recordation shall have the same effect as to creditors or purchasers as the recordation of chattel mortgages.

SEC. 3. Any person buying or soliciting pool or pledged property the list of which have been recorded as herein provided, shall upon conviction be fined not less than $10 nor more than $1,000 or imprisoned not less than 15 nor more than 90 days, or both so fined and imprisoned.

SEC. 4. For recording the agreements herein provided for the clerk shall be allowed a fee of 2 cents for each 20 words.

SEC. 5. Whereas it is greatly to the interest of the farmers of the State that a public record should be kept which shall be notice that their farm products have been pooled or pledged, an emergency is declared, and this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Disapproved, Mar. 8, 1910.)

Passed March 8, 1910, the objections of the governor to the contrary notwithstanding.

An act to declare lawful agreements to abstain growing crops of any given kind for any definite period.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That it shall be lawful for the growers of any kind of farm products to agree to abstain from growing any kind of crops for any given period or season.

(Neither approved nor disapproved by the governor.)

An act to further regulate the pooling of farm products.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared lawful for any number of persons to combine, unite, or pool any or all of the crops of wheat, tobacco, corn, oats, hay, or other farm products raised by them, or proposed to be raised by them, whether or not the said crops have been sowed, set, pitched, or planted, for the purpose of classifying, grading, storing, holding, selling, or disposing of same, either in parcels or as a whole, in order or for the purpose of obtaining a greater or higher price therefor than they might or could obtain or receive by selling said crops separately or individually.

SEC. 2. Whereas it is greatly to the interest of the farmers of the Commonwealth and a public generally that the privilege defined in section 1 of this act should be speedily declared, an emergency is declared to exist, and this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

(Neither approved nor disapproved by the governor.)

Almost every article placed on the free list in this bill is controlled by some great trust. The American people for years have taxed themselves to build up these great trusts, and now that they have grown to be oppressive industrial giants, more than able to defend themselves in the markets of the world, it is time for the people to cease taxing themselves and demand justice from their own creations which seek to destroy them.

One of the fundamental principles of Democracy is "the greatest good to the greatest number." There will never be a downward revision of the tariff in the interest of all of the people so long as each individual Member upon this floor seeks to protect some special interest in his district. If necessity demands, we must be willing to make some personal sacrifice for the common good of our great country. I have the honor to represent the great hemp-producing district in the United States. The production of hemp in the United States has been confined almost entirely to the Blue Grass region of Kentucky. The placing of India hemp, or jute, upon the free list has, in effect, put our farmers out of business on that crop. Yet our farmers have not come to Congress with a single petition asking for a duty on jute.

The placing of a protective duty on jute means a higher price for hemp, but it also means a higher price for the twine of the grain growers, for the burlap of the cotton growers, for the cordage of the entire Nation, and our people are not selfish enough to ask that a tax be placed upon every farmer of the Nation in order that they might add some value to their hemp crop. I commend the patriotic spirit of the people whom I represent. We are willing to contribute our share to a downward revision of the tariff in order to lighten the burden of labor and agriculture, so long overburdened with unjust taxation.

I desire to add to my remarks a note on the hemp crop, which I will not take time to read, but will put it in the RECORD.

The loss of revenue to the Government under this bill is $10,028,989. This amount is inconsiderable in comparison with the great saving and advantage to all of our people. By the policy of economy which the Democratic Party proposes to inaugurate there will not be the great demand for revenue, and

this amount will not be missed. The cutting off of one battleship will fill up the gap caused by this free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Kentuckians are always for peace, and especially on water. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The American farmer has been unnecessarily frightened by Canadian reciprocity. My belief is that the farmer will receive a benefit therefrom. A Republican President (not his party) and a Democratic House can share the honors of Canadian reciprocity. This bill was drawn and will be passed by the united Democratic Party upon this floor. If defeat comes in the Senate or the veto comes from the White House, it will strike a deadly blow at the home of every farmer and laboring man in the Nation. I trust for once at least the Republican Party will forget partisan politics and give agriculture and labor their just due.

The Democracy did not hesitate to vote for Canadian reciprocity for the reason that it was recommended by a Republican President. With dignity and patriotism we met the issue and saved a Republican President from disgrace and humiliation at the hands of his own party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

To-day we present this bill for the relief of labor and agriculture. Will the Republican Party, in control of every branch of the Government except this House, permit labor to prosper and agriculture to blossom and ripen into a glorious harvest?

The threat of corporate gold is beginning to be heard on account of the passage of this bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has told this House of the threat of the Steel Trust in his district. No doubt threats to bring on a panic in the Nation will be made in other congressional districts. It is the old story of corporate greed. If the trusts can not rule the country, they will destroy its peace and prosperity.

That threat means a broader controversy than is embodied in this bill. It reaches to the foundation of American Government. The question must be settled, "Which is the greater, the power of the people through their Government or the power of the trusts?" [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The trusts should take heed from the verdict of the American people rendered at the polls last fall. If the trusts of this country undertake to punish the American people for that verdict, they will "have sown the wind and shall reap the whirlwind."

For a great trust to deliberately and maliciously undertake to destroy the peace and prosperity of this Nation is as grave a crime as for the anarchist to strike at the very foundation of Government by murder or treason, and I for one am ready to help write upon the statute books of our land any law sufficient to prevent the deed. It has been shown repeatedly that the Steel Trust and other great trusts of this Nation need no legislative protection.

Their bluffs and their threats should be called by this House and the issue taken direct to the people as to whether they or the trusts are masters. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, by the passage of this bill agriculture will be greatly stimulated. The cry has gone up from the overcrowded cities of "back to the farm." The people now can go back to the farm with new hope and new energy. Our boys and girls can stay on the farms, because the Democratic Party proposes to see to it that they will not be driven away by unjust taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The necessities of the field and home will be put upon the free list, and the farmer boy will no longer be the serf of some great trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmer will gather new inspirations and new joys, and, with good humor and good cheer, bountifully feed the world.

Mr. Chairman, the farmer is the solid rock upon which rests the security of this Nation. It is his labor, his conservatism, his patriotism, which is the great balance wheel in the vast machinery of our national existence. Generous in nature, sound in sense, clean in morals, the American farmer turns back the tide which would sweep us either into plutocracy or into anarchy. In the American farmer is the main hope for the continuation of a democracy. May God stay the day when we forget the farmers.

Nine billions of dollars each year is the contribution of the American farmer to the national wealth!

Surely the Senate and the President will not deny the benefits of this bill to the makers of such magnificent wealth. If they do, there will be a new Senate and a new President at the next election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmers had a hand in the last election; in the next they will have both hands. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Just one year ago, upon the floor of this House, I warned the President against the oppression of the farmer. His administration had dragged Kentucky farmers into the Federal courts and convicted them because they dared to organize to protect themselves from the Tobacco Trust.

At that time I used this language upon the floor of this House:

> Is the President willing to go before the farmers of Ohio in the campaign to be held in that State this fall upon the issue of whether the farmers have the right to fix the price of their products themselves, either singly or collectively?
>
> Is he willing to have brought into the limelight the records of the two worthies believed to be responsible for the prosecution of the Burley Tobacco Society? This question being answered in the affirmative, Judson Harmon ought to be reelected governor of Ohio by a majority of 100,000.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

I missed the figure only 377. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As a Democrat I rejoice at the great work already done in this House for the benefit of all of the people by my party. There is more good yet to come. I rejoice at the solid front we present to the disorganized and dismembered party on the other side. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By organization and by teamwork great victories are ahead of us. Let no Democrat pull back in the harness—harness is on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] With free sewing machines the farmers' wives can sew up our protection friends, the standpatters, in free burlap and salt them away with free salt to keep until the final judgment day. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the hope of the American farmer is in his own organization and in the policies of the Democratic Party. I am a great believer in organization. In referring to a speech I made here in 1909 I find these words:

> When, by organization, the Democrats of the South stand side by side and divide honors with the great States of Ohio and Indiana, and other States North, West, and East that made such Democratic gains in the last election, we can land the Hon. CHAMP CLARK in the Speaker's chair and the White House after that.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

CHAMP CLARK is in the Speaker's chair [applause], and the White House is waiting for a Democrat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, we novices in the art or profession of manufacturing Federal law, subject, of course, to revision by the Senate, the President, the Supreme Court, and the powers above, have eagerly absorbed what has been said and have learned much that can not possibly be true. How could it all be true when judged by the votes on the reciprocity treaty and by the explanations given for those votes? There is no consensus of opinion on either side of the House, even amongst the most experienced and tutored as to the causes or probable effects of that measure.

In so far as the discussion relates to the protective-tariff theory, there is, however, some unanimity on one point, at least a partial agreement that the protective tariff should be regarded as a "local issue." That this particular national policy must be wrought out of the clash of class, section, district, and other special interests, and settled by a sort of mutual give-and-take, less euphemistically known as log-rolling. This makes of the tariff a sort of a grab bag, and we may reasonably expect that the more powerful get the first, last, and biggest grabs.

I am a Republican, or what used to be a Republican [applause on the Republican side], because I believe in the protection of infant industries that stand some eventual chance of becoming self-sustaining. That many of these industries, once fostered by protection, are now self-sustaining and do not need a protective tariff is abundantly shown and notoriously confessed as to the great steel industry by Mr. Andrew Carnegie. Many industries, having outgrown the cradle, have not been required to hustle for their livelihood, but have been carried bodily to a ward in a hospital where our stand-pat friends advocate keeping them during all eternity, to be doctored, nursed, and nourished at the public expense. One is reminded of the prayer of the man who possessed a cantankerous invalid wife: "Oh, Lord, let her get well, or—or—something." [Laughter.]

It is argued that by taxing one industry for the benefit of another industry, and vice versa, we create a home market that is productive of wealth. This brings to mind a story told by David Starr Jordan concerning the eagle and the blue-tailed lizard. It seems that the eagle one day swooped down upon the lizard and bit off and ate the lizard's tail; whereupon the

eagle acquired sufficient energy to lay an egg. The lizard climbed the tree, sucked the egg, and, through the encouragement thus afforded, grew a new tail. This process continued through many years, apparently, without much profit to either party save as it added to the interest of existence. [Laughter.]

A tale of similar import, but more profitable sequence, was related of a man who lived near the Petaluma marshes and started to raise carp. He was doing fairly well selling carp from his pond, when he suddenly conceived the idea of raising a side line of cats for the fur. He discovered that he could feed the carp to the cats and the cats to the carp, so that he increased mightly in his output of cats and carp and became wealthy. [Laughter.]

I have learned, Mr. Chairman, that it is customary to decorate the oratory of this floor with fruits, with flowers, with flags, and with farmers in various states of happiness and misery. [Laughter.] I respectfully submit a poem produced by a laureate of my district and which concerned itself with the tariff speeches of my esteemed opponent at the primaries:

I read these tariff speeches o'er—the more I read of them the more I do not know, but then I can rely upon our Congressman. Upon the very slightest hint he puts a red-hot speech in print, and when he prints that speech, you see, he has it mailed out here to me.

Mac makes it very clear just how if I pay more than I do now for socks and gloves and baby's dress—while I pay more they cost me less. And then he shows me where I lose by paying somewhat less for shoes, for though I pay less than before, my shoes they really cost me more.

He makes it clear to me that what I lose I gain, you see; and on such things as clothes and shoes I seem to gain but really lose. Thus, if I buy my socks too low, they'll still be higher—Dunc says so—and shoes I thought were high last fall were really low shoes after all.

[Laughter.]

Mac says if I pay less for shoes or hats, the maker has to lose. And if he loses, then, you see, he charges up the loss to me. Now, when I have to pay him more, he reckons profits to his store, and Duncan finds a share for me in all of this prosperity.

The speeches shed a radiant light upon the theme and make it bright; I merely read them o'er and o'er to find more's less and less is more. In buying hat, or coat, or vest, dear's cheap, and cheap is dear at best. High's low, low's high, far's near, near's far, white's black, black's white—and there you are.

We live in topsy-turvy land when McKinlay waves his magic wand.

[Laughter.]

Concerning the change and evolution that has come over the early Republican protective doctrine, designed to foster infant industries, I would further submit the following:

Mary had a little lamb,
Its fleece was white as snow;
It followed her to Pittsburg,
And now you ought to see the darned thing.

[Laughter and applause.]

The old idea of encouraging new industries is being destroyed by the present system, for, in so far as trusts and monopolies are being encouraged, individual enterprise and individual initiative are being suppressed. A monopoly need not confine its charges to a high percentage of profit on the product, but it can charge up to the public all the graft and mismanagement that may go to make up its costs. It is not compelled to be efficient. It can afford to dispense with improvements in machinery and methods. It can put valuable patents in cold storage. Thus the tariff, in so far as it aids the trusts, throttles progress instead of fostering industry.

In song and oratory we are properly reminded of the gratitude we owe to the Providence that placed us in this land of liberty and plenty. Is there not shown a lack of appreciation when we hear the solemn assertions made by some of the gentlemen that our prosperity is not due to the natural bounties of our country, not to the genius and efficiency of our people, but to a system of taxing ourselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Whenever protest is made against the existing protective tariff an argument promptly adduced in its favor is one which was best phrased by the Hon. "Bathhouse" Coughlin in the city hall of Chicago. He asked a fellow alderman how he could advocate the creation of prohibition territory and consequent loss of revenue from saloon licenses, when, as he stated it, "we are all of us heartily in need of funds." If either the Government or any interest happens to be "heartily in need of funds," there is always a means of raising revenue by boosting the tariff. I do not believe that it helps matters much to hold that we ought to lower the wall to such a point as to provide only for the higher wages of American labor plus a profit to the manufacturer or producer. This amendment still justifies the establishment in our country of industries that do not belong here. It would justify the raising of cocoanuts in hothouses. It would justify a tremendous tax upon tea in order that the laborer engaged in tea culture could be recompensed at upward of a dollar a day, while he is now receiving probably less than 10 cents a day on the other side of the ocean. I am unpatriotic enough to be grateful to the heathens who in their blindness are picking tea for us at that rate of wages, and I would not advocate forcing them to adopt our standard of living by the wearing of American clothes, or even the drinking of Missouri champagne, Mr. Chairman, for I fear they might be brought to feel the necessity of charging us more for doing us this service.

No one has ever shown any fund from which can be drawn the tax levied by the tariff and paid out in subsidies to the protected interests except the fund that resides in the pockets of the people. Those who assume that the tariff is a means of creating prosperity or of creating wealth are much better at juggling and at picking coins out of the air than was Hermann, the magician. If we can tax ourselves rich, we can prove poker to be a productive industry. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Equally, an individual may become opulent by shifting coins from one pocket to another, and the Nation can acquire wealth, if not merit, by unanimously consenting to the reciprocal picking of pockets by all the people.

Economists would doubtless urge that this universal and fairly distributed pocket-picking system would be unproductive, but we have had too much of doctrinaire teachings to listen to any more of it.

It might be surmised that should the pocket-picking system become thoroughly established it would not be equally enjoyable to all the people. There would be some more adept than others. There would probably be coteries formed in the profession that would band together in "strong-arm" or "hold-up" work, and when, if perchance through popular clamor, because of overactivity, the practice were put into partial disrepute, and there arose the question of proper limitation, it would be found that the least skilled and the unorganized would first be deprived of the privilege of picking pockets. [Laughter.]

Through many of us newly elected Members the people are protesting, not against the wealth of the country, but against the present system of distribution, which fully deserves the bitter resentment it has incurred. The evils of distribution are caused by special privileges and the protective tariff creates and licenses privilege. It would not interest the men described in the Pittsburg Survey, who are worked to death and thrown on the junk pile, to figure out and to ascertain how many wives per annum a Pittsburg millionaire could afford out of the dividends of the Steel Trust. [Laughter.] Rather would he be interested in supporting one wife and some few children with less work and more pay. There would be little satisfaction to a cash girl working for Marshall Field & Co. at a weekly wage of $3 to know that she and that corporation were jointly worth over $50,000,000. [Laughter.] The people are not satisfied with statistics of national wealth, they want better conditions for themselves.

But after all, the greatest sin that can be laid at the door of the protective tariff is the economic waste which it encourages. The fortunes piled up by the richest men of the country amount to nothing when set against the annual loss caused by the employment of men in unjustifiable occupations.

A subsidy which supports those occupations must come from other occupations which belong on our soil and in our country, and the men engaged in either the wrong thing or the right thing in the wrong place form an army which we might call the "army of the mal-employed." They have to be supported by the well employed, just as much as every standing army is a charge upon industry.

Some day I expect to hear our stand-pat Republican friends making the old confession, "We have caused to be done those things that ought not to be done; we have left undone those things that ought to be done, and there is no health in us." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The RECORD, with its vast compilation of statistics, shows a mathematical ability engaged in proving out what is logically absurd. The accuracy of the almanac does not prove the value of the nostrum it advertises, nor can questions of ethics be determined by the use of logarithms. One is rather inclined to doubt the efficacy of such figures when they are used to prove views diametrically opposed. We certainly get into "topsy-turvy land" when we try to follow the statistics. You must remember the old rhyme—

Down here below two and two make four;
Perhaps up in heaven they make six or seven.

The statement was made on this floor that the dividends paid on the stocks of the great corporations were the proof of the wealth of the country and meant prosperity. There might properly be query made as to whether dividends represent the fruit of production or extortion, whether they were produced by the use of plow and ax or spindle and loom, or whether they were "produced" at the point of a revolver or searched for in the pockets of victims rendered unconscious by sandbag or lead pipe.

As a freshman in this course of education, I can not understand how a country can get rich by sharing its natural resources with all who choose to come, dividing our patrimony, as it were, and at the same time keeping out all possible things that can be excluded that would go to increase the size of our hoard. Privilege clamors for cheap labor and immediate development of everything. Statesmanship calls for readjustment of opportunity for ourselves and our children.

The balance of trade argument is not entirely convincing to some of us. Whenever China or Russia improve their balance of trade by exporting foodstuffs in time of famine, there seems to be something the matter with the mathematical self-sufficiency of this theory. If a freezing tramp should sell his clothes, he certainly would improve his balance of trade, although not his condition. [Laughter and applause.]

Anyone who has lived on the Pacific coast can not fail to entertain profound respect for the self-helping ability of the Japanese. They are the most remarkable self-helpers in all the world, and no one need ever again invite them to help themselves. Some two years ago, in the islands of Hawaii, just at a time when the cane-grinding season was at hand, the Japanese engaged in that industry unanimously struck. They did not appear to be satisfied with their wages nor disposed to recognize the contract they had made with the planters, which procedure was not entirely original on their part. In the course of the dispute they wrote a series of resolutions to the planters to the effect "that it was the duty of the planters, in accordance with the true American principle of protection, to get an increase in the sugar duty and thereby raise the value of sugar, and then out of the added profit they should divide with the laborers." Strange that this simple and excellent and wholly American plan was not at once adopted. [Laughter.]

Let us consider some more phases of Hawaiian sugar. The business was built up first under subsidy and then under a protective tariff. The sugar land is nearly all of it in the hands of the great corporations. These corporations are paying large dividends on inflated values. This is the upper crust of the pie. Next there comes a filling of upward of 400,000 tons of sugar, for which, together with all other sugar, imported and domestic, the American people are paying heavy taxes. The lower crust consists of oriental labor. The yellow man is everywhere displacing the white man, even in the skilled occupations. The white man of small means has little or no chance to inhabit the "Paradise of the Pacific." It is to-day a country of corporations and yellow men. The white men are so greatly outnumbered that there seems danger that the pie may be turned over, to the obvious benefit of the under crust, but to the destruction of the upper crust. To prevent such an unfortunate occurrence and to protect the protected sugar industry we are taxed for an increase in our Navy. To protect the Navy, which must protect the protected sugar industry, we must be taxed to fortify Pearl Harbor. To protect Pearl Harbor, to protect the Navy, to protect the protected sugar industry, we must keep near Pearl Harbor a considerable army of men, and these must be supported out of public taxation.

This is an illustration of the "American doctrine," and the American consumer can realize as he pays his grocery bills that he is not only patriotically encouraging an American industry for the benefit of corporations and yellow labor, but that he is encouraging an indefinite increase in our Navy and a probable increase in our Army, always with the possibility that the Navy and the Army aforesaid may have to be actively used to further protect the protected sugar industry, with all the waste of life and of property incident to war, and at a very rough estimate with four hundred and eighteen thousand millions of dollars of pensions to pay in the years to come. [Laughter.]

I can not agree with those gentlemen on the majority side who believe in a tariff for revenue. There is doubtless justification for a high tariff on certain luxuries, but there is no fairness in a revenue tariff laid upon necessities. The burden is not upon the proper shoulders. Mr. Rockefeller probably pays less Government revenue on the food he consumes than does the average hod carrier. He would doubtless like to pay as much, but he can not without eating as much. For the present we must look to the tariff for revenue. Eventually we shall provide for Government funds from income tax, from heavy taxation of community-created land values, from rentals of the public domain, all of them direct and comprehensible. We shall have internal-revenue taxation on articles not necessities.

I have discussed theory without any idea that we could afford or should make any sweeping changes at once. Too many people inhabit the rickety structure to permit of its immediate demolition. A revision downward, schedule by schedule, is the beginning of the work, and a notice to make preparations to vacate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] At some time or other these patients, the "invalid industries," must leave the hospital, whether to turn their steps to self-support or to the cemetery. [Laughter.] They can not forever remain parasitic. The tariff has been too often revised upward by its friends. The people have commissioned its enemies to revise it downward. That we may have a more just system of distribution and a more equitable system of taxation, we must study the sources of our wealth and the means whereby this wealth may be saved and increased for the benefit of the many.

There is great hope in the growing ideals and the clearing outlines of the great policies of State and national conservation. By saving the common wealth for all our people and by wiping out the great special privileges in land and other natural resources, by breaking down the extortions of monopoly and by regulation of our public utilities, we shall make this country better for the average man, and no worse for any man. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HARRIS] 30 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of this House I am a trifle hesitant in rising for the first time to present my views in the form of a speech.

I was much interested, night before last, in the dream of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. His dream of empire in all things commercial, financial, and political, given and foreordained by the Almighty, but still needing the aid and protection of mere men for its perfect fulfillment, entranced me.

His wonderful revelation of the final purposes of All-Wisdom, under the guiding hand, however, of the owners of the soil in the cotton belt, was not, nevertheless, completely satisfying.

To my mind—developed in a harsher and less favored climate, where life is not one long, sweet dream of universal dominion, as it is a struggle to find means to keep warm most of the year and to keep cool the remainder—it left some things undisclosed or undeveloped. When his dream is fulfilled, when all people are converted from a fondness for wool, and the sheep shall have become as extinct as the dinosaur and the dodo, when the taste of mutton and of lamb shall be as forgotten as the flavor of the viands at Belshazzar's feast, will the lords of the soil in the cotton belt extend to the world and the people thereof something of the grace that has been shown to them, or will they take advantage of their monopoly and charge all the traffic will bear? [Applause on the Republican side.]

When the peoples of those portions of the earth where cotton has been grown and spun and woven and worn for ages before the soil of his empire was disclosed to the eyes of civilized man come knocking at his door seeking market for their cheaper wares, will he invoke the law for their exclusion or will he invite them to his feast? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Pending the fulfillment of the dream and during the process of construction, I am of those who can not see that harm or injustice has been done to him or his, because under a system of human laws industries have grown up here that give employment to thousands who live in less favored spots, who do not expect to enter into his kingdom, that have furnished market for enough of cotton to give a manufactured product of over $450,000,000 each year, and other industries that use cotton as a part of their product, to the value of the cotton consumed in them of over $34,000,000 more.

However, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to engage in a general debate on the question of protection versus free trade. I content myself with saying that I am a protectionist, and desire to foster every industry that needs it in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I rose to say a few words, present a few figures, and show why the products of one industry should not be included in this or any other free list.

As I come from a manufacturing State and from a district which has a great and vital interest in this proposed bill, I do desire, however, to state why the proposed placing of boots and shoes upon the free list works a great harm to a large body of honest laboring people. I believe also that it will work harm to the people that the members of the majority of this House claim that they desire to benefit.

A protectionist by faith and by the demonstrations of recent commercial history, I have believed that the claim of the benefits of diversified industries is a sound one, and that by their growth and increase the farmer has benefited and gained an advantage by the creation of markets at his door. In my judgment the prophecy of the early exponents of the protective policy has been bountifully and wonderfully fulfilled and the faith in it of my Republican predecessors marvelously justified.

My reasoning has been done on the basis of what I have seen in the manufacturing section where we are consumers of food products and not producers.

I do not desire to trespass long on the time of this House, but I do desire to call attention to some things.

First, I want to call attention to the New England group of States, according to the last bulletin that I have been able to get. We have in that group of States wage earners in our shops and factories to the number of 940,750 people. We pay to them annually wages to the amount of $439,050,232, and they turn out products to the annual value of $2,025,998,437. The details of these figures I have set forth by States in the table, which I will not stop to read if it may be made to appear in the RECORD:

New England wage earners and wages.

	Number.	Wages.	Value of products.
Connecticut	181,605	$87,942,628	$309,082,091
Maine	74,958	32,691,759	144,030,197
Massachusetts	488,399	232,388,946	1,124,092,051
New Hampshire	65,366	27,693,203	123,610,904
Rhode Island	97,318	43,112,637	202,109,583
Vermont	33,106	15,221,059	63,083,611
Total	940,750	439,050,232	2,025,998,437

Following the usual method of calculation, but giving a margin for safety in the figures, we may allow four persons dependent on the wages of one wage earner—3,663,000 people who are looking to the work in the shops and factories for their livelihood.

These wage earners spend their money, as we do, pretty largely for food. In my section they are accustomed to three meals a day, 365 days in the year, when work is plenty. We furnish the markets for the producers of the West, the far West, and the South. The grains and meats of the Middle West, the fruits of California, the early fruits and vegetables of Georgia, Florida, and the Carolinas, come to us to be consumed and find a ready and constant market.

In the matter of the particular industry for which I wish to speak the figures are instructive, and at least furnish food for reflection. It is a widespread industry, free from trusts and combinations. It is an industry that is throughout the country:

Boot and shoe industry.

(1,316 factories.)

Capital	$122,526,093
Wage earners	149,924
Wages	$69,059,680
Materials	$197,363,495
Product	$320,107,458

This industry is distributed over 17 States, which turn out an annual product of $1,000,000 and upward, besides other States which have a smaller output.

I have prepared a table of those 17 States, showing the number of wage earners in that industry in each State and the annual value of the product of each. This table I will not read, unless it is demanded, if it may appear in the RECORD. It may be enough to say that the number of wage earners in those States varies from 579 in the smallest to 74,191 in the largest, and that the grand total employed in that industry is 171,891, and that the annual value of the boot and shoe product of those 17 States is $314,290,987.

Wage earners in the boot and shoe industry in 17 States.

California	819
Connecticut	579
Illinois	4,891
Kentucky	861
Maine	7,001
Maryland	735
Massachusetts	74,191
Michigan	2,000
Minnesota	1,930
Mississippi	11,903
New Hampshire	12,226
New Jersey	4,483
New York	19,086
Ohio	15,374
Pennsylvania	9,968
Vermont	1,943
Wisconsin	3,901
Total	171,891

Distribution of industry, States producing $1,000,000 and over.

California	$1,677,688
Connecticut	1,279,755
Illinois	9,026,238
Kentucky	1,029,939
Maine	12,351,293
Maryland	$1,011,393
Massachusetts	144,291,426
Michigan	3,531,028
Minnesota	4,169,732
Mississippi	23,493,552
New Hampshire	22,425,700
New Jersey	6,977,300
New York	34,137,049
Ohio	25,140,220
Pennsylvania	14,607,867
Virginia	2,627,244
Wisconsin	6,513,563
Total	314,290,987

In my own State of Massachusetts there are 502 establishments; there is an average number of over 62,000 people employed, which runs in good times to over 74,000 people; there are over $33,000,000 in wages paid out; there is a product of an annual value of over $144,000,000; and our average wage rate is the highest in that industry in any section in the world. Brockton, in my district, pays more than any other place. I have prepared again a table, and those figures I will now read:

Boot and shoe industry in Massachusetts.

Establishments	502
Wage earners	62,633
Wages	$33,106,667
Materials	$88,493,009
Value of product	$144,291,426
Average wage	$529.44
Above average	$68.84

When I have called your attention to the figures of the shoe industry I have told but half the story. For every wage earner in the shoe factories in the city of Brockton there are many others whose industry depends on his, but whose industrial product is mentioned in no tariff and is covered by no schedule.

Shoemakers do not build the factories in which they work, the houses in which they live, the store in which they spend their money, the bank in which they deposit their savings, the schoolhouses in which their children learn to be good citizens, or the churches in which they worship.

The craftsmen whose product is the completed structure for all of these, built upon the spot, benefits as much and often more than the workman in the factory. The duty covers him indirectly but none the less surely, and he prospers when they do and goes without work and without food and clothes when they do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

These men and their families, again, are consumers and not producers of food. They, too, form a large army; they earn a large amount of money; and they, too, make the market for the products of the soil. All of these have been hard pressed the last few years. All the protection they now have is 10 per cent on boots and shoes. It is perilously low and leaves them on the danger line now.

With Germany and France and Canada imposing duties on boots and shoes, with these countries equipped with the same machinery that our own people have, copying the style and methods, gaining in efficiency in the use of our most approved machinery, and with a wage rate only about one-half of ours, can we expect to benefit the boot and shoe worker by putting his product on the free list?

If you destroy or seriously injure so great an industry, if you send our manufacturers to Canada and Germany and England, to make there, with the same machinery but with cheaper labor, and send in here free of all duty that which has been made here and has supported so many, what answer will you make to the abandoned and desperate body of workers, and what will you say to the farmer who loses so great a food market here at home when they ask you why you have done this thing? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You are proposing to do this to placate the farmer. I have more confidence in that same farmer than you have. I have seen him in the days from 1878 down through 1879 and the early eighties, when drought parched his crops, when the grasshopper pest ate the rest, and when the resumption of specie payment imposed upon him an added burden of debt, sit down with aching but brave heart and a good conscience and refuse to follow the Democratic-Socialistic doctrine of repudiation under the guise of "greenbackism."

I have seen him from 1890 to 1896, when neither he nor the workers in our shops and factories prospered and when things pressed him hard, refuse again to follow the proposed remedy of 16 to 1.

I have seen him steadily following out and supporting the doctrine of protection because he believed that as industry grew around him he profited through his own home markets, and he relied more upon those markets than he did upon the duties set forth in the tariff schedule.

That same farmer is a wise man. He notices that in the last 10 years the population of this country has increased 12,000,000.

He believes that Mother Columbia is not yet sterile, and that in the next ten years she will add to her family some 19,000,000 more. He knows that this added 19,000,000 have got to be fed, as well as housed and employed, and that he will have his hands full in feeding the family.

I have faith to believe that in offering to him old Doctor Democrat's unvaried panacea for that "tired feeling," and every ill, from toothache to smallpox—and like that liniment that was offered to Bill Sykes after his slaughter of the hapless Nancy, also good to remove spots from the trousers and stains from the soul—your Democratic free-trade mixture, you will find he will refuse to take it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In behalf of that industry I ask you to stop and pause before you do us that harm. I live in the next town to the city of Brockton, which town is a little sister to that good city, as they are both children of the one mother, old Bridgewater. I had my office in Brockton for many years. I was there in 1892 and the years that followed. I know what happened to us when the shoe industry languished. I know what came to us when the factories closed and the work ceased. I do not want to see it again. I am speaking for the workers and not for the manufacturers.

The manufacturer will generally take care of himself, but when you say to these people that you are going to strike out that industry, you are going to open the markets of this country free to the world while every other country but England has a tariff from 17½ per cent to 35 per cent against us, I do not believe you are going to do the shoe worker or your farmer much good. In the interest of that industry and the 171,891 people engaged in it, I ask you to stop and think before you do this thing. You will answer to them if you do, and what that answer will be I think I know in my section. You are in control, and you advertise the wisdom with which you are going to deal with the affairs of the country. I invite your attention to some of the great internal questions of finance, commerce, and the regulation of these horrid monopolies, and I think you will find something there that is worthy for your great wisdom to be brought to bear upon which will bring more benefit to the country than it will to remove the tariff wall and strike down the industries we have which are of benefit to the farmer in the West and the factory worker of the East. Take out those things which keep them apart, and do not make us compete with all the world in a fair market where we have good wages and good living. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Massachusetts use?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, it is a great honor to be a Member of this House and a great privilege to have the opportunity to address the Representatives of 90,000,000 free Americans. In view of this I may occupy the liberal time kindly yielded to me by my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and now, in the very beginning, I invite you, my brethren, to draw near and hear the true gospel of Democracy, pure and simple, as it shall be proclaimed unto you by the prophet Ezekiel. [Laughter and applause.]

Our distinguished and able Speaker, upon assuming the chair, when he was elected on the first day of this session, said this:

> My Democratic brethren, coupled with the joy of once more seeing a House a larger majority of which is of my own political faith is a keen sense of our responsibility to our country and our kind. It is an old adage worthy of acceptation that where much is given much is required.
>
> After 16 years of exclusion from power in the House and 14 years of exclusion from power in every department of Government, we are restored to power in the House of Representatives and in that alone. We are this day put upon trial, and the duty devolves upon us to demonstrate, not so much by fine phrases as by good works, that we are worthy of the confidence imposed in us by the voters of the land, and that we are also worthy of their wider confidence. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We could not if we would, and we would not if we could, escape this severe test. We will not shirk our duty. We shrink not from the responsibility. That we will prove equal to the situation in which we find ourselves placed through our own efforts and by our own desires there can be no doubt, and the way to accomplish that is to fulfill with courage, intelligence, and patriotism the promises made before the election in order to win the election. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By discharging our duty thoroughly and well, subordinating personal desires to principle and personal ambition to an exalted love of country, we will not only receive the indorsement of the people, but, what is far better, we will deserve their indorsement.
>
> Chief among these promises were:
>
> 1. An honest, intelligent revision of the tariff downward, in order to give every American citizen an equal chance in the race of life, and to pamper none by special favor or special privilege; to reduce the cost of living by eradicating the enormities and cruelties of the present tariff bill; and to raise the necessary revenue to support the Government. * * * [Applause on the Democratic side.]
>
> 2. The passage of a resolution submitting to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment providing for the election of United States Senators by the popular vote. * * * [Applause.]
>
> 3. Such changes in the rules of the House as are necessary for the thorough and intelligent consideration of measures for the public good, several of which changes are accomplished facts; if other changes are deemed wise, they will be promptly made.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> 4. "Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened." The literal fulfillment of that promise which so nearly affects the comfort and happiness of millions we have begun—and we began at the proper place—by cutting down the running expenses of the House by more than $188,000 per annum. Economy, like charity, should begin at home. That is where we began. * * *
>
> The Constitution gives the House the practical control of the purse strings of the country, and the House should insist, resolutely and firmly, on exercising that control to the end that the appropriation bills may be reduced to the needs of the Government economically and effectively administered. It is our duty to provide every dollar needed for the proper and economical conduct of the Government, but it is equally our duty to prevent waste and extravagance in public expenditures, for we should never forget that it is a difficult task for millions of families to live now in decency and comfort. Surely it is the part of wisdom, statesmanship, humanitarianism, and patriotism to legislate so as to reduce their burdens to the minimum. * * * No good citizen desires to cripple the Government in any legitimate function, but no good citizen desires that the people be loaded down with unnecessary taxes.
>
> 5. The publication of campaign contributions and disbursements before the election. The bill to accomplish that desired reform has been prepared and introduced. It will be speedily passed by the House. * * *
>
> 6. The admission of both Arizona and New Mexico as States. [Applause.] I violate no confidence in stating that so far as the House is concerned, they will be speedily admitted and they will be admitted together. [Applause.]
>
> These are a few of the things which we promised. We are not only going to accomplish them, we have already begun the great task. What we have done is only an earnest of what we will do. We this day report progress to the American people. The rest will follow in due course.
>
> No man is fit to be a lawgiver for a mighty people who yields to the demands and solicititations of the few having access to his ear but is forgetful of that vast multitude who may never hear his voice or look into his face. [Applause.]
>
> I suggest to my fellow Members on both sides of the big aisle—which is the line of demarcation betwixt us as political partisans, but not as American citizens or American Representatives—that he serves his party best who serves his country best. [Applause.]

These were the words of our Democratic Speaker—a patriotic and honest sentiment, expressed in beautiful and in forceful language by a great and good man, whom we all delight to call our friend, CHAMP CLARK, whose big heart beats in unison with the throbbing hearts of the toiling masses of the American people, and who desires above everything else to do those things, and those alone, which will bring about the largest and best results for the greatest number of all the people. I was one of the first to propose his election as Speaker in a speech on the floor of this House, and I am proud of it, and I predict that the historian's record will show him to be one of the greatest Speakers who ever presided over this magnificent legislative body. [Applause.]

How are we fulfilling the promises which we made and which were enumerated in the speech which I have just read? We have already passed the bill providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people. I voted for this bill with a great deal of pleasure. I have advocated it upon the stump and in this Hall heretofore. I believe that the source of all power is the people; and if left to me, I would not only permit them to elect United States Senators, but I would permit them to elect every officer of this Government by direct vote of the people, from the President of the United States down to the constable in the neighborhoods in which they live. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The offices belong to the people, and when an officer is elected he should serve the people, and they should have a voice in selecting him, and he should be responsible to them for the performance of his duties.

We have passed the bill providing for the publication of campaign contributions. This bill provides that the publication shall be made not only before the election and up to the day of election, but that it shall be made of those contributions which may come later, subsequent to the election. The American people are honest themselves as a rule. You may take the plain citizen throughout this country, and in his heart there is integrity and honesty and sincerity and patriotism. He wants the same to be reflected by his officers in the posts which they hold, and therefore he demands that the elections in this country shall be fair, that they shall be honest, that they shall reflect the sentiments he feels, and therefore he desires that the campaign contributions shall be known before the election as well as after, in order that he may be advised of the influences that have been brought to bear in order to control elections and from what sources they come.

We have passed the Canadian reciprocity bill which came to us, the pact entered into between Canada and the United States. It has received the approval of this House and has gone to the Senate. We have passed the apportionment bill providing for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress throughout the United States.

This record has not been surpassed by Congress, since I have been a Member, in the length of time this Congress has been in session. This is but an earnest of the honest, energetic, and sincere efforts we propose to use in passing other remedial and good legislation to follow. Every promise we have made as enunciated by our distinguished Speaker will be redeemed by the party now in power in this House. We believe not only in making promises and declarations to the people, but we believe in keeping the promises and declarations when made. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We do not believe that in order to secure the support of the people at the ballot box we should deceive them like the Republican Party did before the last presidential election by promising before election to revise the tariff downward, and then, after having by this deception secured the election, with unblushing shame revise it upward. We promised to revise it downward, and we will keep that pledge. Therefore we have under consideration what is familiarly known as the farmers' free list bill. This bill I will not now take the time to read in detail, but will incorporate it in my remarks, because I feel sure that all within the sound of my voice have read it and are familiar with its provisions.

It provides, however, for placing on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meat, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles. Do the farmers deserve consideration at our hands? Should we consider what is for their welfare and for their good? I say that of all the people in this country they deserve our highest consideration, because they do more for the Government and do more for the country and they add more wealth to the wealth which we already have than any class of people beneath the shining sun. [Applause of the Democratic side.] Therefore I say they should receive at the hands of every Representative on this floor the most careful, candid, and sincere consideration. Let us see for a few moments what they are doing for the country. I call attention to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1910, which I have in my hand, the last annual report published. He says:

Nothing short of omniscience can grasp the value of the farm products of this year. At no time in the world's history has a country produced farm products within one year with a value reaching $8,926,000,000, which is the value of the agricultural products of this country for 1910. This amount is larger than that of 1909 by $305,000,000, an amount of increase over the preceding year which is small for the more recent years.

Again he says:

A national asset amounting to 3,000,000,000 bushels, worth $1,500,000,000, is found in the corn crop. Its production this year was 3,121,581,000 bushels, a crop that exceeds that of even the great agricultural year 1906. It is greater than the average crop of the preceding five years by 14 per cent.

A notable feature of corn production this year is the growing importance of the South. This has been manifested in a small way in very recent years, but now the increased magnitude of the crop in that section, both absolute and relative to national production, forces itself upon the attention.

Let a comparison be made with corn production in the South in the census year 1889, or 21 years ago. At that time the South Atlantic States produced only 6.2 per cent of the national crop of corn. This year they produced 9.1 per cent, or an increase relatively of about one-half. The relative increase for the South Central States is even greater, being from 14.8 per cent of the national crop of 1889 to 23.4 per cent in 1910. Then the South produced hardly more than one-fifth of the national crop; now it produces one-third.

While the value of this corn crop is below that of 1909 and also of 1908, its amount belongs to stories of magic. It can hardly be reckoned at less than $1,500,000,000, a sum sufficient to cancel the interest-bearing debt of the United States, buy all of the gold and silver mined in all of the countries of the earth in 1909, and still leave to the farmers a little pocket money.

In reference to cotton he says:

For many years the cotton crop was fourth in value among the crops, being exceeded usually by corn, wheat, and hay. But in those days the price of cotton was very low. The crop of this year may be worth in lint and seed a round $900,000,000 at the farm, or more than the corn crop was worth in any year prior to 1901, or more than the wheat or hay crop was ever worth.

Apparently the cotton crop of this year, including seed, is worth $120,000,000 more than the crop of last year, and that crop was far above any previous one in value. During the last five years the cotton crop had an average value of $685,000,000, so that the value for this year is 13 per cent above the five-year average.

Then he discusses hay, wheat, oats, potatoes, sugar, tobacco, barley, flaxseed, rye, rice, hops, and all cereals. Then he takes up the question of exports:

The value of the exports of farm products, after constant oscillation, increased to the enormous amount of $1,017,396,404 in 1908, from which there was a decline in 1909 and another in 1910, for which latter year the amount stands at $871,107,067, a value which has been exceeded only in the years 1901 and 1906 previous to 1907.

In the exports of 1910 the principal item was cotton, with a value of $450,447,243. Next in order stands packing-house products, with a value of $135,959,373; third in order are grain and grain products, valued at $133,320,418; after which are tobacco, $38,115,386; oil and oil-cake meal, $19,251,012; fruits, $18,504,591; live animals, $17,447,735. Compared with 1909, there was a decrease in all of the principal items except in cotton, for which the increase was about $33,000,000, fruits about $2,500,000, and tobacco about $7,000,000.

Thus he discusses the balance of trade and says:

THE TRADE BALANCE.

Until 1898 there was ever a balance of trade against the United States in merchandise other than farm products; in that year for the first time the exports of merchandise other than farm products exceeded in value the imports. From 1898 to 1902 the value of exports of merchandise other than farm products exceeded that of imports, and again from 1904 to 1909. The contrary was true for 1903 and 1910, the adverse balance of the last year for manufactures and other merchandise not produced on the farm being $10,926,193.

On the other hand, in the case of farm products there has been an almost unbroken balance of trade in favor of the United States as far back as inquiry has been made. From 1851 to 1863 is found this favorable balance and also from 1866 to the present time. During the five-year period 1886–1890 the farmer's balance of trade in favor of this country averaged $206,265,002; during the next five years the average was $257,666,800; in the five years that followed the average was $386,637,041; during the period 1901–1905 the average was $431,234,941; and during the last five-year period, 1906–1910, the average was $433,683,775. The increase in this quinquennial average has been unbroken since 1886–1890.

The total balance of trade in our favor in farm products from 1886 to 1910, inclusive, amounts to the enormous sum of $8,577,437,791. But for the exportation of the products of the farm furnished by the farmers of this country to swell our foreign trade there would be a balance of trade against us from 1886 to 1910 of more than $8,000,000,000. In view of this remarkable and marvelous result I ask you the question again, Are not the farmers of this country entitled to the highest consideration at our hands?

I believe that they are, and, in view of that fact, I introduced myself in the early days of this session of Congress two free-list bills, in which was included many articles which are contained in the present bill which is pending before the House. We propose to give to the farmers of this country some relief from the enormous taxes with which they have been burdened so long. We propose to give them recognition for the marvelous service which they have performed for this great Republic. What has the Republican Party ever done for the American farmer along this line? You have required him, by the strong arm of your unrighteous and oppressive law, to pay high taxes on everything on the face of the earth, practically speaking, which he was compelled to buy, and you have forced him to sell everything, practically, which he produces in a free-trade market in competition with the world. He asked you for bread and you gave him a stone. You have pursued him through all his life, in death, and, in fact, practically to the gates of eternity. I will demonstrate the truth of that statement. In the morning the first ray of light which he sees is through a protected window glass. When he arises he puts on his protected clothes, washes his face in a protected wash pan, wipes it on a protected towel, combs his hair with a protected comb, eats his breakfast out of a protected plate, stirs his coffee with a protected spoon, drinks it out of a protected cup and saucer, and eats his food with a protected knife and fork upon a protected table while sitting in a protected chair.

When he has finished his breakfast he puts on his protected hat and goes out and takes his protected bridle and catches his horse. He leads him out and puts on him his protected plow-gear and prepares to go to the field. When he arrives there he hitches him with protected trace chains to a protected single-tree attached by a protected clevis and pin to a protected plow-stock on which there is a protected plowpoint. When he has finished his crop he hauls his corn to the crib and his cotton to the gin in a protected wagon. He gins his cotton in a protected gin, wraps it in protected bagging, binds it with protected ties, and presses and bales it in a protected press, and then he has the great and final privilege of selling it in the free-trade markets of the world. My Lord, what a dose of protection! [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But you are not satisfied with that. You tax every article of clothing he and every member of his family wears. You even tax the cradle in which his good wife rocks the baby. Not only that, but when he passes off the stage of action and is cold in death, you compel him to be buried in a coffin that is protected. You screw down the lid with screws which are protected, with a screw driver which is protected, and then the minister of God, as he stands up to perform the last sad rites at the tomb, does so with the Word of God, the Bible, in his hand, that should at least be free, but alas, alas, how heartless and unsympathetic you are for it is also protected! [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Therefore I say to you that you pursue him not only through life, but you pursue him even unto death 'and down into his grave and to the very gates of eternity itself. It seems that the only relief in life he can ever hope to obtain will have to come from the Democratic Party and the only relief even after he is cold in death must come from the final blast of old Gabriel, who will call him from his protected coffin in the grave to the home

above. May the good Lord deliver us from this overdose of protection and from this heartless policy of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, this House is Democratic. It is admitted, practically, that this bill will pass. It contains in it a provision for free bagging and ties. This is a just demand——

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANDLER. Yes, sir; with pleasure.

Mr. SLOAN. I was interested in your speaking of what was taken from the American farmer. Was that the reason why the exception was made in the lumber schedule here where it says?—

Planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

These, I understand, are frequently used in the making of coffins, and they are excepted in your free list. Is that done so that you can make that kind of a speech, which we have heard, probably, on every stump in the United States?

Mr. CANDLER. The gentleman has been fortunate in hearing so many good speeches, but unfortunate in not being profited thereby. I am sorry he did not learn something from them.

Mr. SLOAN. I asked if that was the reason for the exception.

Mr. CANDLER. Oh, no; the exception was not for that reason. As a rule the plain people in this country are not buried in coffins made out of rosewood. The rich only can afford them. Free lumber was put in this bill to help the thousands, yea, millions, of our people who do not own their homes to build a modest house and own the roof over their heads, and the exception was made because the lumber excepted is not necessary for that purpose. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I was proceeding, when I was interrupted, to discuss bagging and ties for a few moments. They are put upon the free list in this bill along with other necessities for the farmer. This is a recognition of a just demand by the farmers of the South, because they furnish that great product of this country—cotton—which travels across the water and brings back the gold that furnishes prosperity to it. Last year the Secretary of Agriculture says we exported $450,447,243 worth of cotton, which means that it brought in that much gold. I say it is but just to them that they should have the bagging with which they wrap the cotton and the ties with which they bind it free of duty and free of taxation.

A few days ago the New Orleans Cotton Exchange passed a resolution upon this subject.

In a copy of a paper called the Progressive Farmer and Southern Farm Gazette, founded by Dr. Tait Butler in 1895 at Starkville, Miss., in my district, I find the following in the issue of Saturday, April 22, 1911:

That the Cotton Bagging and Tie Trust, "not satisfied with robbing the American cotton planter of nearly $1,000,000 annually through unjust tariff placed upon bagging and ties under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, are planning to increase their levy on the cotton crop to $2,800,000 annually" is declared in resolutions adopted a few days ago by the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. The resolutions appeal to Congress to place bagging and ties on the free list, and urge the enactment of the necessary legislation at the present extra session of Congress.

President W. B. Thompson, of the cotton exchange, in a letter * * * tells of the great importance to the South of this tariff steal. He says, in part:

"The cotton crop of the South yields annually an average of about 12,000,000 bales, of this total approximately five-eighths, or 7,500,000 bales, * * * are exported and exchanged for foreign gold. The mere statement of these facts attests the importance of the cotton-producing industry, emphasizes the obligation which the country owes the producer of this crop, and establishes his right to at least just treatment at the hands of the general lawmaking power.

"Under the present tariff law the duty on steel cotton ties amounts to 0.027 cent per bale, or to $324,000, on a crop of 12,000,000 bales. This tariff is prohibitive, as is shown by the fact that no steel ties are imported. Therefore, the Government has no share in this impost which constitutes simply and safely tribute levied upon cotton farmers for the benefit of the Cotton Tie Trust.

"The duty on jute bagging imposed by the present tariff law amounts to 0.05 cent per bale, or to $630,000, on a crop of 12,000,000 bales. This tariff is, to a large extent, prohibitive, inasmuch as it yields only about $100,000 revenue to the Government. The balance constitutes a tribute paid by the cotton farmers to the Bagging Trust.

"But the Bagging Trust is not satisfied with its share of this impost. It desires to raise the duty to a figure which will not only prevent the Government from receiving any revenue therefrom, but will enable the trust to take from the farm four times as much as it has been able to take heretofore.

"From the reasons stated it will incontestably appear that not only the proposed outrage, but the present tax on bagging and ties is inequitable and wrong; and because the western farmer has now, and has had for more than 15 years his binder twine on the free list, the tax upon the southern farmer stands condemned of the additional vice of discrimination."

These are the facts, succinctly and concisely stated by Mr. Thompson in this letter. I received a letter—yesterday, I believe it was—from a jute-bagging manufacturer, and in view of the present situation and in view of the further fact that they have so long had the benefit of this tariff, which they have taken from the people and put into their pockets, instead of it going as revenue into the Treasury of the United States, they are actually now down upon their knees. We have even got them to praying, because in this letter I find this expression, as he appeals that bagging and ties be not placed upon the free list. He says:

May God forbid such a result.

And not only that, he goes further and says:

We pray you, dear sir, to aid in averting such a calamity. Aid by writing your Representative to vote against free jute. Aid by asking your neighbor to do so. And pray with us that such a calamity may be averted.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Oh, you Republicans may applaud such sentiments, but you know a tax on bagging and ties is unjust, inequitable, and wrong.

The trouble with this manufacturer is that it is only the prayers of the righteous that availeth much. It is not the prayers of him who is willing by law to levy taxes on the cotton farmers and take the honest results of their toil and transfer them from their pockets to his own. The prayers of that man will never prevail. The Representatives of the people of this country will give them the relief which they ask and the relief which they ought to have.

This bill, of course, could not pass in a Republican House. If the same majority existed in this House at the present time as existed at the last session of Congress, of course this bill would not be passed. Because you Republicans refused to give the people relief and increased their tariff taxes when you promised to reduce them is one reason why you met defeat at the polls last November. We are going to give them relief, keep our promises, and reduce their taxes, and continue to defeat you at the polls until we have the Senate and the President, and then we will give the people genuine reform and permanent relief. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

How do I know this bill could not pass a Republican House? I know it because, in the first place, I hold in my hands the views of the minority, signed by S. E. PAYNE, JOHN DALZELL, S. W. MCCALL, E. J. HILL, J. C. NEEDHAM, J. W. FORDNEY, and NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, comprising all the Republican Representatives upon the Ways and Means Committee, and I take it they speak by authority and speak for the other side, and they are unanimous against this bill. I see several of these gentlemen now present, kindly giving me their attention, and by their silence I presume I state the position of their party correctly in reference to this bill. I know for another reason that it could not pass, because in 1908 I introduced a bill covering many of the articles which are contained in the bill now under consideration. It provided for placing upon the free list the following articles:

First. All kinds of agricultural machines and parts thereof, such as cotton gins, steam plows, and other high-power agricultural machinery, agricultural drills and planters, farm rollers, cultivators, manure spreaders, mowers, reapers, harvesters, hay tedders, potato diggers, fanning mills, thrashing and separating machines, and the like, including those machines dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 460 of the present tariff act of July 24, 1897.

Second. All kinds of agricultural tools and implements, such as plows, harrows, rakes, horserakes, hoes, spades, shovels, axes, hatchets, forks, and scythes, including those tools and implements dutiable at 20 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 460 of the present tariff act; handsaws, now dutiable at 30 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 168 of the same act; pruning knives, now dutiable at 40 per cent ad valorem and upward according to paragraph 153 of the same act; grindstones, now dutiable at $1.75 per ton according to paragraph 119 of the same act, and crowbars, hammers, sledges, wedges, and the like, now dutiable at one and five-tenths of 1 per cent per pound according to paragraph 144 of the same act.

Third. Horseshoes, muleshoes, and oxshoes, spikes, nuts, and washers, and nails of all kinds, now dutiable at from six-tenths of 1 cent to 2½ cents per pound according to paragraphs 160 to 163 of the same act.

Fourth. All kinds of vehicles peculiarly adapted to farm work, such as farm wagons, oxcarts, lumber trucks, horse sleds and sledges, wheelbarrows, and the like; also all parts thereof, including axles, wheels, tires, chains, cart and wagon skeins, and the like.

Fifth. Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity, now dutiable at five-tenths of 1 per cent per pound according to paragraph 129 of the same act.

Sixth. Iron or steel wire rods for making rivets, screws, nails, and fencing, now dutiable at four-tenths of 1 cent per pound and upward according to paragraph 136 of the same act.

Seventh. Harness and parts of harness, suitable for animals engaged in farm work, now dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem according to paragraph 447 of the same act.

Eighth. Bagging for cotton or for wheat or other grain, gunny cloths, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton or grain, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted or printed, not exceeding 16 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and weighing not less than 15 ounces per square yard, now dutiable at six-tenths of 1 cent per square yard according to paragraph 344 of the same act.

Ninth. Cloths, knit fabrics, flannels for underwear, and all other manufactures made wholly or in part of wool and valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, and ready-made clothing and wearing ap-

parel of every description composed wholly or in part of wool and valued at less than $1.50 per pound, now dutiable at rates averaging 100 per cent ad valorem according to paragraphs 366, 367, and 370 of the same act.

In this connection I will insert in my remarks the text of the present bill now under consideration:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act the following articles shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds, and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour, and seminola, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain; oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared; round timber used for spars or in building wharves; shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

A comparison of the two bills will show that they have the same purpose in view—that is, to give the farmer relief.

The bill that I introduced in the Sixtieth Congress was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, of which a large majority of the members were Republican. I made a speech upon the floor of this House, in which I advocated the passage of that bill, and I called special attention of the Ways and Means Committee to it. I made that speech on February 3, 1909, when, I understood, the Ways and Means Committee was then considering the tariff question and preparing what is now known as the Payne-Aldrich bill.

I not only introduced the bill, which went to the committee, but I emphasized it by making a speech on the floor of this House and called attention to it. But it received no consideration at their hands and was not reported by them. I appealed to deaf ears and to hardened hearts in the interest of the masses of the plain people of this country, and my appeal received the same answer as such appeals always received at the hands of Republicans. The answer was: "We will bless you; we will make you happy; we will enrich you by increasing your taxes instead of by decreasing your taxes." [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when the bill prepared by the Ways and Means Committee of the Sixty-first Congress passed the Republican House it not only did not reduce the taxes, it not only failed to put the items in my bill on the free list, but it increased the taxes from about 45 to about 50 per cent. Hence I repeat again that when the people asked you for bread you gave them a stone. You promised them reduced taxation; you gave them increased taxation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The pending bill will pass this House because the righteous indignation of the American people, aroused by the continued oppression of exorbitant taxes, demands its passage, and because the bill is supported by the loyal Democrats on this side, who represent the people, the masses of the American people, and represent no classes and represent no special interests and do not favor giving special privileges to anybody. Believing in equal rights to all and special privileges to none, we believe the farmers of the country should receive the relief which they are asking and which they have the right to demand. In view of that fact, we propose to pass this bill and relieve them of the burdens under which they have labored. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is estimated that the bill will reduce the revenues of the Government by the sum of $10,028,989. This, however, is a mere drop in the bucket in comparison with the other great benefits it will confer upon the American people. While it will reduce the revenues about ten million, it will take from the trusts and leave in the pockets of the people ten times that sum. We propose, by a reduction in the running expenses of this Government and by cutting off extravagant expenditures wherever we have an opportunity to reduce them without affecting the efficiency of the public service, to accomplish a saving more than sufficient to compensate for the loss of revenue which may be brought about by the passage of this bill. Not only will that amount be saved, but I dare say much more will be saved, especially if we are given a lease of power and sufficient time in which to accomplish it. As was so well stated by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] this morning, we at present find ourselves in a situation brought about during the last session of the Republican Congress where by their legislation extravagant appropriations have already been made, and they must be met, and the revenue must be obtained necessary to meet them. We will maintain the national credit and with patriotism meet that condition and discharge those legal and binding obligations, but when that is done we can and will then give to the people an economical administration of all governmental affairs.

I appeal to you, my fellow Members in this House, regardless of party, to rise, if possible, above party lines, above self-interest, above the mere interest of your district, and to vote from a patriotic standpoint in the interest of the whole people and for this bill. A vote for this bill is a vote against the Agricultural Implement Trust, against the Bagging and Tie Trust, against the Leather Trust, against the Steel Trust, against the Beef Trust, against the Flour and Cereal Food Trust, against the Lumber Trust, against the Sewing Machine Trust, and against the Salt Trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A vote against this bill is a vote in favor of all these trusts. I appeal to you to vote for it, not only in the interest of the farmers and the toiling masses who make their living by honest, hard labor beneath the sun of heaven in the open field, and who produce the wealth of this country, and who have during all these years brought the balance of trade to our shores, but I appeal to you in the interest of the housewife and of the sewing woman who needs a sewing machine. The Sewing Machine Trust have been selling sewing machines abroad for a great deal less than they have been selling them to the working woman making an honest living by sewing day by day and sometimes far into the night. I appeal to you to let every sewing girl have her sewing machine without taxing it to such an extent that she is unable to pay for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, I ask you on which side do you stand? Will you stand with the people and for the interest and welfare and development and prosperity of the whole country, or will you stand upon the other side and vote in favor of the trusts in this country? One way to destroy trusts is to put their products on the free list. This bill does that. Your vote upon this question will record you upon one side or upon the other. You profess to feel great interest in the farmer. Oh, how often did I hear that sentiment expressed during the debate upon the reciprocity bill. I do not criticize you for that. I feel an abiding interest in the farmer myself. He is among my very best friends. That is one reason why I have always stood and expect to continue to stand for everything I honestly and conscientiously believe in my heart is for his interest. In my district he is my friend and I am his friend and he knows it. I am, again, a member of the great Agricultural Committee by the unanimous vote of a Democratic Congress, and I hope by reason of that position to render him better service if possible. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Another reason why I believe in giving the farmer what he wants is that whatever is for his interest is for the interest of the whole people, and when I am serving him I am serving every class and condition throughout this country, because, as was very beautifully said by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL], he is the foundation rock upon which the whole superstructure stands. If the foundation should crumble, the whole superstructure must come down with it; but when we do those things which will give him prosperity, which will benefit him, through him you benefit every avocation, every calling, and every trade throughout this broad land, from ocean to ocean. Therefore, if you really are interested in him, if in your heart you really feel concerned in

his welfare and prosperity, I appeal to you to show it and prove it by your votes. Do not try to prove it alone by your words, by your speeches, because they are easily made, and, like promises, sometimes easily broken and forgotten; but a vote upon the record stands as a monument through all the years to come as to what your sentiments and what your real purposes and intentions were.

I appeal to you to vote in the interest of the farmer, because without him the prosperity of this country would be gone. You upon the other side of the House have claimed during all these years that you were in favor of protecting the infant industries of the country. You have taxed the farmers and the masses of the American people you say to furnish revenue to run the Government? Yes; but you have taxed them in order also to furnish protection to these great manufacturing industries throughout this country, and they have received the benefits of it, and from it they have amassed and accumulated vast fortunes, some of them so great that they have found difficulty in being able even to give them away as fast as they have accumulated in their coffers. If the farmers and the mass of the people of this country have so enriched these manufacturing interests during all these years, it is an old saying that turn about is fair play. I appeal to you to take away some of that protection and give the farmers the benefit of the reduction and let the infant industries, which are no longer infants but giants and able to compete with the nations of the world, contribute something to help the farmers and the plain people and the masses of the citizenship of this great Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Without these great agricultural interests, without these farmers, the smoke would disappear from the chimneys of your factories, the fires would die out of your furnaces, railroads would cease to operate, the wheels of commerce would stand still, the merchant would close his store, the lawyer would shut up his office, the doctor would close up his office, and your cities would become waste places, and barren deserts.

Therefore, my friends, fellow Members, I appeal to you to vote for this bill and to vote as you shall answer to your constituency, to your people, to your country, and to your God. I thank you for your indulgence, your patience, and your close and kind attention. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413, to place agricultural implements and other articles on the free list, and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the case of James W. Belvin, Fiftieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. CARY, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the case of John Clark, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, April 29, 1911.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 7958) to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SLAYDEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 7959) to fix the salaries and to provide for the retirement of certain judges of the island of Porto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7960) appropriating $10,000 for the construction of a reservoir in Sandoval County, Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7961) to authorize the exploration and purchase of mines within the boundaries of private land claims; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7962) to quiet title to certain lands in Dona Ana County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7963) pensioning the surviving officers and enlisted men of the New Mexico and Arizona Volunteers employed in the defense of the frontier of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona against Mexican marauders and Indian depredations from 1855 to 1890, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7964) to add to the Lincoln National Forest Reserve and to the Alamo National Forest Reserve, in New Mexico, certain portions of the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico and to provide for the sale of certain lands now embraced in said reservations for the creation of a fund for the benefit of said Mescalero Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7965) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7966) amending act of June 27, 1898, permitting payment of pensions to officers and men of Indian wars and their widows, between 1849 and 1854; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7967) to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the passage of local or special laws in the Territories to limit Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7968) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey the unappropriated nonmineral desert lands of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7969) donating the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 36, township 1 south, range 34 east, New Mexico principal base and meridian, in New Mexico, to Bedford Forrest Camp, No. 1606, United Confederate Veterans; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7970) to establish a fish-cultural station at Trout Springs, Gallinas Canyon, San Miguel County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7971) to validate an act of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, with reference to the issues of certain bonds; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7972) to establish a soldiers' home at Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7973) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to allot agricultural lands in the Mescalero Apache Indian Reservation to the Indians resident therein, and setting aside the remainder of said reservation as a national park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7974) to authorize the issue of bridge bonds by the county of Valencia, in the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7975) appropriating $10,000 for the construction of a reservoir in the Manzano Mountains, Torrance County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 7976) to provide for the erection of a public building at Webster Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7977) to amend section 113 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 7978) to place on the free list salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7979) to place on the free list sewing machines and all parts thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7980) to place on the free list all timber and lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7981) to place on the free list boots, shoes, harness, saddles, and saddlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 7982) to amend section 5 of an act approved August 30, 1890, entitled "An act providing for an inspection of meats for exportation, prohibiting the importation of adulterated articles of food or drink, and authorizing the President to make proclamation in certain cases, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 7983) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 7984) authorizing the Public Printer to pay pro rata leave to temporary employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 7985) providing for the admission, care, and maintenance of disabled or indigent employees of the United States of America on the Panama Canal in the several soldiers' homes of these United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 7986) to establish a fish-cultural station in the western part of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 7987) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909, in so far as it applies to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7988) providing for the erection of a public building at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 7989) to improve Lake Traverse in the States of South Dakota and Minnesota; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 7990) granting relief to certain members of the Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 7991) providing for the retirement of certain officers of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 7992) to provide for the acquisition and improvement of the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7993) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico, and the general pension law granting pensions to those who contracted disabilities in the service and in the line of duty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7994) making an appropriation for the construction of an inland waterway from Rehoboth Bay to Delaware Bay, in the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 136) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department to have printing and binding done; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution (H. Res. 137) to authorize the Committee on Education to have printing and binding done; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 138) to provide for necessary printing and binding by the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior during the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STANLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 139) to investigate violations of antitrust act of 1890; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDREWS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 80) approving certain laws of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 81) disapproving certain laws of the Territorial Legislative Assembly of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide for printing of 1,000,000 copies of what is known as Uncle Sam's Cook Book; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 7995) granting an increase of pension to Michael Grigeois; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 7996) granting a pension to Miguel Romero; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7997) granting a pension to John H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7998) granting an increase of pension to Pascualita J. G. de Anaya; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7999) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius J. Demorest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8000) for the relief of Capt. H. C. Smith; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8001) for the relief of Juan Estevan Vigil; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 8002) for the relief of the legal representatives of J. H. Latta, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 8003) for the relief of David C. McGee; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8004) to authorize the payment of $5,000 to the widow of the late Tranquilino Luna, in full for his contest expenses in the contested-election case of Manzanares against Luna; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8005) for the relief of the heir and legal representative of R. W. Daniels, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8006) for the relief of Nathan Bibo, sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8007) for the relief of Eduardo Martinez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8008) for the relief of Jose Antionio Barreras; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8009) for the relief of W. J. Goodwin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8010) for the relief of Louis Kahn; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8011) for the relief of Rebecca J. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8012) for the relief of Ventura Maestas; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8013) for the relief of Pedro Salazar y Garcia; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8014) for the relief of E. H. Biernbaum; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8015) for the relief of F. Nerio Gomez; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8016) for the relief of John S. Bowie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8017) for the relief of W. A. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8018) giving the Court of Claims jurisdiction to adjudicate two claims for Indian depredations of the estate of Blas Lucero, late of Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8019) granting to the Women's Missionary Union of El Paso, Tex., certain unappropriated land for a public sanatorium; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 8020) granting an increase of pension to Warren J. Hazell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8021) granting an increase of pension to Richard Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8022) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Garvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8023) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8024) for the relief of the estate of Joseph G. Murphy; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 8025) granting a pension to Susan E. Whitmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8026) granting a pension to Elizabeth Teets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8027) for the relief of Emanuel Newland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 8028) granting an increase of pension to George W. Nobles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8029) granting an increase of pension to William Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8030) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Israel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 8031) granting an increase of pension to Moses Casner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 8032) granting an increase of pension to Bridget McAloon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 8033) referring to the Court of Claims for adjudication and determination the claims of the widow and family of Marcus P. Norton and the heirs at law, assigns, legatees, or legal representatives of others; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 8034) to remove the charge of desertion against Henry W. Ross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8035) for the relief of John Streckfus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 8036) granting an honorable discharge to William Ham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 8037) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8038) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 8039) granting an increase of pension to Horatio B. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 8040) granting an increase of pension to Richard Holt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 8041) for the relief of Andrew H. Russell and William R. Livermore; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 8042) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8043) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Henthorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to Edward Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8045) granting an increase of pension to Philip D. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8046) granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8047) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 8048) for the relief of Andrew J. McWhirter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8049) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Crall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 8050) granting an increase of pension to Eugene A. S. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 8051) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Curas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 8052) granting an increase of pension to Helen K. Krischenmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 8053) granting a pension to Francis G. French, alias Frank Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8054) granting a pension to Carlos Dinsmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8055) granting an increase of pension to William Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8056) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Van Kleek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8057) granting a pension to Monta E. Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8058) granting an increase of pension to Luther L. Humphrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8059) granting an increase of pension to William J. Teed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8060) authorizing appointment of Hugh T. Reed upon retired list of the Army with rank of captain with 20 years' service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8061) for the relief of John D. Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8062) granting an increase of pension to William M. Miner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8063) granting an increase of pension to Washington T. Alsup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8064) granting a pension to Eliza B. Herbst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 8065) granting an increase of pension to Charles Larkin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8066) for the relief of Walter F. Lockhart; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: A bill (H. R. 8067) granting an increase of pension to Augustus W. Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8068) for the relief of Deloss M. Baker, Frank W. Clay, and Herman V. C. Hart, committee, and to reimburse those who subscribed and paid for site for post-office building at Adrian, Mich; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 8069) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8070) granting an increase of pension to Seth Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8071) for the relief of Mrs. L. A. Royster; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petitions of Thomas Fox Paper Co. and Richardson Paper Co., of Lockland, Ohio, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of Parr Bros., John C. Thomas, Frank & Co., G. M. Fribley, A. J. Harris, John A. Hurst, C. W. Scott, C. E. Lashmers, William Lewis, Baad & Kline, and V. Aeme Bros. Co., all merchants of New Philadelphia, Ohio, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of the estate of Joseph G. Murphy, of Jackson County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: Petition of citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., requesting the sum of $25,000 be appropriated for the purpose of devising means for checking the spread of the alfalfa leaf weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of Local No. 270, International Molders' Union of North America, of Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of La Salle, Ill., favoring a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GILLETT: Petition of South Amherst Adult Bible Class, of Amherst, Mass., requesting the passage of a bill forbidding the transmission of race gambling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Mapleton, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the Hanna bill, paying additional compensation to rural free-delivery carriers; J. Pedersen, of Medora, N. Dak., against parcels post; and S. T. Henderson and W. V. Henderson, of Crystal, N. Dak., protesting against raising the rates of postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEALD: Petitions of Washington Camp, No. 18, of Violi, Del.; Camp No. 3, of Kenton, Del.; and Camp No. 17, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring legislation restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Affidavits to accompany H. R. 5239, to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John H. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: Protest of citizens of Sigourney, Iowa, against the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAMB: Resolutions of Trade and Labor Assembly of Savannah, Ga., favoring amendment to the oleomargarine law reducing tax on same, and by Trade and Labor Council of Lowell, Mass., favoring amendment to the oleomargarine law, reducing the tax on same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of John Rice and 50 others, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 427, Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging enactment of an illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 102, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Steelton, Pa., urging the illiteracy test with relation to the admission of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Division No. 57, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Providence, R. I., to admit to the mails as second-class matter periodical publications issued by or under the auspices of benevolent and fraternal societies and orders and institutions of learning or by trades unions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of Trades and Labor Assembly of Helena, Mont., in favor of parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, against any legislation for a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. STONE: Papers to accompany a bill to increase the pension of Thomas A. Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Avoca Manufacturing Co., of Avoca, N. Y., protesting against jute bagging for baling cotton being put on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *April 29, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Eternal and ever-living God, our Father, incline Thine ear and hear our petition. Thou art infinite; we are finite; Thou art all inclusive, while we are but integral parts of a stupendous whole. Hold us close to Thee, that we may feel the warm, life-giving currents of Thy loving heart, and believe that whatsoever Thou dost order for us is better than anything we could desire for ourselves; that we may harmonize our thoughts with Thy thoughts, our ways with Thy ways, and submit our will to Thine. In the spirit of the Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the free-list bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the speech delivered by President Taft in New York on the evening of April 27, 1911, on Canadian reciprocity. I ask that this be done in view of the speech made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] on yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the speech delivered by President Taft in New York the night before last. Is there objection?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no power to consent to the publication of the speech.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print that speech as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The President's speech is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, and Gentlemen of the Associated Press and American Newspaper Publishers' Association:

I thank the toastmaster for his gracious and kindly introduction. He seems to expect a few candid remarks by me upon the press of the country, and has offered me this occasion as an opportunity for getting even, as it were, with some of its members. But I shall disappoint him. I have no grievance. This is the only world we have, the press is its chief instrument in the formation of public opinion, and I could not hope to change the tone of the press by what I might say here by way of suggesting improvement, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I might make it a good deal worse. I am in a position where every act of mine is fairly subject to review, and whether the comment be friendly and judicial or hostile and unfair, it goes with other burdens of the office, is the price of serving the public, and is to be taken, as every thorough and sportsmanlike golfer will understand, as a "rub of the green."

Your toastmaster has been good enough to mention, as a subject upon which our minds will meet, a general arbitration treaty with Great Britain. I believe that the proposal for this is moving along with as much rapidity as is consistent with care in drafting the agreement and securing for it as broad a scope as possible.

It may not be inappropriate for me to refer to a kindred subject that will indirectly stimulate international peace, and will be a substantial step in that direction, to wit, the reciprocity with Canada.

I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking to a body which fully represents the most important agencies for the formation of public opinion in this country upon a question which has now reached a critical point in its settlement. The agreement is a commercial one, and affects the duties on imports from each country into the other, and, therefore, it is difficult to say that a detailed discussion of tariff schedules is not relevant and important in considering its wisdom. But the general, commercial, economic, and social arguments in its favor are so convincing that I may be pardoned if I do not dwell on specific rates.

The treaty provides for free trade in all agricultural products, and in rough lumber down to the point of planing. It reduces the duties on secondary food products by a very substantial percentage, and it makes such reductions on a number of manufactured articles that those engaged in making them have assured us that the reductions will substantially increase the already large Canadian demand for them.

We tendered to the Canadian commissioners absolutely free trade in all products of either country, manufactured or natural, but the Canadian commissioners did not feel justified in going so far. It is only reasonable to infer, therefore, that with respect to those articles upon which they refused free trade to us they felt that the profitable price at which they could be sold by our manufacturers in Canada was less than the price at which their manufacturers could afford to sell the same either to their own people or to us. Hence it follows that their refusal to agree to free trade in these articles, as we proposed, is the strongest kind of evidence that if we should take off the existing duty from such articles coming into the United States it would not affect in the slightest degree the price at which those articles could be furnished to the public here. In other words, the proposition to put on the free list for entrance into the United States all articles that Canada has declined to make free in both countries would not lower the price to the consumer here. Thus the reason why meats were not put on the free list in this Canadian agreement was because Canada felt that the competition of our packers would injuriously affect the products of their packing houses. If that be true, how would it help our consumer or lower the price of meat in our markets if we let their meat in free while they retained a duty on our meat?

The same thing is true of flour. They would not consent to free trade in flour, because they knew that our flour mills could undersell their millers. If that were so, then how much competition and lowering of the price of flour could we expect from putting Canadian flour on the free list?

And yet gentlemen insist that the farmer has been unjustly treated because we have not put Canadian flour and meat on the free list. And it is proposed to satisfy the supposed grievance of the farmers by now doing so, without any compensating concession from Canada. This proposal would be legislation passed for political-platform uses, without accomplishing any real good.

In another aspect, however, the effect of the proposal might be serious. Of course a mere reduction of our tariff, or the putting of any article on our free list, without insisting on a corresponding change in the Canadian tariff, will not interfere with the contract as made with Canada. Canada can not object to our giving her greater tariff concessions than we have agreed to give her under the contract. But if we do make such concessions, without any consideration on the part of Canada, without any quid pro quo, so to speak, after the contract has been tentatively agreed upon by those authorized to make contracts for ratification in both Governments, then we are in danger of creating an obligation against us in favor of all other foreign countries with whom we have existing treaties containing what is called the "favored-nation" clause. By this clause we agree to give the same commercial privileges to the country with whom we have made the treaty as we give to any other nation. This clause has been construed by our statesmen not to involve us in an obligation to extend a privilege to all

nations which we confer upon one nation in consideration of an equally valuable privilege received from that one nation. In other words, it has been held not to include special bargains or contracts where there is a consideration moving to each side for the obligation of the other.

But the serious question that would arise is whether if, now that the contract has been tentatively agreed upon and is about to be confirmed by Canada, we should grant to Canada more than the contract requires, we could claim that this extra concession was not a pure gratuity and one which was necessarily extended to all other nations under the favored-nation clause. There are two objections, therefore, to inserting in the bill confirming this Canadian contract additions to our free list from Canada. The first is that they are a concession that is of no value to those whom it is proposed to propitiate by adopting it, and the second is that it may involve us indirectly in a doubtful obligation in respect to trade with other countries. If we desire to put meat and flour and other commodities on the free list for the entire world, that is one thing; we can do it with our eyes open and with a knowledge of what it entails after an investigation, but to put such a provision in a Canadian treaty and then have it operate as a free list for the entire world is legislation necessarily ill considered.

More than this, those proposed gratuitous concessions are in the nature of an admission that in some way or other we have done an injury to a particular class by this Canadian reciprocity agreement. I deny it. It is said that it injures the farmers. I deny it. It is strictly in accordance with the protective principle that we should only have a protective tariff between us and countries in which the conditions are so dissimilar as to make a difference in the cost of production. Now, it is known of all men that the general conditions that prevail in Canada are the same as those which obtain in the United States in the matter of agricultural products. Indeed, if there is any advantage, the advantage is largely on the side of the United States, because we have much greater variety of product, in view of the varieties of our climate, than they can have in Canada.

We raise cotton as no other country does. Of course they raise none in Canada.

We raise corn, and hogs and cattle fed on corn, and with the exception of a very small part of the acreage of Canada, in Ontario, it is not possible to raise corn at all in the Dominion.

With respect to wheat and barley and oats, conditions differ in different parts of Canada and in different parts of the United States. Classing them together, and on the whole, the conditions are substantially the same. In prices of farm land the differences are no greater between Canada and the United States than between the different States in the United States. In the matter of farm wages, they differ in different parts of Canada as they do in the United States; but, on the whole, they are about the same—higher in Canada at some places than in the United States and less at others. But there is no pauper class of labor in either country, and the only difference between the two countries is that Canada is farther north than the United States, a difference which, as already said, gives the advantage agriculturally to our side of the border.

It is said that this is an agreement that affects agricultural products more than manufactures. That is true; but if we are to have an interchange of products between the two countries of any substantial amount the chief part of it must necessarily be in agricultural products. As it is we export to Canada more agricultural products than we receive from her, and so it will be afterwards. The effect is not going to lower, in my judgment, the specific prices of agricultural products in our country. It is going to steady them; it is going to reduce the rapid fluctuations, and it is going to produce an interchange of products at a profit which will be beneficial to both countries.

If objection can be made to the treaty on the ground that a particular class derive less benefit from it than other classes, then it is the manufacturer of the country who ought to object, because the treaty, in its nature, will not enlarge his market as much as it will that of the farmer.

I am quite aware that, from one motive or another, a great deal of effort and money have been spent in sending circulars to farmers to convince them that this Canadian treaty, if adopted, will do them injury. I do not know that it is possible to allay such fears by argument, pending the consideration of the treaty by the Senate. It usually takes a considerable time by argument to clarify erroneous economic views of this kind having no foundation in fact, but only in fear, stimulated by misrepresentation and exaggeration. But there is one way—and that a conclusive way—of demonstrating the fallacy and unfounded character of their fears to the farmers, or any other class that believes itself to be unjustly affected by this treaty, and that is to try it on. There is no obligation on either nation to continue the reciprocity arrangement any longer than it desires, and if it be found by actual practice that there is an injury, and a permanent injury, to the farmers of this country, everybody knows that they can sufficiently control legislation to bring about a change and a return to the old conditions. Those of us who are responsible for the Canadian treaty are willing and anxious to subject it to that kind of a test, and we have no doubt that when it is put in operation the ghosts which have been exhibited to frighten the agricultural classes will be laid forever.

Another and a very conclusive reason for closing the contract is the opportunity which it gives us to increase the supply of our natural resources which, with the wastefulness of children, we have wantonly exhausted. The timber resources of Canada, which will open themselves to us inevitably under the operation of this agreement, are now apparently inexhaustible. I say "apparently inexhaustible," for if the same procedure were to be adopted in respect to them that we have followed in respect to our own forests I presume that they, too, might be exhausted. But fortunately for Canada and for us we and they have learned much more than we realized two decades ago with respect to the necessity for proper methods of forestry and of lumber cutting. Hence, we may be safe in saying that under proper modern methods the timber resources open to us in Canada may be made inexhaustible and we may derive ample supplies of timber from Canadian sources, to the profit of Canada and for our own benefit.

There are other natural resources, which I need not stop to enumerate, that will become available to us as if our own if we adopt and maintain commercial union with Canada; and this is one of the chief reasons that ought to commend the Canadian agreement to the farseeing statesmanship of leaders of American public opinion.

But there are other, even broader, grounds than this that should lead to the adoption of the agreement. Canada's superficial area is greater than that of the United States between the oceans. Of course it has a good deal of waste land in the far north, but it has enormous tracts of unoccupied land, or land settled so sparsely as to be substantially unoccupied, which in the next two or three decades will rapidly acquire a substantial and valuable population. The Government is one entirely controlled by the people, and the bond uniting the Dominion with the mother country is light and almost imperceptible. There are no restrictions upon the trade or economic development of Canada which will interfere in the slightest with her carving out her independent future. The attitude of the people is that of affection toward the mother country, and of a sentimental loyalty toward her royal head. But for practical purposes the control exercised from England by Executive or Parliament is imponderable.

Canada has now between seven and eight millions of people. They are a hardy, temperate, persistent race, brave, intelligent, and enterprising, sharing or inheriting the good qualities of all their ancestors, and with a national pride in their Dominion that grows with the wonderful success and prosperity that have attended them in the last three decades. They are good neighbors; we could not have better neighbors. It is more than a hundred years since a hostile shot was fired across the border, and they are like us because our conditions are similar and because our traditions are similar.

They are more restrictive in their immigration laws than we, and perhaps they grow less rapidly; but they have before them a wonderful expansion in population, in agriculture, and in business, and they offer to any nation with whom they have sympathetic relations, and with whom it is profitable for them to deal, a constantly increasing market and an ever-expanding trade.

The question which we now have to answer is whether we propose to maintain an artificial wall across the country of 3,700 miles in length and of indefinite height to prevent the natural trade that would flow between two great nations of people of the same language, of similar character, tradition, business habits, and moral aspirations, when the removal of that wall would furnish to each country the economic advantage of its corresponding enlargement of prosperous population and territory without the added responsibility of government and political control.

The theory that trade is not profitable to one party unless it is done at a loss to the other party is at the bottom of a great deal of the economic fallacies of the past and the present. Trade is mutually beneficial. It is profitable to both parties, for if it is not it can not and ought not continue. As between

Canada and the United States, the trade and the mutual benefit from the trade will increase.

It is amusing—and I am not sure that it has not some elements of consolation in it—to find that all the buncombe and all of the exaggeration and misrepresentation in politics and all of the political ghosts are not confined to our own country, and that there has entered into the discussion in Canada, as a reason for defeating the adoption of this contract by the Canadian Parliament, a fear that we desire to annex the Dominion; and the dreams of Americans with irresponsible imaginations, who like to talk of the starry flag's floating from Panama to the pole, are exhibited by the opponents of the Canadian treaty in Canada as the declaration of a real policy by this country and as an announcement of our purpose to push political control over our neighbor of the north.

I am not an anti-imperialist, but I have had considerable experience in the countries over which we have assumed temporary control. I do not know when that control will end, but I do know that in respect to those countries we have taken over heavy duties and obligations, the weight of which ought to destroy any temptation to further acquisition of territory.

It would be invidious to institute a comparison between the Government of Canada and this country, but there is one part of our jurisdiction and that of Canada that come together sufficiently close to enable the Canadians and ourselves to realize that the sample of government that we exhibit is not alluring. I refer to the control of Alaska as compared with the control by Canada of her northwest territory. The talk of annexation is bosh. Everyone who knows anything about it realizes that it is bosh. Canada is a great, strong youth, anxious to test his muscles, rejoicing in the race he is ready to run. The United States has all it can attend to with the territory it is now governing, and to make the possibility of the annexation of Canada to the United States a basis for objection to any steps toward their greater economic and commercial union should be treated as one of the jokes of the platform and should not enter into the consideration of serious men engaged in solving a serious problem.

Why should not we have a closer union with Canada? Think of the absurdity of separating Manitoba and Minneapolis by as great a distance as Manitoba and Liverpool when certainly Providence intended that their separation, socially and commercially, should only be that of their geographical distance. Canadians have furnished us a large number of our best citizens. We are giving them a large number of the pick of our young farmers. Let us open the gateways between us. Let us give to both countries the profit of the trade that God intended between us. Let the political governments remain as they are. Let us abolish arbitrary and artificial obstructions to our association with our friends upon the north and derive the mutual profit that it will certainly bring.

The Canadian contract has passed the House substantially as adopted and in such form that if adopted in the same way by the Senate it will go into effect as soon as the bill now pending in the Canadian Parliament shall be passed by that Parliament.

I desire to express my high appreciation of the manner in which the present House of Representatives have treated the reciprocity agreement. It has not "played politics." It has taken the statesmanlike course in respect to it.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will treat the agreement in the same way and that no amendments will there be added to the bill. For the reasons given, I think they are dangerous. It is not for me to question the good faith of those who propose to introduce and adopt them, but it is appropriate to say that the use of amendments is a very common method of defeating legislation when the responsibility for its defeat is one that the movers of such amendments do not desire openly to assume.

It may be that the Canadian contract does not go far enough. In making it we were limited by the reluctance of Canada to go as far as we would wish to have her go, but the fact that it does not go far enough is the poorest reason for not going as far as we can. We were making a contract, we were balancing considerations; we were not making a general tariff law or a general tariff revision. It was no part of our duty to reduce the tariff generally in this contract with other countries. If that is to be done, and if there is a sincere desire to have it done, then it ought to be done by separate legislation, and the passage of the present agreement, which I regard as epoch making in the commercial relations between the two countries, should not be endangered by making its passage conditioned on the passage of tariff revision or other legislation having no real relevancy to the contract.

I appeal to this company, representing as it does the press of the United States, to see to it that it is made clear to the public that this contract ought to stand or fall by its own terms, and that its passage or defeat ought not to be affected in any regard by other amendments to the tariff law. Such a method is a recurrence to the old way of making a tariff bill, which has been properly criticized and condemned, by which its passage is secured not on the merits of particular schedules, but by the support that may be secured in the House or Senate through giving a tariff on particular products of particular localities.

I think there is a general sentiment now in favor of revising the tariff, schedule by schedule, and of making this revision dependent on exact information as to each schedule, gathered by impartial investigators. To amend this Canadian contract and to make its passage dependent on other tariff legislation is to continue the old method of tariff revision characterized, not without reason, as a local issue.

I have said that this was a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity. It is critical, because, unless it is now decided favorably to reciprocity, it is exceedingly probable that no such opportunity will ever again come to the United States. The forces which are at work in England and in Canada to separate her by a Chinese wall from the United States and to make her part of an imperial commercial band, reaching from England around the world to England again, by a system of preferential tariffs, will derive an impetus from the rejection of this treaty, and if we would have reciprocity with all the advantages that I have described, and that I earnestly and sincerely believe will follow its adoption, we must take it now or give it up forever.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the policy of tariff for revenue only, as it is interpreted and proposed to be applied by the Democratic Party, is the most unphilosophical, the most illogical, the most inconsistent tariff policy that was ever proposed to an intelligent people. That is a broad statement, but history will attest its truth. There are two primary tariff policies—one is the policy of discriminating in the imposition of customs duties for the purpose of developing domestic industries and the other is the policy of free trade. There is no middle ground that is tenable from the standpoint of logic or experience or from any other standpoint. The policy of protection is right or it is wrong. If it is wrong, it is just as wrong if it be established under a tariff for revenue only as it is if it be properly labeled and go to the country without disguise. There is only one great free-trade country in the civilized world, and that is Great Britain. That country has a tariff-for-revenue-only policy in the real sense of the term. It levies its customs duties exclusively upon noncompetitive products. Our political adversaries insist that duties upon competitive products increase the price of the imported article to the amount of the duty exacted and likewise enables the producer of the domestic article to charge a price equal at least to the price of the imported product, including the duty. Therefore, if that contention is sound, any duty that is imposed under any pretext whatever upon competitive articles enables the producers of those articles in our own country to impose an artificially high price upon the consumer.

It does not make a bit of difference what you term the duty or the policy under which it is imposed; it is immaterial whether you call it protection or tariff for revenue only, it is identically the same thing in essence and it produces the same result. No country in the world has ever adopted a tariff-for-revenue-only policy as it is defined by the Democratic Party. Democrats are protectionists or they are free traders, and judging by the character of the bill that is before the House for consideration at this time, they should be classed as absolute free traders. If they follow their own logic, they can be nothing else than free traders. If revenue is the sole consideration in customs laws, our importations of noncompetitive articles are abundantly sufficient to yield all the revenues that we are accustomed to receive from our foreign trade. The only explanation for the inconsistent attitude of that party upon the tariff question is that they have opposed the policy of protection so long and so persistently and have denounced it so vehemently that they lack the courage to be candid now and admit that they have been wrong all of these years and that the Republican Party has been right, so they are driven to the necessity of avowing a hybrid policy—half protection and half free trade—under the cloak of tariff for revenue only.

They seek to give protection to favored industries under the policy of tariff for revenue only and at the same time they denounce protection as robbery. Take sugar, for instance. We import about one-half the sugar we consume, and the price of

sugar in this country is the price of imported sugar at our ports plus the duty. There can not be one price for the home product and another price for the imported product. Sugars, foreign and home made, sell in our markets side by side at identically the same price. We receive a revenue out of sugar importations amounting to about $55,000,000 a year, and if the Democrats are right, it costs the sugar consumers of the United States over $120,000,000 a year to put $55,000,000 of revenue in the Public Treasury.

The consumer pays over $2 of bounty or duty upon sugar for every dollar that goes into the Treasury of the Government. If you Democrats are right, why do you not take the duty off of sugar altogether, put it on coffee or some other noncompetitive commodity? A tax of 5 cents a pound on coffee would produce substantially the same amount of revenue as the present duty on sugar yields, and there are no home producers of coffee to reap the unearned and undeserved benefit of the tariff, so that every dollar of additional cost that the consumer would pay on account of the tariff on coffee would go into the Treasury. You understand the philosophy of that proposition. You want a tariff for revenue only, you insist, so the home producer will not be able to rob the consumer. Then, why do you not put sugar on the free list and put your duty on coffee? You dare not do it. You run from your own logic. I believe in the policy of protection. I believe in discriminating in the imposition of customs duties upon competitive products with the view of promoting industrial growth in our own country. I believe in discriminating for the purpose of giving employment to more wage earners at good wages; for the purpose of maintaining a high standard of wages and a high standard of living among the American toilers. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, if the policy of protection should be abolished the inevitable result would be that wages in the United States would gravitate to the level of wages in European and other cheap-labor countries. Nothing could prevent it. Wages and values, like water, seek a universal level. The tariff wisely levied under the policy of protection operates like a dam in a river. It maintains a higher level above the dam than the level below it. Destroy the dam and the water above and below seeks a common level, but the water below the dam never goes up to the level of the water above, but the water above, by the immutable law of gravitation, finds the level of the water below. It has been the experience of practically every great producing country in the civilized world that the best results come from a wise and rational policy of protection.

Up to about three-quarters of a century ago Great Britain operated under that policy, and when she attained the position of industrial and commercial supremacy among the nations of the earth she abolished her protective system and established a policy of free trade, or tariff for revenue only, with customs duties upon noncompetitive commodities exclusively. And what has been the result? For 25 years Great Britain's commercial supremacy has been waning. She is no longer commercial premier among the nations. It is said that under the doctrine of Adam Smith, Ricardo, and John Stuart Mill, the great free-trade philosophers, there is a more equitable distribution between labor and capital of their joint products, that the laborer receives a more munificent return for his toil. Has that been the experience in England? Does the wage earner in England under the policy of free trade enjoy a higher degree of prosperity than the wage earner in America or the wage earner in France or in Germany under the policy of protection? I may not be well advised in relation to it, but I understand that Great Britain is the only one of the great industrial countries that has found it necessary to adopt and maintain the policy of old-age industrial pension. When her toilers have worked and struggled in factory and mine for a bare subsistence until they can work no longer, they are paid an annuity out of the public treasury. They are unable to provide for the exigencies of age and disability out of their earnings. They can not hope for assistance from the sons and daughters they have reared, for the sons and daughters are no more than able to provide for themselves and those directly dependent upon them. In the light of England's experience can it be maintained that protection takes from the toiler that just share of the joint creation of labor and capital that would be his under the policy of free trade? Under free trade there is so little to divide between labor and between labor and capital after paying the necessary expenses of production that they both share meagerly.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that they use the public funds with which to feed the school children in England and Wales?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is suggested they use the public funds to feed and support their school children in free-trade England. That, Mr. Chairman, is an object lesson of the disastrous results of free trade. If there is a just and equitable distribution of wealth under the English free-trade policy between labor and capital dividends on stocks must also be paid out of the public treasury.

The bill now under consideration is advertised throughout the country as the "farmers' free-list bill." Our political adversaries, wise and patriotic as they are, and good citizens, of course, have been for generations denouncing the Republican Party for class legislation. Judging from their preachments, they have been standing in solid phalanx against legislation for "special interests"; and now, preparing for the campaign of 1912, doubtless they have taken the American farmer to their sympathetic bosom and propose to give him the benefit of a special free-trade list. Is that class legislation?

Is this a tariff-for-revenue-only bill? Where does the revenue feature appear? It proposes to surrender $10,000,000 a year of revenue, and I am unable to discover where there is any compensating advantage in return. Are the farmers of the United States asking for special legislation? Are they asking to be made the beneficiaries of tariff discrimination? I understand not. They can not afford to be, because the farmer is one of the few producers in this country who is unable to monopolize his products, and he should stand like adamant at all times and under all conditions against legislation for special interests, against class legislation of any kind or character. If it is wise and proper to legislate specially for the benefit of the farmer, why is it not also wise and proper to legislate specially for other industries? The farmer is too wise to be fooled by any proposition that is as thinly disguised as this one. It will not only do him no good, but it will do him positive harm.

This bill, instead of being entitled a bill to put certain articles on the free list, should be entitled a bill embodying the hope of the Democratic leaders to secure the farmer vote in the campaign of 1912.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does not the gentleman believe that the farmers in his district would readily agree to have agricultural implements put on the free list?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Perhaps they would. I do not know of any farmer that would object to it.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Do you know of any manufacturers that would?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have made no inquiry. But that is not what you are proposing to do. We already have reciprocal free trade in farm implements. We already provide in our tariff that implements coming from any country that admits our implements into its ports free of duty shall be admitted without any duty in our ports. The farmers in my section of Indiana are patriots; they are sensible people, and they believe somewhat in the old Blaine policy of reciprocity—that if we can obtain something that will be of substantial benefit in return for valuable concessions to other countries, it is good statesmanship and good business to do it. You propose to open the ports free to commodities that now yield us $10,000,000 a year of revenue, without securing to the farmers of the country a market for a single additional barrel of flour or a pound of pork. You are securing nothing in return for your concessions; you will have nothing in your game bag as a result of your wild chase after votes in 1912, and you surely will not get the votes.

I can scarcely believe that the Democratic leaders prepared and introduced this bill with the intention, or even with the hope, that it would become a law. This is campaign material for 1912, and the expense of printing and distributing it will not be set out in the report of the treasurer of the campaign committee under the publicity act.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. For a question.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The statement you made a moment ago I have heard made repeatedly time and time again in the last 15 days, namely, that we now have free trade in farming implements with the nations of the world. I want to correct that statement. I have consulted with Mr. Curtis, of the Customs Department of the Treasury, and he informs me that there are only two countries that give free trade—England and Russia—in farming implements.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. England manufactures and exports farm implements in considerable quantities, and her exports to this country pay no duty. I did not say that we had absolute free trade in implements; I said we had reciprocal free trade. I said that we have a law authorizing the importation of farm implements free of duty from all countries that accept our im-

plements duty free. The American farmer does not expect this Government to open our markets to foreign countries free of charge unless they make the same or equivalent concessions in favor of our exporters. Should we admit wagons and plows from foreign countries into our ports free of duty while they exclude our wagons and plows from their ports by high tariffs? That is not reciprocity nor good business sense. This country must not become the international "goat," if you will pardon a slang term.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I believe our farmers want this bill passed with these additions to the free list. I will say that to the gentleman.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not think the bill will deceive anybody, either here or throughout the country. It is not the function of Congress to legislate happiness into the hearts or money into the pockets of the people if it could do so. It is the duty of the Government to create conditions under which the people may provide for themselves, having a due regard for the rights of each other. The industry, the intelligence, and the enterprise of the people, after all, must create the wealth. It is the duty of the Government to carry into effect, as far as it can do so by proper laws, the principle embodied in that great political classic, the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal. They should be equal before the law, and it is the duty of the Government to keep the door of opportunity open wide and on equal terms to every citizen without regard to rank or fortune.

It is the business of the Government to see that every citizen has an equal chance with every other citizen to work out his own destiny. The man with only 1 talent should be as tenderly regarded, from the standpoint of government and law, as the man with 10 talents.

When the Government shall have established conditions of that kind it will have done substantially all it can to promote the common welfare, and each citizen must then, in a large degree, be left to work out his own salvation.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman stated that all men are created equal, and a moment afterwards he referred to the case of the man with 1 talent and the man with 10 talents. Does the gentleman think that the man with 10 talents and the man with 1 talent were created equal, and does he think that a man with a diseased liver or diseased mind and a man with a healthy body were created equal, and so on down the line?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not make the statement he imputes to me. I said they were created equal so far as government and law are concerned.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But the gentleman did not make that distinction.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. "A man's a man for a' that." Men are not created with the same capacities, the same aptitudes, the same tastes and ambitions. That is taken for granted. But they are all equal in the right to make the highest and best use of the faculties of mind and body. They are all equal in the right to enjoy the same opportunities under the same conditions. These rights belong to every human being, in virtue of his manhood.

There has been a marvelous increase in the aggregate wealth of the United States in the last 15 years, an increase that has not been equaled by any country in the world's history.

It is true that the accumulation of a vast amount of wealth is not in itself the highest proof of real progress. But we must bear in mind that there can be no permanent progress among any people unless there be economic and industrial independence. The man must be free, economically free, and industrially free, and he can not be either in a poverty-stricken country. So the accumulation of a great amount of wealth during the last 15 years does signify something. It does amount to a great deal in connection with other conditions. It means much if there has been a corresponding growth in the moral and intellectual lives of the people. Has there been?

Evidence abounds on every hand that our people have never progressed intellectually and morally more than they have during these recent years of good times. Note the advance that has been made in methods of production, in the employment of scientific methods, and in the substitution of mechanical power for muscular power in all the industries, including agriculture. In the enlarged application of the forces of nature, in the growing supremacy of brain over brawn in all lines of work, advancement along these lines was never more remarkable in the world's history than it has been during the last 15 or 20 years. And I appeal to Members of this House for vindication when I say that the standard of ethics, individual and social, has never been higher in the world's history than it is to-day. More is exacted of the citizen, more is required of the business man to-day in the way of righteous living and fair and honest dealing than there ever was before. So it seems certain that this large increase in wealth has been accompanied by at least an equal advancement in the moral and intellectual lives of our people. True, much must still be accomplished along these lines before there is perfection. But the world is growing better.

But now to the problem of distribution. Our political adversaries agonize over the fact that some men have grown too rich, that the accumulations of labor and capital have not been equitably distributed among the people.

I admit that if the vast increase in aggregate wealth has been centered in the hands of a comparatively few people, while the great masses have been toiling and struggling in poverty and distress, it means nothing in the way of real progress, less than nothing. What are the facts? Let us consult the statistics respecting savings institutions throughout the country. More than $4,000,000,000 are deposited in the savings banks of the country by more than 8,000,000 depositors, an average of about $420 to the depositor. Who are those depositors? Are they the plutocrats and trust promoters? No. They are the wage earners in the factories and the mines, the clerks in the stores, the schoolteachers, the telegraph operators, and others who have been able to accumulate and lay by this vast sum of money. And the deposits in the savings banks by no means constitute the full measure of the surplus earnings and accumulations of these classes of toilers.

They do not include the multiplied millions that have been invested in homes, in insurance, in building and loan establishments, and in numerous other forms of investment. So it does seem that from the standpoint of the wage earners there has been something near an equitable distribution of the joint earnings of labor and capital. Not perfect, I admit, but the situation shows marked advancement in the right direction.

What is the situation in respect to the farmer? The aggregate value of farm property during the last 15 years has more than doubled—has increased fully $14,000,000,000. Farms alone throughout the Middle West have more than doubled in value. Was there ever a time in the history of the world when the farmers have done as well as they have during these years? Has there ever been a time when the farmers have received as great a share in the distribution of accumulated wealth as they have during these years? Every farmer in the country will answer this question in the negative.

So, on analysis, we find that the wealth of the country is not all in the pockets of a few men. I admit that there are many who have not received as much as they desired, nor as much as they deserved. On the other hand there are men who, prompted by greed and avarice, by selfish motives, and endowed with great ability, have taken advantage of the opportunities that have been open to us all and appropriated to themselves much more than their fair share. It is an easy thing to find fault. It is easy to criticize an existing policy, because the creations of man are not perfect. It does not require a great deal of mental energy to discover flaws. But remember that when you come to establish a new policy, one that is an improvement upon that under which we have made such gratifying progress, the task looms large with difficulties. It is much easier to tear down than it is to build up, and it requires less character and brains.

During these years the Republican party, in power in all branches of the Government, has enacted more great historic measures, calculated to elevate the standard of business ethics, calculated to bring about a higher measure of decency and justice among the people in all their relations, than had been enacted before in all history of the Government. And, what is more, those laws have been made a living force by their faithful execution. The great and powerful lawbreakers have been taught that laws are made to be obeyed in letter and in purpose; that the Government is no respecter of persons; that the laws must be observed by the high and mighty as well as by the lowly and humble. The record of these achievements is imperishably engraved upon our national life and character.

Our civilization is not perfect. It never will be perfect until the day of the millenium, but it is moving along in the right direction. The movement of the great current of humanity is onward and upward toward a higher and better plane of existence. There are counter currents and whirlpools and eddies that retard progress, but they can not stop it. With the proper

direction of the great underlying forces that make for universal good, the individual misfortunes will be ameliorated and the injustices reduced to the minimum.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the gentleman from Indiana give us any statistics about the savings in the banks of the country and the farm values during the last Democratic tariff-for-revenue-only administration?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not have those statistics, but the deposits in the savings banks have almost doubled and the value of farm property has more than doubled since the Republican Party took charge of the Government in 1897.

They talk about the lack of opportunities for the poor. That is an effective way to excite the prejudices of the people. There are always more poor people than rich people in the world. "Riches" is a relative term. There always has been a wide disparity between the condition of the capable and the condition of the less capable, and I presume there always will be. Men of great capacity have been able to take advantage of their opportunities and accumulate large fortunes. Some of those fortunes have been made honestly and some of them by questional methods. Honestly acquired wealth is entitled to the respect and protection of the law. Dishonest wealth and dishonest poverty merit condemnation alike.

The Government can not arbitrarily equalize wealth without regard to merit or capacity to earn. That would be industrial socialism of the most objectionable character. Some men will succeed where others fail. In the profession of the law it is often seen that two or three lawyers monopolize the business in their community. Why is that possible? It is because they have the capacity. They have what the people want and are willing to pay for. That same condition exists in all lines of physical and mental activity. In literature the world has had but one Homer, one Shakespeare, one Milton, and yet the field was open to all. So in the field of invention, in the field of finance, men of great capacity will succeed while others fail, and if their success is honest and honorable there is no just ground for complaint. It is the duty of government to see that men deal honesty with each other, to see that men of craft and cunning do not monopolize the great agencies of production nor close the field of opportunity against others. It is the duty of the Government to protect the masses of the people against extortion and oppression and injustice on the part of those who occupy positions of power and influence, either private or public. This is the great work the Republican leaders have been engaged in for the last 10 or more years, and in which such splendid progress has been made.

We all believe that private corporations are indispensable to industrial progress. They are created by government for the purpose of promoting the welfare of society, and it is the duty of the Government to regulate them to the extent that is necessary to secure to society the full benefit it may justly expect. I have no prejudice against honest corporations and no respect for dishonest corporations. They should all be made to obey the law and deal honorably and justly with the people. When was railroad transportation ever in as satisfactory a condition as it is to-day? I undertake to say, without fear of successful contradiction, that any shipper with a single carload of traffic can get identically the same rate between given points anywhere in this country that is given the great shipper who may furnish millions of dollars a year to the transportation companies. The vicious system of rebates has been destroyed. Our railroad service is cleaner and better than it ever was before in the history of the country.

The policy of the Republican Party is to preserve all that is good and helpful in existing conditions, and by wise and prudent methods eliminate as rapidly as possible everything that is wrong and hurtful. A long and uninterrupted period of control of the affairs of the Government finds the Republican Party somewhat disintegrated, but that condition is only temporary. The party is fundamentally right and will, in the nature of things, be the controlling factor in national affairs. I have no sympathy with the attempt to divide the party into warring factions. While we may have different views upon matters of method, they are too unimportant to be the basis of permanent factional division. The party is progressive and always has been. It is progressive in history, tradition, and purpose. It has met and successfully handled every great problem that has arisen in American politics for the last 60 years. This is the most progressive civilization in the entire world, and no party can secure and retain for any considerable period of time control of this great Government unless it shapes and fashions the laws and policies to meet the wants and the needs of a progressive people. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not like the terms "standpatter," "progressive," "insurgent."

I do not believe in Bourbonism. I do not believe in radicalism. The great progressive force in the Republican Party, the force that makes for permanent progress, is composed of the 85 or 90 per cent of the members of that party who believe in moving forward along safe and sane lines. They believe in taking no step in advance unless it can be held, and in making every forward movement that can be maintained. This force is always advancing, because it refuses to hearken unto the advice of either reactionary or radical. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The party has thus avoided the Scylla of Bourbonism on one side and the Charybdis of radicalism on the other side, and that is the only way permanent progress is possible in our politics. I believe in that kind of Republicanism. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Our Democratic friends have consumed a lot of time and energy in denouncing the trusts, and they have promised to do all manner of things to them. I do not have any love for trusts, if I may be permitted to define them. A trust is a monopolistic combination that uses its power unfairly to satisfy its greed. It is the business of the Government to protect the people against monopolies of all kinds. It is not necessary to destroy the industrial organization; it is not necessary to execute a citizen because he may do something that is not altogether right. It was said by a distinguished statesman that the poorest use society can make of a man is to hang him, but even that may be necessary sometimes. I do not believe in hanging a man for stealing a sheep, as was the custom in England a couple of hundred years ago. I do not believe in destroying corporations because they combine and monopolize, but I do believe in destroying the monopolies and compelling the corporations to serve the interests of society. The Republican Party stands for construction rather than destruction. The Democrats prate about their ability to destroy the trusts, but their remedy is worse even than the trusts can possibly be. A farmer had a fine shepherd dog which was unfortunately infested with fleas. He saturated the dog with kerosene oil to kill the pests. One of his small boys struck a match and made a fuse of the dog's tail and in excruciating agony the dog ran under the barn for shelter. The barn was soon enveloped in flames, and with its valuable contents was completely destroyed. When it was all over the farmer surveyed the ruins and said: "Well, there is one consolation, poor Carlo will no longer be pestered with fleas." [Laughter.] I admit that the Democrats can do something to the trusts, but their remedy is altogether too expensive. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. While the policy of free trade may be able to do something to the trusts, what would it meanwhile be doing to the small independent producer?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It would sweep over the country with the fury of a cyclone and leave nothing in its wake. It would do again what was done under the last Democratic administration. It would stagnate business and devastate industries from ocean to ocean, and, like the plagues of Egypt, would not discriminate between the lawful and the lawless, between the good and the bad. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Well, we know what their policy wrought in the country when it was tried before. We know something about the Democratic capacity to destroy trusts. The bill that is now up for consideration is the most grotesque proposition that has been proposed in Congress for a number of years. If the provisions of the bill could be limited exclusively to Canada I would have no objection to it, because it would supplement the reciprocity measure that has already passed the House, and we need no protection against Canada. If conditions respecting wages, standard of living, and cost of production were the same in all other countries as they are in Canada the policy of protection would not be a vital issue in our politics. We can compete with Canada in all lines of production, but we can not compete with Europe and Asia where the population is dense and wages of workmen are not more than half what they are in this country.

But this bill proposes to admit products free from all over the earth—meats from Mexico and Australia and Argentina and everywhere else. It proposes to admit bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and other fabrics free of duty from all countries. It also allows farm implements, and leather and all manufactures thereof to come to our ports without duty. I have a letter in my desk from a manufacturing concern in North Carolina appealing to the Republican side of the House to save the cotton-bagging industry from this attack upon it by the Democratic Party.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Certainly.

Mr. KENDALL. Is that the industry that they claimed to have 400 men on the pay roll, and that they will all be deprived of employment if this bill shall pass?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; that factory has several hundred laborers on its pay roll, and of course they will all be deprived of employment if this bill should go into operation. That letter states also that there are four or five other cotton-bagging plants in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. KENDALL. And South Carolina.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And other States in that section of the country. I know of a number in other parts of the country employing thousands of laborers at good wages who are able to buy the products of the farm, and if this bill goes into operation those factories will be compelled to close, and who will be benefited? The cotton planter may receive a small benefit, because he may possibly get cheaper bagging for his cotton and cheaper ties. He may be benefited to the extent of 2 or 3 cents on each bale of cotton. But that benefit will come at the expense of whom? At the expense of the wheat growers, the cattle and hog raisers of the country, because it would destroy the market they now have in selling food products to the thousands of men who are now employed in those mills. The duty on cotton bagging is only six-tenths of a cent a yard. We import great quantities of it now. It is manufactured in India——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Cotton manufactured in India?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; cotton bagging. It is not made of cotton, it is made of jute, and is a cover for baled cotton. It is manufactured in India, where wages are only 50 cents a week, and our manufacturers are barely keeping their heads above water in the face of such competition with a duty of only six-tenths cent a yard. There are a number of such establishments in this country employing several thousand men.

These men must seek employment in other channels or go without work, and all that is to be done in the interest of the farmer.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield for a question.

Mr. PAGE. Has the gentleman any other evidence, except the mere statement of the people who are engaged in the manufacture of jute bagging, that the removal of the duty that is now on it and placing it upon the free list will put them out of business?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do have, because under the present duty we import over 25,000,000 yards a year, chiefly from India, which is more than half our entire annual consumption. That is the very highest and best proof that is procurable. If you take the duty off, how can the manufacturers in this country subsist? Of course it means the destruction of the cotton-bagging industry in this country, and gentlemen should carefully reflect before doing a thing as serious as that. North Carolina is interested on both sides of the proposition. Then take the question of free steel and iron. There are some kinds of steel and iron, I think, which the steel mills in this country can produce as cheaply as they can be produced in any country in the world, such as pig iron, steel rails, and heavy structural steel. But when the highly wrought, completely fabricated products are considered, such as hoop and band iron and steel, finished and cut and painted and provided with buckles, all involving a great deal of handwork, it is a different question. Our mills can not compete on equal terms in making that class of products with the cheap-labor countries. I am not willing, Mr. Chairman, to vote on a mere guess for a measure that may close industries in this country that employ thousands and thousands of men. It is too serious a proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAGE. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; for a question.

Mr. PAGE. I merely want to suggest to the gentleman that my information, particularly in regard to those establishments which are in North Carolina that are engaged in the manufacture of cotton bagging, is that they are entirely engaged in making the product out of old bagging and——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman has said enough to get his idea into my speech.

Mr. PAGE. Well, sir, I desire to say to the gentleman that my intention in interrupting him was not to inject myself into his speech, but to see if I could bring out some information which the gentleman had not given.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Admitting that my speech might be improved from the standpoint of the gentleman, I only know this, that these manufacturers in the gentleman's State are appealing to Congress against this free-trade bill.

Mr. PAGE. Just as every other protected interest of America is appealing for protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not because of any necessity but from the standpoint of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The gentleman knows better than I do of the character of men who are engaged in this business in his own State, but we all know this, that when the Democrats had control of the Government and put into operation their tariff policies that practically all the industries in the country were closed, and manufacturers are naturally afraid of Democratic tariff legislation. A burnt child avoids fire. [Applause on the Republican side.] Show some fruit "meet for repentance" before you ask the people to repose confidence in your wisdom respecting tariff legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would like to have about 15 minutes additional time.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield the gentleman 15 minuter additional time.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I believe in a just and rational protective tariff myself, and I am not ready, Mr. Chairman, to vote for this free-trade bill unless we have trustworthy information that we can produce all the articles covered by the bill as cheaply as they can be produced in foreign countries. If that can be done, I am willing to vote to take the duty off, but no one pretends that that is the case. If this bill becomes a law, a number of factories will close their doors and thousands of laborers will be out of work. I stand by the policy outlined in the last Republican platform, of maintaining a duty sufficiently high to cover the difference in cost of production here and abroad plus a reasonable profit to the American producer. I believe in a nonpartisan expert tariff commission that will ascertain with practical certainty the difference in cost of production between this country and other countries. I want to know to a moral certainty that any tariff measure proposed will not destroy our industries before I can give it my support. I am not willing to act upon guesswork, because the consequences that would follow a mistake are altogether too serious.

They want cheap meats without reducing the price of cattle and hogs, so they put meats of all kinds on the free list and leave the duty on animals. A bright idea! We had cheap meats for several years, not a great while ago.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. And cheap soup.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Cheap everything. I do not know what the effect of this particular bill will be upon the cost of meats, but I know this, that we can not afford to close the mills—even the steel mills or the cotton-bagging mills—and turn labor out of employment for the purpose of making meats cheap, although that will do it. We can not afford to secure cheap living by destroying the producing capacity of our people. We never have good times in this country, and never will have good times, except when prices are good. Such a thing is impossible. I do not believe in abnormal prices, in unjust prices, but I believe in good prices as the result of natural, economic law, the law of supply and demand. When prices come that way it is evidence of prosperity. The complaint about the high cost of living seems to be general throughout the country.

I remember very well when living was cheap—that was during the last Democratic administration. Living was cheap enough then. Meats were cheap, but what good was it to a hungry man who was out of a job and who had no credit because he was out of employment, to say to him that meat was cheap? The people of this country procure the necessaries and the comforts of life much easier to-day than they did 15 or 16 years ago. That is evidenced by their greatly increased consuming capacity. If times were so hard, prices were so high, the people would not be able to consume the enormous amount of products they do now. The average American consumes more of the necessaries and the comforts of life than 10 of the average of the world's population outside of this country. Our 90,000,000 of people constitute as great a market for the products of toil and capital as 900,000,000 (more than half) of the average of the world's population in other countries.

If times were so hard and prices so high we could not buy so much. There can be no consumption without there is production. The consumer must produce something to exchange for the things that are necessary to satisfy his wants.

I remember very well the campaign following the McKinley act in 1890. That act went into operation in October. The election came in November following, and the Democrats swept the country. There were hardly enough Republican Congressmen elected to fill the "Cherokee strip" on our side of the

Chamber. The critics and the faultfinders had created so much dissatisfaction and the demagogues had made so many promises that could not be performed that the people were cajoled into voting the Democratic ticket. And McKinley and McKinleyism were declared to be dead and buried forever. Even Mr. McKinley himself went down in defeat in his old Ohio district, the only time in all his illustrious career that he was beaten at a popular election. And there were others.

The campaign of 1892 was waged against the "iniquities" of the McKinley tariff and for a tariff for revenue only, that promised everybody all the good things conceivable. The result of the election seemed at the time to be the death knell of protection and the consignment of Mr. McKinley to his political sepulcher. But he never faltered in his faith. True to the traditions of his party, he went down in honorable defeat. The Republican ship was wrecked upon the shoals of prejudice and misrepresentation, but it had on board the ark of the covenant of the Republicanism of Lincoln, and of Sherman, and of Morton, and of Blaine, and of Harrison. When the country discovered what an awful mistake had been made at the election of 1892, rescue parties were organized to raise the ship and restore it to its proper position of supremacy on the sea of American politics. It required four long, long, impatient years to do it. During those years there was commercial stagnation and industrial paralysis throughout the country. In this land of plenty there was hunger and distress. But the end came, and the hopes of the people were fulfilled and their prayers were answered at the presidential election in 1896. There was joy in millions of hearts when the tidings went over the country that McKinley was elected President. "The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to know if the gentleman thinks that a high tariff was responsible for the hunger and distress that occurred after the 1907 panic, that closed up the banks of the country, so that the people could not get what little money they had there?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the "hunger and distress" in 1907 was like the "milk sickness" down in Illinois when I was a boy. It was said that "milk sickness" existed in that country, but it was always over in the next county, and nobody was able to locate it. [Laughter.] In the State of Indiana we only knew of the panic in 1907 through press reports. Our people decided that if there was a real panic in 1907 as a result of Republican legislation it was far preferable to Democratic prosperity at high tide. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And it was only Democrats who called it a panic. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIXON of Indiana. The gentleman from Indiana referred to the part of the State where he lives, I presume? [Laughter.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I refer to conditions all over the State. I did some campaigning while the panic was at its worst down in the gentleman's section of the State. [Applause on the Republican side.]

History, it is said, sometimes repeats itself. Will the experience of 1892 repeat itself in 1912? Will the Democratic Party carry the election next year [cries of "Yes" on the Democratic side] on such measures as they are proposing to-day? I say no, because the awful experience which the country went through during the last Democratic administration is still fresh in the minds of too many people to permit it. It was burned too deeply into the lives of the citizens to be forgotten so soon. I have no fear of the result in 1912 if the Democratic House passes this bill and other bills of the same general character—free-trade bills, bills that will close industries and turn labor out of employment.

> The tumult and the shouting dies,
> The captains and the kings depart;
> Still stands thine ancient sacrifice—
> An humble and a contrite heart.
> Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet—
> Lest we forget—lest we forget!

[Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HAMMOND. Mr. Chairman, this is the fifth of a series of important legislative measures considered in this extraordinary session of the Sixty-second Congress.

The first of these measures was a code of rules presented by the majority of the House for its government. Heretofore the Speaker of the House has possessed the power of appointing its standing committees. Here, and throughout the country, there was much criticism of the practice. It was claimed that the Speaker's influence in legislative matters was too controlling, and that one of the greatest aids to the maintenance of that influence was his power to select from the membership of the House the members of its great legislative committees. The Democratic Party was not alone in its denunciation of this power; many Members of the Republican Party have as bitterly assailed it and condemned it as did the Members of the Democratic Party. In 16 years of uninterrupted Republican control of this House, in spite of complaints and denunciation, the practice prevailed. The Democratic Party in the very beginning of its ascendancy inserted a provision in the rules of the House taking away from the Speaker the power to appoint the committees of the House and vested that power in the House itself.

Of course, the rules are not perfect; they may be, and undoubtedly will be, bettered from time to time, but those who sincerely desired a change in the manner of the selection of committees might have been expected to welcome the change made by the present rules and heartily to support them. Under the pretense, however, of making them better than they are, many of those whose support, from their previous declarations, might have been expected hindered and interfered with their adoption. Many of those who opposed the rules presented to this body admitted that they were fairly good rules, and when the final vote was reached upon the question of their adoption there were none who made manifest a desire to go on record as opposed to them.

It may then, I think, be assumed by the people of the country that in their first measure the Democratic Party lived up to its declarations and its promises and reformed the rules without the aid or the assistance of those members of the Republican Party whose principal stock in trade for the last four or five years has been the denunciation of the so-called legislative evil eliminated by the rules of the Sixty-second Congress, fashioned and put into effect by the Democratic majority of that Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Chaos, anarchy, and confusion have not followed the making of that reform, and it has been demonstrated that the House of Representatives can select its own committees without great strife, great delay, or great interference with legislative work.

The second measure was the joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States, so that Senators may be elected by the people of the various States instead of by the State legislatures. It would be untrue to say that only the Democrats favored this resolution, for similar resolutions have been favorably acted upon in this House when the Republican Party was in the majority, but it is none the less true that the only opposition that manifested itself upon the floor of the House to this resolution came from the Republican Party and the only votes against the resolution were Republican votes. It was noticeable also in the debate upon this measure that some of those who most vociferously advocated the reform here and elsewhere when the time for action came were prominent in criticism and in efforts to cripple or to injure or to destroy the legislation by amendments demanded by no condition prevailing at the present time, but which might have a tendency to drive from the support of the measure many who were earnestly for it and might also have a tendency to defeat the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution in some of the States of the Union. But again it would appear that the unamended provision was a fairly good one, because upon the final vote 296 Representatives voted in favor of it and only 15 were recorded in opposition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The third of the series to which I have referred was the bill to provide for publicity of contributions to campaigns in which Representatives in Congress are elected. The present law provides that such publicity shall be made after the election; by the new legislation it is proposed to make the publicity prior to the election as well as after it. It is an attempt to make a good law a better law. But again opposition was offered and amendments proposed of doubtful constitutionality and which could not be deemed necessary, unless it be assumed that the several States lack either the wisdom or the desire to maintain or enact wholesome and effective election laws. However, when the final vote was taken upon this Democratic bill 307

Members of the House of Representatives voted "Aye" and not one voted "No." Apparently it was a good bill without the amendments so strongly urged. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The fourth of these legislative measures was the Canadian trade agreement, prepared under the direction of President Taft and presented to the last Congress with the understanding that it should be passed without amendments save those that might be necessary to make the legislation conform to the tentative agreement entered into between the Canadian officials and the American officials who prepared it. Personally I felt unable to support the so-called reciprocity proposition, and opposed it in every caucus, committee, and Congress of which I was a member. I do not propose to discuss the trade agreement at length, but to refer to it because of its relationship to the pending free-list bill, which I most heartily support. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There has been a great deal of discussion relative to the effect of the Canadian trade agreement, if enacted into law, upon the agricultural products of this country. The farmers themselves, especially those in the Northern States, have vigorously protested against its passage, but those favoring the agreement have claimed that the farmers were misled by published statements and articles emanating from persons who were not interested in agriculture itself, but in other things. It is, of course, true that others than farmers bitterly opposed the reciprocity proposition. The lumbermen and the print-paper manufacturers opposed it; so did a number of gentlemen upon this floor who felt that it was a blow at the system of protection, to which they were devoted as a national policy. On the other hand, it was claimed that the brewers of the country, because they would be benefited by free barley; the flour manufacturers, because they wanted free wheat; the railroads, because they wanted the Canadian hauls; and a number of gentlemen who believe in free trade were earnest in their advocacy of the measure. Tables of figures showing exports and imports of the various commodities that may be affected by the agreement and other tables of market quotations have been read and reread during the discussion. It was shown that the price of wheat in the Winnipeg market is less than the price of wheat in the Minneapolis market, and I suppose it is admitted that the Canadian farmer will sell his wheat in the best market, and unless the price in Winnipeg increases or the price in Minneapolis decreases, so that the markets will be about the same, the Canadian wheat, free of duty, will seek the American market. The State of Minnesota produces in the neighborhood of 90,000,000 bushels of wheat each year, about one-eighth of the total production of the United States. It is what is known as hard wheat. Canada produces about twice as much as the State of Minnesota, but with its great area of untilled lands and its great increase in immigration, its production will increase in amount very rapidly, while we can not look for so great an increase in production in this country. If the Canadian farmer is permitted to sell his wheat in the Minneapolis market, it is not an exaggeration to say that twice as much wheat will be offered for sale in that market as at the present time, and it can not be denied that the greater the quantity of any commodity offered for sale in any market the less the price of that commodity is likely to be.

The gentleman from North Dakota, during the debate, called attention to the fact that a village located on the boundary line between North Dakota and Canada had two wheat markets—one on the American side and one on the Canadian side—and the price paid for wheat on the American side was much in excess of the price paid on the Canadian side. There was nothing between the two selling places except the boundary line and a tariff of 25 cents a bushel upon wheat; and inasmuch as transportation facilities from each selling point were the same it would look as though either the line or the 25 cents a bushel tariff made the difference in price. The gentleman from North Dakota asked an advocate of the reciprocity agreement to tell him why the price was higher on the American side of the line than on the Canadian side, and the reply was, "It is a local condition." That is an easy answer, but not very convincing. If, as the advocates of reciprocity have claimed, Liverpool fixes the price of wheat, it is strange that it would fix the price much lower on one side of the line than on the other. It is singular that it would fix the price less at Winnipeg than at Minneapolis, for it must be remembered that Winnipeg is nearer to Liverpool than Minneapolis and the transportation rates are no greater. It is pointed out, however, that the United States exports wheat, and because of that fact it is claimed that the export price governs the price in this country. I do not admit that the export price is so controlling; but even if it were, it would not affect the condition in the Northwestern States. The wheat that is exported from this country is not the kind of wheat that is raised in Minnesota and in North and South Dakota and in Canada. Minnesota wheat is not quoted in the Liverpool market. No appreciable quantity of hard wheat is exported from the United States. There is demand enough for it here. The export wheat is soft wheat and durum wheat.

We export barley, too, but the barley we export is not the barley raised in the Northwestern States; it is the barley raised on the Pacific coast, and it is exported largely for food purposes, while the barley raised in the Northwestern States is used to make barley malt, and the domestic market demands all that is produced. Turn into this country the products of the barley fields of Canada and, in my opinion, the barley raisers of Minnesota and the Northwestern States must quit raising barley or sell it at a less price than that which they have been receiving.

Because I do believe that the farmers of this country will suffer loss if the Canadian trade agreement becomes a law I am in favor of the present farmers' free-list bill, believing that it will tend, to some extent at least, to compensate the farmer for his loss on account of the reciprocity agreement.

I have listened with much pleasure, as well as profit, to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the leader of the majority in this House. I have heard him more than once declare himself to be in favor of a tariff for revenue—a low tariff, necessarily covering a great many articles, raw as well as manufactured.

My own views accord with those I have often had the pleasure of hearing him express. I have listened, also, to statements of their positions made by gentlemen of the minority who have declared themselves in favor of a tariff for protection, but a low tariff, and a tariff distributing its advantages among all classes of our people. It seems to me that the man who favors a low tariff for revenue and the man who favors a low tariff for protection are really working to the same end. Suppose you put a tax upon wheat of 10 cents a bushel and call it a revenue tax; suppose you put a tax upon wheat of 10 cents a bushel and call it a tariff for protection, you may indulge in all the academic discussion you please, but after all is said and done you have 10 cents a bushel on wheat. It is for revenue, for if wheat is imported there will be revenue. It is for protection, because to the extent of 10 cents a bushel it prohibits importations into our domestic markets, and to that extent lessens competition in those markets. Every vendor of a commodity knows that the market where there is the least competition is the best market for him.

I am in favor of low tariff duties, and do not deem it very material whether you call them revenue duties or protection duties. My own purpose in voting for such duties would be to obtain revenue for the country. But I believe that such duties imposed upon articles and products similar to those made or produced in our own country tend to a greater or less degree to give to our domestic makers or producers a better market, because of the exclusion of competition, than there would be if their competitors were permitted to enter our markets freely with their goods and products. Believing, then, that certain advantages to manufacturers and producers come from the imposition of tariff taxes, great or small, I think those advantages should be distributed as well as may be among the different classes and sections of this country. I think the farmers should have them just as well as the manufacturers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the northern part of Minnesota we have a great tract of land rich in iron ore. Beneath its surface untold millions of mineral wealth are stored, and a great corporation employs an army of laborers to take that wealth from the ground and ship it to the manufacturing centers. For many years there was a tariff tax on iron ore of 40 cents a ton; it is now, under the Payne law, 15 cents a ton, I believe. The corporation, it is said, pays to the workingmen better wages than workingmen of the same class receive in other countries, and for that reason these workingmen live better and are able to adopt a higher standard of living than similar workingmen in other countries. If it be true, and for the purpose of argument let it be admitted, suppose another corporation should possess itself of another great tract of land in the southern portion of that State, a tract of land in which there is no hidden mineral wealth, and suppose it should employ a great army of workers to plow the land and to harrow and to seed and to plant it, to care for the crops raised upon it, and to harvest and thresh them and to take them away to the markets of the country, is there any reason why that corporation should not pay wages as large as the wages paid by the iron-ore corporation?

Should not the workingmen in the southern part of the State be permitted to enjoy the same high standard of living? And

how can anyone, really believing that the tariff tax brings about improved conditions among the workingmen, favor the imposition of a tax in favor of the iron-ore corporation but not a tax in favor of the corporation cultivating the land for crops? [Applause.] It is said that corporations are necessary, but few claim that they are in themselves blessings. Suppose the agricultural corporation should be dissolved and the workingmen, instead of working the land for the corporation, should work the land for themselves; no one would claim that they are less deserving of all the advantages this country may furnish them through its legislation.

We hear a great deal about equal rights for all and equal laws for all. I think when laws give advantages the advantages should be distributed as widely as possible among as many classes of our people as may be. I opposed the Canadian trade agreement because it seems to me that it takes away from the American farmer advantages given other classes of our people under our tariff laws, and I favor the present farmers' free-list bill because it is an attempt to give to the farmer the same kind of a market in which to buy as he is obliged to enter when he has to sell. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Believing that a great part of the revenue of the country must come from the imposition of tariff duties, and that by taxing imported commodities like those manufactured or produced in this country an advantage is given to the American manufacturer or producer of such commodities in our markets; holding that these duties should be low, so that all competition may not be excluded from our markets, and that they should be widely distributed and should be imposed upon a great number of articles the like of which are produced in this country, so that the privileges and advantages resulting from the tariff charges should be as widely distributed among the people of this country as is possible, I am not inclined to favor additions to the free list. If it were not for the Canadian trade agreement, which, it seems to me, absolutely deprives one class of our citizens, and a very large and important class, too, of advantages which other classes obtain under our tariff laws, I would not deem it so necessary or advisable to enact the legislation now under consideration.

The views I have expressed accord with the declarations of the Democratic Party as I read them. Section 4 of the national Democratic platform for 1892 is as follows:

SEC. 4. Trade interchange on the basis of reciprocal advantages to the countries participating is a time-honored doctrine of the Democratic faith, but we denounce the sham reciprocity which juggles with the people's desire for enlarged foreign markets and freer exchanges by pretending to establish closer trade relations for a country whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products with other countries that are also agricultural, while erecting a customhouse barrier of prohibitive tariff taxes against the richest countries of the world, that stand ready to take our entire surplus of products and to exchange therefor commodities which are necessaries and comforts of life among our own people.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

In 1892 it seems clear that the Democratic Party did not stand for closer trade relations between this country, whose articles of export are almost exclusively agricultural products, and other countries, like the Dominion of Canada, that are also agricultural, while tariff barriers were maintained against other countries that would take our surplus and exchange therefor the things necessary for the comforts of life among our own people. But now that these closer trade relations are likely to be made between this country and the Dominion of Canada, some of the barriers between this country and the other great nations of the world ought to be removed.

Again, in the national Democratic platform of 1896 we find this statement:

We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government, honestly and economically administered.

Here is a declaration for a revenue tariff. Nothing said about protection, but the privileges and advantages arising from a revenue tariff are recognized, and it is stated that the duties should be so adjusted as to offer equal advantages throughout the country; to do that best the duties must affect a great number of articles, because the greater the number of articles affected by it the better the tariff will operate equally among the people of this country who make and produce those articles. It is stated that the tariff duties ought not to discriminate between class or section; the more than ten millions of agriculturists ought not to be discriminated against; the section of this country occupied by our northern farmers ought not to be discriminated against.

Again, in the national Democratic platform of 1904, we read:

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions, and its discriminations, keeping in view the ultimate ends of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities" and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to wit, the support of the Federal Government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

Here the principle which I believe should underlie all tariff legislation is expressed in the seven words, "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities."

I have endeavored to present to the House my reasons for supporting this measure, although not inclined to extend the free list. The circumstances are exceptional, and because of their exceptional character, brought about by the passage of the Canadian trade agreement, I think it is the duty of Congress to enact into law the legislation now proposed.

This bill is called the farmers' free-list bill because it removes the tariff duties from a great many articles used by the agricultural classes. The measure should be considered from three viewpoints—first, from that of the farmer himself; second, from that of the manufacturer or producer of the things affected; and, third, from the viewpoint of the Federal Government. The Government is interested in the matter of revenue. Its expenditures in the past have been enormous, and, although we hope that economies will be inaugurated and the annual charges of the Nation may be materially decreased, nevertheless, the expenses of maintaining the Government will be very large, and an income great enough in amount to cover those expenses must be provided. No doubt, in line with what has heretofore been done, many amendments will be proposed adding other articles to the free list, in many cases, perhaps, articles with tariff rates that can not be defended, but so connected with other articles that it would be unwise to legislate concerning them independently of the schedules in which they are placed. There will be legislation proposed to revise the woolen schedule, and I think that it would be best to take up that schedule as a whole and not pick from it an item here and an item there and put them in the free list. I believe that legislation will be presented affecting the sugar schedule. It would be folly, it seems to me, to amend this free list to include raw sugar. The Government can not afford to decrease its annual income by $60,000,000, which would be the result of putting sugar upon the free list, unless some way is presented of obtaining that amount of income from another source. The Government will lose by admitting free the articles named in the measure now under consideration about $10,000,000 per annum. The exact amount, based upon the importations during the year ending June 30, 1910, is $10,028,989, but some portion of this amount will be lost through the Canadian trade agreement—that is to say, included in the amount I have stated are duties collected upon importations from Canada that will not, after the Canadian trade agreement goes into effect, give us revenue. This loss of revenue is, of course, considerable, but, in view of the great number of articles placed upon the free list, it is not large, and more than one-half of the loss will result from cotton bagging, sacks, burlap, and so forth, going upon the free list. Therefore, so far as the Government is concerned, although by the passage of this bill the revenue will be reduced, the reduction will be small when compared with the large number of articles that will be affected.

Now, as to the manufacturers and producers of these articles. Of course they are not enthusiastic about the removal of the tariff duties. As I have endeavored to point out the effect of a tariff duty upon articles like those produced in this country is to give to the domestic producer a better market, and this better market is furnished him by making it more difficult for his competitor to enter it. The fewer the vendors and the greater the number of buyers, the greater vendors' market it is. It has been the claim of protectionists that, although foreign competitors might find it more difficult to enter our domestic markets by reason of our tariff duties, the number of domestic producers would increase so that we would still have a competitive market. It happens that many of the producers of the articles mentioned in this free list have found a way to secure themselves against competition without the aid of a protective tariff, and because of that fact, the advantages they might derive from the tariff they have more than secured by means of combinations, trusts, and business agreements. For instance, agricultural implements are placed upon the free list, and the makers of agricultural implements will, of course, lose whatever advantage the present tariff duties give them. But they have successfully restricted competition in our home market. In 1880 there were in this country 1,943 agricultural-implement establishments, having a total capital of $62,109,668. Ten years later, in 1890, the total capital had increased to $145,313,997, but the number of establishments had decreased to 910. Ten years later, in 1900, the capital had increased to $157,707,951, but the number of establishments had decreased to 715; and in 1905 the capital had increased to $196,740,700, and the estab-

lishments had decreased to 648. It looks as though the makers of agricultural implements do not need the protective tariff in order to protect themselves from competition. Now, as to the producers of salt: In 1880 there were 276 salt establishments in this country, with a total capital of $8,548,640. In 1890 the capital had increased to over $13,000,000, and the establishments had decreased to 200. In 1900 the capital had increased to over $27,000,000, and the establishments had decreased to 159; and in 1905 the total capital employed was $25,586,282, and the total establishments numbered 146. So far as the American people are concerned, looking at this question from the viewpoint of certain of the manufacturers and producers of the articles included in this free list, they may, with much reason, claim that there is no necessity of giving to such manufacturers and producers the benefits of a tariff tax, since their own methods have proved so effective in securing much greater advantages in the way of destroying competition than could possibly be secured by the imposition of a moderate tariff tax.

And now from the viewpoint of the farmer. It is only necessary to name the articles included in this bill: Agricultural implements; cotton bagging, sacks, burlap, etc.; cotton ties; leather, boots, shoes, and saddlery; barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, etc.; fresh and preserved meats; flour, cereals, and bread; lumber, laths, and shingles; sewing machines; and salt.

No one can look into the future and determine to an absolute certainty just what effect upon the selling price of this article or that article a tariff change will make. Those who say the Canadian trade agreement will not seriously hurt the farmer may be correct; I hope they are. Those who say the passage of the free list will not be of benefit to the farmer may be correct; I hope not. I fear, however, that the effect of the Canadian trade agreement will be bad for the American farmer, and I believe that this measure, if enacted into law, will do him some good. In any event I believe it is a sincere and honest attempt to modify the existing tariff law for the benefit of the agricultural interests of the United States. I think, in view of other enactments, they are entitled to the benefits, and all the benefits, that can possibly be derived from this legislation. Therefore I support it, and hope it will be enacted into law without material amendment. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 30 minutes on this side, if agreeable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, a democratic form of government is founded upon principles that in their exemplification are alike to all—the rich and poor—to all classes of men in every latitude and under all conditions, commercial and social. Do you inquire what the great Democratic Party stands for? I answer, first of all, "equal rights for all and special privileges to none." We believe alone in the Constitution as a rule of legislative action. Democracy is forever opposed to the theory, to that new exegesis of the Constitution that the Federal power may appropriate and exercise those powers originally conferred upon the States if the States choose not to exercise them. Democracy refuses to recognize the right of any correlative branch of the Government to encroach upon or usurp the functions of a coordinate branch. We would keep forever separate the functions prescribed in the Constitution, believing that in a strict adherence to that doctrine lies the safety of republican institutions. The Democratic doctrine of construction is that the individual citizen is the unit in the Federal structure, and that in his equality before the law in every particular is the Nation's safeguard. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Section 8 of the Constitution, among other things, prescribes that—

> the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the defenses and general welfare of the United States.

Under the authority therein granted more battles have been waged than under any other provision of the Constitution. The greatest question that has always confronted the legislator is, and always will be, how to equitably and justly raise sufficient revenue to defray the expenses of the Government.

It is not, Mr. Chairman, a question of how much we shall raise, but in what manner we shall raise it and how it shall be disbursed. I believe in an economical administration, but that economy does not mean to impair the revenues necessary to develop our widely diversified natural resources. It means that however much we shall take out of the pockets of the people shall be wisely and directly expended. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Because of the taxing power under this section of the Constitution parties have sprung up advocating methods they believed would be remedial of the abuses and advance the interests of the people. The "general-welfare" clause of the Constitution has, in the latitude given to its construction, sufficient scope to admit all parties.

I want to pause here, Mr. Chairman, to say that this country is committed to the theory of raising money to defray the expenses of the Government by a duty on imports. We shall never get away from that theory. Our expenses are so enormous and constantly increasing that in all probability our retrenchment and reformation will be, not in raising much less revenue, but in more judiciously expending it. The Democratic Party has stood for a duty on imports from the very beginning of the Government. It believes in a tariff for revenue only, the only difference between Democrats being the manner in which the rate shall be laid and not in the theory under which it shall be laid. I have no consideration for the demagogue who charges that the Democratic Party is a free-trade party. Its whole history impeaches that declaration, and those charges are only made when reason and argument fail and always with a vicious motive. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Democratic Party has stood for a hundred years for a tariff for revenue only. It has seen parties and "isms" founded upon unscientific economic theories come and go, and it continues to advocate with popular favor those essential principles announced by its founder.

And I call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER], who has just spoken, to the fact that the difference between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party in laying a rate of duty to produce revenue is that we of the Democratic Party lay the rate of duty with the express purpose of raising revenue, while the Republican Party lays a rate of duty for the purpose of protection, and the revenue is an incident to the levying and not its main and original purpose. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No tariff has been written by the Republican Party in 20 years in this House that did not have as its chief feature and its controlling purpose the protection of the manufacturer and not simply the raising of revenue as the principal purpose of that rate.

But, Mr. Chairman, what is the contention here? Are there out in the open advocates and sympathizers with the trusts and combinations in the discussion of this bill? Men who are in favor of confiscation of property under the guise of high protection? As a rule its advocates hide behind some pretext to accomplish by indirection that which they will not espouse in the open. It has taken 50 years to precipitate this contest. It has taken all these years to force the Republican Party into the open on the question of tariff taxation. It fled to its last ambush in the declaration made in its platform in the national convention in 1908; prior to that time we had driven it from one stand to another until there was no further escape. The theory of protection never was a wise and equitable philosophy. It always has been an expedient and an auxiliary to constitute the Government a party in private enterprises. You stood for it first as a war measure, then as a protector of infant industries, then as a protection to American labor, when you invited the foreigners to come to his shop door and bid for his job. You said the foreigner paid the tax, and for a while deceived the people. When you have been routed from all these positions you declared that you were in favor of a rate of protection equal to the difference in the cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the manufacturer.

Two great parties constructed upon widely different theories have prepared for this present contest. Our purpose is to put an end to the colossal fraud of high protection where only the beneficiaries of that tariff are the trusts and combinations for whom it was created. For 14 years the people have sought to free themselves from their unjust burdens. Platform promises made under the most solemn engagements were broken reeds. Driven from the last stand, the Republican Party took refuge in an ambush from which it thought it could not be routed. It declared as a new departure that it stood for the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. That was an announcement to the country that the Republican Party had cast its lot with the manufacturer and against the rest of the country. There is not a man in the party but what knows that if the Payne-Aldrich bill had been constructed upon the old doctrine so long promulgated, viz, that the rate should be expressed in the difference between the cost at home and abroad, that we would not have collected a dollar of revenue from the steel schedule, the boot and shoe schedule, the cotton schedule, and but a small amount from the woolen schedule. No man, to my recollection, has risen on the floor of this House to defend his party in the monstrous proposition of levying a tax against all the people to make a private business profitable much less to fix the rate per cent to express a reasonable profit.

Mr. Chairman, the dollar I receive as a payment for labor honestly performed is my dollar, subject only to a lien first of the General Government to pay my just proportion of the expenses of the Government that protects me and my property, subject next to the law of my State to defray its necessary expenses, then to the demands of my county and municipality to meet my just share of their burdens. When I have done that, the balance of that dollar belongs to me, and the right to possess it is an inalienable right that no constitution can either give or take away from me; and yet, in violation of that right, you assume to take my money and that of every other citizen of the 90,000,000 to swell the profits of the Beef Trust, the Steel Trust, and the Rubber Trust, for which the prohibitive tariff of your party is directly responsible. You guarantee the manufacturer a reasonable profit. Why did you not guarantee the carpenter, who puts his money and his brains into his work in the construction of homes and business houses, a reasonable profit on his business? Why did you not guarantee the miner, a thousand feet under ground, putting his money and ability into his business, a reasonable profit?

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLINE. I do.

Mr. BOWMAN. May I ask the gentleman if there is any better way to pay the miner a good wage than by having the industries of the country flourish?

Mr. CLINE. I assume that, according to the reports from the Bureau of Commerce and Labor, in Pennsylvania you do not pay the miner there any more than he earns.

Mr. BOWMAN. May I inform the gentleman that they pay a higher rate of wages than are paid to any other laborers performing the same amount of labor anywhere in the United States, according to the records?

Mr. CLINE. Not in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOWMAN. In Pennsylvania they do, and I will read you from the records which I have in my desk in a moment.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman can read them in his own time. I am simply stating the facts as brought out on the floor here the other day in a colloquy between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and one of the gentleman's colleagues from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BOWMAN. A question of veracity. It was stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and controverted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. CLINE. And the gentleman from North Carolina produced a voucher for the pay for 12 days' labor, and the amount was eight dollars and some cents. That is the kind of living wages they are paying to the miners in Pennsylvania. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOWMAN. I will produce to the gentleman a voucher for two weeks' work of over $100.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman can do that some other time.

Mr. BOWMAN. And I will repeat that the labor in the anthracite and bituminous districts of Pennsylvania is paid as much or more for the labor performed than in any other place in the United States or in the world.

Mr. CLINE. The gentleman's declaration does not make it any stronger in the face of the bills issued by the companies at a good deal lower rate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why did you not guarantee the farmer, with his savings of a lifetime invested in his business, with his ability, his integrity, a reasonable profit in his business? Why this deep solicitude for the manufacturer? You stand for an unjust and discriminatory system of taxation. You demand that some of us shall make enough out of our unprotected business, exposed to the competition of all the world, to take a part out of our profits and make on the manufacturer's business, who has no competition, a "reasonable" profit, whatever that may be. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] tauntingly asks in the different "saws" he plays on the phrase "Equal rights for all and special privileges to none," whether we believe the proposition to protect every large industrial division and leave the farmer exposed to competition is equal rights for all and special privileges to none. No; we do not. And yet the gentleman from Michigan and the party to which he belongs has steered the farmer up against every brace game that the Dingley law and the Payne Act is capable of housing.

A Member of this House that assisted in passing the late tariff act that exposes the products of the farm to the competition of the world's markets, that is assisting the Woolen Trust to destroy all competition and looks on complacently while that trust gathers a profit of 164 per cent on woolen blankets, ought to be modest in the use of the phrase "Equal rights for all and special privileges for none." The Republican that helped to frame up the present tariff act and forced the American producer and American farmer to reap his profits in world-wide competition and then forces him to submit to the exactions of the Meat Trust so that it reaps a profit of 16 to 32 per cent on its stock, watered and otherwise, ought to feel sensitive in the use of the expression "Equal rights for all and special privileges to none." The party that makes common merchandise of the farmer and consumer in a tariff bill like the Payne bill, under which the American Steel Trust, with a billion and a half of capital, two-thirds of which is water, can double its capital every four years, ought to deny itself the right to comment upon the language "Equal rights for all and special privileges to none." If there is a prohibitive protected industry in this country that has not had its inning on the farmer I would like to know what one it is. These generous tears shed for the farmer! It is urged that this is a sectional bill. What foundation is there for that criticism? The course of Republican legislation invites a comparison. What kind of treatment has the cotton farmer received at the hands of the Republican Party? Scourged with four long years of bloody war of his own choosing, the most terrific in all the history of the race, that swept the fair southland with its blackness, punished by the "black hand" of Republican reconstruction that withered his credit like a simoon from off the desert; yet in two generations out of the ashes of that fierce fire and out of the humiliation of defeat, she redeemed her credit and stands like a colossus astride this commercial continent. Rose by the very power of her might against prejudice and wicked legislation until now she grows the cotton and well nigh weaves the cloth to clothe the world. A million spindles are now making a melody of revolutions in the march of progress of this happy and chivalric people. They were entitled to your consideration. When they came to ask you to give her free bagging and free cotton ties at the time you made up the Payne bill they found, in the language of the street, that the Bagging Trust and the Steel Trust had "beat them to it," and the cotton farmer did not get it. He was only asking that you give him free bagging and ties for his cotton crop, as you had given his northern brother farmer free binding twine for his wheat crop. He comes back with his just claim, and we are going to give it to them in this bill.

But we as a party are charged by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that we came into power by telling the people that they were paying too much for their living and that the price of living could be reduced without reducing the wages of the workingman. The gentleman was fair in many of his statements, but with that characteristic grapevine logic for which the New Englander is noted, he did not charge that the statements were misrepresentations. Mr. GARDNER is an agnostic; he neither affirmed nor denied. I confess we did say so to the consumer who was working for a fixed wage, that the price of living had advanced without lawful reasons and ought to be reduced. Now, I am going to prove it by Republican authority. I am going to take the manufacturers of woolen goods, agricultural implements, tobacco (including chewing, smoking, and snuff), wholesale meat slaughtering, upholstering material, four of the largest businesses in the country, and inquire what the results of combinations in these trades were upon the consumer, and consequently upon the wage earner?

I take the reports of 1905, the last available:

Woolen goods.

Years.	Number of factories.	Capital.	Employees.	Value of product.
1900	1,035	$124,386,262	68,893	$118,474,158
1905	792	140,303,488	72,747	142,196,658
	[1] 243	[2] 15,916,229	[2] 3,654	23,796,500

[1] Decrease. [2] Increase.

What does this show? That in the woolen business these concerns reduced the number of establishments in five years from 1,035 to 793, but increased their capital nearly sixteen millions, and with only an increase of 3,654 workmen increased the value of their output nearly $24,000,000.

Take upholstering materials, and a still greater showing is made. I give the table as I did for woolen goods:

Upholstering materials.

Years.	Number of factories.	Capital.	Employees.	Value of product.
1900	270	$7,593,298	5,096	$10,048,164
1905	236	9,293,120	4,712	12,677,519
	[1] 34	1,699,822	[1] 386	2,629,355

[1] Decrease.

A reduction of 34 establishments, a reduction of 386 employees, but an increase of watered capital of nearly two millions and an increase in value of products of 2,629,336. Why have not we a right to charge that these combinations through the grace of the Republican Party were fleecing the ultimate consumer?

Take tobacco, including chewing, smoking, and snuff, and give this trust the same treatment:

Tobacco, including chewing, smoking, and snuff.

Years.	Number of factories.	Capital.	Employees.	Value of product.
1900	437	$43,856,370	29,161	$103,754,362
1905	433	178,847,556	23,990	116,767,630
	[1] 4	134,990,986	[1] 5,171	13,013,268

[1] Decrease.

A reduction of 4 establishments, a reduction of 5,171 employees, but an increase of $134,990,986 in watered capital and an increase of more than thirteen millions in value of the output.

Let me take the wholesale slaughtering houses and apply the same test:

Wholesale slaughtering houses.

Years.	Number of establishments.	Capital.	Employees.	Value of output.
1900	557	$173,866,377	64,681	$697,056,055
1905	559	219,818,627	69,593	801,757,137
	2	45,952,250	4,912	104,701,072

With the addition of only 5,000 employees on an increased capital of forty-six millions the trust increased their value of products one hundred and five millions.

Take the American Harvester Trust:

Years.	Number of establishments.	Capital.	Employees.	Value of output.
1900	715	$157,708,951	46,582	$101,207,428
1905	648	196,740,749	47,394	112,007,344
	[1] 67	[2] 39,032,749	[2] 812	[2] 10,799,916

[1] Decrease. [2] Increase.

I have a right to say to the consumer that when you amalgamate these great concerns into one combination, decrease the number of employees, increase the stock with all the water it will carry, increase the value of their output by the millions, we correctly charged that, under your Republican theory of government that has bred this nest of commercial conscripts which you confess you are unable to exterminate, they do increase the cost of living to the millions of consumers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You say that to take off the tariff will not affect these criminal combinations or reduce the price of their commodities. Well, I will tell you what we can do and what we are going to do—we are going to dissolve the copartnership between them and this Government that you have created and let the trusts violate the law on their own responsibility. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Is that not worth while trying? Is this country so far in the vicelike grip of these corporations that there is no relief from them? You confessed to the people your inability to control the situation, and the people have commissioned the Democratic Party to try it. I know you say you have prosecuted the Beef Trust, and a greater farce comedy was never enacted by any court of justice. These are the legitimate fruits of a prohibitive protective theory. Protection is an unjust civic principle, because its fullest development depends upon discriminating between citizens of a common country. Any system of economics or any element entering into such a system that reaches its fullest development in the civil state by prejudicing the interests and rights of one class of citizens in favor of another class is an imperfect and unjust system. Protection, in its essence, is socialism, because it implies a benefit to one class of citizens by taxing another class to produce the benefit for which the citizen receiving the benefit gives no compensation. The greater the scope you give to a protective tariff the wider the injustice and the more exclusive it becomes with its benefits. You gentlemen across the aisle stand for and defend a character of government under this iniquitous theory of absolute protection that permits these vast unlimited capitalized combinations to crush out small competition in trade as remorselessly and with as much apparent satisfaction as a wild beast crushes and devours its prey. You permit and encourage, as a part of your system, these immense concerns to scatter ruin and disaster in their pathway when honest citizenship attempts to compete, unless they capitulate and yield to their demands.

No Republican in this House has risen and denounced the covert threat of these great organizations to create a national stress in business if the Democratic Party seeks to enact legislation touching their interests. No Republican has condemned the cowardly act of the American Steel Co. in the Birmingham district in Alabama turning hundreds of men out of employment. The act could have had but one purpose, and that was to terrorize and bulldoze the Democratic Party into a surrender of its purpose to revise the steel schedule. Your attitude toward and sympathy with this concern and those of its kind may be inferred by the country from your conduct.

What is the duty that the Democratic Party owes the country? In the political clearing house the Republican Party has been discounted and charged off so far as the tariff is concerned. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The people issued a new proclamation in 1910, and they demand that patriotism shall be above party and party alignment, and that the good of all the people shall be first in the mind of the citizen. Standpatism must learn that a blind and fatuous idolatry of a party name is not a license to usurp the rights of the people and destroy personal liberty of trade. The time has come when the demagogue can not fan into sectional hate and prejudice for his own selfish ends the firing on Fort Sumter. A new alignment of the electorate of this people is at hand, and it is not along sectional lines. The evangel that shall call the people in the future will be the evangel of equity and justice. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to make an observation or two on a new theory of economics proposed in this House by the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS]. In a pessimistic speech on the Canadian reciprocity that gentleman announced a doctrine so at variance with the history of the whole Anglo-Saxon race that it ought not to go unchallenged—a doctrine that would turn backward the wheels of industrial and social progress of this Republic; a doctrine shocking to a man who believes and wants to know that his country is a world power in the opening dawn of this twentieth century. I do not desire to misquote him, so I read from the RECORD, beginning at the closing paragraph on page 290:

INDEPENDENCE OF THE FARM HOME AND ITS RELATION TO MANUFACTURES.

A century ago the farm home was more preeminently the unit of civilization than to-day. It was almost independent within itself. The father and sons tilled the fields, cared for the cattle, and especially the sheep, while the mother and daughters kept the house and spun and wove the clothing. The daughters were the spinsters, and to this day an unmarried woman, whether she dwell in humble cottage or princely castle, is a spinster—living monument of the old independence of the farm home. In process of time the factory has taken over the family industries, as well as most of the village trades. The farmer and his family devote themselves to the simpler products, the raw materials; and after their own food supply is secure, must sell enough surplus to pay for the manufactured goods, professional services, and so forth, which are needed to satisfy their wants and tastes. It is obvious that if all in the world were farmers, there would be no people to buy the surplus. It is evident, then, that there must be other people, not engaged in farming, to buy and consume this surplus of the farmer, else he will be unable to purchase manufactured articles. It seems most consistent with reason that these other people who are to purchase the farmer's surplus should be his own neighbors, or, at least, of his own Nation or region, and especially those of his neighbors who are engaged in manufacturing the very articles which he needs to buy. And it is evident that both farmers and artisans will be most prosperous and the happiest when there are enough farmers to take the artisan's goods at a fair price, and enough artisans, professional men, and so forth, to take the farmer's surplus at a fair price.

EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN AGRICULTURE AND MANUFACTURES.

This brings us to the question of proportion, or equilibrium, of manufactured and agricultural products. And it is right here on this point that the whole situation likely to be created by this reciprocity treaty develops itself. Our manufactures, syndicated as they are by trusts and associations, are easily controllable and do not tend to run into an overproduction, disastrous to profits on capital or the wages of labor. But the farms, being an aggregation of homes, disorganized, and each impelled by its own necessities, tend constantly to overproduce. And this overproduction becomes disastrous unless the limitation of acreage possible to be cultivated intervenes to prevent. Therefore the element of prime importance in this discussion is the relation of acreage to the capacity of the home market furnished by the nonagricultural classes.

And this is the definition of equilibrium, the new Utopian philosophy of economics. Equilibrium means stagnation, commercial paralysis. It means the destruction of commercial activity. The only country believing in and practicing the theory of equilibrium between agriculture and mechanical production is China, and she has followed it for 40 centuries. It means a

country without a commerce and without the greatest possible civilization, for commerce is the mightiest civilizing power in the world. The gentleman yearns for the independence of the "homespun and flax-wheel period," the time when the farmer must produce only what surplus his neighbor can consume and the manufacturer only what his farmer friend can take. Those were the times when the farmer took his surplus wheat or pork 50 miles to market and slept under his wagon on the road both coming and going. Those were the days of puncheon floors and greased paper window lights. Great God! do we want that kind of independence and equilibrium? Under this new theory there is an overproduction in agriculture if the local manufacturer can not use it, and the production ought to be limited, so he says, when in the markets of the world are the hungry millions asking for bread. There can be no overproduction when there are hungry mouths to feed. That is a narrow and selfish policy that shuts the doors of the graneries of the Egypt of this continent in the face of the world when men are crying for bread. Last year we exported 1,800 millions of agricultural and mechanical products, a very large portion of it coming from the farm direct to the coast and much of it being the raw material for the manufacturer. As against this theory of equanimity that would take our foreign trade from the ocean, let me say that if the farmer did not export his products, stimulate our manufactures, and thereby induce imports this country would go into the hands of a receiver under the present system of collecting revenue. I come from the greatest agricultural section in this country. We raise more corn in a township in Indiana than they raise in the entire State of Maine. Indiana took the sweepstakes in the world's contest, not only for the best and most perfect corn, but for the greatest production to the single acre.

The 12 upper Mississippi Valley States produce six-tenths of all the agricultural products of the United States. We raise our share of the 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn in the United States and we want a market for it. The gentleman says they have abandoned their farms in Maine and gone into the truck business, and we must not raise any more corn than we can sell to "our neighbors or to our Nation, or in this region." If this equilibrium teeter board philosophy is to be adopted, lock up the Panama Canal, through which we were to have opened up our trade with the South American Republics. If this policy is to rule, take down the customhouses and abandon the seas. If this political heresy is to obtain, tell the world we have no use for the open door to the trade of China and Japan. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Take out the maximum and minimum tariff section of the Payne bill and abandon your colonial policy in which you have embarked. Such a policy would stifle and destroy our commerce, and as an economic theory, in its fullest analysis, has no more stability than a cob house in a Kansas cyclone. My friend says that his theory has not been heard from among English-speaking races since the time of the Napoleonic wars. It is to be hoped that it will not be heard from for another century. To brace up this propaganda its author says that the English statesmen recommend a tariff on agriculture. Who are the English statesmen? They are the English high-tariff leagues, headed by Sir Joseph Chamberlain. This was in a report on social economics, so I am informed, from which this gentleman quoted, and Mr. Chamberlain undertook to change the current of English doctrine that had prevailed for a century. He saw our cutlery in Sheffield. He saw shoes made in this country on the counters of English shopkeepers. He saw our cotton cloth on the shelves of English merchants. He knew the English colonies that England had scattered ocean wide in both hemispheres were buying more goods made by us than from the mother country. He tried to obstruct our trade, just as the gentleman from Maine is trying to do now, by erecting a wall that we could not get over. Why should England lay an import duty on the bread that she must buy abroad—lay a tax on the bread that goes into the children's mouths? A suicidal policy. Let me remind the gentleman who advances the new dogma that in all the history of the race no nation ever attained prominence without a great export trade. Our trade abroad is second only to that of the British Empire, that carries to every harbor on the globe a part of two and one-half billions of trade. We reached the enormous export trade last year of $1,800,000,000. We gained this last February—February, 1911—over February, 1910, $51,387,775; and if we shall continue to make that gain for the entire year we shall gain more than $600,000,000, and we shall sell to the nations of the world from the farm and factories more than $2,400,000,000 worth. And that, too, after a Democratic Congress was elected for the express purpose of revising our fiscal policy.

I represent a district through which more than 40 per cent of all transcontinental roads pass. Last year they carried from the interior of this country more than 250,000,000 tons of freight produced in the shops and on the farms. The spreading farms of agricultural richness in northern Indiana, unsurpassed in fertility and grandeur, constitute the home of a great, industrious, and happy people. Luxury and magnificence is theirs through their own toil. Her cities are scattered closely along more than 130 miles of territory, out of the chimneys of whose factories the belching smoke clouds the "sky by day, and by night her furnace fires light up the heavens like the bonfires of welcome to the returning victor of a Roman conquest." Yet all this thing the "man from Maine" would change under the theory of equilibrium to save the truck patches around Portland. [Laughter and applause.] Such a policy would shrink the value of every acre of corn land and every acre of cotton land in the United States. Consider but for a moment the 11 cotton States in the South that produce the cotton of the world limiting its growth and commerce to conform to the theory of equilibrium. Think of the 12 upper Mississippi Valley States that produce, as I said before, six-tenths of all our products—that constitute the meat and bread basket of the continent halting in their mighty conquest for trade for the evolution of the theory of equilibrium! No Anglo-Saxon community, building for itself and its country ever indorsed or practiced such economic heresy. Such a teaching strikes at the very vitals of our agricultural supremacy; and yet this sophistry was applauded by the minority contingent as a wise exhibition of statesmanship.

Let me say to the farmer who is inclined to fear the effect of the reciprocity bill that of the eighteen hundred millions of export trade we had last year more than twelve hundred millions of it was foodstuffs from your farms. What would you do with that vast amount if you did not have a foreign market in which to sell it? Why not open up trade relations with 9,000,000 of new customers just across the line for a part of this trade instead of carrying all of it over seas? Of what value is your export beef, pork, and mutton—the finished products of your farms—if you have no market for it?

Give us a broad, liberal, unrestricted market where the genius, thrift, and skill of the American citizen can enter the race for supremacy in trade without a hobble or handicap. Competition with Canada! We have developed 92,000,000 of population in less time than Canada has developed a population of 8,000,000. We have accumulated one hundred and thirty billions of capital while Canada has accumulated ten billions. Every additional market that comes to this 92,000,000 of people enlarges their opportunities for trade. It is said that we are offering this free list as a salve to the wounds we have inflicted upon the farmer. Let me show you how seriously the farmer is being wounded under the present trade agreements between Canada and ourselves, which no man denies are against him. I call your attention to the increase of trade with Canada in the month of February, 1911, just passed with that of February, 1910—a comparison for just one single month. We sold to Canada in February, 1910, and in February, 1911, as follows:

	February, 1910.	February, 1911.
Potatoes.....bushels..	32,301	[1] 189,181
Lumber.....feet..	26,621	220,407
Tobacco.....pounds..	1,046,435	2,541,034
Paper, books, etc.....	$249,932	$292,305
Illuminating oil.....gallons..	524,509	1,511,192
Hams and shoulders.....	$114,644	$152,792
Boots and shoes.....pairs..	91,295	101,276
Electrical machinery.....	$29,561	$48,888
Iron and steel.....	$3,768,202	$5,142,535
Electrical appliances.....	$137,536	$208,358
Cotton cloth.....yards..	814,106	865,945
Unmanufactured cotton.....pounds..	7,401,523	9,182,549
Wheat.....bushels..	2,882	11,516
Corn.....	$689,930	$1,310,004
Agricultural implements.....	$264,994	$437,363

[1] In 8 months ending February, 1911, 1,717,253 bushels.

Do these figures look like calamity to our trade with Canada? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The men who opposed the reciprocity pact are opposing the free-list bill, not so much on the theory that it will injure any class of citizens, but because it is a blow at the exclusiveness of high protection. Let me have a word on the wheat question. Wheat is one of the greatest cereal products of the United States. We produce more wheat than any other country in the world. Then, in the order of their production, come Russia, France, India, Austria-Hungary, and Canada. Liverpool is the world's market for the surplus of all these countries, and it fixes the price of that surplus brought there, and that price governs the price of what we consume at home. The price of wheat in New York, Paris, Mos-

cow, Vienna, and Bombay, for their respective countries, under normal conditions is the Liverpool price, less the cost of transportation, insurance, brokerage, and other proper charges.

Every man against the reciprocity agreement denied that proposition, and he did it in the face of every respectable authority and in the face of the actual fact. They were compelled to deny it, because to admit that the Liverpool market fixed the price, both in our market and Canada, meant the abandonment of the argument. For the purpose of securing the most reliable information on this point, yesterday I telegraphed to the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and the Chicago Chamber of Commerce this inquiry: "What is the cash price of wheat to-day in your market and on what basis is this price fixed." I have received answers to these telegrams, and they are as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 26, 1911.*

Hon. CYRUS CLINE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

One and two red, 91. Liverpool and Continental markets prominent factors in establishing values, but do not control absolutely.

J. C. F. MERRILL, *President.*

[Applause on the Republican side.]

You are applauding a little too quick over there; wait until you get another one:

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, *April 26, 1911.*

CYRUS CLINE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

One red winter 90 cents on basis Liverpool; our 1 northern, 94. All our prices generally based on Liverpool markets. Those prices are in store Fort William.

N. BAWLF.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me submit a proposition that a boy in the first year of his high school ought to have no difficulty with. Granted that both the United States and Canada are exporters of wheat and eliminate the question as to how the price is fixed here, except that the price in the world's market is governed by world-wide demand and supply. If Canada has two hundred millions of wheat for export and refuses to sell in the Liverpool market, and concludes to dump her surplus in our market, then is it not true that the world's supply would be that much short and the price in Liverpool go up corresponding to that shortage? What difference could it make, then, whether we market this surplus or whether Canada markets it, except so far as the facilities for shipping in one country or the other may affect its local market? A singular feature in this contest is presented when the farmers in Canada are passing resolutions against the adoption of the reciprocity agreement for fear that the cheap wheat from the States will ruin their market, and the American farmers are passing the same kind of resolutions for fear that the cheap wheat from Canada will destroy their market.

I call your attention to the articles of the free list in this bill and the enormous value of the product of each of them for a single year:

Salt	$9,540,824
Agricultural implements	112,707,544
Bagging for cotton, sacks, and burlaps	26,031,644
Cotton ties, hoops, and band iron	12,639,953
Leather, boots and shoes, harness and saddlery	493,005,263
Barbed and other fence wire	113,027,205
Fresh and preserved meats	801,757,137
Flour and grits, cereals, and bread	713,033,395
Lumber, laths, and shingles	580,022,690
Sewing machines and parts	20,869,547
Total	2,881,945,002

The rates of duty on these articles under the Payne-Aldrich bill are as follows:

Salt, 11 cents per 100.

Agricultural impements, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Bagging for cotton, sacks, and burlaps, 0.6 cent per square yard.

Cotton ties, hoops, and band iron, 0.3 cent per pound.

Leather, boots and shoes, harness and saddlery, 10 per cent ad valorem and up.

Barbed and other wire fencing, ¼ cent per pound.

Fresh and preserved meats, 1½ cents per pound.

Bacon and ham, 4 cents per pound.

Flour, grits, cereals, and baked bread, 25 per cent ad valorem and up.

Lumber, $1.25 per thousand feet.

Laths, 20 cents per thousand pieces.

Shingles, 50 cents per thousand pieces.

Sewing machines and parts thereof, 45 per cent ad valorem.

The rates of duty on these products have been high enough to keep out all importations, practically, and consequently give to the producers power to fix the prices in a market where there is no competition. The products of these few industries alone amount to the enormous sum of three thousand millions of dollars in a single year, and every one of these articles enters into the daily use of the farmer and ultimate consumer. There is not an article in this list but what the manufacturer of it has been able to enter into combination to advance the price of the article. The truth of that statement is confirmed by the fact that these same organizations sell the same goods cheaper abroad than they sell them to the farmer at the very door of the manufacturing concerns, and no one denies it who is correctly informed. We propose to remove the prohibitive rate on these goods and give the farmer competition for his money or compel these combinations to sell as cheap to the farmer as they do to the foreigner.

What does it cost the Government to do this? We lose in revenue on importations that have gotten over the tariff wall with a few goods in these lines, behind which these combinations have been concealed, less, probably, than $10,000,000, but if we can reduce the price through competition, by putting these productions on the free list, by even 10 per cent of the duty now levied under existing law, we can save the farmers and consumers of this country $300,000,000 a year. Is there a man representing an agricultural district that dares to withhold with his vote this benefit from the farmers in his district? The inquiry has been made why we did not amend the reciprocity measure by adding the free list as a separate section, if we were not playing politics. We did not for two reasons: We proposed to save the reciprocity measure by sending it to the Senate as it had been agreed upon by those who negotiated it, so as to insure its passage; and, secondly, we proposed to hand this free list up to you stripped of all conditions and compel you to elect whether you would stand by the farmer and the great consuming class or whether you were against them and with these great commercial combinations. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We did not propose to combine these bills and give you a chance to vote against both of them and protect these combinations under the plea that we wanted to give the farmer Canadian competition in his wheat market for which you would not stand. The farmers of this country are going to have a record made, so that they may know where the men who represent them and volubly profess their friendship really stand. We propose to smoke you out and make you stand up and be counted.

If you are for reciprocity and the free list, you ought to want these measures presented in such a way that both will pass. If you are against either of these measures, it does not come within your province to criticize the manner in which they are presented. I have no complaint to make against manufacturers or corporations that obey the law and do not violate it by combining in restraint of trade. This is a progressive age, and I recognize the benefits that flow to all classes of citizens through a thorough system in business methods. Honest capital and honest corporate interests that obey the law in the conduct of their business have nothing to fear from the Democratic Party. We are their friends and want to protect their business by giving to them all the encouragement that legislation can provide, if such legislation creates no favoritism. We know and understand that the small business interests of the country are as tired of commercial domination as the common people are. We know that they are with the Democratic Party. Their rights shall not be prejudiced by any unfair legislation.

The United States, more than any other nation, is self-supporting. The very vastness of her territorial expanse, the multiplicity of her industries, the interdependence of the millions engaged in them but serve to exaggerate the demand that there shall be fair and equal legislative treatment to all. The sovereignty of the Nation rests with the people; they can not long suffer injustice and wrong that legislation can correct, if they but will it so. The great problem of the age is to keep in steady and equal march all the heterogeneous forces that make for our national life. Commercial favoritism by governmental agency must cease.

The great Democratic Party is the sure refuge of every humble citizen as well as the possessor of wealth. The Anglo-Saxon race has struggled for personal liberty for a thousand years, and at last finds its surest type a nation on "the crown of all the continents of the world" and the conservator of the personal liberty of every race. The greatest duty God ever gave to man is a patriotic preservation of that liberty. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in yielding me liberal time on this debate from the fact that while I agree with my Republican colleagues as to the principle of protection, and as to the policy that ought to control in the application of that principle to all American industries, yet I can not agree with

many of them, probably not the majority of them, as to what ought to be the attitude of Members of Congress representing agricultural States toward this particular measure.

Now that a minority of high-protection Republicans have joined with the majority of free-trade Democrats to place all agricultural products on the free list so far as our great competitor to the north, Canada, is concerned, it is not an easy matter for a Republican who believes implicitly in scientific protection as defined in the Chicago national platform of 1908, to keep his bearings at all times in this Chamber. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I certainly shall not oppose the course of the Democracy in this bill to administer some free-trade medicine to the high-tariff manufacturer protectionists on this side of the Chamber, and the probability is that when the time comes for me to cast a vote on this measure the vote will be in accordance with that suggestion.

I trust I shall make it plain before I shall have consumed the hour yielded to me that if, perchance, I should record a vote in favor of this measure it will not be because I believe it will bring any great direct benefits to the farming population of the United States, but rather that it may bring some confusion, which I think it due, to the high protectionists who are interpreting the policy of protection to mean a high protection upon the articles manufactured in their districts and no protection upon the rest of the industries of the country. A man who stands on the Chicago platform and believes that for the first time in history a scientific definition has been evolved that ought to control the application of the principle of protection to all American industries is, since the passage of the so-called Canadian reciprocity agreement and the introduction of this pending legislation, figuratively speaking, between the devil and the deep sea. It is more than likely that I shall conclude between these alternatives, neither of which I take easily to, by taking a plunge temporarily into the Democratic deep sea of free trade. But in doing so it will not be because I enjoy the cold bath by any means, but that I may take down with us as we are going down the second time some high protectionist Republicans who have forgotten the principles that ought to be observed in applying protection to American industries.

A man was very much disturbed and broken of his sleep by the perpetual howling of a dog under his window outside. His wrath finally reached a pitch where he could stand it no longer. He jumped from his bed and, without making a proper toilet for the cold winter night, rushed out and succeeded in grabbing the dog. "There," he said, "you brute; I will hold you here until you freeze to death." He in a measure succeeded, but he got extremely cold himself. [Laughter.] I had a client—a farmer—whose crop was destroyed by a hailstorm. I happened to be driving down in his neighborhood shortly thereafter and was very much shocked by the evidence of devastation upon all sides. He was a plain German, with clear intellectual processes, but with imperfect English. In describing one of his predicaments, where he had tried to reach the barn from the house in the midst of the storm, he said: "A hailstone the size of my fist struck me on the head and knocked me sensible."

Mr. Chairman, I think some Massachusetts Foss Republicans who have come to the conclusion that protection is made for them alone and not for the great Northwest and the farming industry, wherever it is being carried on, would be benefited by a hailstorm. [Laughter and applause.] It is an heroic case, requiring heroic remedies. I have great hopes that a cold-water plunge, a hard frost, and a hailstorm may bring some of our Republican brethren to their senses.

You may say that retaliation is not a high order of statesmanship. It is sometimes the only effectual statesmanship. The boot and shoe interests and the leather interests were extremely clamorous for free hides. They got free hides in the Payne bill, but the prices of boots and shoes and leather products are maintained at the old standards. The same interests are now exceedingly anxious to try the free-trade experiment on the balance of the products of the farm. My idea is that it will be instructive to try the free-trade experiment on boots and shoes and on some other manufactured articles at the same time. This will hasten our return to Republican sanity and fair play.

It was particularly unfortunate, from a Republican standpoint—and I will be frank in all I have to say—that following the splendid progress that had been made in the enunciation of the scientific basis for the application of protection in the Chicago platform, following the legislation that the Republicans were seeking against Democratic opposition to place permanently on the statute books in the form of a law which would aid in the carrying out of that application to all industries by the creation of a permanent Tariff Board, which in an impartial way would gather the facts as to all American industries and the difference in the cost of production of all commodities here and abroad—I say it was, to say the least, unfortunate from the standpoint of the country and certainly from the standpoint of Republicanism—that in the very initiative of the application of that policy we should be confronted with a bill such as the so-called Canadian reciprocity bill, which proposed, under whip and spur, to immediately pass legislation seriously affecting the basis of our greatest industry, agriculture, without a report from our Tariff Board as to the difference in cost of production in the two countries of the articles to be affected by this important and far-reaching agreement.

We were expected to legislate upon that agreement without investigation, and the suggestion was made that as to any other schedules—the woolen or the cotton or the manufacturing schedules generally—it would be in good form if we would wait until the facts could be collected by the Tariff Board.

It was entertaining this afternoon to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] plead for delay in the consideration of the bill now pending until the Tariff Board could investigate the facts affecting the cost of production of jute, hemp, and certain iron and steel products that this bill would put on the free list. His counsel against destroying or crippling any American industry without knowledge of the facts was touching and pathetic. But he and some other Republicans from manufacturing districts, equally inconsistent, when the Canadian bill first passed the House, were not restrained in their zeal to put farm products on the free list by the consideration that the Tariff Board had made no report on the facts. No information upon this great question was furnished us by the so-called agents who negotiated this remarkable agreement on behalf of the United States, and none was offered from our Tariff Board. Between the first and second passage of the bill through the House a report of the Tariff Board was obtained. This was brought forth by a corkscrew process in the form of a resolution from the Senate of the United States asking for this information. And when it was placed before this Congress for its consideration it appeared that there was a great difference in the cost of the production of agricultural products in Canada and in the United States amounting to at least 20 per cent in favor of lower cost of production in Canada than in this country.

It is indeed unfortunate that a piece of legislation resulting so completely in class and sectional advantage should have been forced through this body almost without consideration. That it is simply class legislation, if not apparent to every Member of this body, will become so by the merest perusal of the vote on both sides of this Chamber upon the question. It is a clear case of the city dweller against the farmer, the city districts against the country districts. Take our neighboring State of Minnesota, for example. Nine high-minded Members represent the constituencies of Minnesota upon this floor. Three of them hail from city districts—Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. Six of them come from the districts over the balance of the State. The three from the city districts, representing the sentiment, as they believe, of the people in those districts, are all recorded in favor of the reciprocity agreement. The six from the country are all against it. One of them is a Democrat, is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and while this involves partisan politics, he is not able to blind his eyes to the fact that this is a sectional measure. It is a controversy between country life and city life, and this House has gone on record as supporting the city side of that proposition at a time in our history when, if there ought to be one American policy more prominent than another on both sides of this Chamber, which ought to be espoused independent of politics, it is some well-conceived policy that will check the mad rush of population from the country to the cities.

Now, my friends, I see no reasonable expectation that there will be any modification of this Canadian pact unless it be modified before it becomes a law. Once fixed, in my opinion, it will have to remain until it is repealed. It is perfectly evident that the people of the north, the Canadians, have obtained in this agreement all that they desire in the adjustment of trade relations between the two countries. Perhaps your attention has already been called to an extract from the speech of the Hon. John Charlton made in the Canadian Parliament in 1903, in which, referring to the great prosperity of the United States and the great disadvantage of Canada in business relations between the two countries, he spoke as follows:

> The American policy has been applied not only to us but to all the world. The object of the United States has been to sell all that it possibly could of the products of its soil and its mills and its workshops and to buy just as little as it could from other countries, and thus having as much of the balance of trade in its own favor as possible. The result has been that the balance of trade in favor of the United States

last year amounted to $600,000,000 against the whole world—$71,000,000 against Canada. That is a good thing for the United States and will be her policy as long as the rest of the whole world will permit her to do it, but it is not a good thing for us.

He goes on to say:

Something must be done to change the trade relations that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Nothing short of this will do it, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than it has already made. We can not afford any more.

The present trade agreement gives to Canada precisely what is disclosed by that statement as being desired by Canada, and certainly no reasonable man can expect at any time to get more favorable concessions from Canada than in this agreement unless obtained here and now before this legislation is concluded by the two Houses of Congress.

This campaign in favor of a new trade policy with Canada, aside from such influence as may have been brought into the campaign in the interest of the great newspapers of the country who were not satisfied with what they were obtaining in the way of print-paper concessions in the Payne-Aldrich Act, has been brought about and promoted in large part, and almost entirely, upon the outcry against the high cost of living. We might make the same complaint against the high cost of dying as we do against the high cost of living.

We are living in times of great prosperity. High prices always prevail in eras of prosperity. Eras of low prices have always been eras of hard times, and instead of adopting the policy of bringing down the general prosperity to a lower level, the course of statesmanship would have been to adopt a policy that would lift the scale of wages of the wage earner and of men on fixed salaries, up to a level of the great era of prosperity in which we are living.

We, following the Democratic leadership, have started upon the other course, the killing of the goose that lays the golden eggs, instead of a more equitable distribution of the eggs.

There can be no doubt that the agreement with Canada, if adopted in its present form, will work some degree of injury to the great agricultural interests of the country. To what extent and with what measure of disaster it might apply we can only guess. I think it would be difficult to find any subject upon which so much sophistry has been spent as upon the effort by the friends of this pact to show that, in the first place, the American farmer will not have to take any lower prices for his commodities, but that the American consumer would be benefited as the result.

The truth is, if we can safely anticipate the truth, that the very reverse of that is likely to happen under the bill in its present form. The American farmer will be compelled to take less for his commodities; but it is, indeed, extremely doubtful whether any portion of that reduction will filter through for the benefit of the ultimate consumer. As long as the middlemen in this country are organized to appropriate whatever additional advantage may arise from a lower purchase price the consumer is not likely to reap the benefits.

In the case of the reduction recently of the rates in the wood-pulp schedule in the Payne bill the Paper Trust simply appropriated the reduction. When we placed a reduction of practically $2.75 per ton on wood pulp in the Payne-Aldrich bill, it was anticipated it would bring about a reduction in the price of print paper in this country. My information is that exactly the reverse has been the case, and the price of print paper to the consumers of that product is higher to-day than it was when the Payne-Aldrich bill was passed.

Mr. KAHN. Two dollars and twenty-five cents.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. My understanding is that the final effect of it is $2.75; but that is unimportant.

But it is said, and by so able a gentleman as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], that the price of wheat in this country is fixed by Liverpool and not by the competition in this country. I questioned the gentleman from Massachusetts on that subject when he was on the floor. Some of you may remember that I asked him, if the price of wheat is fixed, not in the United States but in Liverpool, whether the passage of this Canadian reciprocity agreement would affect the price of wheat in this country; and his reply was:

When I say the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool, of course that is only popularly correct.

Whatever that may mean.

The price of wheat is fixed,
Said he,
Compared with the world's demand and the world's supply.

What is the fact about this price of wheat in Liverpool? Is it absolutely necessary that when we approach the discussion of a great economic question we must abandon our common sense and our usual methods of reasoning? The United States produces 700,000,000 bushels of wheat every year. It consumes 600,000,000 bushels, shipping about 100,000,000 bushels to other countries. The price of wheat in Liverpool may have a very marked effect upon the price of that 100,000,000 bushels that must be sold outside of the United States, but the price of the 600,000,000 bushels that must be consumed in the United States will depend upon the competition that the American market has to supply the 600,000,000 bushels. If Liverpool could buy wheat and import it into the United States, she might become a competitor in this market and have something to say as to what would be the price of that 600,000,000 bushels.

But as long as we have an export the price of what we export will necessarily be controlled very much by the export market; and if you look through the Liverpool, Winnipeg, and Minneapolis market reports upon wheat from time to time you will find that it is very rare indeed that the price of wheat in Liverpool is sufficiently higher than the price of the northern grade of spring wheat in the United States to permit of exportation at all. It requires a difference of price in favor of Liverpool of at least 15 cents before the American farmer can get his No. 1 hard wheat into the Liverpool market, and in these tables, prepared by our own Tariff Board, I find that in the entire year 1910 there was not a month, according to the official figures here given, when the difference in price between the United States and Liverpool upon that grade of wheat was such as to justify its exportation at all. During the one month of July, 1910, the price of wheat of that grade was actually higher in the United States than in Liverpool.

That old saw about the price of wheat being fixed in Liverpool, and not in the competitive market where it is used, I have had handed out to me in debating clubs since I was a boy. It is so old and ancient and unphilosophic that it has not only whiskers, but gray, shaggy whiskers upon it. [Laughter.] The price of wheat consumed in this country is never fixed in Liverpool, although it may be somewhat influenced by it, until a time when that price is such that Liverpool could become, in a sense, a competitor in supplying what we consume here at home. On the other hand, if you examine these same tables, prepared by our Tariff Board, you will find that the difference in price between Winnipeg and Liverpool, from month to month, generally represents just about the difference in freight that it would take to carry a bushel of wheat from Winnipeg to Liverpool. That country produces vastly more than it can consume, and therefore Canadian wheat is much more influenced by the market in Liverpool than is the wheat grown in the United States.

But I have taken too much time in the discussion of these matters in detail. I believe in a protective policy in the adjustment of tariff rates in the United States. If I were to undertake to state my reasons therefor you would say that they are academic. That may be true, but I believe, my Republican friends, that this is one of the times when academic principles and fundamental doctrines had better be tried out before we make radical changes in the basis of a great industry.

I was pleased to hear the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND]. I think it was as fair a statement of the fundamental differences between the Democratic doctrine of a tariff and the Republican doctrine of a tariff as could be made. The gentleman reminded you Democrats on that side, as I like to remind my Republican colleagues on this side, that a great part of the discussion which we engage in with such heat, not only in these legislative debates but also upon the stump, is a mere confusion of terms. When you place a tariff upon any article that is or can be produced in this country, whether you call that a tariff for revenue or a tariff for protection, it in effect is a protection upon that commodity to the amount of the tax, and any other statement is a mere parley over definitions and terms. If I am engaged in a manufacturing industry in the United States, if I am engaged in a farming industry in the United States, and as between the United States and our main competitor in that article of production a tariff rate is placed upon the commodity, as, for example, 10 cents a bushel on wheat or 50 cents a barrel on flour, it protects my American market in that commodity just to that extent, whether you call it a tariff for revenue or a tariff for protection.

And right here is the essential difference between the Democratic and Republican theories of the tariff. We must raise over $300,000,000 per year by tariff duties to help pay the expenses of Government. The Democrats ignore the protective principle and would apportion rates to different articles solely with a view to their revenue-producing quality. Republicans, while raising the revenue, would apportion the rates in a manner to foster and protect all industries that can be profitably carried on in this country.

There are disadvantages and perils in the protective system as well as great advantages, and it has become incumbent upon us as members of the Republican Party to eliminate, so far as practicable, those perils and dangers from the system. The perils of protection—and they grow out of any tariff, no matter what you call it—are, first, the difficulty of preventing protection which is too high, and, secondly, the fact that if the protection is too high, it encourages the formation of trusts or combinations in the United States to control that particular line of industry. Primarily it has been the Republican doctrine that protection was made, in its chief purpose, for infant industries. Yet we find in practice that an industry may grow gray with age, and still when you reduce the tariff upon that industry it will be done under protest; and we have not always, as Republicans, exercised the proper judgment and firmness in scaling down protective rates which have become too high for the best good of the industry and the people of the country.

When the conference committee was appointed by this House after the Payne bill had passed the House and gone to the Senate and had there been amended in many particulars, I made a brief address upon the floor of this House, not anticipating, of course, that my view would control, but still stating plainly my convictions upon the subject, that the Republican Party had undertaken, in the campaign, to hold out reasonable assurances that the revision of the tariff which we were to make would be a revision downward; and I suggested, in the face of a condition whereby many of the schedules had been placed much lower in the House than in the Senate amendments, and many other schedules had been placed in the Senate lower than in the House—I suggested as a Republican policy that the conference committee, just as far as possible, should accept the lower rates where the Senate had made an amendment downward, and insist upon our rates when our rates were lower than the Senate rates.

That may have been done in some instances. It was not done in all. If that course had been generally followed it would have spared the party much of the criticism that has since been made against the tariff act. It would have given us the pulp and paper schedule in a form generally satisfactory to the great newspaper interests. It would have saved the Republican Party from the absurdity of increasing the Dingley rates on cotton cloth.

I made personally a very careful investigation of the changes that were made in the Senate upon the cotton-cloth schedule. Very full hearings were had before the Ways and Means Committee. We have not an older manufacturing industry than the cotton industry. If I mistake not, the centennial anniversary of that great industry in this country is being celebrated this year, or will be. Witnesses came before the committee from the cotton mills of the South and the cotton mills of the North. Every witness before that committee, without an exception, stated that that industry was in a healthy and normal condition; that they did not need any increase of rates, but they asked that no reduction should be made. Amendments were made in the Senate which very much increased the rates upon countable cotton cloths. Some of you know something of the effort that was made to get the schedule back again to the Dingley rates, with the result that when the conference report came in, while some slight modifications were made, the Republicans were placed in the absurd light upon a very important schedule of materially advancing the Dingley rates on an industry that every witness from the industry said ought not be increased; that they were large enough.

It is not necessary for me to guess what influences made those changes. They were made, and our efforts to reduce them seemed ineffectual. When, in the face of that sort of proceeding on the cotton-cloth schedule, we see Members from districts very closely related to the cotton industries coming upon the floor of this House as ardent and active champions of a trade pact with Canada that will bring about free trade with our principal competitor upon farm products, there need be no surprise that the American farmer is hastening to the conclusion that something is necessary to bring about consistency again upon the part of our Republican colleagues in the manufacturing districts. I said then, and I say again, that it is such instances of greed that bring the American protective tariff system into disrepute in the house of its friends.

This particular bill will bring no great good to the farmer. The man who named this the farmers' free-list bill had a very fine sense of humor. The Canadian pact places all the products of the farm upon the free list, so far as Canada is concerned. This proposed farmers' free-list bill in effect places all of his products upon a free-trade basis with the balance of the world. That is probably a logical justification for calling it the farmers' free-list bill.

Agricultural implements are proposed to be placed upon the free list. An American farmer would not use any other implements than those made in this country if he could get them imported free. The wooden plow of India or the agricultural machinery of most civilized countries, indeed, would have little place upon an up-to-date American farm. It developed in the debate to-day that already by the reciprocal exchange provision under the terms of the Payne bill we can now get agricultural implements from Germany and from England free of duty, and if there is any country in the world that would be likely to make any implements that an American farmer would use in this country and maintain his self-respect, it would be one of those. There were only $79,000 worth of agricultural implements imported into the United States in 1910. We make in this country the agricultural implements of the world, and during 1910 $28,000,000 worth of agricultural implements were exported from the United States to other countries. The benefits that an American farmer can get out of that Democratic sop of free agricultural implements, under a condition in which they may now come in from England and Germany free, is so negligible that he will never be able to realize it.

Lumber is to be placed upon the free list. That will benefit western farmers a little. We from the Middle Western States have stood for free lumber. If in that we have seemed inconsistent, I think it can be argued that the question of free lumber is one of high public policy; that is, there are other considerations surrounding it than that alone of tariff rates. It is well known that it has become a question of public policy to conserve the American forests. A forest does not grow in a lifetime; it takes generations to develop a forest. By careless and wasteful methods in this country, under private greed and enterprise, we were fast reaching a point when the American forests would disappear from view. A forest has ethical and utilitarian purposes besides furnishing lumber. The forest on the mountain is an ornamentation to the landscape; it holds back the snow, fills the springs, and conserves the safety of the valley below. We are spending millions of dollars a year in an effort to conserve the American forests, and that is being done because we have reached the place in our development where it has become necessary in order that great elements that enter into civilization and progress shall not disappear from this country.

Now, then, the reduction of the tariff upon lumber may make a reduction to that extent, but the $1.25 upon lumber that is now levied since the Payne bill went into operation, is an insignificant element in determining the price of lumber, even if it is all applied directly to the purchaser of lumber. The price of lumber is inevitably high because of the conditions to which I have referred, and therefore I think it should be the policy to invite free transmission of lumber from other countries having great forests into our own, in order that we may conserve the remaining forests as far as we can for the generations coming after us until other forests can be grown. That will be for the self-interest of the American farmer. But it will be nothing to compensate him for what he will suffer by reason of going into free-trade markets upon his great products.

It is, indeed, a very narrow policy to throw a great American industry, an industry which has in the value of its capital more money invested than all of our manufactures and all of our railway capitalization combined, I say it is a very narrow policy that will throw a great industry of that kind into a free-trade market with Canada on all of its products while preserving protection upon manufactured products. I say it is a very narrow, unrepublican, and, I believe, un-American policy.

It is a very little consolation to the American farmer after you have reduced, perchance, by sharp competition from other countries that can produce cheaper the profits of his business—because usually 20 per cent in cost of production is the difference between prosperity and adversity—I say it is very little consolation after in a measure you have injured the chief, prime industry of the United States to cheapen the cost of the tools the farmer works with.

I do not believe, however, that this bill will at least immediately seriously injure the American farmer beyond what he will already be injured by the Canadian pact, if it shall go into law. It is true that all grain products and all meat products are placed on the free list. But under present economic conditions in the United States, as compared with other countries in the world, it is at least doubtful whether we will attract from countries south of us—Australia, Argentina, and Mexico—so sharp a competition upon meat products as to further impair the American price to the American producer. I find upon examination that we imported from all countries of the world during 1910 less than a million dollars' worth of meat products of all kinds—smoked meats, preserved meats, and fresh meats

altogether. We only imported about $700,000 worth in 1910. On the other hand, the United States exported to help feed the hungry mouths of continental Europe and Great Britain $106,000,000 worth.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I understand the gentleman is in favor of putting up the home market so as to get a high price for agricultural products. Does he think that it would be fair to the people to sell them their products at a very high price and to sell the surplus to foreign countries at a lower price?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Not at all. My view is that every important American industry that has sufficient dignity for its development as an American enterprise should be protected to the extent of the difference in cost between the production abroad and at home, and the only question is how it should be applied so as to get only a reasonable profit and still preserve the advantage to the American producer. But I certainly do not favor any policy that would give any better opportunities to the American producer of manufactured products than to the American producer of agricultural products. I simply say, as a matter of fundamental American policy, if we are to abandon the protective principle to American industries, considering the magnitude of agriculture, its importance in this country——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. But the gentleman does not come to the point that I made.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Oh, let me finish the sentence first and then I will come to it. Considering the importance of agriculture in this country, I say it should be the last industry, if we are to have an order of procedure, from which protection should be removed.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. In defending this home market and exploiting it as the gentleman does, is it the notion of the gentleman that we should sell to each other, farmer to the manufacturer and artisan, and artisan and manufacturer in turn to the farmer, at higher prices than we sell the same products, either manufactured or natural, abroad? Do you want to sell to our home market at a higher price than you would sell our surplus for to a foreign market?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I want the American manufacturer and farmer to sell his product in the best market in the world, which is the American market. I want him to have a little advantage in getting into this market, because I insist that we should have the American market primarily for the American producer. He is an American citizen, and we have a higher standard of living in this country than in any other country. It is the best market in all the world. The internal commerce of the United States is as great as all of the foreign commerce of all of the countries of the civilized world.

I say this market should be in the first place protected at least to the extent of the difference in the cost of production here and elsewhere, making a liberal provision for the American wage earner, who ought, as an American citizen, to be paid a larger wage than any other citizen of the world, and he ought not to be thrown into competition with the labor of monarchical countries that do not undertake to have the high standards of citizenship and living that we have.

I know in actual practice it is not possible always to gauge the manufactured output, for example, precisely to the local demand, if an effort be made to do it. I know, furthermore, as to agricultural products, it is impossible to gauge the supply precisely to the demand. The industrious American farmer always raises all that he can of anything that he thinks will be of value. Therefore, we have a surplus in this country. It ought to be our policy to continue to have a surplus in this country, and thereby, from the exigencies of the market, the manufacturer will be glad to take from some foreign country a lower price for his surplus than he has succeeded in getting in a live American market. There are many times when the agriculturist, the grower of wheat, accepts a less price for his surplus in the Liverpool market than he has obtained for what he has sold in the American market.

It is nothing against the American system, it is nothing against the producer or the manufacturer of these articles. It is simply due to natural business conditions. We can afford to sell our accidental surplus in a foreign market for a quick return, even though it does bring somewhat less than the prevailing prices for the portion of the commodity needed in this country.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman refers to our accidental surplus. Does he not think that we ought to have an intentional surplus both of manufactured and farm products, and does he not think it would be manifestly unfair to that farmer, for whom he assumes to be speaking this afternoon, to charge him for agricultural implements that he uses in raising his wheat a higher price than those same implements sold to his Argentine, Canadian, or Russian competitor, who is selling with him in open competition at the Liverpool market?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. You can have an answer either way to that question, whatever side suits you best.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I suppose the gentleman will make the answer that suits him best.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. My answer is already made. I think the American farmer ought to be able to sell the products produced in this country with a reasonable margin of profit, and I say that if we apply the Republican doctrine of protection as we have announced it, and apply it to each American industry, whether agriculture or manufacture, on the basis of the difference in cost of production here and elsewhere, with a reasonable margin of profit—a question not always easy to determine, although I think in most instances the difference of freight, particularly from Europe, will perhaps be a reasonable margin of profit—there will be no danger of the American producer receiving an unreasonable price from the American consumer. And I say, if we will apply the Republican doctrine of protection as we have announced it in our platform, we will refuse to enact any legislation, as Republicans, that is not consistent with this doctrine; we will eliminate the high tariff that may apply to certain specific industries under the present schedules, and we will proceed with a successful relation between all American industries, whether farm or factory.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Just along that line. There is a high excise tax upon alcohol and a high internal tax upon whisky, upon tobacco, and upon cigars that the American consumer buys, yet the whisky that is made from the corn that is raised in Missouri, when it is sent abroad, is relieved of a tax of $1.10 a gallon, or two dollars and something if it be alcohol, under our system, and it has always been so. Last year, in round numbers, $7,000,000 that was exported was relieved from the excise tax, and yet the gentleman from Missouri, perhaps, is not happy.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I also suggest to the gentleman, in reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri, that the practice of selling a small proportion of the surplus abroad is by no means an American institution. It is done by every nation in the civilized world, with a tariff or without a tariff; in fact, the expression "dumping process," by which term this method is known, was invented to apply to free-trade England.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I think entirely too much is sought to be made by our Democratic opponents. We have radical differences on the subject of the tariff——

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Not until I get through with this sentence, then I will be glad to yield to anyone—of the fact that in certain isolated instances, and perhaps quite often, less is accepted for the surplus of a manufactured article abroad than at home. It is one of the exigencies of trade. As any man of business knows, it is difficult at the end of the year to dispose of his surplus if he has manufactured more than can be consumed at home, and he sells, even at a disadvantage, abroad in order that he may get in the ready money to set into operation active business for the coming year. Now, with farm products it is practically the same way. You might as well criticize the farmer because he sells grain cheaper abroad than at home.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina rose.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Let me finish the sentence. You take the Liverpool market of wheat for the month of January, 1910, a year ago this last January. The market in Minneapolis of No. 1 hard, the average for the month, was $1.15½. The price in Liverpool was $1.22, a difference of only 6½ cents. Now, if a bushel of No. 1 hard wheat had been marketed in that month by the American farmer in Liverpool he would have lost the difference between 6½ cents and 15½ cents, which it would cost to get it over there, and then you would have put to the American farmer that he was scandalizing the industry by selling his wheat cheaper abroad than at home. There was no month during 1910 that the American farmer, who grows northern spring wheat, if he had sold in Liverpool, would not have accepted a less price, after taking out the freight, than he would have gotten at home; not a single month.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does the gentleman believe that a bushel of wheat ever went to Liverpool when wheat was cheaper in Liverpoool than it was in the United States?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Well, "ever" is a long time; and if it did, it was an economic mistake.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Then it is not true he sells in Liverpool cheaper than in America.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I have just made the statement that any month of 1910 he would sell in Liverpool at a lower price than here.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. And he would accept it?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I do not know whether he would or not, but——

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I am not——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I said he would get a better price here——

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I happen to live in an export State——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I have yielded freely to the gentleman, and I do not care for the gentleman to make a speech in my time, but if he has a further question I will be happy to meet it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. We sell about 7,000,000 bales of cotton from the South, and we get for every bale of it in Europe more than we can get in America.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There is reason for that, and that reason is a splendid protection for our southern brethren, and I do not criticize at all their advantage in it. I am glad for them. But the United States grows three-fourths of all the cotton of the world, and why should it sell any abroad unless it got as good a price as could be gotten here? On the other hand, we do not grow three-fourths of the wheat, and have only 100,000,000 bushels more than we consume, and we have to seek a foreign market for a little of our product, and have to accept that price after we pay the freight.

I do not wish to be misunderstood on the subject of Canadian reciprocity. I said at the beginning of that controversy that I was favorable to the general idea of Canadian reciprocity, and I would be in favor of either of two horns of a dilemma. I would be willing to have Canadian reciprocity on all American-produced products and Canadian-produced products upon the principle of the Republican doctrine of protection, or difference in cost of production, whichever way it might be; or I would be willing to accept the other alternative and have free trade with Canada on every product produced in the two countries. I am not opposed to either idea. I am opposed to a reciprocity, so-called, with Canada that gives free trade on the products of the farm, but retains our high protective duties on the products of the factories.

I am, in other words, opposed to a Canadian reciprocity that must be purchased at the cost of the disturbance and overthrow of our reciprocity here in the United States. I want that we shall have the same proper adjustment between the industries of the farm and of the factories as heretofore, and do not want them sacrificed to a scheme that will place one great industry on the free list while preserving a protective tariff upon the balance.

Now, we as Republicans have long ago, I think, or at least in part, declared in favor of schedule-by-schedule revision of the tariff. Certainly, very prominent leaders have done so, and the prominent leaders upon the Democratic side, at least of this body, appear to have come to about the same conclusion. Schedule-by-schedule revision of the tariff is all right if we have a principle to guide us in that revision. The criticism upon the old system is that no principle fundamentally believed in by either party has controlled in a revision en masse; that the revision of the tariff has often become—and it is as much chargeable to Democratic tariffs as to Republican tariffs—too much influenced by the practice of compromise and barter and sale, the keeping of one industry upon a high-protection schedule if another one can be put there or kept there.

But I want to remind Members on both sides of this Chamber that there can be no worse revision of any tariff than a revision by schedule that has no fundamental principle to determine it except the brute force of votes.

If we were proceeding as Republicans to revise the tariff, we should revise it upon the principle of the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. There is no place for free lists in either a Democratic or a Republican revision of the tariff, unless you can place some principle at the basis of it. There is no basis for a free list in a Republican revision of the tariff, whether by schedule or any other way, unless it should be applied to an American commodity that can be produced here as cheaply as abroad, or to some article that can not be economically produced here. I think it can be applied to many. We applied it to some additional articles in the Payne bill. My opinion is that agricultural implements can be manufactured in this country just as cheaply as anywhere in the world. If so, they ought to be put upon the free list, not because the American farmer wants it to be done, but because, fundamentally, the principle of protection, that we as Republicans subscribe to, has placed them there. I suppose a Democratic free list—although some Democrats can better define it than myself, for they have a consistent doctrine that the tariff should be adjusted simply for the purpose of raising revenue, and the principle of protection should be lost sight of entirely—I suppose, logically, a Democratic free list would consist of articles that the placing of a tariff upon them would destroy their revenue-producing quality; that is, would prevent importation. If there is any other Democratic idea to be conserved in a free list, we will find it out from Democratic definition.

There are fundamental differences, my friends, between the two parties upon this question, and as a Republican I am anxious that we shall not lose sight of these differences in the legislation which is pending and that may be brought before the consideration of both these legislative bodies.

I concede that the Republican doctrine of protection is made primarily for the American producer instead of for the American consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. May I have 10 minutes more?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I concede, I say, that the Republican policy of protection has in view, first of all, the American producer. Our theory is to encourage production, to reward generously every man who will labor, either with his hands or his head. Our theory, further, is that if you will make every able-bodied American a producer and give him a good wage or price for his products he will be able to purchase all that he can consume.

Of what avail are low prices of living or of dying if you have not the price? All American citizens are consumers. All American citizens ought to be producers. And one advantage of the Republican policy is that it has always kept our factories at work; it has kept everybody busy, and the rewards of comfort and a good support have come to the man who will toil. The Republican policy has always worked well in experience. On the other hand, the policy of our Democratic friends has, so far as I have observed, worked poorly in practice.

We have had investigations, official investigations, as to the reasons for the high cost of living or the high cost of food products. The Secretary of Agriculture made a thorough investigation upon this subject. He reported that the difficulty, so far as the price of food products was concerned, was not that the American farmer was receiving an unreasonable price for his commodities. As I remember, the result of that investigation showed that it could not be said that the American farmer, even in these prosperous times, was receiving to exceed 6 per cent on his investment. Practically the same conclusion was reached by the Senate committee—the Lodge committee—investigating the high cost of living. From both of these investigations it would appear that between the farmer and the consumer the organized corporations and industries organized for the purpose of handling the farmer's products, changing their form, perhaps, and passing them on to the consumer, are adding to the original price all the way from 50 per cent to 150 per cent.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Dakota yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. That is a very interesting statement, and I state that truthfully. Does the gentleman take into consideration this fact in connection with the ultimate price that the ultimate consumer pays a great rate of interest upon watered stock?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes. There is a great deal of truth in that, but that is only a remote phase of the question. But it is very well worth consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have already said that the provision in this pending bill to place all meat products upon the free list will, to some extent, further cripple the advantages of the American producer of beef—the farmer. It has, however, some advantages, and I want to do it justice. Those of you who took interest enough to observe know that I sought to amend the Canadian pact in this House so as to place meat products, so far as our trade relations with Canada are concerned, upon the free list. I have said at different times that this Canadian agreement did not go far enough. By that I meant to say that if we were to have free trade at all with Canada, it should go

all along the line, and I am not at all deaf to the altruistic arguments that are produced to show that we ought to have closer trade relations with Canada.

But in saying that it ought to go all along the line I have always referred to our trade relations with Canada and not our trade relations with the whole world. But under this bill meat products from all over the world are placed on the free list. My opinion is that that will not, at least for a few years, injure the American producer of meats. When you load meat on a ship, either from Australia or Argentina, and start it on its destination to market, it will not naturally seek the American market first, where we are already exporting $106,000,000 worth of preserved and dressed meat annually, but it will seek the world's market.

There is plenty of opportunity to market meat in Germany, which must buy every year of some countries at least $100,000,000 of food products, and my judgment is that any injury to the American farmer by reason of extending these particular provisions will not be serious, at least for some years to come.

On the other hand, we are gaining something in the economic adjustment of our relations with Canada. I believe that agreement ought to have provided for free meats with Canada if we are going to have free live stock. This legislation, while a very roundabout method, would give us at least free flour, free bread products, free meat products from Canada as well as from the rest of the world, and therefore would have a very marked effect on the system, so far as the present Canadian pact is concerned; and my candid judgment is that the consumer, by reason of bringing this element of competition in against the American Flour Trust and the American Meat Trust in our relations with Canada, will gain sufficient in the matter of meat and lower-priced flour and bread products to compensate, probably, for any additional danger to the American producer of live stock by reason of bringing in competition from the other countries.

I have tried to speak candidly of this bill. I believe it is radically wrong in the principle that it starts out upon. It is a companion piece of another piece of legislation that is radically wrong in principle. We either should have trade relations with Canada that preserve for the American producer the difference in cost of production here and there, or if for altruistic and fraternal reasons we should treat them as brethren and bring them in under one industrial system, we ought to have universal free trade with Canada.

Now, you are seeking to cure a latent and inevitable defect in that system by another bill, in the nature of a reprisal. Inasmuch as you have given a hard blow to the American farmer in that piece of legislation, you are now seeking to give a hard blow to some American manufacturers, in order that the farmer may even up. I do not believe that legislation of this character can be permanent. The present bill is justified, from a Republican standpoint, only upon the ground that it will hasten our return to industrial justice and fair play.

The worst is yet to come. We shall have a fair test of Democratic tinkering with the tariff, as we have already had once in my lifetime. History will repeat itself. Republicans will come back again to their faith. They will realize that they can not, and that they ought not if they could, place in operation a protective system that ignores the American producer of food products. Out of it all we will have a political revolution that will bring back, without its former defects, the American Republican protective system. The tariff hog and the free trader will both be repudiated. American markets will be primarily for American producers, and the United States will again resume its march as leader among the great commercial nations of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, the exercise of the taxing power is and has always been one of great moment to the American people. It was the arbitrary exercise of that power by Great Britain that plunged the United Colonies into war with the mother country. England laid a tax on tea, and our fathers resented it. It was not because English tea was so delicious that our people objected to the tax; it was the principle involved. We really had here a substitute far better than English tea, and that was the old-fashioned sassafras tea. [Laughter.] In my youth time I used to dig the red roots from the ground, and I thought that they made the finest tea that ever tickled the palate of man. How sweet its memory still! Does it seem strange to you on that side of the House now to think that the thirteen Colonies staked so much and dared to do so much because England taxed just one item—tea? What would the fathers think if they could come back to this Republic and see this Government under the control of the Republican Party laying a tax on more than 4,000 items of the necessaries of life? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota] boldly said that there is no place in a Republican schedule for a free list. Mr. Chairman, Henry Clay, the ablest champion of the protective theory that this country has ever produced, predicted nearly 70 years ago that the day was not far distant when protective duties would be abandoned. He pointed to the day when the industries of America could get along without taxing the consumers to support them. He asked the people in that early time to submit to this extraordinary tax only temporarily, and he assured them that in a little while these industries could compete with the world. Henry Clay has been dead more than half a century, and has the Republican Party abandoned the policy that he said should only live while our industries were in their infancy? No, Mr. Chairman; that party has become the tool, the handy instrument, of the interests that Clay sought to help when they needed help. I can not believe that Clay ever dreamed that the temporary protective system that he helped to establish would produce such evils as afflict and curse our country to-day. The captains of these industries led Clay to believe that they would voluntarily request the abolishment of protective tariff duties in a very short time. Did they do so? No, sir. They had grown rich, and they wanted the American masses to continue to work for them. Instead of doing as they had induced Clay and the people to believe that they would do—cease to ask the public to contribute to them under the requirements of law—they went into politics, formed combinations of special interests, and spent money helping to elect men who would serve them and helping to defeat men who opposed them, and to-day they have grown so powerful that they hold up the producer with one hand and rob the consumer with the other. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, this is a great battle that we have to fight. The powers that oppose us are tremendous, but the people are more powerful than they. All that we have to do is to reach them with the truth and the whole truth. God grant us the strength and the courage to keep up the fight. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

> Work on bravely God's own daughters,
> Work on bravely God's own sons,
> But till you have smoother waters,
> Let truth fire her minute guns.

We hear it noised around this Capitol and whispered throughout the country that if the representatives of the people undertake to reduce the tariff tax so that the average man can have a decent chance in the struggle for existence, the haughty barons of high protection will cause trouble in the business world. Aye, we are told of their power to create panics. Mr. Chairman, have we reached that awful time in the history of our country when a few men, grown fat on special privileges, can frighten us away from our patriotic duty? Shall these men continue to rob and plunder the American people because they desire to do so, and because they would become offended and create temporary disturbances in the business world if we dared to disturb the cruel power that they now employ to oppress the people? Did the fathers who followed Clay in the early days as he gathered tariff taxes from the people for the benefit of infant industries dream that they were inaugurating a system that would one day control national legislation in perpetuating its existence to the detriment of the rights and liberties of the people? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The time is ripe for us to educate the people regarding this great evil, and they are being educated. There are subsidized newspapers doing all they can to keep the truth from the people. I do not mean that all the newspapers are subsidized—not at all—for a great many of them helped us in the battle for the people in 1910. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I mean a great number of them are subsidized or owned by this vast tariff money power, and that the purpose of their existence is to deceive the people with regard to tariff blessings, and to keep them in the dark regarding the awful evils of high protection. Mr. Chairman, we have had a hard time in reaching the people because so many of these vehicles of information, the newspapers, have been owned or controlled by the interests that want to keep the people ignorant of conditions as they are. The people are at last waking up, and we intend to continue our war against this band of tariff marauders who collect taxes on everything that we use, from the cradle to the grave. When I came to Congress we had only 127 Democrats.

But to-day 227 Democrats respond in the name of the people in this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This great change in party representation in this branch of Congress is

indeed significant. It means that the principles for which we have so long contended are at last commanding the approval of the people. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans had been beating us so long that two years ago a Republican ball team, composed of Members of this House, challenged nine of us Democrats to meet them on the diamond. I took part in that game. Speaker CANNON was there to encourage the Republicans and to rejoice with them in their victory—if victory they should achieve. But, Mr. Chairman, we met them and we conquered them. And I then and there made the prediction that our victory over the Republican players was a forerunner of Democratic victory in 1910. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If I may be permitted to indulge in prophecy on this occasion, I will say that the victory achieved for the Democratic Party in 1910 is the forerunner of a glorious Democratic victory in 1912. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The high protective theory has been condemned by the American people. The system has grown in greed and avarice, until to-day its withering, blighting influence is felt in every avenue of American life and its evil agents are here in the Congress of the United States pleading to be permitted to continue in the name of the law their robbery of the American consumers. This is a deplorable and a humiliating situation. The lamented Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, a Republican, in a great speech condemning the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, said: "Congress has become a bargain counter." Mr. Chairman, that was an awful indictment of the Republican Congress, made by a Republican Senator. Congress a bargain counter—a place where the privilege to increase the tariff tax is sold to the highest bidder! The American people believed, with Senator Dolliver, that Congress had become a bargain counter, where those who fattened on the Republican tariff system could by the aid of their swollen fortunes have a Republican Congress put tariff taxes on new articles or raise them on old ones. "Make a fat contribution to the Republican campaign fund—help to perpetuate the system—and tell us what you want in the way of a tariff tax, and we will make the people pay it; make out your check and turn it over to the campaign committee, and all will be well." This, I imagine, is what took place, in view of what Senator Dolliver said about the Republican Congress being a bargain counter. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What else could he mean? A bargain counter where the people's rights were bartered away. Ninety-odd millions of people taxed to build up colossal fortunes for men like Carnegie, whose whole property when the Dingley tariff law went in effect, in 1897, was valued at $10,000,000, and in less than three years, under the higher tariff tax granted him at the bargain counter, his property had increased so marvelously that it was estimated to be worth $360,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is the sort of legislation that you have placed upon the statute books of this Nation. These men who contribute so generously and lavishly to the Republican campaign fund get it back multiplied thousands of times in tariff taxes from the people. Mr. Chairman, I have heard Republicans in this House laugh and make merry when we have from time to time assailed the protective theory that has caused so much trouble and distress among the masses of our people. But, sir, the time for their mirth and laughter has passed. Behold the haughty agents of these tariff taxgatherers, frowning upon us for the last few years for daring to suggest a revision of the tariff downward, coming out in 1908 with their faces wreathed in deceptive smiles proclaiming that they, too, believed that the tariff should be revised, but they said, "We will revise it downward, trust us once more"; and the people trusted them once more, and what did they do? They broke their platform promises and crucified their campaign pledges. [Applause on the Democratic side.] President Taft called an extra session of Congress. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the high priest of protection in the Republican Party, said that he did not know whether the tariff would be revised up or down. Another Republican in this House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE], said the whole country knows that we met here to revise the tariff downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, if there is any one thing that the American people know and know well, it is the sad fact that the Republican Congress did not revise the tariff downward. The bill that they put through the House vastly increased the tariff burdens of the people, and when it got through the Senate it was the worst tariff law ever written. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When it reached the President, he admitted that it was not a full compliance with the promises made to the people by the Republican Party, but later on, in his Winona speech, he said it was the best tariff bill ever written by the Republican Party, which goes to prove the saying that—

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
> As to be hated needs but to be seen;
> Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me quote a Republican authority upon your failure to keep your promise to revise the tariff downward. The Philadelphia North American, a Republican paper published in Philadelphia, said just after the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill became a law, speaking of the Republicans:

> They have kicked the national platform into the wastebasket.

And then, speaking of the bill, said:

> It is a revision drawn only to fatten the profits of the trusts, to grind every consumer a little nearer to poverty, and juggle duties so that they become prohibitory. The party is shamed as no party ever was before.

Concluding, the paper says:

> The law will be a cheat and the burden will be laid upon the consumer and the wage earner to pay more toll to special privilege.

Mr. Chairman, this Republican newspaper's criticism of the Republican Party is justified by the facts of that party's broken promises to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The election following your betrayal of the people returned a majority of Democrats to this House, and this, I repeat, is the forerunner of what we are going to do unto you in the entire country next year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I must hasten. The gentleman on the other side said a few days ago that the reciprocity agreement with Canada would take seven or eight million dollars of revenue from the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I had rather let this seven or eight millions of dollars in revenue remain in the pockets of the American consumers than to take it from them to be squandered in useless and extravagant expenditures by Republican Party officials. We have charged the Republican Party with having wasted millions of the people's money. We have charged them with reckless extravagance. And what did they say? They smiled and said that we did not know what we were talking about. We continued to cry out to the American people that they were taxing them to obtain money to meet useless expenditures, and when the people were convinced that we were right President Taft, a Republican, admitted that they were expending annually a hundred million dollars more than was necessary for the conduct of the Government. This admission on the part of a Republican President puts the Republican Party in an awful ugly predicament. It brands that party with willful extravagance or with utter inability to run this Government in an economic, business way. But, Mr. Chairman, there is another Republican whose familiarity with the necessary and unnecessary expenditures of this Government is greater than that of the President. I refer to Senator Aldrich, who was the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate until March 4, 1911. He said that we are uselessly expending or wasting $300,000,000 of the people's money every year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Yes, Senator Aldrich has admitted that if the Government were honestly and economically administered $300,000,000 could be saved to the tariff taxpayers of America. You are taxing the American masses to put $300,000,000 into the hands of extravagant Republican officials, and these custodians of the people's funds are squandering them in a shameful and reckless way. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Payne-Aldrich tariff law collects about $335,000,000 a year from the pockets of the American people, and a Republican, Senator Aldrich, says that you are squandering $300,000,000 of this money. So we have only $35,000,000 of this vast sum left to aid in defraying the legitimate expenditures of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What else do you Republicans do? You try to deceive the laboring man by telling him that tariff taxes are laid upon the American people for his benefit. God of our fathers, how many crimes have been committed by the Republican Party in the name of the laboring men of this country? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The high protective tariff system that now so afflicts the American people is the worst enemy that the laboring man has. What is the treatment that you accord the laboring man of America? You say the manufacturer gives him employment. Well, that is true, but he does so because he needs his labor and profits tremendously by it. The laboring man obtains fairly good wages because he is organized and is constantly demanding a living wage, but in spite of all your boasted benefits accruing to the laboring man under the present tariff system, the labor-

ing man continues to have a hard struggle and to live in humble surroundings, while the trust magnate for whom he toils lives in a mansion surrounded by all the comforts and luxuries that go to make up a life of ease. Mr. Chairman, that is not all; you bring foreigners here by the hundreds and thousands—yes, by the millions. And if the organization of the laboring man demands of your trust kings greater wages, saying that the cost of living has so increased that he can not support himself and wife and children on the wage that he receives, what happens to him? Why you turn him out of your factory and you take these foreigners from whose labor in Europe you have promised to protect him and you bring them here and put them in the place of the man whose only offense was a demand for decent wages. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that is not all. You make him a slave. When election time comes around and the people are demanding that the tariff tax be reduced on the common necessities of life, your tariff-fattened captains of industry tell him, "Unless you vote as I vote, you lose your job."

And that is not all. You sell the product of the American laborer in the foreign land to the foreigner cheaper than you sell it to the laboring man here at home, and cheaper than you sell to any man in America. So, Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party brings the cheap labor of Europe here to take the place of the American laborer whenever he manifests a desire to better his condition by demanding a better wage. [Applause on the Democratic side]. The capital of the laboring man in this country is his manhood, his skill, and his energy. But you do not care for that. The Republican Party has never manifested much concern about such things. When Henry George said, "I am for men," he struck a note that rang around this Republic like a trumpet call. [Applause on the Democratic side.] To protect and preserve the rights of the people will continue to be the chief end and aim of the Democratic Party. This country needs an old-fashioned revival of patriotism, and, Mr. Chairman, the way for this Government to have and hold the affections of its people is to be so just and fair that no man can truthfully assail it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Did you ever hear any talk like that on the other side of this House?

No; you are always talking about reasonable profits for the purse-proud plutocrats that your tariff system has created. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This reasonable profit for a favored few is the rock upon which your party is breaking. You now have the standpatter, the insurgent. What is a standpatter? Why, the very name suggests inactivity and decay. There is no standstill place in life. We progress or we retrograde. The power unused is the power that perishes, and the stand-pat Republican is like the Irishman's turtle—dead and don't know it. [Laughter and applause.] Then there is the insurgent. The trouble with him is he does not insurge long enough. Now and then he breaks away from the old guard and, like a bantam rooster mounting an ash hopper, crows vigorously for awhile, displaying, you would think, considerable courage; but let him see a trust hawk circling in his direction and right under the Republican barn house he goes and you do not see him any more. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] They are clever fellows, some of them, but they will not insurge far enough.

An insurgent Republican studies more about his immediate political future than all other things put together. And now I am going to tell him how to save himself and serve his country. Let him leave the time-serving Republican Party and he will obey the Scripture, which says:

> Come ye out from among them and be ye separate from them.

[Laughter and applause.]

The Republican Party's claim that high-tariff taxes are levied to protect the laboring man is a delusion and a snare. It is a fact well known to the Republicans of this House and to the country that when the McKinley tariff law went into effect, tariff duties were increased and yet wages were cut all over the country, and this was true when the Dingley law went into effect, and the Payne law also. Would the same thing have happened if the tariff had been reduced? Again, you threaten us with a panic if we dare to disturb your robber band as they go about the Republic gathering enormous tariff taxes from the people. You threatened us in 1892 and 1893, and your tariff clans gathered and put into operation forces that brought on a panic in 1894.

It was a Republican panic. You had the steel plates ready for printing the bonds, which were later issued and this before the Republican President went out of office. You held the panic back until President Cleveland went into office, and then you let it go, and when you saw that Republican panic afflicting the country you called it a Democratic panic. But the distress and suffering that the country experienced in 1894 were the bitter fruits of the tree that you had planted. For years you deceived the country by proclaiming it from the housetops that the Republican Party produced prosperity and that the Democratic Party produced panics. But the Republican panic of 1907 when you were in control of every branch of the Government has exposed your false claim to the world. Yes, you boasted that your protective system brought prosperity. Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of the story told by Mr. Bryan about the chanticleer, who told his sweetheart, the pheasant, that his crowing brought the dawn. For months and years she believed him. She heard his shrill voice ringing out in the darkness before day and then she saw the east radiant with the dawn. She gazed proudly upon the handsome chanticleer and firmly believed that his crowing brought the dawn. But one morning he was boasting of his power—still deceiving his sweetheart—and the dawn came before he crowed.

The long-deceived pheasant showed her embarrassment and her disappointment, and there in her presence stood discredited and humiliated the once-proud chanticleer, whose hypocrisy had made him contemptible in the eyes of her who had loved and trusted him. [Laughter and applause.] You were in power in every branch of the Government in 1907 when the panic came, and your claim of power to produce prosperity and prevent panics was proven to be false; and your party stood discredited before the American people and your hypocrisy stood exposed to the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The American people who had believed you and trusted you so long said, "Away with the Republican Party. We will trust it no more." And then you said, "Trust us once more; give us one more chance and we will revise the tariff downward." [Laughter and applause.] You made that promise to the people, and they gave you another chance, and what did you do? You broke that promise, and they drove you from power in this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have not had a lick at the Republicans in the other branch of Congress who helped you to break your promise to the people, but we will have soon. I am reminded of the story of a tramp who, while walking along the road, came upon a crowd of people at a picnic. He was very hungry, and he said to them, "Won't you give me something to eat?" And they gave him some cake and some pie, and if there is anything on this earth that a Republican loves it is pie. [Laughter and applause.] And they gave him some meat and fruit and a little of everything good to eat. They put it in a large napkin and told him to take it with him. He was very grateful and went his way rejoicing. Not far down the road he took a seat under a mulberry tree and ate his lunch. After he had eaten it he felt drowsy and fell asleep. The mosquitoes came around and lit upon his hands and upon his bare feet. The flies crawled over his face and over his feet and hands. He determined at first to drive them away, and then he said, "No; the people who gave me that lunch have been exceedingly kind, and I will let these insects enjoy themselves for awhile." [Laughter and applause.] And so he lay there and slept. Finally a yellow jacket came along and struck him square between the eyes. Smarting with the sting, he smote the yellow jacket and said, "For that you will all get off." [Laughter and applause.]

As I have said, you Republicans in this House are the only ones that we have had a lick at. For your broken promises and for the increased cost of living caused by your service to the trusts you have gone out of power in this House, and now for these sins and others you will all soon get out. [Laughter and applause.] The Republican Party has raised up here a gang of tariff barons who, when we want to put a stop to their oppression of the people, threaten us with a panic. They threaten us in order to frighten us away from a revision of the tariff. And when they do bring on a panic like the one that came in 1907, the big fish eat up the little fish. [Laughter and applause.] If there is any one thing that delights a Republican—a trust-tagged and tariff-owned Republican—it is to see the big fish mercilessly devour the little fish. [Laughter and applause.] In these panicky times money becomes scarce and then trouble begins for many of the stockholders in the trust-controlled concerns. The big man says to the little man, "You must buy my stock or sell me yours." And the little man says, "I can not buy your stock, and I would like to keep mine." And then the big man fastens the bony fingers of the panic around the little man's throat and chokes him to death. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The little man is crushed and a few big men profit by reason of the hard times produced by Republican panics. When the people cry out for a change in conditions a trust Goliath stalks around and defies the American people. He tells us that if we interfere with him and his gang, as they go about reaping where they have not sown, and gathering where they have not labored, he will punish us by producing a panic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a Democratic David in the land, armed with sling and pebble, representing the courage and determination of the people and a righteous cause, who will come along next year and destroy this cruel giant of the trust magnates. I want to see the day come, and I expect to see it come, when the changing of this Government from one political party to another will not affect legitimate business in this country. I want to see the time come when the platform of each party will declare for governmental honesty, for rigid economy, for justice and fairness to all the people, and that only those laws shall be enacted which will bring about the greatest good to the greatest number. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And I trust that we shall never see again those truckling lines to the trusts written in the Republican platform of 1908, where you guarantee to the tariff barons a reasonable profit. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] referred the other day to the fact that when we have war with other countries, we call on all the people to fight our battles. I was glad to hear him say that. It is refreshing now and then, although it may be a dropstitch remark to hear a Republican say something that suggests his friendship for the people. Republicans only think of the people when they want them to go to war or to bear increased tariff-tax burdens. But when it comes to dispensing blessings they think only of a few men who make large contributions to their campaign fund. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, some amusing things have occurred during this debate. The other day a gentleman on the other side of this House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE], undertook to frighten the farmers of this country into opposing the reciprocity agreement with Canada. And after that bill passed the House he tried to frighten all of the Canadians by threatening to annex them to the United States if they dared to ratify the reciprocity agreement. [Laughter.] Another gentleman on that side of the House urges us not to mistreat the American farmer on this side of the Canadian line. Let us see, Mr. Chairman, how the Republican Party has treated these same farmers and sheep owners. Here is what you do in the interest of the Wool Trust. If an American farmer owns a flock of sheep on this side of the line between the United States and Canada, and if he owns land just on the other side of this line in Canada, the Republican Party will not allow him to take his own sheep out of the United States and graze them on his own land in Canada and keep them there over six months and return them to the United States without paying a tariff tax to the tariff barons of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Do you blame the intelligent farmer out there for going into Canada to live? How can you? Who are they that have increased the population of Canada so rapidly in the last few years? I will tell you. They are the farmers who live near the Canadian line. And why have they gone in such large numbers to Canada? Because they have found your talk of tariff protection to the farmer to be a delusion and a fraud. These so-called tariff-protected farmers of America are flocking over to Canada by the hundreds and thousands. They have gone there because they wanted to get away from the tariff burdens of the United States. You have pretended always that you were protecting them here and making them rich. From time to time they have gone into Canada, and when they returned they told their neighbors that all this talk about tariff helping the farmer is bosh. And they said to their friends and relatives here, "Come, go with us to Canada. We have made more money there than we could make in the tariff-cursed United States."

And some of them go there to get away from the criminal horde that you are pouring into this country every year from foreign lands. Mr. Chairman, under the reign of the Republican Party more than a million foreigners come into our country every year. I have nothing to say against the men who come, in limited numbers, of their own accord, with the desire to better their condition, and who will love and support our institutions. But I protest against the black hand, the bomb thrower, and the anarchist who are being poured into our country by the thousands. Under the reign of the Republican Party this criminal horde is being emptied into the United States every 12 months. They make life cheap in our country, and they constitute a great menace to the peace and happiness of our people. They make life miserable for thousands of Americans. And why does the Republican Party permit them to come in such large and alarming numbers? I will tell you why. You permit it because the steamship companies have found that this traffic in these criminal beings furnishes to them a lucrative trade and they contribute to the campaign fund of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When will this evil end? That is not all that you do. You sell to the foreigner cheaper than you sell to the people at home, and you violate that principle of Scripture which says charity should begin at home. [Laughter and applause.] You sell the farmer's wife a sewing machine here for $29 and you sell the same machine in Scotland or in any other foreign country for $19.

A friend of Mr. BURNETT, of the seventh Alabama district, was in New York some time ago and he saw a sewing machine that he liked very much. Upon inquiry he found that it would cost him $29 to purchase that machine. He decided to do so, and when they asked him for his address, he said he desired to send it to his mother in Edinburgh, Scotland. And then to his surprise he was told that it was not necessary to purchase this machine; that they had sent to Edinburgh, Scotland, machines just like it, and that their agent there would deliver the machine to his mother for $19. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So, Mr. Chairman, this is a sample of what the Republican Party is doing in this country, and the fact that we are disclosing these things and acquainting the people with these facts are the reasons why you are being driven from power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is high time that this Government were being cleared of the barnacles and jellyfish that are upon it. On a trip down Mobile Bay on a revenue cutter I saw at a distance a long silver fish leap from the water high into the air and then strike the water again. I asked the captain of the boat why that fish leaped out of the water, and he said, "Why, he was annoyed by jellyfish and probably covered with them, and he leaped from the water into the sunlight in order to shake them off." My friends, the old ship of state sailing under the management of the Republican Party is so completely covered with jellyfish of the bloodsucking kind—trusts and tariff barons—that it will take heroic efforts on the part of an aroused and indignant electorate to remove the ship of state from the sickening stream of privilege. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A majority of the people of this country are tired of the Republican Party, but the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] said here to-day that the people did not trust the Democratic Party. I wonder what more the gentleman needs to convince him that the people do trust the Democratic Party than the victory that we achieved at the polls last year. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Has he forgotten that we had an election last November? When he looks upon this side of the House and sees such a large majority of Democrats is he not reminded that something has happened to the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You have fooled the people of this country for a long time.

Mr. Chairman, Sir Walter Scott was anxious to outstrip a classmate in his answers to questions propounded by the teacher. It was a difficult task. One day Scott noticed that when a question was asked the young man he would take hold of a button on his coat and fumble with it while his mind went in search of the answer. Scott cut the button off, and the next time the young man was interrogated by the teacher he missed the button and stood confused and confounded. The spell of the button was broken. Its inspiriting charm had fled and Scott triumphed. The Republican Party has been able to place the western farmer's vote in the Republican column because you led him to believe that your tariff laws brought him prosperity. Whenever the question was asked what have you done for the farmer you took hold of this long-worn and now badly damaged tariff button and said: "We give him prosperity through the protective tariff system." He believed you and voted the Republican ticket; but, sir, the day for you to stand confused and confounded in the presence of the American farmer is near at hand. When this reciprocity agreement with Canada becomes a law, your button is gone, and when the mask of your deception has been torn away and the farmer finds how he has been duped by you, he will vote the Republican ticket no more forever. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen on the other side assail this farmers' free list. Did you ever read the Republican free list for the farmer? Well, sir, it is the most grotesque and in many respects the most picturesque counterfeit on a free list that was ever perpetrated upon a free people. Here are some of the things that you have permitted to come into the United States without paying a tariff tax, and all for the benefit of the farmer. Listen to it: Acorns, persimmons, and ipecac. [Laughter and applause.] Beet-root ashes, hog bristles, and pebbles from Brazil. [Laughter.] Seaweeds and croton oil. [Laughter and applause.] Then comes dragon's blood, dried insects, and horsehair. [Laughter and applause.] Then we have dried blood, beeswax, and catgut. [Laughter.] Then comes whalebone, tobacco stems, and human skeletons. [Laughter.] And that is not all. Fishskins, insect eggs, and nux vomica. [Laughter and applause.] Then we have hair, rags, and moss. Seeds of morbid growth, leeches, and lemon peel. [Laughter and ap-

plause.] The farmer asked you for a fish and you gave him his skin. [Laughter.] He asked you for a horse and you gave him his hair. And he asked you for a hog and you gave him his bristles. [Laughter and applause.] He asked you for tobacco and you gave him the stems. He asked you for clothes and you gave him rags. [Laughter and applause.] There are some other things on your Payne-Aldrich free list for the farmer. Listen: Manna, balm of Gilead, and sesame. These are on the free list. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Chairman, manna is that food that the Almighty rained down from heaven when the children of Israel were about to starve in the wilderness, and I do not blame the Republican Party for putting manna on the free list, for that party knew of the hard times to come under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. And it expected that during the sore trial of the people that before the good God would let them starve he would again perform the miracle of raining down manna from heaven. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Now for balm of Gilead. Mr. Chairman, that stuff has been scarce since Edgar Allan Poe cried from the deepest depths of his sorrowful soul, "Is there no balm in Gilead?" [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Then there is sesame. When I was a boy I read the tales of the Arabian Nights, and I remember there was a gang of hunters or robbers who inhabited a cave, and when one of their number went out in search of food or other things he could not reenter the cave until he gave the password "Sesame." [Laughter.] So, Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party has put on the free list in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law the password of the Arabian Nights. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, let us see what you put on the free list for the rich man. Diamonds, in the rough and cut, and radium. Do you know how much radium costs? A thimble half full of that stuff would cost $1,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And only trust magnates and tariff barons can buy it. So you let that come in free of tariff tax. Then you have diamonds on the free list. Why, a diamond in the rough as big as a goose egg, struck three times with a grinding rock and flashed under a brilliant light would put any Republican's eye out in this House. [Laughter and applause.] How about the farmer? He asked you for free lamp wicks, and you gave him lightning bugs. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] He asked you for free matches and you gave him fox fire. He asked you for the opportunity to buy untaxed kerosene oil, and you gave him croton oil. [Laughter and applause.] He asked you for free pork, and you gave him dried insects. He asked you for free wheat, and you gave him a dose of ipecac. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Chairman, let us contrast the Republican Party's treatment of the farmer with the treatment accorded him by the Democratic Party. We are putting agricultural implements on the free list—the things with which the farmer toils in producing the stuff that feeds and clothes the world—and we have put many other necessities on the free list. Here are some of the items on which you tax the farmer in a shameful manner: On $100 worth of harness you collect from him in tariff taxes $16.70, to say nothing of the trust profit, which is at least $15 or more. On $25 worth of buckles—and buckles were discussed here this afternoon—you make him pay a tariff tax of $10.90. On $100 worth of salt in bulk you make the farmer pay in tariff taxes $44.20. No wonder you do not want the farmer to have a free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You let diamonds come in free and you let radium come in free, because the trust kings do not want any tariff tax added to the price of them. But when the farmer asks you to put window glass on the free list, you put $22.85 of tariff taxes on every $50 worth of common window glass that he buys; and on every $50 worth of machinery for the farmer you place $23.05 in tariff taxes. On every $50 worth of iron shovels that he buys you make him pay $15.05 in tariff taxes. On every $50 worth of hoes that he buys you make him pay $15.55 in tariff taxes. On every $50 worth of blankets that he buys you make him pay a tariff tax of $25.85. On every $50 worth of linen wearing apparel you make him pay $18.75 in tariff taxes. On every $50 worth of woolen dress goods you make him pay $25.65 in tariff taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] On every $50 worth of flannels that he buys you place a tariff tax of $29.55.

On every $50 worth of ready-made woolen clothing you make him pay $20.25 in tariff taxes. On $50 worth of plain chinaware you make him pay a tariff tax of $17.25. These are a few of the items that I have called your attention to in order that the country may know how you have been imposing upon and oppressing the farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And yet you talk about tariff benefits for the farmer. The farmer feels your tariff blessings about like the old negro did the possum. Old Rastus went out one night and caught a big fat possum. He cleaned him good and put the oven on a bed of rosy coals. And he laid the possum in the oven and put some yam potatoes around him and some butter and pepper and salt. Then old Rastus said: "I'm gwine ter lay down here fer a little while and I'm gwine ter dream erbout eatin' dis possum, and den I'm gwine ter eat 'im shore enuf, and I'll enjoy 'im twice." So old Rastus fell asleep. Sambo came along and smelt the possum cooking. He looked in and saw old Rastus sound asleep. He lifted the oven lid and took the possum out. He was baked brown, smoking and smelling good. Old Sambo ate him. He took some of the grease and smeared it on the mustache of old Rastus and put a little on his chin, a little on his hands, and piled the bones down beside Rastus's head, and departed. Rastus finally awoke and said: "Sholy I a'int eat dat possum. Sholy I a'int eat 'im. But heah's grease on my lips, and grease on my hands, and heah's de bones lyin' by me." Then, pressing his hand gently against his stomach, he said: "If I did eat dat possum he weighs lighter on my constitution and has less influence wid me dan any possum dat I'se ever eat in mah born days." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

So, Mr. Chairman, the tariff-produced prosperity that the Republican Party has handed out to the farmer weighs lighter on his constitution and has less influence with him than any prosperity that he ever felt in his born days. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican Party taxes the farmer and the masses of the people generally in order to make good its contract with the manufacturing trusts, to which it guarantees a reasonable profit. Do you suppose the people of this country are going to permit you to single out one class of individuals and bind the great body of the people to work for them in creating colossal fortunes?

This contract that you entered into with the trust manufacturer to give him a reasonable profit reminds me of old Uncle Ephraim. His master told him to go out and hunt a colt that was missing from the lot. Old Ephraim said, "Yes, sah; I'll go, Massa John, but I jes' nacherally know that I'm gwine to see a ghost on de journey." His master said, "Never you mind about a ghost." Uncle Ephraim said, "Yes, sah; but I'm shore to see one." It was late in the afternoon, and when Uncle Ephraim got over in the woods he heard a dog bark some distance from him. Then he heard something running in the leaves, and he stopped and said, "There it is now." Then he heard a dog bark again. Then he saw a great, big buck coming out of the woods, running toward him. The deer was looking back toward the dog and running sideways toward Uncle Ephraim, and he could see nothing but his side. There was a lane leading down a long ridge, not a great distance from Uncle Ephraim, and there were mock orange trees on either side, so when he started down that lane he had to go to the other end or turn back; there was no getting out along the sides. The deer and Uncle Ephraim darted into the lane about the same time, and the deer, with his great head of horns, was moving with the speed of the wind. Uncle Ephraim, with his hat in his hand and grunting every time he hit the ground, finally got a little in the lead of the deer, and he said to him, "If you expect to run wid me, you'll have to throw dat rocking-chair off yer head." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] To my Republican friends I want to say that if you ever expect to run with us again before the American people, you will have to throw that manufacturer's reasonable-profit rocking-chair off your head. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words regarding bagging and ties. You have been giving the farmers of the West free binding twine for their grain, and you have given them free wire with which to bind their hay, and the farmers of the South have never objected to that. I am in favor of them having free binding twine and free wire for their hay, but I want you to be as fair to the farmers of the South as you have been to the farmers of the West, and give them free bagging and ties. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This bill of ours puts bagging and ties on the free list. Some of you on that side of the House, when the reciprocity agreement with Canada was up for consideration, talked as though you would vote for free bagging and ties if they were put upon that bill. I knew that you were not in earnest—that you were trying to kill that bill with amendments. One of the frankest men on that side of the House—the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]—admitted on this floor that he wanted to load the reciprocity bill down with amendments, so that it would be defeated; and that was the purpose of all of you.

Now that you have an opportunity to vote for free bagging and ties and free agricultural implements you are obeying your trust masters and are opposing the measure. By taxing the farmer on his bagging you have built up a Bagging Trust, and

it has our farmers at its mercy. You have denied here that there is a Bagging Trust. I will prove that there is such a trust, and I will show you how it has destroyed competition in the bagging business. Mr. McMillan, of New Orleans, stated to the Ways and Means Committee during the Sixty-first Congress that the American Manufacturing Co., of New York; the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, of Boston; and the Peru Bagging Manufacturing Co., of Peru, Ind., owned and controlled every mill in America then making bagging for cotton. He said that the first two companies agree at the beginning of each season upon the price to open the market at, and the Peru company follows. Mr. McMillan stated, further, that a few years ago there were several independent mills engaged in making bagging, but that these companies that I have just mentioned managed to put them out of business by underselling them for a little while and embarrassing them financially, so that they were compelled to sell their property, and that these three companies bought them and dismantled them, leaving a clear field for the Bagging Trust. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill in this House, in 1909, Mr. BURLESON, of Texas, one of the best friends that the farmer ever had in Congress, said of cotton ties, that almost the entire output of cotton ties is controlled by the United States Steel Corporation, and that the tariff tax on cotton ties is so high that it shuts out competition and makes the southern farmer pay 25 per cent more for cotton ties than he would have to pay if the tax were removed and competition restored. Our free-list bill has bagging and ties on it and I expect to see it pass this House, but what will the Republican Senate do about it?

Will not you insurgents vote with us for this free list for the farmer? I think some of you will. And if the old guard—the standpatters—get after you about it, come over and join us permanently. They have been trying to lecture some of you of late. If they make it too hard for you over there and undertake to read you out of the old stand-pat party, I imagine some of you will be like old Yad Potter, down in my district, who kept getting drunk and the brethren of the church kept excusing him, until finally they told him that if he got drunk any more they would turn him out of the church. Whereupon Yad said, "Turn me out if you want to, and I will go kerplunk into the Methodist Church." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] So if the stand-pat gang turn you out, just come kerplunk into the Democratic Party. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said here about promises made to the people. The Republican Party will promise the people anything in campaign times in order to remain in power. But it soon forgets its promises. You all remind me of the old negro in Mississippi who was a candidate for baptism. He stood down by the water's edge with his hand resting against a hickory tree, and the old parson said to him, "Come right in, my brother." But the old fellow had his eyes firmly fixed on something out in the water, and he said, "No; I ain't er comin'." The parson insisted, "Come right in, my brother; come right in." The old negro said, "No; I ain't er comin'." "What is the matter with you? Has your faith stumbled? Don't you remember when the whale swallowed Jonah, God Almighty smote him on the back with a red-handled wagon whip, and the whale cast him up on the sand? Don't you know if your faith is right and an alligator swallows you he will cast you up on the sand?" Whereupon the negro said, "Parson, you may be acquainted with whales, but you don't understand these Mississippi alligators. If ever a Mississippi alligator swallows a Negro, he will go off and go to sleep and forget all about him." [Laughter and applause.]

So, my friends, we are educating the people to the fact that they have not understood these Republicans with regard to making promises. A Republican will make a promise in campaign times, and when he gets in office he goes off and forgets all about the people and the promise he made them. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to have 10 minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is so much to say about the sins of the Republican Party that I can not begin to do justice to the subject. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say one more thing about the foreigners who come here and compete with our home laborers. They take out or send out of the United States every year more than $300,000,000. You are pouring a stream of foreigners in here of more than a million a year. They are taking out more than $300,000,000 of money. Senator Aldrich says that you are squandering $300,000,000 a year, and yet the American people are called upon to meekly submit to this system of robbery and plunder. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I belong to a party, Mr. Chairman, that has lived and battled for the people for more than a hundred years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Other parties have come and gone. The Republican Party came into existence, claiming that its mission was to abolish the slavery of the Negro. You paraded that boast before the American people for years and years. If you have destroyed a form of slavery that existed for 6,000,000 Negro slaves, you have instituted a form of industrial slavery and serfdom in this country that affects 50,000,000 of white people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By your tariff system you are gathering money at the door of every poor man in the country.

You are depriving millions of the necessities of life in order to pile up fortunes for a favored few. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I recall the picture drawn by Senator SMITH of South Carolina. He was standing near Kings Mountain at the close of an autumn day. The sun was sinking in the west and a flood of gold played upon leaves of red and brown and yellow and as he looked upon this lofty mountain, he said, "This is the most gorgeous sight that ever attracted my gaze." Then I turned from the scene and I looked down into the long valley below. The mist and fog had gathered, and darkness had already settled there. The farmers of the valley had retired for the night. Then he said, "How true is this picture to the prosperity of my country, the sun of this tariff-produced prosperity is lighting up the castle-crowned rocks of the trust kings and tariff barons, while over the masses of millions of the plain people there hovers the cloud of distress and over them the darkness of hard times has settled." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to see the time come when patriotism will be the thing paramount in the minds and hearts of the American masses. I want to see that time when all men will love the flag, and when Congress shall serve the whole people, and not be given over to legislate reasonable profits into the pockets of trust manufacturers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen have made reference here to the South. I hail from that glorious section of our great country. I am proud that I live in the South.

To you, my Democratic friends, permit me to say that I have seen the time when Republicans, loaded down with campaign funds furnished them by the trust kings and tariff barons, defeated you in the East, in the West, and in the North. I have seen the time when not a single Democratic governor answered to his name in the North, in the East, or in the West, and only a very few Democratic Representatives came here from these sections, but, thank God, the South, that section which gave Jefferson, the father of the Democratic Party, to the Union and to the world, has stood victorious with unfurled flag guarding the sacred ark of our covenant in political affairs. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We saw you battling against the cruel forces that rob and oppress the people, and we saw you pass through the valley of defeat and sore trial, and we said to the faithful Democratic warriors of the North, East, and West, "Fight on and on, our cause is just and victory will come again to the standards that we bear in the name of the people." [Applause on the Democratic side.] You said to us, "Stand firm and fear not. We will keep the faith," and to-day we behold a reunited national Democratic Party controlling the people's branch of Congress, and next year we will drive from power the enemies of the Republic and restore this Government to the people. [Long and loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413, putting agricultural implements and other articles on the free list, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted, by unanimous consent, as follows:

Mr. SHARP, for four days, on account of sickness in his family.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, indefinitely, on account of important official business.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that motion is not a privileged motion as against the regular order, and I demand the regular order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the calendar be called.

Mr. DALZELL. The regular order is the bill the House is now considering.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The House has just disposed of the bill for the present that is now being considered. If the House desires to take it up again, it can.

Mr. DALZELL. General debate is still under way. It is not the only bill on the calendar. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that if his motion prevails we will not have an opportunity to consider the pension bill on Monday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that there is no pension bill in order on Monday.

Mr. DALZELL. And I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees is in order, and the pension bill is the second bill on that calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman has overlooked the fact that under the rule of the House a bill must be on the calendar a certain number of days, and that the pension bill has not been on the calendar the necessary 7 days. It must have been before the committee for 15 days, and it must be on the calendar for 7 days.

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will read the rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very well.

Mr. DALZELL (reading):

Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee 15 days prior thereto. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on a calendar to be known as a Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. Immediately after the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday, it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least 7 days prior thereto.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is why I called the gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. DALZELL. I have been informed that this motion has been entered for 7 days.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will examine the calendar, he will see that it has not.

Mr. DALZELL. It has been on the calendar since April 25.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Always in estimating the number of days you exclude the first or the last, include one and exclude the other.

Mr. DALZELL. There are bills on the calendar that could be considered on Monday. The immigration bill is on the calendar.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. But the point the gentleman was making was that we were trying to postpone the pension bill.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman did not say so. That is mere inference from what the gentleman did say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understood the gentleman, he stated he objected to taking a recess, because it would displace the pension bill. I call his attention to the fact that it will not.

Mr. DALZELL. I did not give it as a reason at all. I insist upon my point of order, that this motion is not in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that this does not displace the pension bill, and I am desirous of having full latitude of debate. I do not think it is necessary to take up the Discharge Calendar on Monday. I think it is better for the House to proceed on Monday with the consideration of this bill. Now, it might set aside some bills that are on the Discharge Calendar on Monday. It does not set aside the pension bill. I have tried to exercise due latitude and to give every man in the House, whether on this side or the other, full opportunity for debate. I am anxious to have the bill run along and to have debate disposed of at as early a date next week as possible.

As the Members of the House do not desire to stay here after 5 o'clock in the evening, I would like to have the morning sessions begin at 11 o'clock, and thus get in six hours of debate. That is my purpose. I regret very much that the gentleman should see proper to try to interfere with it.

Mr. CANNON. But does the gentleman seek to cut the House off from that privilege which has been wrung from an unwilling majority, the Calendar for Discharge of Committees, when 92,000,000 of people are seeking to have a majority work their will under a rule obtained through a great revolution? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will say to the gentleman that while I consider the Discharge Calendar a very important part of the rules of this House, and a right every Member ought to exercise, yet we are seeking to lower the taxes for 92,000,000 of people, and I consider that of more purpose. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be candid with the House. I made the point of order for the reason assigned by the gentleman from Missouri, that we might have an opportunity to consider on Monday the pension bill, which is on the Discharge Calendar. I was mistaken as to that, and I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that the House do take a recess until Monday, May 1, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House stood in recess until Monday, May 1, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speakers' table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the House, copies of orders and regulations relating to the use of waters of the Rio Grande and tributaries for irrigation purposes (H. Doc. No. 39); to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Chief Justice of the Court of Claims, requesting the return of certain findings transmitted to Congress March 16, 1908 (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8072) to amend an act relating to soldiers and sailors' homesteads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8073) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station at a point in or near the city of Biloxi, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 8074) to amend section 2297 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 8075) to amend section 953 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8076) to amend section 1537 of an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 8077) to define the true intent and meaning of section 48 of the act of August 28, 1894, levying taxes upon distilled spirits, to regulate the business of reclaiming waste spirits from empty whisky barrels, and to define the status of persons engaged in such business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8078) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 8079) to place on the free list fence wire; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 8080) to divide the State of Oregon into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 8081) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8082) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Reedburg, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 8083) for the extension of the post office over the entire business of public transportation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8084) to place agricultural implements on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 8085) to regulate length of service in tropical countries of enlisted men and to effect economy in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8086) to regulate the payment of travel allowances and to effect economy in the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8087) to regulate the issue of clothing and payment of clothing allowances in the Army and to decrease expense therein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8088) to consolidate departments, to simplify administration, and to effect economy in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8089) to fix the term of enlistment in the Army and to provide a reserve corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 8090) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8091) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Cumberland, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 8092) to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission by giving to that body the power to fix reasonable rates, based upon physical valuations, to be charged by railroad, express, telegraph, and telephone companies and all other common carriers, in the transaction of interstate business, and also giving to said commission the power to fix reasonable prices to be charged by persons or corporations when found to be exercising a monopoly in the interstate sale of any commodity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 8093) to establish a fish-cultural station in the southern section of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: Resolution (H. Res. 140) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department to have necessary printing done; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 141) relative to the addition of a new rule to the House rules; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) requesting the President to consider the expediency of effecting a treaty with European powers providing for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands and to protect an independent government there when established; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) for the appointment of a commission to investigate the status of the full-blood Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8094) granting an increase of pension to John A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8095) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8096) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8097) granting an increase of pension to James S. Middaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8098) granting an increase of pension to Susan Fairchild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8099) granting an increase of pension to James McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8100) for the relief of the estate of M. R. Buchanan; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 8101) granting an increase of pension to Henry Abrams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8102) granting a pension to Nancy E. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 8103) granting an increase of pension to James H. Maclay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8104) granting an increase of pension to Michael Broadbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8105) granting an increase of pension to John Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8106) granting an increase of pension to Salathiel S. Stalnaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8107) granting a pension to Alfred J. Osborn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8108) granting a pension to William M. Pomroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 8109) for the relief of the heirs of Larkin Nash, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8110) granting an increase of pension to Lucen T. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8111) granting a pension to Virginia Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8112) for the relief of the Wilmerding-Loewe Co., of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8113) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Sageser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8114) for the relief of the heirs of Adolphus Dobke; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 8115) granting an increase of pension to Zimri Harrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8116) granting an increase of pension to William B. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8117) granting an increase of pension to Richard Elliott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 8118) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Keymer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8119) granting an increase of pension to Polk D. Southard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 8120) granting an increase of pension to William G. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8121) for the relief of Charles F. Parker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 8122) granting an increase of pension to William W. Padgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8123) granting a pension to Sarah Werkheiser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 8124) granting an increase of pension to Florence S. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 8125) granting an increase of pension to John Niar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8126) granting an increase of pension to Albert Fletcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 8127) granting an increase of pension to John L. Temple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8128) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 8129) granting a pension to Charles Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8130) authorizing the payment to the widow of Dorence Atwater of compensation for services rendered the United States of America; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 8131) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8132) granting an increase of pension to John W. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8133) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8134) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8135) granting an increase of pension to P. W. McReynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 8136) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Statler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers to accompany bill to increase pension of Thomas A. Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of John L. Brown and 9 other merchants of Waynesburg, Ohio, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of the Sioux Falls and Vermilion conferences, Norwegian and German Lutherans, at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 255, as contrary to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON: Resolutions, petitions, letters, etc., protesting against the 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine, and asking Congress to repeal it; also asking Congress to investigate and endeavor to check the spread of tuberculosis and other diseases carried through dairy products were presented by organizations throughout the country as follows: International

Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers, Local 433, Walter Constance, recording secretary, Springfield, Mo.; Trades and Labor Council, Charles E. Anderson, secretary, 32 Middle Street, Lowell, Mass.; Progressive Study Club, Mrs. P. R. Noble, secretary, Revillo, S. Dak.; Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local Union No. 20, J. P. Edwards, recording secretary, box 636, Westfield, N. J.; Railway Mail Association, Women's Auxiliary, Mrs. T. B. Walker, Mrs. W. S. Kirk, and Mrs. J. M. Miller, committee, Denison, Tex.; Woman's Club, Mrs. Ida D. Bird, corresponding secretary, Kankakee, Ill.; National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, Local No. 24, W. A. Aughinbaugh, secretary, Wellsville, Ohio; Women's Club, Mrs. M. A. Mann, Everett, Wash.; International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Subdivision No. 475, J. S. Gallegly, secretary and treasurer, Smithville, Tex.; Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, Branch No. 95, W. H. Gass, secretary, Brackenridge, Pa.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Independence Lodge, No. 483, C. O. Torgeson, recording secretary, 1419 South Main Street, Crookston, Minn.; Granite Cutters' International Association of America, Cape Ann Branch, Gloucester and Rockport, Mass., Abraham Lurvey, corresponding secretary, Pigeon Cove, Mass.; Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local Union No. 713, Robert Hamilton, president, and F. W. White, recording secretary, 34 Franklin Street, Port Jervis, N. Y.; Chester Federation of Labor, Plumbers, Gas and Steam Fitters Local No. 403, George P. Smith, 1309 West Third Street, Chester, Pa.; Trades and Labor Assembly, Savannah, Ga.; Racine Retail Merchants' Association, Racine, Wis.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of the estate of M. R. Buchanan, of Rutherford County, State of Tennessee; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOCHT: Resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 603, New Columbia, and Washington Camp, No. 321, Huntingdon, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring the illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition asking that a law be passed authorizing the payment of the Coeur d'Alene Indians for certain lands within the former Coeur d'Alene Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of Idaho, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago shoe manufacturers, in opposition to placing shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of Sturgis Grange, Sturgis, Mich., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of Gem, Medina, and Pigree, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Eckman, N. Dak., favoring the passage of the Hanna bill, providing for paying additional compensation to the rural free-delivery carriers, and T. F. Woods, of North Dakota, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of L. E. Henry, Jacob Brown, and C. E. Bell, of Sauk Rapids, Minn., favoring the passage of the Sherwood bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Renneby, Minn., protesting against sending troops to the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: Resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 541, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lehighton, Pa., urging passage of illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PRAY: Petition of 39 citizens of Park County, Mont., favoring the parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of James L. Cowles, secretary and treasurer of Postal Progress League, favoring cheap parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Papers to accompany H. R. 7577, for the relief of L. C. Chisholm; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMS: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Jasper N. Kelley, Linden, Tenn., and John W. Rowe, Hollow Rock, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: Petition of various citizens of Northville, Mich., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May 1, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution passed by the Fifty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 14.

Whereas the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America at its first session begun and holden at Washington, in the District of Columbia, on Monday, the 15th day of March, 1909, by joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in words and figures as follows, to wit:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid in all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution:

"ART. XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration."

Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Tennessee, That said amendment to the Constitution of the United States be and is hereby ratified; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by his excellency the governor of Tennessee to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively.

Adopted April 7, 1911.

[SEAL.]

N. BAXTER, Jr.,
Speaker of the Senate.
A. M. LEACH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, April 11, 1911.

BEN W. HOOPER, *Governor.*

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Twentieth Continental Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring an appropriation for the erection of a memorial to the signers of the Declaration of Independence, to be placed in the Capitol Building, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Helena, Mont., relative to the persecution of American citizens of the Jewish faith in Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of the Trades Assembly of Fort Edward, N. Y.; of the Village Board of Trustees of Fort Edward, N. Y.; and of sundry citizens of Keene, Swanzey, and Canaan, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Fifth Seventh Day Adventist Church of Washington, D. C., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the National Association of Tanners, remonstrating against leather being placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a resolution, in the nature of a memorial, of the German-American Alliance of the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union of Boston, Mass., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Canaan, East Swanzey, and Swanzey, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRISTOW presented a resolution, in the nature of a petition, of Lew Gove Post, No. 100, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Manhattan, Kans., praying for the passage of the old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAMBLE presented memorials of Black Hills Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Whitewood, and of sundry farmers and business men of Ottumwa, Gann Valley, Desmet, and Brown County, all in the State of South Dakota, remon-

strating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Progressive Study Club of Revillo, S. Dak., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of the State Board of Agriculture, of sundry employees of the Central Paper Co. of Muskegon, and of sundry citizens of Otsego, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of the National Business League of America, praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the State Pilots' Association of Florida, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further regulate pilotage by the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented petitions of Washington Camp No. 22, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Jersey City; of Washington Camp No. 148, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Succasunna; and of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Hoboken, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch No. 14, Glass-Bottle Blowers' Association, of Woodbury, N. J., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the German-American Alliance of New Jersey, praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 152, Patrons of Husbandry, of New Market, N. J., and a memorial of Riverside Grange, No. 125, Patrons of Husbandry, of Three Bridges, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of John C. Lennon, of Newark, N. J., and of sundry citizens of Wharton, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BORAH. I present a joint memorial from the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 2.

To the President of the United States of America:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent:

Whereas the Coeur d'Alene Indian Reservation was opened to entry and settlement on May 2, 1910, to those citizens whose rights to select homesteads therein had been previously determined by drawing;

Whereas certain of these homesteaders made their selections on land bordering on the St. Joe River within said reservation, having taken up about 6,500 acres;

Whereas a temporary easement had been granted by a former Secretary of the Interior, permitting the flooding of these lands along the St. Joe River has been revoked by the present Secretary of the Interior, but as yet no steps have been taken by the officials of the National Government to afford adequate relief to these homesteaders, whose homes and health have been put in jeopardy on account of this temporary grant; and

Whereas the testimony taken at the hearing ordered by the Secretary of the Interior upon the matter of revoking this easement and now on file in his office will show the conditions which now confront these homesteaders, but unless prompt and immediate relief is given they will not be able to do scarcely, if any, tilling of the soil this spring, and in some cases none at all, owing to the flooding of these lands, and also preventing them from making those improvements required under the homestead laws, and can not maintain themselves or their families as a result of these conditions: Now therefore

Your memorialist earnestly urges that relief be granted these homesteaders by virtue of the executive power vested in you as the President of the United States of America, and your memorialist will ever pray.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 2d day of March, 1911.

CHARLES D. STOREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 3d day of March, 1911.

L. H. SWEETSER,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within memorial No. 2 originated in the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho during the eleventh session.

[SEAL.] JAMES H. WALLIS,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BORAH. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 6.

Be it resolved by the senate (house of representatives concurring):

Whereas under the present internal-revenue laws of the United States the Government of the United States sells to any person applying therefor a license to sell intoxicating liquors in any State, or division of the State, regardless of State laws regulating or prohibiting the liquor traffic; and

Whereas it is manifest that the sale of such internal-revenue license authorizing the sale of liquor in States, or portions of States, where the sale of the same is prohibited by the State laws, retards and interferes with the proper enforcement of such State laws: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate of the State of Idaho (the house of representatives concurring herein), That our Senators and Representative in Congress be requested to do everything in their power to have the internal-revenue laws of the United States so amended that United States licenses shall not be sold or issued to any person to sell any intoxicating liquors in any State, or portion of a State, where the sale of such liquors is prohibited by the State laws. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Senators and Representative in Congress by the secretary of state.

The within senate concurrent resolution No. 6 passed the senate on the 15th day of February, 1911.

L. H. SWEETSER,
President of the Senate.

The within senate concurrent resolution No. 6 passed the house of representatives on the 24th day of February, 1911.

CHARLES D. STOREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate concurrent resolution No. 6 originated in the senate of the eleventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.] CHAS. W. DEMPSTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I present a joint memorial from the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 9.

To the honorable the President of the United States, the honorable the Secretary of the Interior, and the honorable the Secretary of Agriculture:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas townships 54 and 55 north, range 2 east, Boise meridian, State of Idaho, are included in the Coeur d'Alene National Forest Reserve, and the land in said townships was burned over by the forest fires of 1910 and practically denuded of all live timber, and it is clearly appearing that whatever value shall be saved from the burned timber must be saved within the next year; and

Whereas the lands included within the said townships are for the most part settled upon by homesteaders who entered upon the lands prior to the including of the area within the national reserve; and

Whereas the Government is resisting the claim of the homesteaders to the said lands, and by reason thereof the settlers have been forced to incur heavy expense and are in uncertainty as to their rights; and

Whereas the settlers have suffered heavy loss by reason of the fires of 1910, which swept over these lands;

We therefore pray that townships 54 and 55 north, range 2 east of Boise meridian, be eliminated from the Coeur d'Alene National Forest Reserve and that they be made available for homestead entry at once: Be it

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this memorial to each of the following officers: The President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of the Idaho congressional delegation.

This memorial passed the house of representatives on the 17th day of February, 1911.

CHARLES D. STOREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This memorial passed the senate on the 1st day of March, 1911.

L. H. SWEETSER,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that this joint memorial originated in the house of representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho during the eleventh session.

[SEAL.] JAMES H. WALLIS,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BORAH. I present a joint memorial from the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas a bill is now pending in Congress having for its purpose the guaranteeing to the respective States the fullest jurisdiction over all

intoxicants consigned to them from the time they enter the State, said bill being known as the Miller-Curtis bill, being bill No. 23641, House of Representatives, and bill No. 7528, Senate; and

Whereas we believe that under the present laws the State is seriously hampered in carrying out its policies relative to the liquor traffic and that the passage of such act would be of great benefit to the several States: Now therefore

Your memorialists urgently recommend that said bill be enacted into law.

The secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and copies of the same to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

This senate joint memorial No. 4 passed the senate on the 9th day of February, 1911.

L. H. SWEETSER,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial No. 4 passed the house of representatives on the 24th day of February, 1911.

CHARLES D. STOREY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the above senate joint memorial No. 4 originated in the senate during the eleventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

[SEAL.]

CHAS. W. DEMPSTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the Trades Assembly of Fort Edward, N. Y., and a memorial of the Village Board of Trustees of Fort Edward, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CURTIS presented memorials of Highland Grange, No. 249, Patrons of Husbandry, of Scranton; of the Farmers' Club of Burlingame, and of sundry citizens of Glen Elder, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of N. B. Page Post, No. 94, Department of Washington and Alaska, of Cashmere, Wash., and a petition of Green Lake Post, No. 112, Department of Washington and Alaska, Grand Army of the Republic, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of Linnea Grange, No. 244, of Mount Vernon; Local Grange No. 221, of Bayview; Pine Lake Grange, No. 324, of Monohan, and of Sulphur Creek Grange, No. 391, of Riffe, of the Patrons of Husbandry, and of sundry citizens of Freeman, Lowell, and Everett, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Oakfield, Germania, Forest, Byson, Garfield, Eden, Ashford, Friendship, Eldorado, Osceola, Fond du Lac, and Waupun, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

LANDS ALONG ANACOSTIA RIVER.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 15, submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 13th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows (S. Doc. No. 19):

Resolved, That the letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia transmitting the second report of Mr. Hugh T. Taggart, special counsel, on the ownership of lands and riparian rights along the Anacostia River, in the District of Columbia, be printed, with accompanying illustrations, as a document.

PRINTING OF CANADIAN CUSTOMS TARIFF ACT.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Printing, I ask that the Canadian customs tariff act of 1907 be printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. No. 15). It will be found on pages 102 to 126.

Mr. SHIVELY. What is the act?

Mr. SMOOT. The Canadian customs tariff act of 1907. It is the existing tariff act of Canada.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, and it was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the Canadian customs tariff act of 1907 be printed as a Senate document.

RECIPROCITY TREATY OF 1854.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Printing I ask to have printed as a public document a history of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with Canada by Mr. Chalfant Robinson (S. Doc. No. 17). It is found in his book, beginning with chapter 1 to the end of that article.

Mr. SHIVELY. I thought there was an order made by the Senate the other day for printing the history of that treaty. I believe, however, it had reference only to the debates in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. It had reference only to the debates in the Senate and House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; only to the debates in the Senate.

Mr. SHIVELY. Only to the Senate, as I recall it.

Mr. SMOOT. This is an article by Mr. Chalfant Robinson, a very eminent writer.

There being no objection, the order was agreed to, and it was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the history of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 with Canada, by Chalfant Robinson, be printed, with accompanying illustrations, as a Senate document.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the Committee on Printing, when these publications which have been ordered will be likely to be ready for use?

Mr. SMOOT. In relation to the order that was made last Friday, that matter was referred to the Finance Committee, and as soon as they meet they will doubtless take immediate action to have the order of the Senate carried out. The orders which have been authorized by the Senate to-day will be ready for the Senate within four or five days.

Mr. STONE. How long does the Senator think it will take to print the documents which have been ordered to be printed?

Mr. SMOOT. Only the time required to get the contents ready for publication.

ALASKA COAL-LAND CASES.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Printing, I ask to have printed as a Senate document a decision rendered by Judge Hanford, of the United States district court for the western district of Washington, in reference to coal-land laws of Alaska (S. Doc. No. 18).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. BORAH. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if it is not rather premature for a report to come from a committee whose jurisdiction commenced to-day at 12 o'clock? We passed a resolution for the organization of the committees in which it was provided that their jurisdiction as committees should commence to-day.

Mr. BORAH. It is now 30 minutes after 12.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I merely make the suggestion in the interest of orderly procedure that a committee having charge of a measure of this importance should at least give time and opportunity to Members of this body to present their views with regard to it to that committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this joint resolution was considered by the committee which had charge of it, and the joint resolution has been reported in the orderly course of business. I have no doubt that the senior Senator from Idaho will have ample time to present his views to the Senate regarding it, but as we had no request from him and no supposition that he desired to come before the committee, of course we did not wait for him.

Mr. HEYBURN. I merely desired that it should not appear in the RECORD that no notice was taken of this pauper's burial. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORAH. There was no danger of that happening while the senior Senator from Idaho was here.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is true. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate I desire to ask a further question. Has the Committee on the Judiciary had a meeting for the consideration of this joint resolution since it was a legal committee at 12 o'clock to-day?

Mr. BORAH. I do not remember at just what time the committee adjourned, but we had a regular called meeting of the committee.

Mr. HEYBURN. Since 12 o'clock.

Mr. BORAH. No; not since 12 o'clock.

Mr. HEYBURN. You were not a committee until 12 o'clock, because we said so by resolution. I want the RECORD straight upon this question. I may want to move to rerefer the joint resolution to the committee.

Mr. BORAH. I understand it is always within the power of the Senator to move to recommit.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, I call attention again to the fact that, while the Senate committees have been reorganized by a resolution, the old organization of the Senate was continued by a resolution adopted at the last session. So there was no necessity for the reorganization of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, although it did meet this morning under the new arrangement and the new assignment, and agreed to report the joint resolution favorably.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, the resolution continuing the committees was subject to the action of the Senate. The Senate has acted and rescinded the original resolution continuing the committees and provided for the time when they should take jurisdiction as committees. So that until 12 o'clock to-day there was no Judiciary Committee authorized to sit and direct a report to be made, and whatever meeting may have been held this morning was merely a meeting of individual Senators, but they had no authority or jurisdiction to act upon this question and to instruct any member of the committee to make a report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON COMMISSIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on April 20 I introduced a bill (S. 1876) to provide for a commission to investigate commissions and to make recommendations concerning the same, and had it referred to the Committee on Public Expenditures. That committee has since then ceased to exist. I do not know whether the introduction of the bill frightened the committee out of existence or not. I rise now for the purpose of reintroducing the bill, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

The bill (S. 1885) to provide for a commission to investigate commissions and to make recommendations concerning the same was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC EXPENDITURES.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. The Senator from Mississippi has just stated that recently the Committee on Public Expenditures has gone out of existence. I wish to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire, as this is the first intimation I have heard of it, when that was accomplished and how.

Mr. GALLINGER. It was the judgment of the committee on committees of both sides of the Chamber that the committee had not done anything to justify its continuance, and it was dropped from the list.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit me one moment, I will say that I greatly regret that that was done. I realize, of course, that the Committee on Public Expenditures was not made an active committee, but the reason why it was not made an active committee was because the acting chairman of that committee did not call the committee together. That committee was devised for a great and useful purpose, and that purpose ought to have been pursued and the results expected from it ought to have been accomplished.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will suggest to the Senate that the acting chairman is not now a member of the body and can not answer for himself. I apprehend that he did all he could to put life into that committee, but it was dead from its birth. I think it is a post-mortem on the part of the Senator to discuss the question.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say upon that subject the purpose of that committee was to determine upon the budget of the Government and to inquire into the public expenditures with a view to so limiting the expenditures of the various departments as to square our expenditures with our income, a thing which has not been accomplished. It was expected that whilst the committee itself was to be composed of the chairmen of the appropriation committees of the Senate and a certain number of other Senators, the chairman himself should not be the chairman of any appropriation committee, but should be a Senator who would be unembarrassed by any other duty and who would attend thoroughly to the duties of the Committee on Public Expenditures. No chairman of that committee was ever appointed or selected. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations assumed the position of acting chairman, and we went on practically without effective organization. It was called together on only two or three occasions, if my memory is right, and we started then inquiries regarding matters which would, in my judgment, have had far-reaching results. The creation of that committee was considered a businesslike thing. I can recall that the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations urged this side of the Chamber to appoint strong and experienced men upon that committee, stating that the purpose of it was to make it a great and efficient body.

If that committee has proved its incompetency it has not been because of the lack of capacity or the lack of effort upon the part of the members of that committee, but because the acting chairman of the committee was so absorbed in other duties that he failed to call its members together.

I hope that this matter will come up again for consideration, and that that committee, or some committee similar to it in its duties, will be restored, and that we will have the great work of coordinating the various appropriation committees which are now acting independently in some such way as to make the expenditures of our Government square with the receipts of our Government and to promote economy and efficiency in every department.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I desire to say that the minority had no part or parcel in the creation of this committee or in its abolition. When the makeup of the committees was being considered the chairman of the steering committee of the majority party informed me that that committee was to be abolished. I made no issue about it. It had been created by the majority party after the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] had stated on the floor of the Senate that the expenditures of the Government could be decreased $300,000,000 per annum by proper attention to the appropriations.

This committee, as I understood it, was created to bring about that great economy—$300,000,000 per annum. We all know that it failed in the accomplishment of any such purpose, and I understood that the majority party which had created the committee had come to the conclusion that it was useless and had determined to abolish it. I was notified that it was to be abolished and I accepted it as the edict of the majority party without going into a discussion of the wisdom or unwisdom of the course pursued by the majority party. It was their responsibility, and they disposed of it. Whether they disposed of it wisely or not it is useless to discuss. I simply wish to let the responsibility for the creation of the committee and for its abolition rest with the majority party without accepting any part of the responsibility for what was done in either case.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask the Senator, if I may, whether he made any objection to the abolishment of the committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I did not. I stated distinctly that I made no objection and I did not discuss it. I was notified that it was to be done. It had been, as far as I know, absolutely useless, and I was not surprised that it was abolished.

Mr. WARREN. I had no hand in the formation of that committee two years ago, although placed upon it. When calls for meetings were made the committee was in attendance and was duly organized as a committee and with subcommittees. I did not understand that there was to be any other action, so far as the chairman was concerned, than that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations should act as the chairman of the committee.

At one of the meetings of that committee a number of subcommittees were appointed. The several chairmen of the subcommittees were selected from Senators who were not chairmen of appropriating committees, or, to be more explicit, members of committees in charge of general appropriation bills. Each subcommittee chairman, being a nonmember of an appropriating committee, had on his subcommittee as associate members two or three of the members who were on the corresponding appropriating committee.

The subcommittee to which the bills I had charge of were referred, and whose chairman was the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], met as directed to do and considered such bills as should be considered by that subcommittee. I do not know as to the other subcommittees.

At another meeting of the full committee we provided for a joint committee of the House and the Senate to take up the whole matter of expenditures, especially as to the expenditures of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the departments. We could get no cooperation on the House side. The newspapers stated, while the Members of the present House were in conference providing for their committees, that there would be a committee on public expenditures on that side. But after due consideration, as I am informed, the Members of the House of Representatives decided that it was unnecessary, or, if necessary, it was not the time to consider it, and passed

it over, leaving the Senate where it was before, without any chance of cooperation through its committee with a corresponding committee on the House side.

Appropriation and revenue bills originate in the other House, and if we are to have such a committee in the Senate as the Senator from Nevada suggests it is vastly more important that there should be such a committee on the House side. That body formed no such committee in this Congress, and therefore the members of the committee on committees were, I think, unanimous in deciding that it was unnecessary and useless to continue the committee on this side without the cooperation of the other House.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I am glad to know that the minority is able to acquit itself of any responsibility for the destruction of this committee.

In reply to the Senator from Wyoming, who declares that the members of this committee were practically unanimous that there was no reason for the continued existence of the committee, I have to say that I have no knowledge of any meeting of that committee at which any such question was discussed. I think the Senator must rely for his view on the expressions of individual Senators in conversation with himself, for certainly there was no action of the committee upon that subject.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Nevada must not misunderstand me. I was speaking of the committee on committees, which had that matter under consideration, and not of the members of the former committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I thought the Senator referred to the Committee on Public Expenditures.

The President of the United States has now for the first time in recent experience, so far as I know, sought to bring about the coordination and cooperation of the various departments with a view to reducing public expenditures and with a view to securing a well-defined budget, a thing which we have not as yet secured. This matter, as we all know, has been one of Cabinet discussion. The chiefs of the various departments have been brought into cooperation with a view to making a reduction of the public expenditures and with a view to increasing the efficiency of the various departments. The President of the United States, acting first upon his own initiative, and afterwards, I believe, with the authority of Congress, opened at the White House itself a bureau or service, of which Mr. Cleveland is the head. Mr. Cleveland, with a corps of experienced men, is now making a study of this important question. In connection with that work the Committee on Public Expenditures of the Senate was organized.

At that time the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was impressed with the importance of such an organization. Years ago the Committee on Appropriations had charge of all the appropriations of the Government, the appropriations for the different departments coming under the jurisdiction of subcommittees of that committee. Later on the jurisdiction of the general Committee on Appropriations was gradually diminished by the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and other committees assuming, with the sanction of the Senate, jurisdiction of the appropriation bills which referred to matters under their charge. Thus gradually the Appropriations Committee of the Senate was weakened in its power of making a study of the entire field of appropriations and of parceling out the public moneys to each department according to some well-defined plan of fair apportionment.

The result was that each independent committee, reaching out for power and an extension of authority and jurisdiction, as committees always do, was increasing the appropriations, and the committees were in a race with each other as to which could get the most money from the Federal Treasury. This was also the condition of the departments themselves. They were not working together with a view to securing efficiency and economy in the general public expenditures, but each department was reaching out for an enlargement of its jurisdiction, for an increase of its force, and for an increase of the appropriations coming to it. We all recall how the then Senator from Iowa, Mr. Allison, called attention to this as a gradual weakening of the power of the Senate through its Committee on Appropriations over the entire field of appropriations, and it has been suggested that we should resume the old practice, take away from these several committees the power of appropriation, and confine them simply to the duty of reporting bills authorizing public works or creating public bureaus and services, leaving to the general Committee on Appropriations, with the aid of subcommittees, to prepare the appropriation bills for each department and each service of the Government.

Now, as a substitute for that, the suggestion of a committee on public expenditures was made, which committee was to embrace all the chairmen of the various committees which had jurisdiction of appropriation bills, so as to bring into cooperation the chairmen of these various committees for consultation and to impress them, and through them the committees of which they were chairmen, and to animate them all by a common purpose of efficiency and economy. To that committee were added certain men; and I recall that the then Senator from Maine, Mr. Hale, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was particularly insistent that men of large experience and capacity should be put upon that committee. That committee met. My recollection is that the purpose of that committee was not that its chairman should be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but that he should be one selected from those Members who were not chairmen of any of the committees having charge of appropriation bills, so that we would have a chairman not charged with responsibility in any other committee, who would see to it that there were regular meetings and that the attention of the committee was called to matters properly coming within its jurisdiction.

So far as I am concerned, my objection from the first was to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations being installed as acting chairman of the Public Expenditures Committee, for his hands were full with the duties of the Committee on Appropriations. This was the primary difficulty, and owing to this the committee was not made efficient; matters were not brought up there which ought to have been brought up. The cooperation of the legislative branch of the Government with the executive branch of the Government in promoting efficiency and economy was not accomplished. The majority party having urged this reform clearly in the line of business efficiency, having failed to do the least thing to carry out the purpose of the organization of that committee, now comes and admits its incompetency, proposes to throw down the entire work, and to abolish this committee. So far as I am concerned, I wish to raise my protest against this action.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 1784) authorizing the acceptance of the dedication of certain land for a street, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1785) to amend section 647, chapter 18, Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to annual statements of insurance companies;

A bill (S. 1786) to provide for an addition to the courthouse in the District of Columbia for the accommodation of the juvenile court and the municipal court of the said district (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1787) to amend "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 1788) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia E. Sawyer;

A bill (S. 1789) granting an increase of pension to Harriet T. Summers; and

A bill (S. 1790) granting an increase of pension to Josephine C. Allyn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 1791) to correct the military record of Henry Duffey (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1792) to correct the military record of Adam D. Shriner; and

A bill (S. 1793) to correct the military record of Samuel J. Kearnes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1794) granting a pension to Jennie Dunn;

A bill (S. 1795) granting a pension to Lucy J. Parker;

A bill (S. 1796) granting an increase of pension to W. R. Foote;

A bill (S. 1797) granting a pension to Charles A. Rupert;

A bill (S. 1798) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Warren;

A bill (S. 1799) granting an increase of pension to David Collins;

A bill (S. 1800) granting a pension to James H. Seward;

A bill (S. 1801) granting a pension to Anna E. Warden;

A bill (S. 1802) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Morrow;
A bill (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Gray;
A bill (S. 1804) granting a pension to Katherine Van Strate;
A bill (S. 1805) granting a pension to Mary A. Dawes;
A bill (S. 1806) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Wiggins;
A bill (S. 1807) granting a pension to Emeline C. Seger;
A bill (S. 1808) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Vahue;
A bill (S. 1809) granting a pension to Samuel Limenstall;
A bill (S. 1810) granting a pension to Leonard C. Wiswell;
A bill (S. 1811) granting a pension to Emma J. Pride;
A bill (S. 1812) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Barton;
A bill (S. 1813) granting an increase of pension to Eunice C. Wickware;
A bill (S. 1814) granting a pension to Helen Mirrin;
A bill (S. 1815) granting a pension to John C. Hurst;
A bill (S. 1816) granting an increase of pension to George M. Horton;
A bill (S. 1817) granting a pension to Lucy Ann Palmer;
A bill (S. 1818) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Stroup;
A bill (S. 1819) granting a pension to Archie H. Wright;
A bill (S. 1820) granting a pension to Cynthia A. Slayton;
A bill (S. 1821) granting an increase of pension to Geraldine Tift;
A bill (S. 1822) granting an increase of pension to Albert L. T. Bush;
A bill (S. 1823) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Peterson;
A bill (S. 1824) granting an increase of pension to George Alexander;
A bill (S. 1825) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Philbrick;
A bill (S. 1826) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fitzgibbon;
A bill (S. 1827) granting a pension to Sarah J. Fix;
A bill (S. 1828) granting a pension to Mary Caroline Douglas;
A bill (S. 1829) granting an increase of pension to George A. Brown;
A bill (S. 1830) granting a pension to W. H. Rugg;
A bill (S. 1831) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Ecker;
A bill (S. 1832) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Whitman;
A bill (S. 1833) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Graham;
A bill (S. 1834) granting a pension to Louisa Moorman;
A bill (S. 1835) granting an increase of pension to Frank La Flame;
A bill (S. 1836) granting an increase of pension to Martin Selak;
A bill (S. 1837) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mulliken;
A bill (S. 1838) granting a pension to Agnes Hunt;
A bill (S. 1839) granting a pension to Nora Julia Buchanan;
A bill (S. 1840) granting a pension to Verona H. Coon;
A bill (S. 1841) granting a pension to Robert Fletcher;
A bill (S. 1842) granting an increase of pension to Augustus M. Barnes;
A bill (S. 1843) granting a pension to Susan M. Sumner;
A bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to Rachel F. Prince;
A bill (S. 1845) granting an increase of pension to John A. Battenfield;
A bill (S. 1846) granting a pension to John Waalkes;
A bill (S. 1847) granting an increase of pension to John Hapeman;
A bill (S. 1848) granting a pension to Almira J. Sterling;
A bill (S. 1849) granting a pension to Hattie L. Fox;
A bill (S. 1850) granting an increase of pension to Peter Boyer;
A bill (S. 1851) granting a pension to Lydia A. Brigham;
A bill (S. 1852) granting a pension to Mary E. Smith;
A bill (S. 1853) granting a pension to Alvena Wiggins;
A bill (S. 1854) granting an increase of pension to William S. Dailey;
A bill (S. 1855) granting an increase of pension to Sidney M. Smith;
A bill (S. 1856) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Moore;
A bill (S. 1857) granting an increase of pension to Elias Riegle;
A bill (S. 1858) granting a pension to William Cordes;
A bill (S. 1859) granting an increase of pension to Marshall H. Burnham;
A bill (S. 1860) granting a pension to Louisa E. Lawrence;
A bill (S. 1861) granting a pension to Sarah Elise Green;
A bill (S. 1862) granting a pension to Lucinda W. Van Hyning;
A bill (S. 1863) granting an increase of pension to Renselarr B. Ransom;
A bill (S. 1864) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Stebbins;
A bill (S. 1865) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Golding;
A bill (S. 1866) granting a pension to Annie B. Jackson;
A bill (S. 1867) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Gaylord;
A bill (S. 1868) granting a pension to Hiram S. Millis;
A bill (S. 1869) granting a pension to George W. Derby;
A bill (S. 1870) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Norris;
A bill (S. 1871) granting an increase of pension to John M. Randell;
A bill (S. 1872) granting an increase of pension to George M. Peaslee;
A bill (S. 1873) granting a pension to Margaret A. Barker;
A bill (S. 1874) granting a pension to George Seward;
A bill (S. 1875) granting a pension to Emma R. Walters;
A bill (S. 1876) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Houghton;
A bill (S. 1877) granting a pension to James O'Neill (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1878) granting a pension to Charles H. Sedgwick (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1879) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Daniels (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1880) granting a pension to Samuel A. Holt (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1881) granting an increase of pension to George O. Richardson (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1882) granting a pension to Albert Raymond (with accompanying paper);
A bill (S. 1883) granting a pension to Albert A. Loveland (with accompanying paper); and
A bill (S. 1884) granting an increase of pension to George S. Putnam (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
A bill (S. 1886) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for Mr. PERCY):
A bill (S. 1887) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Brabston and Roche H. Brabston (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY:
A bill (S. 1888) granting an increase of pension to Richard Simpson; and
A bill (S. 1889) granting an increase of pension to William H. McKay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM:
A bill (S. 1890) granting an increase of pension to William O'Callaghan (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:
A bill (S. 1891) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural delivery routes may be established; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
A bill (S. 1892) for the relief of the heirs of John C. Newton, deceased;
A bill (S. 1893) for the relief of the heirs of John Sullivan, deceased;
A bill (S. 1894) for the relief of A. M. Randolph and the other children and heirs of Robert Lee Randolph, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 1895) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Farmville, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:
A bill (S. 1896) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Spanish Fork, in the State of Utah; and
A bill (S. 1897) for the erection of a public building at Ephraim, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1898) providing for the protection of the interests of the United States in lands and waters comprising any part of the Anacostia River, or Eastern Branch, and lands adjacent thereto, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1899) to repeal a portion of an act heretofore passed relating to the alienation of the title of the United States to land in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 1900) granting an increase of pension to William Smith Lackor;

A bill (S. 1901) granting an increase of pension to Henry Mingles;

A bill (S. 1902) granting a pension to Cill L. S. Fee (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1903) granting a pension to Clarence W. Fallor (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1904) granting an increase of pension to Edward Vanderveer Holland (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 1905) granting a pension to Samuel H. Portz;

A bill (S. 1906) granting an increase of pension to John M. Guthrie; and

A bill (S. 1907) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1908) for the relief of Harry Fosdick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama:

A bill (S. 1909) for the relief of the heirs at law of A. J. Reese; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 1910) to grant an honorable discharge to Patrick Quinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1911) for the relief of James R. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1912) granting an increase of pension to William S. Hosack;

A bill (S. 1913) granting an increase of pension to William Roberts;

A bill (S. 1914) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Casson; and

A bill (S. 1915) granting a pension to Caroline M. Anthony; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 1916) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Hugo, Colo.; and

A bill (S. 1917) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Canon City, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 1918) granting an increase of pension to James P. Cassedy (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1919) granting an increase of pension to Hannah S. Caward (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1920) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Greenslate (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1921) granting an increase of pension to John B. Farris (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1922) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Coffen (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1923) granting an increase of pension to William H. Topping (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bogis (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 1925) to correct the military record of Charles W. Cathers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1926) granting an increase of pension to George Anderson;

A bill (S. 1927) granting a pension to Ada Ward;

A bill (S. 1928) granting a pension to J. J. Peasley;

A bill (S. 1929) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin C. Rickards (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1930) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Waymire (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1931) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fogleman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 1932) for the relief of the heirs of Powhatan Perkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 1933) granting an increase of pension to Seeley Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 1934) granting an increase of pension to Amos Lee;

A bill (S. 1935) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Miller;

A bill (S. 1936) granting an increase of pension to Recorder M. Mudgett;

A bill (S. 1937) granting an increase of pension to Walter S. McArthur;

A bill (S. 1938) granting an increase of pension to Robert McKinnis;

A bill (S. 1939) granting a pension to George W. Perry;

A bill (S. 1940) granting a pension to Elizabeth Parker;

A bill (S. 1941) granting a pension to Corrilla J. Robbins;

A bill (S. 1942) granting an increase of pension to Isaac D. Rowden;

A bill (S. 1943) granting a pension to Thomas B. Ryan;

A bill (S. 1944) granting an increase of pension to Mortimer Seymour;

A bill (S. 1945) granting an increase of pension to Karl Somerlatt;

A bill (S. 1946) granting an increase of pension to Stephen M. Van Camp;

A bill (S. 1947) granting a pension to James M. Woods;

A bill (S. 1948) granting a pension to William E. White;

A bill (S. 1949) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin C. Zeitler;

A bill (S. 1950) granting an increase of pension to William R. Amen;

A bill (S. 1951) granting an increase of pension to David E. Banks;

A bill (S. 1952) granting an increase of pension to Michael Barrett;

A bill (S. 1953) granting an increase of pension to James N. Bascue;

A bill (S. 1954) granting a pension to Harriet Bockerman;

A bill (S. 1955) granting a pension to Richard W. Berry;

A bill (S. 1956) granting an increase of pension to Mary Boyington;

A bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Josephine M. Buck;

A bill (S. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Darwin Coykendall;

A bill (S. 1959) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Curtis;

A bill (S. 1960) granting an increase of pension to James M. Fenning;

A bill (S. 1961) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Fearing;

A bill (S. 1962) granting an increase of pension to John Finegan;

A bill (S. 1963) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Greenstreet;

A bill (S. 1964) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Heath;

A bill (S. 1965) granting an increase of pension to John M. Herman;

A bill (S. 1966) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam M. Hill;

A bill (S. 1967) granting a pension to Joseph Holtz;

A bill (S. 1968) granting an increase of pension to Franklin D. Joy;

A bill (S. 1969) granting an increase of pension to Himanus De Witt;

A bill (S. 1970) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus N. Doom;

A bill (S. 1971) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Fackler;

A bill (S. 1972) granting an increase of pension to Amon H. Johnson;

A bill (S. 1973) granting an increase of pension to David E. Jones;

A bill (S. 1974) granting an increase of pension to Nathan T. Kimball;

A bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Jacob Korby;

A bill (S. 1976) granting an increase of pension to Ira N. Levalley;

A bill (S. 1977) granting an increase of pension to William Akin;

A bill (S. 1978) granting a pension to William Abernathy;

A bill (S. 1979) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Fletcher (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1980) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Horrie (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1981) granting an increase of pension to George W. Holsted (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1982) granting a pension to Martin W. Sewall (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1983) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Stotler (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1984) granting an increase of pension to Alwilda Smith (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Peter Lory (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1986) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Miller (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1987) granting an increase of pension to James C. Bowerman (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1988) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Baldwin (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 1989) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Bennett (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 1990) granting an increase of pension to William O. Campbell (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) authorizing and directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to ascertain the value of the physical properties of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment relative to the salary of the assistant clerk to the Committee on Immigration, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. PENROSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, by subcommittee or otherwise, to make investigations of internal-revenue, customs, currency, and coinage matters, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary, and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof; and for this purpose they are authorized to sit, by subcommittee or otherwise, during the recess or sessions of the Senate, at such times and places as they may deem advisable, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary, the expense of such investigation to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee is authorized to order such printing and binding as may be necessary for its use.

COST OF LIVING.

Mr. BRIGGS. I have an article, taken from the Times weekly edition, London, April 14, 1911, on the cost of living in the United States—wages, rent, and food—in comparison with Great Britain. I desire to have the article printed as a Senate document, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for action. (S. Doc. 22.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be referred to the Committee on Printing for recommendation.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from a previous day, which has been once read.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to correct errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911, was read the second time by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to call up Senate resolution No. 6, introduced by me on the 6th of April and now on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the resolution.

The SECRETARY. A resolution (S. Res. 6) to appoint a special committee to investigate certain charges relative to the election of WILLIAM LORIMER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin call up the resolution for present consideration?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I call it up, Mr. President, to ask that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PRINTING OF TARIFF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The other day requests were made for republishing certain letters of Robert J. Walker when Secretary of the Treasury. As supplemental to them, and as aiding Senators in the determination of the questions involved in those messages, I ask that such parts of Executive Document No. 7, being a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury—the same Secretary being still in office—dated December 11, 1848, be printed in the document (S. Doc. No. 16). The parts which I have marked are the parts which relate to reciprocity treaties and to the tariff. Let the same course be taken with it as was taken with the others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It will then go to the Committee on Finance.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have made diligent inquiry on both sides of the Chamber, and I find that, with the exception of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], Senators are not ready even to make speeches for the next two or three days. For that reason I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the reciprocity agreement made between the executive officials of the United States and Canada and the measures which have been introduced in Congress this session and last for the purpose of carrying that agreement into effect have caused widespread and animated discussions; and considering the variety of interests immediately and prospectively affected by the proposed measures, it is not to be wondered at that many interested people are busying themselves about this legislation; nor is it at all surprising that a great number of misstatements have been made and circulated as to what the agreement really is, and as to its probable effect upon the different industries of the country. It seems as if a propaganda was being deliberately exploited to excite opposition to the reciprocity agreement, based on misrepresentation, and intended to deceive and mislead.

Mr. President, my purpose in addressing the Senate to-day is to correct some of these misstatements of the truth. I propose to-day to confine my observations to two things: First, to a consideration of the comparative wages paid for farm labor in the United States and Canada; and, second, to a consideration of the comparative values of live stock in the United States and Canada.

I shall confine myself to those two things to-day, but notify my colleagues now that it is my intention in the near future to inflict upon the Senate and to encumber the RECORD with some additional addresses on this reciprocity agreement. I intend in the first of those speeches to address myself to the comparative cost of production and the market value of farm products in the two countries, and especially of wheat. And then a little later on, when I can find fitting opportunities, I shall address myself to the question of the cost of living, the cost of agricultural implements, and other things covered by the agreement before the Senate. But to-day I shall only take up the two subjects I have mentioned and confine my remarks to them.

LABOR.

We have heard a good deal said here in the Senate and a good deal out of the Senate about farm wages paid in the two countries, the contention being made that the wage of farm laborers in Canada is much less than it is in the United States, and that if the products of that labor in Canada are admitted free to the markets of the United States it will make necessary a reduction of the price of farm labor in the States.

I hold in my hand a printed report of hearings had in February last during the closing days of the last Congress before the Senate Finance Committee. That committee wasted a number of precious days on those hearings. I say "wasted," because many of the same witnesses had not more than a month before appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and covered the same ground in statements there. If all of the same witnesses did not appear before both committees, those who did appear before both committees traveled the same road and discussed in substantially the same way the same subjects. One hearing was but a repetition of the other. It seemed to me then that it was a useless expenditure of time; useless, if there had been any desire on the part of a majority of the Senate committee to pass the bill which had already passed the House. If it was the desire and purpose of the committee to kill time and prevent the passage of the bill by the Senate, then the days consumed in the hearings were cleverly occupied. I think there is no doubt that the majority of the

Finance Committee did employ the so-called hearings as a device to defeat the consideration of the bill in the open Senate. However, the hearings were had, and now I wish to quote from them some sample expressions and then show how unreliable and valueless they are.

Among the witnesses who appeared before the Finance Committee was Mr. Nahum J. Bachelder, of New Hampshire, master of the National Grange. Speaking to the question of wages, he made this statement:

Is it, or is it not, a fact that the cost of growing the great staple crops, such as wheat, barley, oats, and hay; *of raising cattle, horses, and sheep;* and of producing butter, eggs, poultry, cheese, apples, etc., is greater in this country than in Canada? We affirm that such is the fact, and would state in support of our contention the further facts * * * *that the wages paid farm labor in Canada are much lower than in this country.*

I had occasion, while Mr. Bachelder was addressing the committee, to ask him some questions, and I desire now to read a part of that examination:

Senator STONE. Can you tell me what the difference in the cost of production is on a bushel of wheat, for example, in the United States and in Canada?

Mr. BACHELDER. I can not state it definitely. The cost is less in Canada than it is in the United States for the reasons that I have stated.

Senator STONE. You said it was because of cheaper labor.

Mr. BACHELDER. Yes.

Senator STONE. That was one reason.

Mr. BACHELDER. Yes.

Senator STONE. How much cheaper is the labor in Canada than it is in the United States? By about what per cent?

Mr. BACHELDER. I understand it is 25 per cent cheaper, sir.

Senator HALE. At least.

Senator STONE. That, I should think, would be a disputed question. Upon what data do you base that statement that it is 25 per cent cheaper?

Mr. BACHELDER. I base it upon the testimony of the farmers in the northern part of the country, who go to Canada to employ their labor, and they get it, they tell me, 25 per cent cheaper than they get labor on this side of the line.

Senator MCCUMBER. I am informed, Senator STONE, that within the last week the Agricultural Department has reported the difference in the cost of producing grains in Canada and in the United States, and that it ranges from 30 to 50 per cent. I do not know how correct that is. I get it from outside.

Senator STONE. My information is very different from that.

It will be observed that Mr. Bachelder says that farm wages in the United States are 25 per cent higher than in Canada.

I read now from page 45 of the Senate hearings a statement made by Mr. Charles M. Gardner, master of the Massachusetts State Grange. Mr. Gardner says:

In relation to this matter of farm labor—not to go into detail, but just to give my observation—I will say that we are not very far from the Canadian line, perhaps 150 miles or so; but it is true that in the last few years we have been getting all the labor we could of this kind, because we could get it cheaper than other farm labor in Massachusetts; and at the same time these very men have come over very readily because they were bettering their condition by coming.

Senator MCCUMBER. By coming from Canada?

Mr. GARDNER. By coming from Canada. And I want to say to you that I believe the suggestion of 25 per cent less in the wage rate is not overstated; that it is a fair statement.

Turning to page 50 you will find some questions I propounded to Mr. Gardner and his answers thereto. I will read a part of that examination:

Senator STONE. You say the difference in price of labor in Massachusetts and in Canada, immediately across the line from New England, is about 25 per cent?

Mr. GARDNER. I understood, sir, the national master to say that he thought that was a fair presentation of the difference.

Senator STONE. And you agree?

Mr. GARDNER. I said that in my observation I thought that was at least not an exaggerated statement. I think it is a fair statement.

Senator STONE. You mean by farm labor, men who are hired to work on farms?

Mr. GARDNER. I mean the men who do the work on the land.

Senator STONE. For a wage?

Mr. GARDNER. For a wage.

Senator STONE. Do you in Massachusetts hire men by the day or by the month, usually, for farm work?

Mr. GARDNER. By the month, usually.

Senator STONE. Do you furnish them their board?

Mr. GARDNER. There are so many different conditions in connection with those things that it is hard to say. In some cases their board is furnished. In others, if there are little houses on the farms for the farm laborers, they live there. There are so many different arrangements that it is hard to say what the prevailing method is.

Senator STONE. Aside from furnishing things of that kind—board and like accommodations—what do you ordinarily pay in Massachusetts per month to laborers?

Mr. GARDNER. There is such a difference in the different sections that I should be very glad to ask two or three of these gentlemen to tell you about what it is in their sections.

* * * * * * *

Senator STONE. No; I mean the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. That is a hard thing to state, because there are so many different kinds of agriculture and so many different rates of wages. If I might ask these gentlemen to answer that single question as to the prevailing rates in their particular sections——

Senator STONE. Where do you reside?

Mr. GARDNER. Just west of the Connecticut River.

Senator STONE. What is the town?

Mr. GARDNER. Westfield.

Senator STONE. Do you reside in the town or out on a farm?

Mr. GARDNER. Just outside of the town. We are a tobacco section. We are not a great agricultural section in that immediate vicinity.

Senator STONE. What particular branch of agriculture are you engaged in?

Mr. GARDNER. I am interested in the milk business.

Senator STONE. In the dairy business?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, sir; but not to any great extent, because my time is so much taken up with my grange work.

Senator STONE. With what work?

Mr. GARDNER. With my grange work, as master of the State grange.

Senator STONE. What is paid for farm labor (I am not now speaking of labor that is employed in running a dairy, but in cultivating the soil) in the section with which you are familiar?

Mr. GARDNER. In my own particular part of Hampden County the principal staple raised is tobacco. That is about, I might say, our exclusive agricultural work. I can not tell you exactly the prevailing price. If you will ask Mr. Healey, of Connecticut, who is right in the tobacco section, I think the conditions in his section would be not materially different from ours. I do not know what the prevailing price there is.

Senator STONE. Have you much gardening in your immediate section?

Mr. GARDNER. Not very much.

Senator STONE. But to some extent you have?

Mr. GARDNER. To a very limited extent.

Senator STONE. For market purposes?

Mr. GARDNER. To a very limited extent, for Springfield.

Senator STONE. Do you know what price is paid for labor in that work?

Mr. GARDNER. I am not sure about the price exactly. I have taken this matter up with some of our men at the statehouse, who are concerned in the agricultural board. I am a member of the State board of agriculture, and I have asked them to give me as closely as they could, from the averages in our State and the averages as they had them from Canada, the price of farm labor; and my deductions are drawn from the information that they gave me, representing the whole State, generally.

Senator STONE. And not from your personal knowledge?

Mr. GARDNER. Not from my personal knowledge, because I have not been in Canada for two or three years. But I thought that was a fair way to get at the average of the price.

Senator STONE. Do you personally know what is paid for farm labor—that is, for the men employed to work on the farms and cultivate the soil—in Canada?

Mr. GARDNER. I can not give you more than that specific knowledge. I thought that was sufficient.

Senator STONE. I asked if you personally knew how much per month was paid.

Mr. GARDNER. If you mean by that, going and asking them what they get, I can not say.

Senator STONE. Then you do not know?

Mr. GARDNER. I think I might say I know, if I have the statement from our State board of agriculture, who have compiled the averages across the line or either side, and have told me that there is a difference of fully 25 per cent. I supposed that was reasonable information to rely upon.

Senator STONE. Then your information is based upon reports that you have read or heard read, rather than upon your personal knowledge?

Mr. GARDNER. I would not say reports, because that is hardly a fair term. My judgment is based on information, sir, that I gathered in that way. I did not feel, sir, that it was fair to compare my own little section, or any other one section of Massachusetts, with some little section of Canada, and to get at the matter in a broad way, I suggested that we try to get a fair average on the other side, and from that I learned what I have testified to as information.

Mr. President, there is much more of the same kind in these hearings and in the hearings had before the Ways and Means Committee a month earlier; but what I have read is ample to indicate the general character of the contention made by those who appeared before the committee to oppose this reciprocity agreement.

Now, I wish to read a resolution adopted by the Republican central committee of Chariton County, Mo., which I find published in the Globe-Democrat, of St. Louis, Mo., under date of April 22:

Resolved, That we believe that this measure will be so detrimental and ruinous to the farmers that the present liberal scale of wages paid to farm laborers can not be maintained, and would result in decreased wages, discontent, and idleness among a class whose condition is fairly satisfactory.

Mark this language—

that this measure will be so ruinous to the farmers that the present liberal scale of wages paid to farm laborers can not be maintained—

not even in Missouri.

Mr. President, statements such as I have quoted, made by these distinguished representatives of the Grange, and in the resolution I have read, could be repeated over and over again, if I cared to multiply them; and yet the assertions of all of them are based on a total misapprehension of the facts.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have not read the testimony from which the Senator has been quoting, but if I understood him correctly he was quoting from a New England man.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I quoted from Gov. Bachelder of New Hampshire and Mr. Gardner of Massachusetts.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Is there anything in the testimony which indicates that they were speaking about the wages prevalent on either side of the line—that is, as distinguishing between the wages east and west; in the Province of Quebec, we will say, and New England, or the wages prevailing in the northwest territories of Canada and the corresponding parts of the United States?

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will take occasion to read what I have read (and I am not taking time to read it all) he will discover that the whole trend of the statements made was to compare the wages paid in Canada as a whole with wages paid in our northern border States as a whole.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. As a whole. I do not know whether the Senator intends to refer to the report of the Tariff Board published during the month of March.

Mr. STONE. I do intend to refer to it. I have it here for that purpose.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It clearly distinguishes between the wages in the Province of Quebec and in the New England States.

Mr. STONE. Clearly, and it ought to.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes. By that it appears that the wages in New England for farm labor are very much higher than in Canada.

Mr. STONE. It is true that the Tariff Board report gives a higher average wage in New England, particularly on yearly hirings, than in the eastern Provinces of Canada. But I will come to that phase of the subject presently. The Senator is anticipating.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I will not interrupt the Senator as long as he intends to refer to that report.

Mr. STONE. I intend to get to it in due course.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has quoted from the master of the National Grange, and I think also from the master of one State Grange.

Mr. STONE. Of Massachusetts.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of Massachusetts. I will ask the Senator if he has carefully read the statement of Mr. T. C. Laylin, master of the Ohio State Grange, on this question, and would it interrupt the Senator if I read four or five lines?

Mr. STONE. No; it will not interrupt me.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. Laylin says:

I have here figures taken from the report of the Department of Commerce and Labor—

This is not outside talk at all; it is official—

in regard to the wages paid along the border in Canada and in the United States from the ocean to western New York. I will mention just a few of the places and give the average on both sides. In this table Eastport, Calais, Fort Fairfield, Van Buren, Fort Kent, and two other places in Maine are compared with Halifax, Nova Scotia (right over the border), Yarmouth, and several different districts of St. John. The average cost of labor in eastern Maine is from $25 to $31 a month. The average cost of labor in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick is from $17 to $24 a month.

And on page 60 Mr. Laylin inserts a very illuminating table from the report of the Department of Commerce and Labor, showing that there is substantially that difference all along the line in the case of farm labor.

Mr. STONE. What difference?

Mr. GALLINGER. The figures themselves show, I should say, 20 to 21 per cent; and if it would not trouble the Senator or in any way disarrange his illuminating speech I would like to have that table inserted right here. It is an official table.

Mr. STONE. I think I would rather not put that into my speech, for I have not examined that table and am not prepared at this moment to analyze it or pass judgment upon it, and it would have to go in without any answer from me. That would hardly be fair to me or to the cause of truth.

Mr. GALLINGER. I observe that while the Senator did interrogate ex-Gov. Bachelder and one or two others he did not take Mr. Laylin in hand, and I am surprised that he did not.

Mr. STONE. I was not present when he addressed the committee nor have I since examined the table alluded to.

Mr. GALLINGER. We can have the table inserted later on.

Mr. STONE. It can be inserted later in the RECORD.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a very valuable exhibit.

Mr. STONE. I intend now to submit some data on this subject of wages prepared by the Tariff Board and sent to the Senate near the close of the last session of Congress by the President in response to a Senate resolution calling for the information. After that I intend to submit other data on the same subject. So far as the Tariff Board is concerned, I will say that the figures the board gives ought to be accepted as conclusive by our friends on the other side. They have been beating the air and clamoring for a Tariff Board, so that we might accurately ascertain the difference in wages paid in the United States and other countries in all the various industries. For myself I have never had much faith in a Tariff Board. I have always opposed the creation of a Tariff Board and am still opposed to having one, particularly an Executive-made Tariff Board. But since we have a Tariff Board—a pet creation of Senators on the other side, and especially of such Senators as my friend from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and created by them for the purpose and with the assurance that it would supply Congress and the country with absolutely trustworthy information—it seems to me that the mouths of its sponsors are closed against protest when I quote the figures furnished by that body.

Mr. President, I propose first to quote some figures for the especial benefit of my distinguished friend the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]; in fact, for the benefit of both Senators from that State, for both have inveighed against this trade agreement. Let me read from the report of the Tariff Board:

The tables submitted herewith relate to wages of farm hands in 1910 in the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, Canada, and in the States of North Dakota, Minnesota, and South Dakota. Wages in the States were secured altogether by personal interviews with farmers and owners of thrashing outfits employing help; while wages in the Canadian Provinces were secured by personal interviews with farmers and owners of thrashing outfits employing help, and also from the records of the commissioner of immigration at Winnipeg.

In general it may be said that the wages of experienced season hands (hands employed for a period of seven, seven and a half, or eight months, beginning about April 1) are on the same general level in Manitoba and Minnesota and also on the same general level in Saskatchewan and North Dakota, and they are higher in the two last-named localities than in the two first named.

I desire to call the attention of the North Dakota Senators to this report, both of whom, in February last, lifted their eloquent voices in such vehement protest against this measure because of the fear they had that American farm wages would be reduced if Congress should enact the agreement into a law. Remember what I have just read is from the report of the Tariff Board, and what I am about to refer to is also from that report. I have a Tariff Board table before me, and from that I find that—

The average wage paid per year, with bed and board, in 1910, in North Dakota, was $350, while in Saskatchewan, just across the line, it was $370. That was the average yearly wage paid in 1910. Then they hire hands by the season, the season running from seven to eight months, beginning April 1. Season hands, with bed and board, were paid in 1910 in North Dakota an average of $33.79 per month, while in Saskatchewan the monthly season wage was $35.14.

Mr. WARREN. Per month?

Mr. STONE. Per month for season hands, the season running from seven to eight months.

This table shows that, whether by the year or by the season, the monthly wage paid in Saskatchewan was higher than that paid in North Dakota. The Tariff Board then goes into particulars and furnishes a table of wages as to special individual employments. Here are some of the comparisons: Spike pitchers in North Dakota received $3 a day; in Saskatchewan, $3 a day. Field pitchers in North Dakota, $2.50 to $3; in Saskatchewan, $3. Engineers—that is, thrashing-machine engineers—received in North Dakota $5 to $6 per day; in Saskatchewan, $5 to $7 per day. Separator men in North Dakota, $5 to $6; in Saskatchewan, $5 to $7. Water haulers, without teams, in North Dakota, $2.50 to $3; in Saskatchewan, $2.50 to $3. Bundle haulers, without teams, in North Dakota, $2.50 to $3; in Saskatchewan, $2.50 to $3—all showing that in every instance the wage paid in Saskatchewan was equal to, and in some instances greater than, the wage paid in North Dakota for the same description of labor.

I invite the prayerful attention of my friends from North Dakota to this report of their Tariff Board, aye, their Tariff Board. If they care to contradict or to join issue with the board they have my permission. I am free to say that I have not myself profound confidence in the accuracy of the figures given. I have not profound confidence in their accuracy for the reason, as I shall show later on, that according to the wage scale given by the statistical authorities in Canada the wage actually paid in the Provinces is higher than that given by the Tariff Board. But I ask the North Dakota Senators to bear in mind that the wage as given by the Tariff Board is higher in Saskatchewan than in their State.

Now, I leave my North Dakota friends to cogitate on these figures, and turn to give respectful, though brief, attention to some of my Missouri friends. Accordingly I bow to the Chariton County Republican committee, who in solemn conclave expressed a grave fear that reciprocity was going to decrease the munificent wages now being paid to farm laborers in Missouri. I am going to show these ill-advised constituents of mine that they are wholly mistaken, and that they have been deceived as to the facts. I say they have been deceived as to the facts, and I will add that I believe they have been deliberately deceived by secretly interested parties.

I will pause here long enough, Mr. President, to say that whenever any move is made to lower the burden of tariff taxes on anything, and especially on the productions of any important industry, the great protected monopolies of the country, which have grown enormously rich through extortions on the consuming public, become alarmed and forthwith put an opposing force in motion. They not only stand ready to support, but they first secretly initiate and then support movements intended to excite alarm among the people immediately affected in the hope that the threat—any serious threat—of tariff reduction may be suppressed. In this instance there is an organized effort, adroitly worked, to alarm the farmers, and to that end a propaganda has been established to scatter misinformation among the farmers with the hope and expectation that they will rush forward and thrust their hands into the fire to pull out the chestnuts of the very monopolists who seek to use them. The monopolists may not be immediately interested in a given movement to reduce tariff taxes, and they are not immediately interested in the removal of duties on agricultural products; but they are afraid of every movement in the direction of tariff reduction, fearing that the tide might run on until it beat against their own fortress. Hence they are against everything that tends to disturb the status quo and menace the strongly-protected and opulent privileges they enjoy and have enjoyed for so many years. But I will not longer digress. I return to the Chariton County Republican committee.

Let me read again from the report of the Tariff Board so as to give my Chariton County constituents information somewhat more reliable as to wages paid farm laborers than that they seem now to possess. The Tariff Board gives the average wage paid by the month in 1909 for season hiring in Missouri at $21.10, and gives the average wage paid per month on yearly hiring at $18.85. Now, Ontario lies practically due north of Missouri, and it is fairer perhaps to compare the wage paid in Ontario with that paid in Missouri than to make the comparison between the State and any other Province. The Tariff Board says that the wage paid with board for this same year (1909) in Ontario per month on hirings for the season was $21.52, as against $21.10 in Missouri; and that the wage paid in Ontario on yearly hirings was $17.63 per month as against $18.85 in Missouri, thus showing that the wages in Missouri and in Ontario, according to this Tariff Board report, are substantially the same.

Mr. President, I wish now to call attention to some figures for the especial benefit of our lamented friend, former Senator Hale. I say "lamented," because I believe it to be true that every Senator who served with Mr. Hale misses him and regrets his absence. We Democrats, of course, find a soothing consolation in the fact that he is displaced by a Democrat, and a fine Democrat at that. If you recall what I have read from the tariff hearings it will be remembered that Senator Hale indorsed what Mr. Gardner and Mr. Bachelder said to the effect that there is a difference of 25 per cent in farm wages as between the United States and Canada. When Mr. Bachelder said to the Finance Committee that labor was 25 per cent cheaper in Canada than in the United States, Senator Hale responded, "At least." Let me further quote from the Tariff Board, getting nearer home to Senator Hale and Mr. Bachelder. I find that the board gives the wage per month for season hiring—the season running from seven to eight months beginning April 1—in New York, at $26; Michigan, $25.10; Ohio, $22.11; making an average for the three States of $24.40.

These figures are somewhat higher, though not materially higher, than the figures given for the same States in a tabulated publication dated March, 1911, and given out by the Department of Agriculture in what is known as the Crop Reporter, a departmental periodical issued under the auspices of the Secretary of Agriculture. According to these figures given by the Agricultural Department, the average wage for farm labor per month in the three States of New York, Michigan, and Ohio is as follows: For New York, $23.50; Michigan, $23; Ohio, $21; average, $22.50. The department does not say whether these figures are for annual or season hiring.

Now, take three of the eastern Provinces of Canada—New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario—and I find that our Tariff Board gives the monthly wage on season hiring in those Provinces as follows: New Brunswick, $22.59; Quebec, $23.33; Ontario, $21.52; making an average of $22.48. Now, group these three averages and we find: For the three States, per Tariff Board, $24.40; for the three States, per Crop Reporter, $22.50; for the three Provinces, per Tariff Board, $22.48.

The difference thus disclosed in monthly wages between the three States and the three Provinces, as shown by the Tariff Board report, is $1.92 per month; while the difference as disclosed by the Crop Reporter report for the States and the Tariff Board report for the Provinces is only 2 cents per month. So that, instead of the average difference in farm wages, even in the Eastern States and eastern Provinces, being 25 per cent, they are substantially equal.

I wish it kept in mind as we go along that the Canadian wage as given by the Tariff Board is lower than the Canadian wage as given by the statistical authorities of Canada. When we examine into this difference between the official reports of the two Governments we find a very interesting phase of this subject, and I shall advert to it presently in a specific way.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Does the Senator intend to give the comparison between the New England States and the Province of Quebec and the other eastern Provinces of Canada?

Mr. STONE. In a way later on I will do so, but not so specifically as with the States I have named, and for the reason that I can not go on multiplying specific comparisons indefinitely, and besides it seems to me that New York, Ohio, and Michigan can well be taken as being even a little more than typical of the Eastern and Middle-eastern States. I shall, however, embody tables in my address covering the subject of farm wages in all the States and Provinces.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. My reason for interrupting was this: Of course the agriculture of New England differs from the agriculture of any other section of the Union. It has its near-by markets, and it suits its products to those markets. By the report from which the Senator was reading I see that the average rate of wages for the season in Maine and Vermont would be $27.23 per month, while in the Province of Quebec, lying directly north and being the great general agricultural Province of Canada, the wages were only $23.33, or 16.70 per cent less in the Province of Quebec than in those States. If the comparison were made between those States and Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec combined, the wages of those States would be 22 per cent more than in the Provinces I have named. I only mention it because I see the Senator is inclined to be fair and wants to bring out all the facts, and the agriculture of New England being so peculiar to itself, I thought that a comparison between the wages paid there and in the near-by Canadian Provinces ought to appear in the debate.

Mr. STONE. I will say to the Senator that presently I shall lay before the Senate and put into the RECORD complete tables showing the wages of all the States in New England and elsewhere and the wages of all the Provinces of Canada, so that the comparison can be made by anyone who wishes to make it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will put in the official figures, I take it.

Mr. STONE. I will put in the figures I get from official documents.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Canadian Government issues a publication called the Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly, and in the issue for January, 1911, there will be found a statement of wages.

Mr. STONE. I have it here.

Mr. GALLINGER. And our Agricultural Department has taken up this same subject.

Mr. STONE. It has.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know the Senator, of course, aims to be fair, and I merely suggest that I trust the figures will be official, because a great many wild statements are made outside.

Mr. STONE. Every figure I have given and every figure I shall give will be taken from an official document, and I will name the document.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very glad to know that, and I will take occasion to examine them later on.

Mr. BACON. Does not the Senator from Missouri think that it is pertinent to remark in connection with what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] has said as to wages in his particular section, that he himself has given the explanation of the superior wages in that particular part of the country in citing the fact of its proximity to the great cities? It seems to me that the question of wages is one of general average throughout the country, and I am sure that if the general average throughout the United States were taken it would be far less than the general average throughout Canada.

Mr. STONE. It is, as I will show presently.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. STONE. Senators are anticipating me, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I simply wanted to say, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], that the State of Maine is very little nearer to the markets of New England than is the Province of Quebec, which produces 67½ per cent of the dairy products of the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the figures read by the Senator from Vermont from the report of the Tariff Board—they are from that report, are they not?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. STONE. Those figures from the Tariff Board report are unquestionably as the Senator has stated them, and they show a somewhat higher rate of wage in Maine and Vermont than in Quebec.

But while the Senator from Vermont is in a large measure bound by what his Tariff Board says, I do not place, and am under no such obligation as he to place, implicit faith in the figures the board gives to the Senate and the country with respect to Canadian wages. I shall undertake presently to show that the wage in the Canadian Provinces is higher than that stated in the report from which the Senator read and from which I have read. I have read from the Tariff Board report partly to impress my argument on our friends on the other side, for, although they may deny the accuracy of other statistics, they are estopped in all good faith from assailing what their pet Tariff Board furnishes to us. To Republican Senators the Tariff Board should be sacred and its deliverances above reproach. A little later on I will call attention to the Canadian wage as given by the Canadian Government, which, as I understand the statistics, show a much higher level of wages in Canada than that given by the Tariff Board.

Now, so far I have directed my remarks principally to monthly wages on season hirings. I will now call attention to monthly wages on yearly hirings, and make comparisons between the Provinces and the States on that basis. The average per month for yearly hirings in New York, Michigan, and Ohio, as given by the Tariff Board, is $20.94, while the average, as given by the same board, for the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, is $17.60. Manifestly, according to these figures, there is a larger demand for labor during the winter months in the States than in the Provinces; and, according to these figures, wages during the winter months are somewhat higher in the States than in the Provinces, while during the seven or eight months which cover the farming season the wages are substantially the same. But, Mr. President, it would seem that the monthly wage given by the Tariff Board for yearly hirings in the Canadian Provinces is less than that given by the Canadian authorities themselves.

I hold in my hand the publication to which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] referred, entitled "Census and Statistics Monthly," a statistical periodical published by the Dominion agricultural department. On page 2 of that publication for the month of January I find a table giving the average farm wage, including board, for both season and yearly hirings, in all the Provinces for the years 1909 and 1910. The average wage given in this table for Prince Edward Island is $25.27 per month on season hirings; Nova Scotia, $31.20; New Brunswick, $32.59, and so on with the other Provinces. Mr. President, I ask leave, at this point, to insert the table referred to and from which I have just quoted, or so much thereof as will make clear what I am endeavoring to show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Table showing average wage per month paid in Canada for farm labor, including board on both season and yearly hirings, and average value of board per month, 1909 and 1910.

Provinces.	Year.	By season hiring.	By yearly hiring.	Average value of board.
Prince Edward Island	1909	$25.27	$18.87	$8.00
	1910	26.60	20.41	10.15
Nova Scotia	1909	31.20	25.90	10.00
	1910	33.70	26.77	11.50
New Brunswick	1909	32.59	19.95	10.00
	1910	33.90	24.12	11.25
Quebec	1909	33.33	27.58	10.00
	1210	36.40	29.12	11.56
Ontario	1909	31.52	27.63	10.00
	1910	31.40	27.99	12.00
Manitoba	1909	35.95	30.45	11.00
	1910	40.00	33.33	14.79
Saskatchewan	1909	38.30	32.40	16.00
	1910	40.00	33.54	14.00
Alberta	1909	40.08	35.13	15.00
	1910	40.00	34.66	16.79
British Columbia	1909	45.50	35.00	15.00
	1910	57.40	[1] 47.00	20.00

[1] Estimated.

Mr. STONE. According to this table the average wage per month on yearly hirings in Quebec and Ontario is $27.60 instead of $17.60 as given by the Tariff Board. According to the Tariff Board the yearly wage in the Eastern States is slightly above the yearly wage in the eastern Provinces, while this table gives the yearly wage in those Provinces as materially higher than it is in the Eastern States. A little further on I shall show, Mr. President, the plan adopted by the Tariff Board by which it figured wages for the Provinces lower than the Canadian Government puts them, but for the present I merely call attention to the fact that the board's figures are lower than the figures given by the Canadian Government.

Mr. President, I have compared farm wages in the Northwestern States with farm wages in the Northwestern Provinces and find them to be substantially equal, as shown by the Tariff Board report. I have compared wages paid in Missouri with wages paid in Ontario, especially for the benefit of my Republican friends in Chariton County, and find that wages in Missouri per month are almost exactly the same as those paid in Ontario, as appears from the Tariff Board report.

I have compared the three great easterly Lake and border States of New York, Michigan, and Ohio with eastern Canadian Provinces and find the differences to be slight, according to the figures furnished by the Tariff Board. I wish particularly that the comparisons between the States named and the Provinces named, which are based on figures furnished by the Tariff Board and our Agricultural Department, be kept in mind, and that for the present the figures furnished by the Canadian Government be put aside. Comparisons based on Canadian figures constitute another and a quite different story, and the two bases of comparison should be kept separated. Now, the States of New York, Michigan, Ohio, Missouri, and North Dakota, all of which I have used for comparative purposes, maintain a higher average level of wages than the average of all the States. In fact, that is true of all the northern border States; their average is higher than the general average. These States are high up among the leading industrial and agricultural States of the Union, and the rate of wages paid in them for all kinds of labor is much above the general level of the whole country.

According to a table printed last month in Crop Reporter, a publication of the Agricultural Department, the average of wages paid per month, with board, for farm labor in the whole United States is only $19.21. That is the average of all the States. If you will examine the eight South Atlantic States, you will find the average monthly farm wage, as shown by this table, to be only $13.77. If you will take the eight South Central States, you will find the average wage to be only $15.28.

If you will take the 9 North Atlantic States, from Maine to Pennsylvania, inclusive, you will find the average wage to be only $21.65. According to the Tariff Board report, the average wage on yearly hirings paid in these three groups of States—that is, the 8 South Atlantic States, the 8 South Central States, and the 9 North Atlantic States, or 25 States in all—is $16.90, whereas the average monthly wage on yearly hirings, as shown in the Tariff Board report, paid in the Canadian Provinces, is $18.45, or $1.55 per month more than is paid in the 25 States named. Mr. President, I wish at this point to insert the table to which I have referred, printed in the Crop Reporter, March, 1911, at page 19, under the title "Farm wages." This table gives the wage, with and without board,

per month for all the States on yearly hirings. I understand this table to be based on yearly hirings, as contradistinguished from season hirings, although that does not distinctly appear. I ask leave to insert that table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

The table is as follows:

FARM WAGES.

The average wages of farm labor (male) during the past year, based upon reports of agents and correspondents of the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Agriculture, with comparisons, is given as follows:

Wages of farm labor when employed by month.

States, Territories, and Divisions.	1910.	
	Without board.	With board.
Maine	$34.50	$23.50
New Hampshire	35.50	23.50
Vermont	35.50	25.00
Massachusetts	37.20	22.75
Rhode Island	34.00	21.00
Connecticut	36.00	21.00
New York	35.00	23.50
New Jersey	31.50	19.50
Pennsylvania	29.00	18.75
North Atlantic	33.19	21.65
Delaware	24.75	16.00
Maryland	21.50	13.50
Virginia	19.50	14.00
West Virginia	29.00	19.40
North Carolina	19.50	13.60
South Carolina	16.50	12.00
Georgia	18.00	13.00
Florida	25.00	15.00
South Atlantic	19.75	13.77
Ohio	29.00	21.00
Indiana	28.40	20.50
Illinois	32.90	24.50
Michigan	33.00	23.00
Wisconsin	37.25	26.00
North Central, east of Mississippi River	31.81	22.94
Minnesota	38.00	26.00
Iowa	39.00	28.00
Missouri	29.50	21.50
North Dakota	42.00	29.00
South Dakota	39.00	27.00
Nebraska	38.00	26.50
Kansas	34.00	24.00
North Central, west of Mississippi River	35.45	25.10
Kentucky	23.10	16.00
Tennessee	20.00	14.00
Alabama	18.50	13.00
Mississippi	19.50	13.30
Louisiana	20.25	13.50
Texas	24.50	18.00
Oklahoma	28.10	19.10
Arkansas	24.00	16.25
South Central	21.90	15.28
Montana	50.00	38.00
Wyoming	49.00	35.00
Colorado	44.50	29.80
New Mexico	34.25	24.50
Arizona	45.00	30.00
Utah	47.50	35.00
Nevada	54.00	37.00
Idaho	49.50	35.00
Washington	50.00	33.00
Oregon	44.50	32.00
California	47.00	32.00
Far Western	46.48	32.60
United States	27.80	19.21

Mr. STONE. And now, by way of immediate contrast, I present the following table, covering the same period and showing the average monthly wages paid on yearly hirings, with board, in the several Canadian Provinces, with an average of the whole. This table is based on the figures given by our Tariff Board, not by the Canadian Government:

Prince Edward Island	$10.87
Nova Scotia	15.90
New Brunswick	9.96
Quebec	17.58
Ontario	17.63
Manitoba	24.17
Saskatchewan	30.83
Alberta (estimated)	26.10
British Columbia	20.69
Canada	19.30

By comparing these two tables I have just asked leave to insert it will be seen that the average of the monthly wage, with board, paid on yearly hiring for the United States as a whole is $19.21, while the average for the same time and on the same basis for all the Canadian Provinces is $19.30. Thus it appears that according to the statistics furnished by our own Agricultural Department and Tariff Board the average yearly wage as between the two countries is substantially the same. If we should compare the average monthly wage paid in the two countries on season hiring instead of yearly hiring the average would be appreciably larger in favor of Canada.

Now, Mr. President, the comparisons I have here made are, as I have said, based on data furnished by our own Government. I wish now to revert to the table I submitted some time ago, showing the average wage per month paid in Canada, including board, for the years 1909 and 1910, as given by the Canadian Government. These Canadian statistics show that the average wage per month, including board, in all the Provinces on yearly hiring is $30.44. All the figures in this table are official except those given for yearly hiring for 1910 in British Columbia, which are estimated. Now, grouping these three averages together, we have this showing.

Average in the United States, as per Agricultural Department table, $19.21; average in Canada, as per Tariff Board, $19.30; average in Canada, as per Canadian statistics, $30.44.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do I understand the Senator to say that the average monthly wage paid in the United States is nineteen dollars and some cents?

Mr. STONE. Nineteen dollars and twenty-one cents, as shown in the table printed in Crop Reporter.

Mr. GALLINGER. And in Canada $30?

Mr. STONE. Thirty dollars and forty-four cents, as shown by the Canadian report, and $19.30 as shown by your Tariff Board report.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is a most astonishing statement. I think before we get through this debate the Senator will want to change his figures.

Mr. STONE. I am not giving my figures.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, the figures which have been given here.

Mr. STONE. I am giving the figures furnished by our Agricultural Department, by the Tariff Board, and by the agricultural department of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me a single observation, it is a remarkable circumstance, if that is the case, that Canadian workingmen are coming to this country in much larger numbers than Americans are going to Canada——

Mr. STONE. That is a statement——

Mr. GALLINGER. I mean laboring men; while, according to the Senator's figures, they get $12 a month more in Canada than they would across the border. It is inconceivable that that can be so.

Mr. STONE. In the first place, I do not admit that Canadian laborers are coming into the United States in greater number than American laborers are going into Canada. During the winter months French Canadians, as I am told, do come across in numbers more or less great into the New England States and seek employment there because there is more employment during those months in the States than in the adjacent Provinces. But, taking the Provinces and the States as a whole and for the whole year, I do not admit what the Senator from New Hampshire assumes. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not go to Canada. He would deprive his country of valuable services if he should.

Mr. GALLINGER. If I was a laboring man, under those conditions I surely would go there.

Mr. STONE. If this wage in Canada is so tempting as to put into the mind of my friend the thought of going across the line, it is surprising, if his contention be true, that some of the statesmen of Canada do not come over and seek homes in this land of the free.

Mr. President, I am about through with this subject of labor as between the United States and Canada, but I wish to print a table giving a comparison of the average wages paid agricultural labor in specified States and Provinces. I give in column 1 of this table the wages as fixed by the Tariff Board for season hirings and in column 2 the wages fixed by the Tariff Board for annual hirings. In column 3 I set down the wages paid in the Provinces, as given in the Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly, for season hirings; in column 4, like fig-

ures from the same source on yearly hirings; and in the fifth column I give the average value in the Provinces of board per month.

The table is as follows:

Comparison of average wages of agricultural labor in specified States and Provinces in Canada.

	Tariff Board's report, included with President's message on reciprocity, February, 1911.		From Dominion of Canada Census and Statistics Monthly, January, 1911.		Average value of board per month, from Census and Statistics Monthly, January, 1911.
	Season hiring, 1909.	Annual hiring, 1909.	Season hiring, 1909.	Annual hiring, 1909.	
UNITED STATES.					
Maine	$27.60	$23.17			
New York	26.00	22.06			
Michigan	25.10	21.57			
CANADA.					
Prince Edward Island	17.25	10.87	$25.27	$18.87	$8.00
Nova Scotia	21.20	15.90	31.20	25.90	10.00
New Brunswick	22.59	9.96	32.59	19.96	10.00
Quebec	23.33	17.58	33.33	27.58	10.00
Ontario	21.52	17.63	31.52	27.63	10.00
UNITED STATES.					
North Dakota	33.34	29.16			
Minnesota	29.25	27.83			
Montana	29.29	25.00			
CANADA.					
Manitoba	31.84	24.17	35.95	30.46	11.00
Saskatchewan	35.14	30.83	38.30	32.49	[1] 14.00–16.00
British Columbia	30.50		45.50		15.00
UNITED STATES.					
Washington	36.39				

[1] This table in the Census and Statistics Monthly of Canada, January, 1911, gives value of board in Saskatchewan as $16 for 1909 and $14 for 1910. Evidently these figures should be $14 for 1909 and $16 for 1910.

This table shows that with two exceptions the Tariff Board arrived at the monthly wage paid in the Canadian Provinces as shown in columns 1 and 2 by subtracting the board of the laborer from the monthly wage as given in the Census and Statistics Monthly of Canada, January, 1911, from which the Tariff Board obtained their statistics. On the other hand, it does not appear in the Tariff Board report that the board of the laborer was deducted from his wage in the States.

Mr. STONE. I will now show the process followed by the Tariff Board in fixing the wage in the Provinces lower than the wage was fixed by the Canadian authorities. It was done in this way.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Will the Senator give us the figures as to the amount paid by the season in North Dakota?

Mr. STONE. I have done that, and at the time regretted the absence of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to say to the Senator from Missouri that I tried to listen to his address, but I was called out of the Chamber for a few minutes. I wish to say to the Senator that I am a farmer, and I am paying by the season $35 per month for laboring men. No farmer pays less than $30 per month for the season. The season is generally about eight months.

Mr. STONE. That is right.

Now, for the benefit of my friend from North Dakota I will again read what I have already read from the Tariff Board report with respect to wages in North Dakota and in Saskatchewan. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not impeach or repudiate his Tariff Board. It is an official body that the Republicans have been so——

Mr. GRONNA. It is not my intention to repudiate anything. I am simply stating facts which I know to be absolutely true and which I know of my own knowledge.

Mr. STONE. I do not question anything the Senator says he knows of his own knowledge, and in this instance it is not necessary for me to do so, for the Senator and the board do not disagree. In what I said I was only seeking to impress on my friend from North Dakota and on all my friends on the other side, that they are not in position to reproach, much less to condemn and repudiate what the Tariff Board furnishes the Senate as the wages received by laborers of any kind in any country.

Now, here is what the Tariff Board says about North Dakota and Saskatchewan. The Senator spoke of season hiring. The Tariff Board speaks of season hiring also, and for the year 1910 the Tariff Board gave the average monthly wage for season hiring paid in North Dakota at $33.79, and gave the average wage paid for the same year in Saskatchewan at $35.14. In other words, the wage in Saskatchewan was $1.35 per month higher than in North Dakota. Does the Senator still think that if this reciprocity agreement goes through the farm laborers of North Dakota are likely to suffer seriously from cheap labor in Saskatchewan?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not particularly enamored with tariff boards or tariff commissions, but the Senator is quoting from the Tariff Board and holding the Republican side of the Chamber responsible for it. I have in my hand the message from the President of the United States transmitting a report from the Tariff Board in response to Senate resolution of February 23, 1911. If the Senator will turn to page 86 of that message he will find this statement by the Tariff Board:

> Where North Dakota and Manitoba join each other the wages for season hands are about $5 higher in North Dakota than in Manitoba.

Now, it seems to me that either the Tariff Board is considerably mixed on its figures or else the Senator's contention is not sustained.

Mr. STONE. I did not compare North Dakota with Manitoba.

Mr. GALLINGER. North Dakota and Manitoba adjoin each other.

Mr. STONE. So they do, and so do Saskatchewan and North Dakota adjoin each other.

Here are some figures, to which I invite the attention of the Senator, given by the Tariff Board for monthly wages on season hirings for 1910:

North Dakota	$33.79
Saskatchewan	35.14
Minnesota	31.68
Manitoba	31.84

These two States and two Provinces lie altogether in a bunch. The wage in Manitoba is somewhat below that in North Dakota, but so is the wage in Minnesota below that in North Dakota. The differences are common alike to the States and the Provinces. If the Manitoba wage is a little under that of North Dakota it is still a little above that of Minnesota. And here I will call the attention of my friend from New Hampshire to the fact that the Canadian authorities give the average wage on season hirings in Manitoba for 1910 at $40 per month.

It is not my province to defend what the Tariff Board says or does. That burden lies upon the shoulders of Senators upon the other side. The board is of their creation, not of mine or ours. For myself, I think the board is subject to criticism for the way in which it prepared and published its figures on farm wages in Canada. The Tariff Board, for example, gave the average wage in 1909 in Prince Edward Island on season hirings at $17.25, while the Canadian Government gave it at $25.27. Now, how did the Tariff Board arrive at its conclusion? Here is how it was done: The Canadian Government in the same table in which it gave the average monthly wage also gave the average value of monthly board. In Prince Edward Island the value of board was fixed at $8 per month. The Tariff Board subtracted the $8 board from the $25.27 wage, and the remainder was put down as the average wage for that Province. Take Nova Scotia for another example: The Tariff Board fixed the wage at $21.20. Canada fixed the wage at $31.20, and fixed the average value of the laborer's board at $10. The Tariff Board subtracted the $10 from the $31.20, and that left $21.20, which the Tariff Board set down as the average wage for the Province; and so on with the other Provinces. The same rule was not applied to wages and board in the States. That strikes me as strange, to say the least; it is inexplicable; I do not know why it was done. I do not know why the Tariff Board subtracted the board of the laborer in Canada from his wage and did not subtract it from the wage paid, to the American laborer. They put down so much as paid the American laborer, with board, and left it stand at that, but they subtracted the board from the Canadian wage and set the remainder down as the sum received.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if that fact appears in the report of the Tariff Board or in any official document?

Mr. STONE. It does not, so far as I have been able to find.

Mr. GALLINGER. Where did the Senator get his authority for making the statement?

Mr. STONE. I got it from the Census and Statistics Monthly issued by the department of agriculture in Canada, coupled with the statistics furnished by the Tariff Board.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me inconceivable that any board in making up a table could do so absurd a thing as to subtract the price of board in one country and not in the other.

Mr. STONE. And it seems so to me.

Mr. GALLINGER. It certainly must look so to everybody, and I think we had better wait to hear from the Tariff Board on that subject.

Mr. STONE. I tried to get the board this morning by phone, but was unable to do so. I would be glad to hear an explanation, but that is the way the matter appears in the tables and in the reports. Possibly it can be explained, and I hope it can be.

Mr. President, I ask permission to insert this table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Table showing monthly wage, with board, on yearly hiring (1910) paid farm laborers in States named, as shown in table published by United States Agricultural Department in Crop Reporter, March, 1911, and also showing monthly wage, with board, on yearly hiring (1910) paid farm laborers in Canadian Provinces as shown in table published by Canadian agricultural department in Census and Statistics Monthly for January, 1911.

Maine	$23.50
Vermont	25.00
New York	23.50
Ohio	21.00
Michigan	23.00
Wisconsin	26.00
Minnesota	26.00
Iowa	28.00
Missouri	21.50
North Dakota	29.00
Montana	38.00
Washington	33.00
CANADA.	
Prince Edward Island	$20.41
Nova Scotia	26.77
New Brunswick	24.12
Quebec	26.12
Ontario	27.99
Manitoba	33.33
Saskatchewan	33.54
Alberta	34.66
British Columbia (estimated)	47.00

Mr. STONE. Now, Mr. President, I am through with the labor phase of this discussion, at least for the present. I think if this official data, abstracted from the official reports of both countries, can be relied upon I have demonstrated that farm wages are not higher in the United States than in Canada. Our own official figures prove that they are not higher, while the Canadian statistics prove they are lower. If these official figures can be relied upon, then all this hullabaloo about higher wages being paid farm laborers in the United States than are paid to like laborers in Canada is the merest bosh.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. STONE. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator from Missouri is always so candid and fair that I am sure he does not want any statement to go out to the country that he does not fully believe, and so I am going to ask him a plain question. Does the Senator believe that, as between the wages of farm laborers in this country and of farm laborers in Canada, they are really 50 per cent more in Canada than in this country?

Mr. STONE. No. I do not so believe.

Mr. PAGE. Then I misunderstood the Senator, because I understood him to state that the labor wage in this country is $10.21, as against $30 in Canada; in other words, more than 50 per cent more in Canada than here.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator mean the average of the whole country?

Mr. PAGE. I took the Senator's statement as he gave it, and if I misunderstood him I want to be corrected.

Mr. STONE. This is my answer to the Senator's question as I now understand him: The figures I have given show the average wages paid farm laborers in all the States to be $19.21 per month. These figures I have taken from official reports furnished by the Agricultural Department of the United States. The average wages I have given for Canadian labor in all the Provinces I have taken from two sources, first, from the report of the Tariff Board, and, second, from a report given out by the agricultural department of Canada. Comparing the average monthly wage on yearly hirings for the whole United States as given by our Agricultural Department with the average of all the Provinces according to the estimates of the Tariff Board, we have this result:

Average for the United States	$19.21
Average for all the Provinces	19.30

Comparing the same average for the United States with the average of the Provinces as given by the Canadian Government, we have this result:

Average for the United States	$19.21
Average for all the Provinces	30.44

According to our own statistics, the average wage in Canada is slightly higher than in the United States, while the Canadian statistics show the average wage in Canada to be much higher than here. Does the Senator ask me to say that the Agricultural Department of the United States, so long and so ably conducted under the wise and judicious supervision of its distinguished and venerable head, publishes statistics that are incorrect; that they can not be relied upon; that they are absolutely untrue; or does he ask me to say that the agricultural department of Canada has cooked up and falsified figures, without any apparent object, to deceive?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am not seeking to question the figures of the Senator from Missouri. I am simply asking him if he wishes it to go out to the world that he believes (and he certainly has given us language which prompts us to think he believes) that as a matter of fact the wages of Canada are 50 per cent more than they are in this country. That is a plain question as to the Senator's belief.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator wants my belief as to whether the official figures furnished by the agricultural departments of the two countries are reliable, I am bound to say that prima facie they are reliable. Being from Missouri, until I can be shown to the contrary, I must accept the official data as accurate.

Mr. PAGE. I simply wish to press the matter home. Does the Senator say to me that he believes in his own heart——

Mr. STONE. My heart does not exercise the function of believing. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAGE. Of course I would not insist that the Senator was uncandid. He can not be.

Mr. STONE. I am not uncandid, nor do I intend to be.

Mr. PAGE. But living as I do within the shadow of the border wall, as I am only 33 miles from the line, I know it is not true. I know that it can not be true. I believe the Senator himself knows as well as I do that it is absolutely impossible.

I remember that during the contest over the tariff bill of 1909 the question of wage in the granite industry in Vermont and across the line came up and I took pains to investigate it. I found that in the town of Stanstead, Quebec, about 50 miles from where I live, the price paid for the commonest kind of labor was 20 cents per hour in the granite quarries, and about 15 miles from where I live, in Hardwick, Vt.—and the towns of Stanstead and Hardwick are only about 35 or 40 miles apart—the wages were 25 cents per hour or 25 per cent more on this side of the Canadian border than on the other. Anyone who lives on the border, as, for instance, our good friend the Senator from North Dakota, knows that it can not be possible that wages under like conditions are higher in Canada than the United States, and yet we have a right to infer that the Senator from Missouri believes they are. I do not believe he has been correctly shown anything of that kind, for nothing of that kind really exists.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is somewhat too provincial in the scope of his thought respecting this particular matter. He speaks of wages in Vermont and in the adjoining Province, while at the time he interrupted me I was reading comparisons made in official figures relating to all the States of the Union and all the Provinces of the Dominion.

I call the attention of my friend from Vermont to the fact that the average monthly wage for the season of 1910 in British Columbia was $57.40, as given by the Canadian Government, and the average value of the laborer's board was fixed at $17 per month. If we should follow the rule established by the Tariff Board and subtract the $17 from the $57.40, there would still remain $40.40 as the wage paid in cash. That is nearly double the cash wage paid in Vermont for farm labor. The wages in the other northwestern Provinces are not quite so high as in British Columbia, still in all those Provinces the wage is very high, and in all of them far above the wage paid in Vermont. You can, of course, select a given State in New England or elsewhere and compare the wages paid in that State with the wages paid in some particular Province and find that the wages in the particular State are higher than in the particular Province; but when you take the figures as

given by the two Governments and average them as a whole you will get a totally different and more accurate result. I have no reason to question the accuracy of the statistics published by the agricultural departments of the two Governments.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I apprehend that the Senator from Missouri is not only giving the Senate his views, but is giving to the country at large his opinion with reference to the comparative wages in the United States and in Canada. I want to believe that he desires to be candid, and I want to believe that he means to have the public understand that he has compared like with like. If he takes the wages paid in the Klondike and compares them with the wages of South Carolina, under conditions so vastly different, he may reach conclusions that can be explained away.

Mr. STONE. But I have done nothing of that kind, nor have I had the remotest thought of doing so.

Mr. PAGE. But the general proposition that wages are higher in Canada than they are here is something that is so foreign to those who have lived near the border and who understand those conditions from personal contact that I did not feel I ought to allow the Senator to make the statement without question.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. If my friend from Vermont will pardon me for saying so, it seems to me that he follows closely the Yankee fashion of answering a question by asking one. I put a direct question to him which he evades by a counterquestion. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator from Missouri a question for information. I am greatly interested in this discussion. I ask the Senator whether in making this average it does not make a very great difference that the colored labor of the South is very much cheaper than the labor in any other part of the country?

Mr. STONE. I think that should be and will be taken into consideration; and yet the colored laborers of the South are chiefly engaged in farm work, and they constitute a part of the great army of men who work on the farm. Of necessity they are included in any average of wages made for the United States; but undoubtedly the wage paid the colored laborers in the Southern States is below the average paid to white laborers in the Northern States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but inasmuch as the laborer is paid so much less per month or per day than is paid in the North, especially in the States along the border, States this reciprocity agreement is going to very seriously affect, it is proper that we should keep that in view.

Mr. STONE. I will say to the Senator that the tables I shall print contain complete data which any intelligent man can use to make any comparison he may desire between different States or between different States and Provinces. I will furnish the material for any kind of comparison any man wants to make, and from that he can draw such conclusions as will best appeal to his own judgment or afford him the greatest comfort.

Mr. GALLINGER. I venture to make the assertion, and I will endeavor to substantiate it before this debate closes, that taking the rate of wages paid in agricultural pursuits, starting in New York State and going to Eastport, Me., we pay from 20 to 25 per cent more than is paid across the line in Canada. I make that statement without any qualification whatever.

Mr. STONE. Very well, we will wait to discuss that promise until the Senator makes his showing.

Mr. President, I have now concluded what I have to say on the subject of labor for a short while. I will now direct my attention, and, so far as I can, the attention of the Senate to the comparative prices or values of live stock in the States and the Provinces.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator from Missouri passes to this new subject I want to be clear about one thing, because the statement made by the Senator from Missouri is a startling one, and if it be a just criticism of the Tariff Board it is one that well deserves examination.

May I say here, in answer to the very kind reference made to me in my relation to the Tariff Board, I beg the Senator from Missouri will remember that I have never been an advocate of the present system—that is, the present Tariff Board or a board of experts. I have been doing what little I can for the establishment of a permanent as well as a nonpartisan and independent tariff board, with a continuous existence and with the necessary power to ascertain the truth in respect to these things. I do not in saying that disparage the work of the present board at all, but I want it to be fully understood that the existing system is not one to my liking, and it is one I intend to use what little influence I have to change just as soon as I can. I tried it at the last session, but I found the Senator from Missouri a great obstacle in the way of bringing about the change that we so much desired. I hope the Senator from Missouri will follow me in this reference. The Senator has stated that in Table 2 of the message of the President of the United States, transmitting this information in response to a resolution which I had the honor to offer, on page 85, in determining the monthly wage of workers in the United States or in certain States of the United States and in certain Provinces of Canada the board in dealing with the Canadian wage has deducted the price of board. I marvel at this, because the table begins with this statement:

Average wages of agricultural labor, with board, in specified States, eastern Canada, and British Columbia, 1909.

Now, if the Tariff Board has deducted the cost of living from the wages of the Canadian workingman, then the statement contained in the beginning of the table is an error, because it declares that these are the average wages of labor with board. It will be observed that with reference to the Canadian table a reference is made to the Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly, January, 1911, page 2. I have not that publication at my hand.

Mr. STONE. I have it here.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I ask the Senator from Missouri, and it is entirely for information and not in the way of contradicting what he has said, if the pamphlet to which reference is made shows that the average wages in Prince Edward Island are twenty-five dollars and some cents per month with board?

Mr. STONE. The Senator asks me if the pamphlet shows that fact. What pamphlet?

Mr. CUMMINS. I mean the pamphlet to which reference is here made. It is alleged or suggested here that these figures are taken from the Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly, January, 1911, page 2.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will hand the Senator from Iowa the table printed in the Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly, January, 1911, to which reference is made in the report of the Tariff Board.

Now, here is what I wish to call the attention of the Senator to. There is nothing that I have found in the report of the Tariff Board showing in so many words that the laborer's board was deducted from his wage, but here is what I do find in this table. The Senator can see by examining that the wage is given for both season and yearly hirings, and that the average value of board per month is given in the last column of the table.

Mr. WARREN. Will both Senators be kind enough, so far as they can, to state to us what table it is and the page, because we shall want to look it up hereafter, and do not now like to break in and ask questions?

Mr. STONE. The table which I handed the Senator from Iowa is printed in a publication issued by the Canadian department of agriculture, entitled "Census and Statistics Monthly." The table appears——

Mr. WARREN. What date?

Mr. STONE. I was going to say it appears in the issue of January, 1911.

Now I am going to ask my friend from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to hold that table in his hand while I read from a table I have prepared partly from it and partly from the report of the Tariff Board. Let us take Prince Edward Island for comparison on season hirings——

Mr. CUMMINS. I beg the Senator to remember that I only asked with regard to yearly hiring.

Mr. STONE. Then, we will take the yearly hiring. The monthly average wage for annual hirings in Prince Edward Island, as shown in the report of the Tariff Board, is $10.87, with board; while the monthly wage on annual hirings as shown in the Canadian publication, which the Senator holds in his hand, is $18.87.

Mr. CUMMINS. I beg pardon of the Senator. That does not appear in just that way. Here [indicating in the book] are the yearly hirings. The figures are given for the year.

Mr. STONE. They are; but the amount stated is $226.47 per year.

Mr. CUMMINS. For male labor.

Mr. STONE. Yes; and if the Senator will divide $226.47 by 12 he will find the monthly wage to be as I give it, $18.87.

Mr. CUMMINS. I take it for granted, however, that the average is intended to be the average for both male and female.

Mr. STONE. I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. It says "agricultural labor."

Mr. STONE. Well, I have been speaking of agricultural labor, and the figures used relate only to wages paid to males.

Mr. CUMMINS. And it will be remarked that under the same table here the price paid to female help, as against $226.47 for male help, is but $144.27.

Mr. STONE. I have not taken up female wages, for the reason that it has not been the subject of calculation in the reports as I have used them.

Mr. CUMMINS. It might be necessary, however, Mr. President.

Mr. STONE. We are talking about agricultural farm labor, and females are not reckoned as farm laborers, but domestics. But, aside from that, what I want to do is to show the Senator that whereas the Tariff Board fixes the monthly wage on annual hirings in Prince Edward Island at $10.87, the Canadian Government fixes it at $18.87. The laborer's board is valued at $8 per month in Prince Edward Island. Now, if you subtract $8 from $18.87, it leaves $10.87, the exact amount given by the Tariff Board as the wage, with board, paid in that Province.

In Nova Scotia the Tariff Board gives the monthly wage at $15.90, while the Canadian Government gives it at $29.90. I think there is a mistake in the figures given by the Tariff Board; I think they should be $19.90 instead of $15.90. Subtract $10, the value of the board, from $29.90 and you have $19.90 left.

Mr. SMOOT. The figures are $15.90. The Senator had them right in the first place.

Mr. STONE. But I think there is a typographical mistake.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator had the figures right in the first place.

Mr. STONE. Very well. Run down the list, taking New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and so on, and you will find that in each instance the Tariff Board deducted the value of the monthly board of the Canadian laborer from his total compensation including board, and gave the remainder as the wage received.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is very evident that a serious mistake has been made in the table presented by the Tariff Board, no matter upon what basis it may be considered, whether including all the males and all the females, or simply the males.

Mr. STONE. My friend can take the average for yearly hiring in Ontario——

Mr. SMOOT. That includes males and females.

Mr. STONE. No; I am taking males, and I have the figures both for season hiring and yearly hiring. Let me give the figures——

Mr. WARREN. Aside from the figures which the Senator from Missouri has quoted, in the Senator's personal knowledge does he believe that those figures are correct?

Mr. STONE. I have only a limited personal knowledge about the matter.

Mr. WARREN. They do not seem to conform to any knowledge that we have.

Mr. STONE. My statement is that if you will subtract the average board as given by the Canadian Government for Canadian workmen from the laborers' wage as given by the Canadian Government, the remainder will be the wage as given by the Tariff Board for Canadian farm labor.

Mr. WARREN. How much per month is the average board for agricultural laborers in yearly hiring?

Mr. STONE. It varies in different Provinces.

Mr. WARREN. We know the figures are absolutely incorrect as to the yearly price of labor and the price per month.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is not now dealing with the price of labor in this country, but he is dealing with the price of labor in Canada.

Mr. WARREN. The comparison is in my mind, and it is incorrect in both cases.

Mr. STONE. I will put it up to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] as I did to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE]. The figures as to this country are taken from the official report of our Department of Agriculture, indorsed by the Tariff Board. The Canadian figures are taken from the official report of the Canadian Department of Agriculture. The Senator may wave his hand arbitrarily and say that these figures are false; that the Tariff Board and the Secretary of Agriculture of this country and the minister of agriculture in Canada are ignorant and that they are giving statistics to the people of their respective countries which are absolutely unreliable. The Senator can take that position if he pleases.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, well, there are opportunities for misunderstandings; but facts which are in the minds of those who are observant, of course, can not be set aside upon the array of any man's figures until we have had at least the opportunity to compare them.

Mr. STONE. What are the average wages paid farm laborers in Wyoming?

Mr. WARREN. They run from $25 to $45 a month.

Mr. STONE. What will that make the average?

Mr. WARREN. Of course, they have board besides.

Mr. STONE. That makes what average?

Mr. WARREN. An average of $35 a month.

Mr. STONE. I do not, of course, know the extent of the Senator's knowledge or the extent of his inquiry into the subject, but I accept his assurance. Now this table I hold, printed in the Crop Reporter, was made by the Department of Agriculture and, the officials say, was compiled after diligent inquiry, and on that showing I hold that prima facie it is entitled to credence. Let us test its accuracy in Wyoming. In this table the Department of Agriculture gives the average monthly wage in Wyoming for 1910 at $35, being exactly what the Senator from Wyoming says the average monthly wage is in his State.

Mr. JONES. With board?

Mr. STONE. With board—just as the Senator from Wyoming says.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. JONES. I merely asked whether the figures given by the Senator from Missouri included board. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to say that his figures did not include board.

Mr. WARREN. Farm laborers in Wyoming get $35, with board.

Mr. STONE. I understood the Senator in the first instance.

Mr. WARREN. Net. Of course the farm laborer has his board.

Mr. STONE. So I understood the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri asked me what my information was. I dislike to inject my personality into the debate, but I will say that I have paid wages to not less than a hundred men and from that to several hundred men a month for a great many years, engaged in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. STONE. In herding or in farming?

Mr. WARREN. In both.

Mr. STONE. How much is paid to those engaged in farming?

Mr. WARREN. The wages do not vary much in farming and herding. Since the Senator has been good enough to ask me regarding my State, I wish the Senator would tell us from his personal experience what farm laborers get in his State.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator from Wyoming refer to farm hands?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; I should be glad to know what wages they receive.

Mr. STONE. They get much less than in Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. I should like to know from the Senator's own knowledge and then consult the figures and ascertain if they come out as well as they do for Wyoming.

Mr. STONE. I am not so ready to speak from personal knowledge as are the Senators from Wyoming and Vermont. My own knowledge is somewhat limited, and I could not speak from that standpoint with confidence, but the figures as given by the Agricultural Department put the Missouri average much below that of Wyoming and the other new and rapidly growing States of the Northwest. The wages, with board on annual hirings in Missouri, are put down in the table prepared by the Agricultural Department, and from which I have read to the Senator, at $21.50 per month. The Tariff Board places the Missouri wage somewhat below that sum.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Observing the difference in wages in Missouri, a central State, and in Wyoming, near the northern line, does not the Senator think that the wages in the States bordering along Canada should be considered as apart, perhaps, from those in the extreme southernmost State when comparing them with Canadian wages and trying to ascertain what might be the effect of this reciprocity measure which the Senator is indorsing?

Mr. STONE. If it had been convenient and agreeable to my friend to have been present during the remarks I have made to the Senate and heard all that I said, he would know that I did

compare the border States with the border Provinces, and then I took up and compared the two countries as a whole. We were upon this latter phase of the subject when the Senator came in and had his attention called to the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. In examining both reports I can not arrive at any other conclusion than that which the Senator from Missouri has reached, that the Tariff Board has made a mistake in relation to the Provinces of Canada by deducting from the statement of wages the amount of board, as referred to in the Canadian Census and Statistics Monthly of January, 1911, page 2. There is no doubt in my mind but what the mistake has occurred in this report just as the Senator from Missouri has indicated. I can not conceive how the board made the mistake, but they evidently have done so in this particular report.

Mr. STONE. So it looked to me. It may be that the mistake is only apparent and can be explained. It is not my purpose to criticize the Tariff Board unduly or unjustly. I merely desire to call attention to what appears to be a mistake. Possibly it can be explained to our satisfaction. So far as my argument goes, it is in no wise materially affected even if the board has committed no error. If no error has been committed, and if the figures given by the Tariff Board are correct, it still remains that according to the statistics of both Governments the wages in Canada, taken as a whole, are somewhat higher than in the United States. The only effect of the mistake I have indicated, if a mistake has been made as seems to be the case, is to increase the margin of difference in favor of Canada above that shown by the figures of the Tariff Board.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Inasmuch as I asked the question which precipitated this examination, I desire to say that the conclusion of the Senator from Missouri seems to me to be true. There must be a mistake in the table as reported by the Tariff Board.

Mr. STONE. The mistake consists in the fact that the Tariff Board ought not to have deducted the laborer's board in the Provinces without deducting it in the States.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know whether it was deducted in the States or not.

Mr. STONE. I do not find anything to indicate that it was.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no information upon that point, but the Tariff Board refers to the pamphlet that I hold in my hand, furnished me by the Senator from Missouri, as the source of its information. Consulting that source, it is manifest that the board has deducted the cost of living in the Canadian Provinces, and therefore that the statement at the beginning of the table is incorrect, because it does not represent Canadian wages with board.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. There is nothing except the heading of the table in the report in relation to the wages of American farmers to suggest that the cost of board has not also been deducted in that instance. Therefore we can not say whether the Tariff Board has deducted that item or not; but, even with the board added to the wages paid to the farm laborer in Canada, there is but very little difference between the wage paid in Canada and the wage paid in the United States, according to this table.

LIVE STOCK.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will leave the wage question at this point and proceed to discuss the comparative values of live stock as between the United States and Canada. Preliminary to that, I will read a part of a resolution or address recently adopted at a mass meeting held at Sikeston, Mo., on April 22, by citizens of my State who are interested in agricultural pursuits. This meeting was held to protest against this reciprocity agreement. I read from the address, as follows:

We are painfully aware of the fact that owing to such favorable conditions—

The alleged favorable conditions having been previously recited in the address—

Owing to such favorable conditions Canada has in the past been able to pay the duty *and make large shipments of cattle* and wheat to this country, and we can not but believe were the tariff barriers withdrawn the effect would be ruinous to many of our agricultural sections.

I shall not take up the subject of wheat at this time. I have already indicated my purpose to do that later on. I shall confine myself to live stock now—one thing at a time. And here I wish also to read part of a letter that I received recently from a friend of mine residing in Texas—a large cattle raiser and shipper. I think he was at one time president of a live-stock association in the Southwest, and I know he was until recently the president of the Western or Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress. I refer to Col. Ike T. Pryor. He has written me a letter protesting against the proposed reciprocity agreement, in which he says:

The stockman and farmer can not compete with Mexico or Canada (more especially Mexico) in producing live stock on competitive markets. In the first place, the labor in Mexico is very cheap, while in the United States it is high. In the second place, land on which live stock is produced in Mexico is very cheap, while in the United States it is reasonably high, both of which facts would give Mexican and Canadian producers a decided advantage over our home producers. I hope I am not overly selfish in holding these views, and I need not tell you should live stock be placed on the free list it would result in my going out of the cattle business in the United States and taking up the same occupation in Mexico; and I believe in this I voice the sentiments of a great many thousands of live-stock producers in the United States.

Mr. President, I will dispose of that part of this letter referring to Mexico by saying, that there is no proposition anywhere pending to put Mexican cattle on the free list—certainly not in this reciprocity agreement, for that relates to Canada only—and there is no proposition pending or expected, so far as I know, to put the live stock of Mexico on the free list. Hence there is no need to consume time in discussing that. But my friend, Col. Pryor, seems to think that if Canadian cattle are put on the free list he will have to go out of the cattle business, or go into Mexico if he would continue in it. Like the Missouri farmers who met at Sikeston, Col. Pryor fears Canadian cattle duty free, to say nothing of Mexican cattle, would drive him out of the cattle business.

I want to show Col. Pryor and these friends of mine at Sikeston, and all others who suffer from this apprehension, that they are mistaken so far as cattle and other live stock are concerned. I want to show them that they have been imposed upon and that there is no danger of an overflow of cheap Canadian cattle into the United States. Now, as to the facts: First, let use see about dairy cattle. Turning to the Tariff Board report, at page 109, here is what I find about dairy cattle. I will read it:

Prices of dairy cows range from $33 to $39 a head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is practically the same. In the western border States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50. In eastern Canada prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48, and in western Canada from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. STONE. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Is the Senator reading from the report of the Tariff Board?

Mr. STONE. It is the report of the Tariff Board sent by the President to the Senate in response to a resolution offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. HEYBURN. And it gives the price of cows in Idaho?

Mr. STONE. Dairy cows.

Mr. HEYBURN. Dairy cows, and gives the price at from $35 to $45 per head?

Mr. STONE. Let me see. It says:

In the western border States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50.

Mr. HEYBURN. They readily command, I think I might safely say, double that.

Mr. CUMMINS (to Mr. STONE). On page 110 you will find Idaho specified.

Mr. STONE. I will turn over to that page.

Mr. GALLINGER. What page is that?

Mr. STONE. Page 110. On that page is a table giving prices in various States and Provinces. The average in Idaho for dairy cows is fixed in this table at $41.40.

Mr. HEYBURN. Forty-one dollars?

Mr. STONE. That is the average.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is above the other average——

Mr. STONE. No.

Mr. HEYBURN. But it is very much below the fact.

Mr. STONE. It is not above the average of the values given in what I first read. That covered three States—Montana, Idaho, and Washington—and gave a range of values for the three States of $41.80 to $46.50.

Mr. HEYBURN. In my State a cow that is considered worth keeping and feeding will bring $75 and upward.

Mr. STONE. The Senator can settle that with the Tariff Board—his Tariff Board. The Tariff Board claims to have investigated the facts and to speak with definite information. I will not stop to exchange offhand opinions with the Senator.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me, of course that means that that is the general average on the general range of cattle. It does not mean that there may not be here and there, in connection with private residence, a cow running up to $70. At the same time there are a great many on the range that run down to $20.

Mr. HEYBURN. Dairy cows are not kept on what we call the range. They are kept within an area where they can be found at least twice a day, and they are fed and taken care of, as they should be in any country. The price of dairy cows that are considered worth keeping is above $75. The accidental scrub cows, of course, have a price according to the individual cow.

Mr. STONE. I am speaking not of scrub cows, but of dairy cows. I do not know whether the cows described in the report are Jerseys, Holsteins, or what, but they are dairy cows.

Mr. HEYBURN. The price will run up above $100 when you get into that class of cattle.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. The average dairy cow is a grade cow and worth less than half as much as the Senator from Idaho estimates. Of course the registered Jersey cows are worth more, and, taking the highest as well as the lowest prices of them, would perhaps average $100. But the average dairy cow of the country will not command one-half that much. They certainly will not equal $50 per head.

Mr. HEYBURN. The effort has been for years to raise the standard of our cattle, both beef cattle and dairy cows, and it has resulted in the establishment of some of the best cattle-breeding farms in the United States, and it has resulted in raising the grade even of the ordinary dairy cow so far above what it was a few years ago that unless you have kept pace with the advancement in the betterment of the grade of dairy cattle you are apt to be mistaken in an estimate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to say just a word? As a farmer all my life, I can assert that throughout New Jersey and the most of New York it is a rarity to find a milch cow in the dairy districts that will command over $50. There are instances, as the Senator states, where dairy cows will run from a hundred to one hundred and fifty dollars, and I have neighbors who have paid as high as $2,500 for a cow. But the average cow throughout the dairy districts of New York State, up in great Orange County, the dairying county of New York State, and through Sussex County, will not average over from forty-five to fifty dollars.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I simply desire to state that in the dairy districts of the State of Washington a cow at less than $50 is a rarity.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can find you hundreds of them for $40 throughout Sussex.

Mr. JONES. I am speaking simply of the State of Washington. I know nothing at all about New Jersey or New York.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Washington might buy cows in New Jersey and sell them in Washington at a good profit.

Mr. JONES. Not very well, with the expense of sending them out there. It is too far.

Mr. HEYBURN. Just a word. It does seem to be conceded that the dairies of the East are composed at least in part of mixed breeds of cattle. Among men who engage in dairying for profit in the West they do not keep mixed cattle to any extent.

Mr. STONE. It certainly will not be contended seriously by the Senator from Idaho that in his State, or in any State, dairies kept and run as a business for milk and butter are made up of thoroughbred cows?

Mr. HEYBURN. To a very large extent, and more so every year.

Mr. STONE. My observation has been and my belief is that dairy herds are made up for the most part of mixed blood or grade cattle. The thoroughbreds are used chiefly for improving the grade cows. Thoroughbred bulls are often sold at high prices, and cows, too, for breeding purposes.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator from Missouri should consider that in a new country, where we are stocking up for the first time, we are not apt to have any carried-over stock, as it were, while in an older country they have a remnant of a condition that is not the same as that which prevails in a new country. We have very little of what you would call the old breed of cattle. Whatever we have is new and the best.

Mr. STONE. There is at Columbia, Mo., a thoroughbred dairy cow called Missouri Chief Josephine, now about 8 years old, belonging to the State agricultural farm, valued at $20,000. One of her calves sold for $3,000. But that cow is of course a rare exception. Such cows are produced only in Missouri.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have a herd in New Hampshire that will compare favorably even with that famous Missouri cow. But that was not what I rose to inquire about. This is an interesting phase of this discussion. As I understand from this table which the Senator has quoted, the average value of dairy cows in the United States is $35.79?

Mr. STONE. No; not in the United States; in 17 States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, in 17 States—the dairy States?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. They comprise the dairy States. Thirty-five dollars and seventy-nine cents and in Canada $43?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have never believed we would get much for the United States out of this reciprocity agreement. People have talked about its being a great boon to us to get into the Canadian market for cattle, and yet it seems that that is a delusion and a snare. According to the Senator's argument, we are not going to get any benefit from that, and the claim that reduced cost of living will result is a myth.

Mr. STONE. I think we would get benefits from reciprocal trade in Canada. But I will not now be diverted into an argument about benefits, which would lead me entirely away from what I am discussing and thus confuse when I am seeking to instruct. Later on we will discuss the question of benefits. One thing at a time.

Mr. BAILEY. With the permission of the Senator from Missouri, I have here the Statistical Abstract, which gives, on page 148, the number and value of specified farm animals. The number of milch cows in this country in 1910 is given as 21,801,000, and the value of those milch cows as $780,308,000, making an average value of less than $40 per head in the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. The average.

Mr. STONE. As the Senator from New Hampshire has already called attention to the average price of dairy cows in 17 States and in the Provinces of Canada, showing the average in the States to be $35.79 and in the Provinces $43, perhaps I had better read into the RECORD the names of the States from which this average is made. They are Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me for a moment, although I hardly will get credit for it, I have had some little experience in this business. The trouble with the Senator from Idaho is that he estimates the value of a cow when she is at her best, giving milk, whereas the average of the same herd of cattle is based upon the value of the cow when it is not in that condition of productivity, if I may use such a term, and when it is giving no milk at all. Therefore the two things are very different. A cow is productive, practically, for only one-half the time; of course she gives milk largely more than half the time, but the average value is not the value at her best. A cow in full milk is worth fully 50 per cent more than when she is not giving milk. So the average must be taken that way.

Mr. HEYBURN. A cow is averaged up for a year, and she sells on her yearly average. It is not a dairy cow after it ceases to be productive.

Mr. BACON. Oh, yes; they are all dairy cattle.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is converted into meat or whatever it can be converted into.

Mr. BACON. Certainly that is what is meant when they take the average of dairy cattle. They mean dairy herds. They do not mean simply the cattle at their best in giving milk.

Mr. HEYBURN. A cow that has a record or can make one is worth as much at one time of the year as another.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President and Senators, with your permission, I will now proceed. I have given the average for the 17 States and for the Provinces. I wish now to make some particular comparisons. In the eastern border States, from Maine to New York, prices for dairy cows range from $33 to $39 per head; in the Middle States, from Michigan to North Dakota, inclusive, dairy cows likewise range from $33 to $39 per head; in Montana, Idaho, and Washington the range of prices rises from $41.80 to $46.50. In the eastern Provinces of Canada the value of dairy cows ranges from $32 to $48, as against $33 to $39 for the Eastern States. In western Canada the value runs from $39 to $41, as against $33 to $39 in the Middle States and $41.80 to $46.50 in Montana, Idaho, and Washington.

Mr. President, I wish especially to commend these figures to Dairyman Gardner, the master of the Massachusetts State Grange. He is engaged in the dairy business, and when before the Finance Committee last February he seemed to be suffering acutely from an oppressive fear that if this reciprocity agreement should be consented to by Congress the prices of his dairy stock might be disastrously affected.

Having said this much about dairy cattle, I will now speak of other cattle. I will begin by reading an excerpt from page 110 of the Tariff Board's report:

Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of prices is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.

Does no one rise to dispute that?

Next I will call attention to some figures given at page 130 of the Tariff Board report, which furnish a comparison of prices—specific prices—in certain cities. The first comparison to which I call attention is between Buffalo, N. Y., and Toronto, Canada. According to the table of prices given by the Tariff Board the producer's price for beef steers and heifers ranges from $4 to $6.20 per hundred pounds at Buffalo, while at Toronto the price runs from $4 to $5.65. These figures are for January, 1911.

Next, take stockers and feeders. At Buffalo the price for this class of cattle ranges from $3.30 to $4.75; at Toronto, $3.75 to $5. This table covers other descriptions of cattle, but instead of reading all of it I will insert it.

Now, let us compare Detroit, Mich., with Windsor, Ontario. Beef steers and heifers range in market price at Detroit from $3.65 to $5.30 per hundred pounds, and at Windsor from $3.95 to $5.60 per hundred pounds. Stockers and feeders range at Detroit from $2.45 to $4.15 and at Windsor from $3.70 to $4.90 per hundred pounds.

There is also in these tables a comparison of wholesale prices as well as the prices of producers, and relatively they run about the same. There are other tables and other comparisons, but what I have given should suffice. However, Mr. President, I will ask leave to insert in my remarks the two tables on page 130 of the Tariff Board's report to which I have alluded. They can be studied with profit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted as requested.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Comparative prices of agricultural products, January, 1911.

LIVE STOCK AND MEATS.

[Prices quoted January, 1911.]

Commodity.	Price.	Buffalo, N. Y., and Toronto, Canada.			
		Producer's price.		Wholesale price.	
		Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
		Per 100 lbs.	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*
Beef steers and heifers	A.	$6.20	$4.00	$6.75	$5.25
	C.	5.65	4.00	6.25	4.50
Beef cows	A.	4.80	3.55	5.35	4.00
	C.	4.75	2.60	5.25	3.00
Stockers and feeders	A.	4.75	3.30	5.25	3.75
	C.	5.00	3.75	5.50	4.25
Calves	A.	6.55	5.35	7.25	6.00
	C.	7.80	2.50	8.50	3.00
		Per head.	*Per head.*	*Per head.*	*Per head.*
Milkers and springers	A.	$61.00	$18.00	$70.00	$20.00
	C.	71.00	26.00	80.00	30.00
		Per 100 lbs.	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*
Lambs	A.	$5.90	$4.15	$6.50	$4.75
	C.	6.70	5.20	6.25	5.75
Sheep	A.	4.60	2.25	4.50	2.70
	C.	4.15	2.55	4.65	3.00
Hogs	A.	7.75	5.40	8.50	6.00
	C.	9.30	6.50	10.00	7.15

Commodity.	Price.	Detroit, Mich., and Windsor, Ontario.			
		Producer's price.		Commission price.	
		Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
		Per 100 lbs.	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*
Beef steers and heifers	A.	$5.30	$3.65	$6.00	$4.25
	C.	5.60	3.95	6.25	4.50
Beef cows	A.	4.00	3.00	4.50	3.50
	C.	4.65	2.50	5.25	3.00
Stockers and feeders	A.	4.15	2.45	4.75	3.00
	C.	4.90	3.70	5.50	4.25
Calves	A.	8.75	3.40	9.50	4.00
	C.	7.25	2.50	8.00	3.00
		Per head.	*Per head.*	*Per head.*	*Per head.*
Milkers and springers	A.	$47.00	$20.00	$55.00	$25.00
	C.	70.00	25.00	80.00	30.00
		Per 100 lbs.	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*	*Per 100 lbs.*
Lambs	A.	$5.60	$3.90	$6.25	$4.50
	C.	5.65	5.15	6.25	5.75
Sheep	A.	4.70	2.00	4.25	2.50
	C.	4.15	2.55	4.65	3.00
Hogs	A.	8.40	5.50	9.15	6.25
	C.	9.20	6.50	10.00	7.15

(In this table A. stands for United States and C. for Canada.)

Mr. STONE. Now, I wish to call attention to what I consider a rather important fact. During the five years, from 1906 to 1911, the value of all cattle, dutiable and free, imported from Canada into the United States was $1,193,796, while the value of the dutiable cattle exported during that period from the United States to Canada was $1,578,179, showing an excess of exports over imports of $384,383.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri a question at this point, because I do not think that any conclusions can be drawn from the statement that he has just made without either explanation or an addition to it.

Mr. STONE. I am going to make one explanation——

Mr. CUMMINS. Namely, what are the duties——

Mr. STONE. I am just going to refer to that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well; then I will withhold my question.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Iowa anticipated me just a moment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. STONE. The Canadian and American tariff duties on cattle are not materially different. The duties levied in the respective countries are as follows:

Canada, duty on all cattle, 25 per cent ad valorem.

United States, duty on cattle under 1 year old, $2 each.

Duty on cattle over 1 year old and worth not over $14 per head, $3.75 each.

Duty on cattle worth $14 or over, 27½ per cent ad valorem.

On imported cattle which come in under a specific rate it is necessary to ascertain their value in order to estimate the equivalent ad valorem. Accordingly I requested Mr. Charles M. Pepper, the head of the Bureau of Trade Relations, to reduce specific duties to ad valorem duties and inform me what was the ad valorem duty paid on all Canadian cattle imported into the United States for the last fiscal year ending June 30, 1910. I assumed that the imports of that year would represent a fair average of the imports for a series of years. Responding to my request Mr. Pepper wrote me as follows:

United States dutiable imports for consumption of cattle from Canada during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, consisted of 5,168 head, valued at $109,772, a per capita value of $21.24. Reference to Canadian export statistics shows that approximately three-fourths of these were over 1 year old and were therefore dutiable at 27½ per cent ad valorem, only 2½ per cent higher than the Canadian rate of 25 per cent against American cattle. The remaining one-fourth were dutiable at but $2 each, an average ad valorem of only 21 per cent. In the face of identical duties, Mexico during the same period sold to the United States $2,594,706 worth of cattle, the majority of which were taxed at 27½ per cent. This shows that if Canada had wished to sell her cattle in the United States she could have found a good market in spite of the duty.

So, Mr. President, it appears that of the cattle imported from Canada last year three-fourths paid a duty of 27½ per cent and one-fourth a duty of 21 per cent ad valorem as against 25 per cent paid on our exports to Canada. It will be observed that the average ad valorem rate paid on cattle going from the States to the Dominion and coming from the Dominion into the States was almost identical.

And now, Mr. President, I desire to introduce a distinguished Canadian witness. I will take the liberty of reading a brief

extract from an address delivered in the Canadian House of Commons on March 7, 1911, by the Hon. Mr. Currie, a member of that body. I have been reading with keen interest the debate in the House of Commons, and I find that there are many members of that body as intensely opposed to this reciprocity agreement as any Senator on this floor. Mr. Currie is one of them. I read as follows from his speech:

We hear a great deal about the cattle trade in Ontario. The honorable member from South Wellington [Mr. Guthrie] told the House, with a great deal of chest benting—

They are almost as complimentary over there as we are on this side of the line—

That he would warrant that the statistics of the Mail were very reliable, and that if one opened the Mail he would find that at any time in the last 10 years the price of beef cattle was higher in Chicago than in Toronto.

That seemed strange to me, because when I was a young newspaper man I used to write the market reports for the Mail, and I know a little about the business.

Thereupon Mr. Currie, like the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Wyoming, proceeded to testify and give his personal experience. Proceeding, he says:

However, I went to the library and I hunted up the files of the Mail, and I took the prices at haphazard for each two weeks during those several years; and I have prepared a table and that table shows, among other things, that when a professional man talks to an intelligent audience like this he ought to speak the truth, because I never heard in all my life so many absolutely improbable and untruthful—if that is a parliamentary expression—statements made with regard to any question as have been made about this treaty. To get these prices I took the steer weighing about 1,100 pounds, which would average about 70 per cent of the cattle. Of course, there may be a high-priced bunch that would fetch a dollar a hundredweight more than the ordinary animals for Christmas beef or something like that, but I took the prices for the standard animal in Toronto and Chicago from the files of the Mail and Empire from 1901 to 1910, and this is the result:

	Toronto.	Chicago.
May 4, 1901	$4.25	$3.95
May 14, 1902	5.25	5.00
May 13, 1903	4.90	4.06
May 12, 1904	5.20	4.90
May 9, 1905	5.70	5.50
May 10, 1906	5.10	4.00
May 17, 1907	5.12½	4.00
May 15, 1908	5.50	5.00
May 25, 1909	5.75	5.10
May 13, 1910	7.00	6.25

It seems as if Sir Wilfrid Laurier is having his troubles, too. Over there, as over here, there are powerful influences operating to defeat this trade agreement, and they use much the same kind of arguments against it that we hear in the American Congress, only they say if the agreement is ratified and carried into effect, it will ruin Canada, while on this side we are told it will ruin the United States. It must be a fearful pact, indeed, that the President and Sir Wilfrid have concluded if it would be ruinous to both countries.

Mr. President, this concludes what I have to say about cattle. Just a word now about sheep. I want, if I can, to allay the apprehension of my friend from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the watchful guardian and champion of wool growers and sheep herders, that the sheep industry is in danger of destruction from this agreement. Let me read some statistics about sheep. Possibly the Senator from Wyoming is all cocked and primed to show that these statistics are unreliable; but they, too, are statistics furnished by his Tariff Board.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I assume the Senator is approaching the figures with a good deal of apprehension himself that they are incorrect.

Mr. STONE. No; I am not. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the data furnished by the board, and, having no information to the contrary, I must accept what they say as correct. On page 110 of the Tariff Board report I read as follows:

Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada, due to the fact that Ontario specializes on pedigreed flocks, as appears later on. In the United States they range from $2.90 per head in Texas to $5.30 in Illinois and Iowa, while in Canada the range is from $4 in Nova Scotia to $7 in Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

With these higher prices prevailing in Canada as compared with the prices given for the States, it would not seem that there is any imminent danger of the sheep herders of Wyoming or any other State being overwhelmed by an undue influx of Canadian sheep into the United States.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will indulge me a moment I will then yield.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. I have already obtained leave to insert some tables showing the comparative prices of sheep in different leading markets in both countries. I will ask Senators to examine those tables, and thus relieve me of further referring to them at this time. I am getting weary from this protracted speech, and I fear the Senate is also.

I yield now to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Since the Senator has so broadly referred to me, I am tempted to make an observation or two.

I notice that when he quoted the price of beef in Chicago and in Toronto he quoted various days in different months. If one wants to make an absolutely correct statement, he ought to take the price every day during the month in one market and the price every day in the other, and compare the averages, or if he wants to abbreviate it, he ought to have the market price taken on the same day of the month in each month quoted. I observe that the prices quoted are on the 26th day of the month in one case and the 13th day in another, and so forth. Prices go up and down in the various markets. Sometimes they are lower in one and higher in the other. I notice that difference often between the Chicago and Omaha markets.

Mr. STONE. I will ask the Senator to be a little more definite so that I may better understand him. I do not know just what the Senator means.

Mr. WARREN. I was alluding to the quotation which the Senator made from figures given at two places in comparison. I will not charge the Senator with any unfairness.

Mr. STONE. I read what a member of the Canadian Parliament said.

Mr. WARREN. That is very true.

Mr. STONE. Giving the figures for a series of years.

Mr. WARREN. That is true.

Mr. STONE. For the same day in each town.

Mr. WARREN. The same day in each town, but the Senator did not take the same day of the month.

Mr. STONE. Let us settle that fact. Take May 4, 1901. The price is given in Toronto and Chicago for that day.

Mr. WARREN. I observe that.

Mr. STONE. Take May 13, 1910, the same thing is done; and so with the others.

Mr. WARREN. But why did not the Senator take May 3 or May 4 in every year? It shows to me the effect of juggling figures not in a way, I will say, that is not prevalent with a man who likes to make his case. You may take the market of Chicago on the 13th day of the month in comparison with Omaha and take the 26th day of another month, and it is perfectly easy to prove from such figures that one market is higher than the other.

Mr. STONE. But in the table quoted the same day of the month is taken for each year.

Mr. WARREN. No; but you are comparing them.

Mr. STONE. The comparison is made for the same day in each year.

Mr. WARREN. I understand. Now, then, a comparison of the price of sheep between the United States and Canada proves nothing. In the first place, if they are that much higher in Canada I do not know any reason why we should remove the tariff; I do not see any benefits that we would get from it. But, on the other hand, sheep in Canada are grown largely for the sale of thoroughbreds for breeding purposes, and of course they average higher. They have not the large flocks of plain mutton sheep and plain wool sheep that there are in the United States. I do not see that it cuts any figure whatever as to the tariff whether the prices there are higher or lower.

Mr. STONE. But it has been contended that this agreement would injure the American sheep raiser by letting in the cheaper sheep of Canada. I have endeavored to show that that assumption is not well founded. To show that is the full scope of my present purpose, and the Senator from Wyoming now says that it cuts no figure, so far as the tariff is concerned, whether prices in Canada are higher or lower than in the States. I think I can afford to dismiss the sheep question at this point.

As to swine, I will just put in a little bit in passing. There is not enough exchange of swine between the two countries to make this subject worth discussing.

Mr. GORE. Put in a few shoats.

Mr. STONE. There are not hogs enough going and coming, even with the shoats, to make the subject interesting.

On page 110 of the Tariff Board's report I find what I read:

Prices of swine are slightly higher in Canada than in the United States. In our eastern border States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York—they range from $10 to $11.50 a head; and in the central border States the range is about the same. In the western border States the range of prices is from $10.40 to $11.10. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, prices of swine vary little from those already quoted. In eastern Canada the range of swine prices is from $10 to $13, and in western Canada from $12 to $13. The highest American price is $11.80 a head in Wisconsin, as against the highest Canadian price of $13 a head, which is quoted for Quebec, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

In addition to that I will ask Senators to examine the comparative prices of swine in leading markets of the two countries, as shown in the Tariff Board tables I have obtained leave to insert in my remarks.

Now, a word or two about horses and I am done. On page 109 of the Tariff Board report I read:

Prices of horses range from $106 to $125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho, and Washington from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices of horses range from $107 to $139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from $107 to $156. In the great agricultural States of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa prices range from $120 to $124. In all the Canadian Provinces except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia the prices are higher than in any of our States.

I wish to call attention to the average price of horses in 17 States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. The average price in these States is $108.19. The average price in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia is $133.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is that last year?

Mr. STONE. It is for 1909.

Mr. President, the table I hold here, found at page 110 of the Tariff Board report, shows the comparative prices of cattle, sheep, and swine, as well as horses, as between certain States and Provinces, and I ask leave to insert it in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request is granted.

The table is as follows:

Number and average value per head of live stock on farms, by classes, in specified States and Canada.

	Horses.	Dairy cows.	Other cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
Number of live stock on farms (in 1909):					
United States [1]	21,040,000	21,801,000	47,279,000	57,216,000	47,782,000
Canada [2]	2,132,489	2,849,306	4,384,779	2,705,390	2,912,503
Average value per head (in 1910):					
United States [1]—					
Maine	$125.00	$33.00	$16.90	$3.70	$11.50
New Hampshire	106.00	36.20	20.30	3.70	11.50
Vermont	106.00	34.20	14.40	4.00	10.00
New York	125.00	39.50	18.20	5.00	11.50
Indiana	122.00	41.00	24.50	5.20	10.00
Illinois	124.00	42.80	26.40	5.30	10.90
Michigan	126.00	39.50	18.50	4.70	10.50
Wisconsin	121.00	36.60	16.40	4.50	11.80
Minnesota	111.00	33.00	14.30	4.00	11.50
Iowa	120.00	36.00	22.20	5.30	11.30
North Dakota	114.00	33.90	20.50	4.00	11.00
South Dakota	105.00	33.00	21.50	4.00	11.10
Texas	73.00	29.50	15.30	2.90	6.60
Montana	80.00	46.50	27.40	4.20	10.10
Idaho	102.00	41.40	21.40	4.70	8.70
Washington	108.00	41.80	19.90	3.90	9.40
Oregon	103.00	39.60	18.50	3.70	8.20
Average	108.19	35.70	19.41	4.08	9.14
Canada [2]—					
Prince Edward Island	107.00	32.00	23.00	6.00	10.00
Nova Scotia	113.00	37.00	29.00	4.00	11.00
New Brunswick	131.00	34.00	28.00	5.00	12.00
Quebec	139.00	31.00	31.00	6.00	13.00
Ontario	133.00	48.00	34.00	7.00	10.00
Manitoba	107.00	40.00	23.00	7.00	13.00
Saskatchewan	156.00	41.00	31.00	7.00	13.00
Alberta	126.00	39.00	30.00	6.00	12.00
British Columbia					
Average	133.00	43.00	31.00	6.00	11.00

[1] Crop Reporter, United States, February, 1911.
[2] Census and Statistics Monthly, Canada, January, 1911.

Mr. STONE. Mr President, I am through with what I have to say relating to live stock; and having shown from these official figures the comparative prices of live stock as between the United States and Canada I want to ask the Republican committee of Chariton County, and also my Republican and Democratic friends who assembled in mass meeting at Sikeston, Mo., to protest against reciprocity, what the producer of cattle, sheep, or swine, or the horse breeder has to fear from Canadian competition?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator, who has promised us two more speeches on this subject, if he is going to take up agricultural products?

Mr. STONE. I have so stated.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I will venture the observation that inasmuch as the Senator has proved, not to my entire satisfaction but from so-called statistics that labor is higher in Canada, that cattle are higher, swine higher, sheep higher, and horses higher, I utterly fail to see what benefit is going to come to the American people from that phase of this reciprocal agreement? As an illustration, we are promised a lower cost of living; it is going to lessen to the American consumer, about whom we have heard so much, the price of living. Manifestly it is not going to do so in the matter of meats. For that reason, I inquired of the Senator if he is going to take up agricultural products, because possibly he may prove to us that there is some advantage to the American consumer along that line. I do not know whether he will or not, but the Senator has absolutely refuted, in the statistics he has given us to-day, the claim that we are going to have lower prices and cheaper living if this reciprocity agreement becomes a law.

Mr. STONE. The Senator is shifting his position. However, I have not been trying to prove that the people of the United States would be benefited by free trade in live stock, or that the farm laborers of the United States would be benefited by this reciprocity arrangement. I have not so far sought or attempted to point out what benefits would accrue to our people from the agreement, but I have been endeavoring to show that the people of the United States would not be injured by free trade with Canada in live stock, and that farm laborers would not be injured by this reciprocity agreement with Canada. I have been endeavoring to refute the contention widely made that injury would result to farm laborers and the producers of live stock if this bill should be enacted into law. Having refuted that contention I am now asked to tell in what way the agreement would benefit the United States. I will say that I doubt whether free trade in live stock between this country and Canada will result in cheaper meat to the consumer, and certainly not immediately. If it will not lower the price of cattle, and it will not, then it will not on that account lower the price of beef.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is my judgment.

Mr. STONE. More than that, I am not prepared to say that this reciprocity agreement, standing alone, will result in any immediate material benefit to the people of the United States as a whole. It will materially aid some industries, and then, what is more to the point, it is a decided advance in the direction of broader trade relations with the world, and that is a step in the right direction.

Mr. GALLINGER. And yet we give away $10,000,000 of revenue to Canada.

Mr. STONE. We give away $10,000,000 of revenue, but Canada also gives away a part of her revenue.

Mr. GALLINGER. A million and three quarters or so, possibly two millions.

Mr. STONE. I have not the figures at my finger tips; but if they give away a million and three-quarters or two millions, that to Canada is about as much as ten millions to the United States.

However, I can not now take up the question as to what benefits would result to either country. I think in the end there would be great resultant benefits to the people of both countries. It is my purpose later on to discuss that, but not now.

For the present it is sufficient for me to say that I will vote for this bill because it is a movement in what I think is the right direction. Freer trade with our great, growing, and prosperous neighbor on the north will, I believe, open the way to freer trade with the world. But while I am heartily for this trade agreement, I shall insist upon following it with additional legislation that will result in immediate and perceptible benefits to American consumers.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator be in favor of coupling that additional legislation with the agreement?

Mr. STONE. If the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators around me, on both sides of the Chamber, like the

Senators from New Hampshire, Iowa, and Utah, will vote for the reciprocity bill, coupled with the free list embodied in the pending House bill, or substantially that, I will be more than happy to join them in passing the bill in that form.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. If we can pass a bill in that form, I will be only too glad to aid in passing it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Speaking for myself, I will say I will take great pleasure in voting against them both.

Mr. STONE. I supposed the Senator would do that.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose one reason why the resolutions were passed in a certain county in Missouri in relation to cattle was that they knew the free list included cattle from all the world and that——

Mr. STONE. The reciprocity agreement does not provide for free cattle for all the world.

Mr. SMOOT. No, not the reciprocity agreement with Canada.

Mr. STONE. The resolution referred to the agreement.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought it referred to Mexico and all the world.

Mr. STONE. No; they were discussing the effect on cattle production in Missouri. I have been trying to show them that reciprocity with Canada will not reduce the price of cattle in Missouri.

Mr. REED. The bill pending in the House does not put cattle on the free list.

Mr. STONE. As my colleague suggests, the bill pending in the House does not put cattle on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. It puts meat on the free list.

Mr. STONE. Oh, well, the Senator said cattle.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, meat is simply slaughtered cattle, and it could come in that way just as well as on the hoof.

Mr. STONE. And so the coat the Senator has on is the product of sheep's wool, but it is not a sheep's fleece.

Mr. SMOOT. No; and neither could the sheep come in free.

Mr. STONE. No; they do not come in free. I appreciate what the Senator has in mind, namely, that if meat is put on the free list it opens our markets to meats slaughtered in Argentina, Mexico, or anywhere. But, Mr. President, we have been discussing the reciprocity bill, which is before the Senate, and not the free-list bill, which is not before the Senate. I will discuss that bill after it passes the House and reaches the Senate. For the present I will stick to the bill we have before us, and I shall not allow others to run away from it and confuse the argument by shifting the ground.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STONE. Yes, I will yield; but as I am through I would prefer to yield the floor.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe that my friends, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], would like to be grouped with me upon matters relating to the tariff, and I hasten to relieve them of the somewhat embarrassing situation in which the remarks of the Senator from Missouri left them.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no embarrassment whatever.

Mr. STONE. I did not mean to embarrass either Senator. Rather did I suppose that to couple their names would be esteemed by each as a compliment to all.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not in the least embarrassed about the grouping; but I wanted to be permitted to ask the Senator from Missouri one or two questions before he closes, because there must be some conclusion to be drawn from the facts which he has stated, facts which, I think, are in the main well sustained by the proof.

Assuming that it is true that horses and cattle of all kinds and sheep and hogs are higher in price in Canada than in the United States——

Mr. SMOOT. Labor is higher——

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall not discuss the labor question now. Then, with the tariff duties removed as between the two countries, I assume, under a perfectly well-recognized law of political economy, or, rather, of commerce, that the movement of trade with respect to these things will be from the United States into Canada, rather than from Canada into the United States. The Senator from Missouri will recognize that.

Mr. STONE. My friend from Iowa is now endeavoring to help out Mr. Currie and other members of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; you will observe presently that I am not. I assume that the Senator from Missouri will recognize that well-established law of trade and commerce. I assume, also, that he recognizes that the price of a commodity of which this Nation is a large exporter is fixed chiefly, at least, by the price at the market to which the export goes. If that is true, then I assume that he will agree that, with respect to all these things, free trade between Canada and the United States will increase the price in the United States; that, in other words, the price of cattle, of horses, of swine, and of sheep will be higher in the United States than that price has hitherto been. I simply want to fasten one proposition clearly in the mind of the Senator from Missouri and of the Senate, that, so far as these things are concerned and upon this evidence, instead of reducing the cost of living, the tendency will be to increase the cost of living.

Mr. STONE. Another proof that our friends on that side are shifting their position. Now, as to whether free trade in live stock—since we are confining ourselves to that——

Mr. CUMMINS. I confine my suggestion to live stock.

Mr. STONE. Would result in an increase of exports to Canada. I think it is safe to say that if the relative prices, as given in the statistics I have submitted, should be maintained; that is to say, if the prices for cattle, horses, and so forth, should be higher continually in Canada than in the United States, the natural impulse of our export trade would be to Canada—inevitably so; but with free trade between the Provinces of Canada and the United States, it seems to me as certain as the sun shines that prices would seek a common level, very much as they do between the States where we have free trade. In some of the States prices are higher than in other States, as in some of the Provinces prices are higher than in other Provinces. Cattle may be higher in the Northwestern Provinces than in the Northeastern Provinces, and higher in the Northwestern States than in the Northeastern States, but there is no perceptible movement of live stock on that account from the East to the West either in Canada or in the United States. Canada and the United States adjoin as Iowa and Missouri adjoin. With free trade between the two countries the prices of cattle in the two countries will find a common level, and the trade will be regulated by the same economic principles which now obtain between the States or between the Provinces.

There would be no more reason for larger exports into Canada than there is for exporting New Jersey dairy cows to Washington. If it be true, as I have no doubt it is, from what my friend from New Jersey says, that dairy cows command the price he gave in his State; and if it be true, as I have no doubt it is, from what the Senator from Washington says, that dairy cows command a higher price in his State than in New Jersey, why, as I asked the Senator from Washington, are not dairy cows shipped from New Jersey to Washington? The Senator from Washington said that transportation charges and other considerations would make that impracticable and unprofitable. No more can you transport dairy cows, or any other cows, from Quebec to British Columbia for market purposes. And if we had free trade on live stock between Canada and the United States, you could no more ship cattle from Quebec to Washington than you can from New Jersey to Washington. The same law of commerce would obtain, and the prices of cattle of all kinds, young or mature, calves or beeves, would be substantially the same in the markets of the two countries. I believe that is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. I fully agree with the Senator from Missouri with regard to his general analysis; but there is a single reason why these things are higher in Canada, if they are higher—and I think they are—than in the United States; and that is because it costs more to produce them, assuming that they want no more profit there than we do. If it costs more to produce them in Canada than it does in the United States, then the production of Canada will give way to the production of the United States; and I am sure the Senator from Missouri will admit that at least there will be no tendency whatever to reduce the price of any of these articles if we establish free trade in them between the United States and Canada. That is all the point that I desired to suggest to the Senator from Missouri, because I wanted him to draw a conclusion before he left the facts.

Mr. STONE. I do not know just what character of conclusion the Senator desires me to draw that I have not drawn, and hence I am at a loss. I have already said that I did not believe that Canadian cattle raisers would be imperiled by reciprocal free trade, although many Canadians contend that they would be. If the Senator means to ask whether I believe that free trade in cattle between these two countries would reduce the cost of beef in the United States or in Canada I will say to him that I doubt it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, Mr. President, I simply want this discussion, so far as I can help it along, to proceed upon its true basis. There are some people who think, apparently, that if we enter into free-trade relations with Canada there will be an appreciable reduction in the cost of living. I do not so

believe. If there is a reason for entering into this relation—and I do not say that there is not—it is not because it will reduce the cost of living. The conclusion that I drew from the Senator's very lucid and illuminating statement was that, with respect to live stock at least, no hope could be based upon these statistics for any reduction in the price of horses or dairy cows or other cattle or sheep or swine, and when we reach that conclusion, if that be the proper one, we are prepared to examine the proposition from some other standpoint.

Mr. STONE. I think the Senator understood me correctly. I have said several times that my chief purpose has been to show that free trade in live stock between Canada and the United States would not result in depreciating the value of cattle in the States. As to the benefits that might result from this agreement, that is another and totally different phase of the question. In due time I will express my views on that phase of the subject, but I will wait until I reach it in the course of my plan for discussing the whole subject before taking it up.

Mr. President, I wish now to thank the Senate and Senators for their attention and kind indulgence.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, before the Senator concludes, I desire to ask him a question. I do not know that I understood the Senator a little while ago when he made reply to an inquiry I put. I am very much interested in his reply. After the Senator had stated that he was in favor of the free-list bill, which is now pending in the other House, I inquired if he would favor joining that free-list bill with the reciprocity agreement, so as to incorporate them both into the same act. That was the scope of the inquiry I made of the Senator, but I am not sure that I understood the Senator's reply to that question. The Senator said he was in favor of both, as I understood him.

Mr. STONE. I can not make myself more intelligible than I attempted to do in the reply I made to the Senator's question.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator may have made himself clear to others, but I did not hear him distinctly.

Mr. STONE. I am in favor of a free list, and without having examined it critically, I will say that in the main I approve the free list embodied in the bill before the House. Personally, I would be more than willing to incorporate the free list as an additional section on the reciprocity bill, if it can be done without defeating the whole legislation. I would like to know, however, something more than I now know as to the effect such an amendment would have on the chance of passing the reciprocity bill. I am for the reciprocity bill; I am also for the free-list bill, and I would be delighted if we could pass the two together as one.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am delighted to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. STONE. But at the same time I would want to have some conferences with other Senators with respect to that matter before committing myself unreservedly to a program of that kind.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I understand the Senator to say that he sees no objection in the nature of the two bills to coupling the legislation, and that he would be in favor of doing so, provided he was assured that the two measures so coupled could receive a majority vote of the Senate so as to become a law?

Mr. STONE. Oh, certainly.

Now, Mr. President, I feel considerably fatigued, and if there are no further questions to be asked, I will again thank Senators for their kindness and close this installment of my reciprocity series. I hope my future addresses will not be so protracted as this has been.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. In view of the fact that the Senate has agreed to adjourn over until Thursday, I think it important that we should have a brief executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 4, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 1, 1911.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Perry M. Lytle, of Pennsylvania, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania. (Reappointment.)

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Charles W. Cobb, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General for the Interior Department, vice Oscar Lawler, resigned.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF NEW MEXICO.

John R. McFie, of New Mexico, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

James Ward, of Pennsylvania, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps with rank from April 27, 1911.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 28, 1911.

Rufus Bartlett Hall, of Ohio.
Richard Henry Whitehead, of Virginia.
John Overton, of Tennessee.
Charles Sherman Carter, of Alabama.
James Jesse Peterson, of Alabama.
William Henry Condit, of Minnesota.
Robert Emmett Austin, of California.
John Elmer Bacon, of Arizona.
Joseph Lawyer Bell, of California.
Caspar Ralph Byars, of Texas.
Malone Duggan, of Texas.
Charles Henry Fischer, of Colorado.
Albert Pope Fitzsimmons, of Nebraska.
Edward Burke Bailey, of Alabama.
Bonaparte Preston Norvell, of Oklahoma.
David Wilmot Overton, of New York.
Archibald Moltz Wilkins, of Ohio.
George Francis Wilklow, of New York.
Charles Franklin Smith, of Michigan.
Daniel Baen Street, of New Jersey.
Joseph G. Wilson, of New York.
Robert Emmett Caldwell, of Maryland.
Gerry Sanger Driver, of Colorado.
Francis Valentine Langenderfer, of Ohio.
Fred Fellows Sprague, of California.
Michael Edward Connor, of Massachusetts.
John Milton Armstrong, of Minnesota.
Thomas Andrew Burcham, of Iowa.
Frederick Ellsworth Clark, of Vermont.
Herbert Clay Lieser, of Washington.
Frederick William O'Donnell, of Kansas.
Cassius Derby Silver, of New York.
Alfred Harrold Thomas, of New York.
Frank Christollo Vanatta, of Wyoming.
William Cotman Whitmore, of Maine.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Chaplain Aldred A. Pruden, Second Infantry, to be chaplain with the rank of major from April 26, 1911.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Harry Phelps to be a captain in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander George W. Williams to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Alexander S. Wadsworth, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Kenneth Whiting to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Machinist James J. Cullen to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1910, upon the completion of six years' service as a machinist.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as carpenters:

Stuart P. Mead,
William H. Sampson, and
Louis Haase.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

E. E. Nicholson to be postmaster at Beardstown, Ill., in place of John S. Nicholson, deceased.

INDIANA.

Hood P. Loveland to be postmaster at Peru, Ind., in place of Hood P. Loveland. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1910.

IOWA.

Louis C. Kurtz to be postmaster at Des Moines, Iowa, in place of Joseph I. Myerly. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

MISSISSIPPI.

Sallie Millsaps to be postmaster at Hazlehurst, Miss., in place of Sallie Millsaps. Incumbent's commission expired May 7, 1910.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Robert F. Emerson to be postmaster at East Rochester, N. H. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

NEW YORK.

Frederick Rohde to be postmaster at Stapleton, N. Y., in place of Adolph Lienhart, removed.

OKLAHOMA.

Clay Cross to be postmaster at Skiatook, Okla. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William M. Deihm to be postmaster at Honey Brook, Pa., in place of Thomas F. Hampton, deceased.

John W. Ramsey to be postmaster at Midland, Pa., in place of Frank P. Oberlin, who failed to qualify.

G. Clinton Williams to be postmaster at Spring City, Pa., in place of G. Clinton Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1911.

TENNESSEE.

John R. Richards to be postmaster at Oliver Springs, Tenn., in place of Abraham L. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1911.

H. Filmour Shoun to be postmaster at Greeneville, Tenn., in place of Joseph W. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1910.

VIRGINIA.

Charles A. Lacy to be postmaster at Houston, Va., in place of Charles A. Lacy. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1910.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1911.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

William Lindsay to be United States marshal for the district of Montana.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Reed M. Fawell to be a lieutenant.
Midshipman Arnold H. Vanderhoof to be an ensign.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

Horace M. Bradley, Green Cove Springs.

ILLINOIS.

John C. Hale, North Chicago.
E. E. Nicholson, Beardstown.

INDIANA.

Edgar T. Botkin, Farmland.
Enos Coffin, Carthage.
Robert B. Hanna, Fort Wayne.
William H. Hathaway, Aurora.
John Lynn, La Fontaine.
Joel F. Martin, Bourbon.
Frank R. Morrison, Galveston.
William O. Nash, Jasonville.
Percy V. Ruch, Mulberry.
John C. Schleffler, Wolcottville.

IOWA.

Daniel P. Ellsworth, Lohrville.
O. C. Hill, Clearfield.
Louis C. Kurtz, Des Moines.
Almon C. Steele, Coon Rapids.

LOUISIANA.

B. F. Edwards, Marksville.
Richard E. Hodges, Jena.

MAINE.

Abial H. Jones, Wilton.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Chestina B. Robbins, East Templeton.
Harriet F. Seaverns, North Scituate.

MICHIGAN.

Charles Gauntlett, Milan.

MINNESOTA.

Cornelius Berghuis, Clara City.
Sarah Dahl, Cottonwood.
Fred W. Olson, Raymond.

MONTANA.

John J. McDonald, Townsend.
Don E. Schanck, Libby.

OHIO.

John Shaw, Leroy.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Clark D. Eckels, Cambridge Springs.
Burd R. Linder, Orwigsburg.

TEXAS.

John H. Carson, Dayton.
William D. McCaslin, Detroit.
Rufus H. Windham, Newton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May 1, 1911.*

[Continuation of the legislative day of Saturday, April 29, 1911.]

The recess having expired at 11 o'clock, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement: Hon. EDWARD L. TAYLOR, Jr., of Ohio, is hereby appointed a member of the board of directors of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb. Hon. THETUS W. SIMS holds over.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place agricultural implements on the free list, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to place agricultural implements on the free list, and for other purposes, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The bill was read by title.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss]. [Applause.]

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this debate it was not my purpose to engage in it. There are so many orators among the Members of this distinguished body that to sit and listen is not only a pleasure, but it seems to be almost a duty since one orator rarely enjoys the orations of other men. If some men love to talk, others should prefer to listen. But, Mr. Chairman, this whole debate has raged around the farmer and the interests of the farm; assertions have been made with such recklessness that I am in sympathy with Mark Twain when he said that he did not object to any speaker knowing all about his subject, but that he did object to any man knowing so much that was not true. The farmers of our country are patriotic citizens whose only interest in good government is that it shall promote the common interests of all our people and not the special interests of a few of them; and I wish to voice my protest against the good name and reputation of the farming classes of our country being used to protect the well-known abuses which have grown up in our Government and that the supposed interests of the farm shall be used to defeat progressive legislation which is intended for the benefit of all our people.

This is not the first instance, Mr. Chairman, when an attempt has been made to use the virtue which has its home on the farm to shelter the vice which exists in the commercial systems of our great cities. We have only to recall the debates on the floor of this House in 1906, when the frauds and corruption in the great packing houses was exposed to public view. The Beef Trust was then known to be a criminal corporation which had been systematically robbing the farmers on every load of cattle which were driven across the scales which lead from the feed lot to the slaughter pens. They were even then under indictment and active prosecution for criminal exploitation of the products of the farm; but when it became noised about that their methods of preparing and distributing their products were even more destructive to the general welfare of society than their methods of buying their produce from the farmer—that both producer and consumer were exploited—and that not even the public health was protected from their insatiable greed for gain, what influence was invoked to shield them from

exposure? It was a frantic appeal to the President to hold his hand, because the exposure would hurt the interest of the farmer. If ever brazon effrontery were carried further it is at the present moment, when the same appeal is being made to defeat the progressive legislation now under consideration. When will good citizenship be respected by the representatives of the special interests of this country?

F. J. Hagerbarth, vice president of the American National Live Stock Association, was among the first to attempt to use virtue to shield crime. In a signed statement published in the National Provisioner of June 16, 1906, he says:

The President has seen fit to ignore urgent requests from official representatives of the live-stock industry requiring him to withhold any radical message or reports to Congress bearing on abuses of the packing interests, for the reason that such message if heralded over the world would work irreparable loss, both at home and abroad, to the producers of live stock.

What a libel on the patriotism of the American farmer, that he could wish to coin the health and the well-being of the world and weigh it in the balance against the profits on his cattle. What convincing evidence of the power of money to dwarf even the soul of a man, born in the image of his Maker! Not a thought was given to the welfare of the thousands of employees who worked in these insanitary plants; not the least concern manifested for the health of the world; but the demand went forth that all this vice be smothered in order to protect the cattle growers of the Mississippi Valley from irreparable losses.

This plea for the farmer soon found its way to the floor of this House. In the National Provisioner of the same date is found this significant statement:

Members of Congress, inspired by the feeling of indignation among their constituents over the injury done to American industry by the President's ignorant and ill-considered assault on the meat trade, could not wait for a committee report on the meat-inspection bill, but began to express their sentiments as early as Tuesday of this week on the floor of the House.

The editors of the American Economist must have read this statement before writing some of their recent editorials about President Taft and Canadian reciprocity. This feeling of indignation was first aroused in the breast of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. The RECORD shows that he asked unanimous consent that he should address the House on this important subject before the report of the committee brought it regularly before them for consideration. Mr. MONDELL appears in the RECORD as saying:

These reports and criticisms scattered broadcast, highly colored and exaggerated as they were passed along, have resulted in incalculable injury not only to the packers, but to the live-stock industry of the country generally. It was a bad day for Chicago and the packing and live-stock industries of the United States when that now historic porker slipped his trolley and fell—just where he fell is in controversy—and he goes down in history as entirely eclipsing that other famous Chicago animal, Mrs. O'Leary's cow, in the awful havoc and loss he has wrought. If the packing industries of this country were alone affected, their rights should demand attention; but the great live-stock industries of the country are equally affected. They have already suffered losses amounting to many millions by this agitation.

Now, was not that an awful blow to be landed on the solar plexus of the honest farmers of our country merely because the packers were selling decayed and diseased meats to the country and were destroying the health of their employees as well as of their customers? This message of President Roosevelt was nearly as destructive to the farming industries as the reciprocity pact as seen by the gentleman from Wyoming. Is it not wonderful how the American farmer manages to recover from these irreparable damages and recoup these incalculable injuries? And to think that these plagues should be visited on us one after the other by the headstrong action of Republican Presidents. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No wonder that western papers are running an advertisement in the want columns for a candidate for President on the Republican ticket. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not wish to weary the committee with numerous quotations from the RECORD. If time permitted, it can be shown that many Members who profess to believe now that the recommendations of President Taft will ruin the farmer were equally convinced that the recommendations of President Roosevelt would ruin the stock grower in 1906. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They were wrong then, Mr. Chairman, and they are mistaken now. Their former efforts fastened an army of tax eaters on the Federal Treasury for life in order to give a decent reputation to the commercial products of "Packingtown" in the markets of the world, and their purpose now is to defeat the enactment of progressive legislation which will revise the tariff in the interests of the great consuming masses of our citizenship.

The policy of reciprocity has been attacked on the ground that it is inimical to the farming interests of the country, and that it is being adopted hastily without investigation or information. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] was reckless enough of his reputation to hazard such a statement. He says:

You are proposing a great new policy that goes to the very social fabric of America, and where is the great committee of this House that has probed to the bottom of it and where is the book that has spread its investigations before the American people?

This well illustrates, Mr. Chairman, the difficulties which a famous specialist meets when he gets beyond his reservation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the gentleman from Maine were as familiar with current agricultural literature as he is with the contents of Hinds' Precedents he could not have been betrayed into so glaring an error. I do not know what estimate the farmers of Maine will put on this point of order which is raised by the distinguished parliamentarian against this pending legislation, but it will be a revelation to the intelligent and progressive farmers of the Middle West who have discussed this question for years and have been knocking at the doors of Congress and demanding the enactment of reciprocal legislation in the broadest terms. In the few minutes which have been allotted to me I can not attempt a full discussion of the advantages which reciprocity will bring to the farmers of our Nation, but I trust that I shall be able to show that the wonderful growth of public sentiment in favor of reciprocity in this country is due to the intelligent expression of agricultural thought and of the agricultural press. The gentleman from Maine regrets that Mr. Emery and his associates on the Tariff Board have not had time to make an exhaustive report on the subject. Does he not know that Mr. Saunders, who is Mr. Emery's associate, has written exhaustively on this very subject, and that he did so after careful study and personal investigation? No student who is at all familiar with agricultural literature or the evolution of progressive policies in the minds of the American farmer could have shown the ignorance which has been displayed in this debate by the would-be leaders of the farmers.

The great national movement among the farmers of the United States to advance reciprocal legislation began with a meeting held in the Grand Pacific Hotel in Chicago in 1905. There were present at that meeting delegates representing the National Live Stock Association, American Short Horn Association, National Live Stock Exchange, Chicago Commercial Association, Millers' National Federation, and other great producing and exporting interests. It was decided to hold a national conference to advance reciprocal tariff legislation. Mr. Alvin H. Saunders was chosen as the leader of the new movement. Who is Mr. A. H. Saunders? He is a member of the Tariff Board which was appointed by President Taft, and one of the men, according to the gentleman from Maine, who could so well make a scientific investigation of this subject. Mr. Saunders at that time was the editor of the Breeder's Gazette, the most influential and widely read farm journal in the United States. In accepting this appointment, Mr. Saunders issued a signed statement as to the purposes of the conference and of the necessity for its organization. This statement should prove interesting to those who have assumed that no investigation has been made and that no authority stands sponsor for reciprocal legislation. Mr. Saunders said:

The managing editor of the Gazette was unanimously requested to act as chairman of the committee on arrangements. He has consented to do so with the specific understanding that the interests of the farmers and stock growers should be paramount; that their wants should receive first consideration, and that partisan politics will have no place in the campaign to be waged.

I call particular attention, Mr. Chairman, that this movement at the very beginning was to be devoted to the interests of the farmer and the stock grower, and that it was to be nonpartisan in its character. The statement went on to say:

We have in years of average production a large surplus of breadstuffs and provisions for export. We grow more grain and mature more meat than is required for home consumption. The price received for the product consumed at home is largely governed by the price commanded by the surplus for which a market must be found abroad. We have virtually prohibited France and Germany from selling part of their manufactures here, and they have retaliated by gradually closing their markets against us. It is time therefore that somebody should take up the cudgels in this matter against those who for selfish purposes destroyed Blaine's reciprocity conventions, slaughtered the Kasson treaties, and are still barring the American stockmen and grain growers from a large and lucrative outlet for their goods.

There is no question of Republicanism or Democracy involved in this proposition. It is simply a matter of passing an act of Congress which will enable the President and his successors, no matter to what political party they belong, to open the doors of the hungry millions of Europe, put a roast in every French and German pot, and a loaf of good American bread upon every shelf from Rome to Copenhagen, and in doing it put probably $100,000,000 per annum in the pockets of the American producers.

The thing can be brought about if we will drop party lines and put none but friends of this proposition in positions of Federal power. If Senators and the present Members of the House of Representatives will not do this thing, the people have the power to send men to Washington who will exercise that power. The sooner our public men understand this the better. This fight for better markets, worth unknown millions

per year to the farming communities, will not be won in a week or a year. It means a battle royal against intrenched power, but it will be won because it is right.

Mr. Chairman, that is the report to the farmers of this country by a member of the present Tariff Board, which they have studied for six long years. I am not surprised that the gentleman from Maine has never read it. It was published before he began the study of farm economics. There is always that disadvantage in a sudden change in occupation, but I can not forget the impression it made on my mind when I first read it. I was then an active farmer and was walking behind the plow and through the feed lots. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I had shipped my cattle to markets which were glutted, and had seen the sellers begging to receive decent bids for their offerings, and had my stock sold for prices which did not leave me the reasonable profit which was guaranteed to the manufacturers in the last Republican platform. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I enlisted in that campaign against intrenched privilege and helped to fight the battle because it was right. I was with Mr. Saunders for reciprocity then and I am for it now whether he is with me or against me. I would rather follow a plain American citizen on his honor as a man than to take my opinions from an official whose salary may depend upon the official reports he may sign. I did not foresee that I was one of the men who were to be sent to Washington with the power to act to take the place of some of those who having the power were refusing to act. But I am here, Mr. Chairman, ready to act, and I am proud of the intelligent vote which sent me here. I may not be able to fight the good fight, but I am willing to keep the faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No better presentation of the subject of reciprocity from a farmer's standpoint can be made than this statement made by this member of the Tariff Board, and I commend it to those who need instruction on this subject. It leads up to the very point which the gentleman from Maine well says is the "whole situation," the equilibrium between agriculture and manufactures. The gentleman says:

> But the farms, being an aggregation of homes, disorganized and each impelled by its own necessities, tend constantly to overproduce. And this overproduction becomes disastrous unless the limitation of acreage possible to be cultivated intervenes to prevent. Therefore the element of prime importance in this discussion is the relation of acreage to the capacity of the home market furnished by the nonagricultural classes.

The gentleman from Maine was chosen to open this debate and therefore is the leader of the opposition to reciprocal legislation; his words are an orthodox statement of stand-pat Republicanism as applied to the development of our agricultural industry. Now, what does this statement mean? The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] denounced the scheme of valorization or monopoly by which the Brazilian Government is seeking to maintain an equilibrium between the production of coffee and its consumption. This system, simply stated, is a limitation of the acreage which can be devoted to the cultivation of coffee. Mr. NORRIS says:

> This agreement has been in successful operation since the latter part of 1908. In accordance with its terms, the Brazilian Government enacted a law preventing the planting of additional coffee trees and providing for severe penalties for any offense against this provision of the statute. Inspectors were appointed who went through the country and destroyed any new trees that had been planted and administered severe punishment against those who were guilty of an infraction of the law.

Did the gentleman from Maine get his ideas of valorization from Brazil, or did the Brazilian statesmen come to Maine for inspiration and instruction? Which nation has the genuine and which one possesses the "phony" statesman? The burden of proof is in favor of Brazil, because the gentleman himself informs us that "we have heard little of this doctrine of equilibrium of the home market among English-speaking nations." Therefore he kindly informs us just what it means—

> And it is evident that both farmer and artisan will be most prosperous and the happiest when there are enough farmers to take the artisan's goods at a fair price and enough artisans, professional men, and so forth, to take the farmer's surplus at a fair price.

And to bring this ideal state about he proposes to limit the acreage to the capacity of the home market. Now, what does that mean to the farmer and to the Nation? We sold last year in the foreign markets over $1,000,000,000 worth of the surplus products of American farms. This new statesmanship proposes to stop this production, refuse this enormous national income, and throw out of employment the thousands of farmers and their sons who produced this vast volume of wealth. Why take this radical action? Why, to establish an equilibrium between agriculture and manufacture. The southern farmers sold $450,000,000 worth of cotton to foreign nations. The cotton acreage will have to be reduced until the equilibrium is restored.

The farmers of the West sold $135,000,000 of surplus meat products. The breeding of cattle must be checked until our home markets can consume the entire output. We foolishly sold $133,000,000 of grain. The plows must be stopped. Our farmers sold $38,000,000 of tobacco; the planting must be stopped, the equilibrium is in danger. This new statesmanship resembles the fable of the monkey dividing the cheese between the two cats [applause on the Democratic side]; if the yield of grain is heavy, let more acres lie idle; if the mills are supplied with improved machinery, employ fewer hands. But whose lands are to lie idle and whose mills are to be closed down in order to maintain this sacred equilibrium? Who is to be the monkey and who will consent to be the cats? I do not know what the people of Maine think of such wisdom, but in Indiana the whole scheme would be called monkey business. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We grow a surplus of farm products beyond any possible needs of our population. The latest report of the Department of Agriculture says this is true back as far as inquiry has been made. We grow more grain and mature more meat than our Nation can consume. In 1910 we exported $286,728,126 in value of grains and meats from our farms. Yet we are told by some of the Members of this House who practice law in the great cities and who see the farms from an automobile or car window that reciprocity will ruin the farmer. What is the effect of the export trade on prices? Mr. Armour, in his work, "The Packers and the People," says:

> It is the export business that absorbs the surplus live stock grown by American cattlemen and farmers and steadies and supports the home markets for live stock. If this export business were taken away or even reduced, the effects of it would be directly felt by every farmer who raises a steer, sheep, or hog for market.

This testimony by Armour is fully sustained by Mr. Holmes, Chief of Division of Foreign Markets, Department of Agriculture. In Bulletin No. 55, speaking of the influence of our exports of meat products on domestic markets, Mr. Holmes says:

> If such an immense quantity of surplus meat food were to be confined within this country by the refusal of foreign countries to buy it, there would follow consequences to farmer, rangeman, slaughterer, and packer which would be financially disastrous.

Mr. Saunders knew these facts, and without ever a thought of restoring an equilibrium by limiting our production, and thus destroying industry and the national wealth and income, he proposed to enlarge our foreign markets and thus encourage and stimulate industry and increase our national wealth and income.

There are but the two ways of maintaining an equilibrium between agriculture and manufacture. The gentleman from Maine proposes to restrict the agricultural acreage to an artificial basis, and thereby decrease production. The member of the President's Tariff Board would increase our markets so as to stimulate industry and increase our national wealth. The choice between these two theories is really a choice between a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection. Our prohibitive tariff laws prevent the people of continental Europe from selling to us, and in retaliation they prohibit us from selling our agricultural products to them. This reduces the competition in the markets where the farmer sells and also prevents competition in the markets where he is compelled to buy. This naturally reduces selling prices and increases buying prices to the farmers of our country. This destroys the equilibrium between manufacture and agriculture, from the farmer's viewpoint, and is the condition which the American farmer is most anxious to remove.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. With pleasure.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if the Hinds theory of economics is followed and the restriction of the agricultural products of this country is limited to what the manufacturers take, if that would not have a tendency to reduce very materially the value of farm lands in the upper Mississippi Valley, and, in fact, the value of lands that are suitable for agriculture generally?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. There can be no question in the world of that, Mr. Chairman. It is high prices for the products of the farm that make high-priced land. To reduce the total income of all the farms of the United States is to reduce the value of these farms, because if you were to destroy entirely their productive capacity you will have destroyed their selling value.

Do you wonder that the farmer is in deadly earnest about reciprocity and that he has been the real leader in the great educational movement which has grown strong enough to overthrow the Republican majority in this House and which promises to make Democratic success nearly certain in 1912? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This national conference of agricultural organizations was the beginning of a new era in our political world; it was the genesis of that spirit of insurgency which has since become so

rampant in both political parties that Gov. Woodrow Wilson is quoted as saying:

The only essentials in American politics to-day is the difference between the progressives and the reactionaries. We have in the last 10 years come out of the merely negative in politics.

That great movement to center public thought on measures of legislation and not upon the party organization to which any man may belong goes back to that day when the farmers of this Nation declared that legislation was not a question of Republicanism or of Democracy, but of the enactment of laws, and they will not soon forget that fundamental truth. This great conference was attended by more than 600 delegates, representing every principal agricultural organization in the Nation. I will print in connection with my remarks a complete list of these organizations. From the State of Indiana were the Farmers' Congress, Society of Equity, Angus Breeders' Association, Live Stock Exchange, and State board of agriculture, and at the close of its session the following resolution was passed:

That we recommend that a permanent organization be formed under the style of the Reciprocal Tariff League, and that a committee of 15 be appointed by the Chair with full power to organize and further the work for which this convention was assembled.

I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to follow this movement further; it is an active, virile force in our body politic, molding public sentiment, breaking down slavery to party organization, and creating a commendable spirit of independence among the voters of our country. It was significant that at the very moment when this great convention was sitting in Chicago trying to secure better foreign markets for our food products that 2,000 butchers and meat dealers in Germany were holding a still greater convention to demand that the Fatherland should open up the frontier and permit importations of American cattle, so that the German workman might have meat on his table. What a strange situation. The farmers of America willing to sell and the workmen of Germany eager to buy; we desirous to trade a small portion of our surplus food for a small proportion of their surplus manufactures, so that the people of both countries should be better fed and better clothed, because labor in both countries will be better rewarded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes additional to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to interrupt the gentleman, but I wish to ask the date of that convention.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It is August, 1906. I can give the gentleman the exact date.

This beneficent result is prevented by a prohibitive tariff system in both countries, behind which the industrial trusts and combinations of this country are sheltered and from which the landowners of Germany secure equal freedom from competition. Thus we have the swollen fortunes and idle rich nourished and sustained in republic and empire by the same methods of legislation.

The gentleman from Maine was again unfortunate when he applied his celebrated theory of equilibrium to the agriculture of Germany and England. It seems that he had read a book on agriculture written by a railroad man [applause on the Democratic side], and after comparing it with his home-market theory he established the following facts about equilibriums:

As we turn from England and her sad picture we find another story in Germany and France, where statesmen and people united to preserve the equilibrium of the home market.

As his whole argument rests on equilibriums, I am going to call a witness as to the conditions actually existing in the markets of England and Germany. I am not going to summon a railroad man, but will call on a member of President Taft's Tariff Board. I shall quote from a signed article written by A. H. Saunders while he was in England and published August 5, 1908. The article states that he was in personal attendance at the markets in question. Mr. Saunders says:

The English are the best-fed people in the world. Their ports are open to the food supplies of all nations.

That is the picture that a member of our Tariff Board draws of the English people—that they are the best-fed people in the world. Now, what splendid condition did he find in France and Germany to contrast with this picture? He says:

But a few hours distant by steam across the English Channel there are millions of people who scarcely know the taste of a good rib or loin of beef. What little beef there is on sale is mostly lean and tough. No wonder horseflesh sells readily alongside of it. No wonder that the canine and feline creations are called on to make good the dearth of good bovine supplies.

Now, that is another way of keeping up the equilibrium in the home markets. The Germans can kill dogs and cats to supply the beef which they have not got and can not get. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But the gentleman from Maine says that this proud position of the German farmer is due to the wisdom of Bismarck, who investigated and then acted, instead of acting first and then investigating. The record shows that this sentiment was applauded by the membership of this House on his side of the aisle. What does Mr. Saunders, of our Tariff Board, say is causing this condition of the German Nation? He omits to mention the wisdom and statesmanship of Bismarck, but says that—

Continental parliaments are in the grip of the landed proprietors, who prefer to see a virtual meat famine among the laboring people and classes, with cattle and hogs selling at 12 to 15 cents per pound, live weight, rather than to consent to the relaxation of the rigid rules and high tariffs by which foreign-grown foodstuffs are excluded.

After this signed article had been published in the Breeders' Gazette an Iowa farmer wanted to know the "true cause" why America and Germany could not get together on a trade agreement. Mr. Saunders replied as follows:

The true reason is the effective opposition up to date of people who are profiting largely by the status quo—plethoric German agrarians on the one hand and certain well-fed interests on the other. The former are very active in the German Parliament and the latter in the American Congress.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Since the publication of this report many a Republican Congressman has failed to maintain his equilibrium at the ballot box. I commend these reports to the gentleman from Maine when he begins a revision of his theory of equilibriums of the home market.

Agriculture is the basis of our national wealth, and to make this foundation secure for the future generations we must conserve the fertility of our soil. Every bushel of grain which we sell abroad reduces our national wealth to the extent of the loss of plant food which produces that product. We can not go on forever selling our raw grains to be fed on foreign soils, because you can not take away from the land without making a return to the land. Grain farming encourages soil erosion and thus lowers or destroys the life-sustaining power of the soil in two ways—by washing away of the soil particles and by a loss of the chemical elements which produce the growth of plants. In both of these directions our losses are appalling. It is estimated that 1,000,000,000 tons of soil washes from American farms and is carried to the sea by our rivers every year. The waters of the Potomac are never clear, and the mighty current of the Mississippi can not carry its burden of silt to the sea. Our farmers are spending millions of dollars for fertilizers every year, and the tax is an ever-increasing one. We need to have no fear of an increasing population if we can only avoid a decreasing soil fertility. For this reason alone it is wise statesmanship to extend our markets for finished food products rather than to stand paralyzed with fear of competition in raw grains. The best farmer in any community is he who sells his products in their most concentrated form and who saves his by-products to increase the fertility of his lands. This means that the progressive farmer is in reality a manufacturer. His grains, his grass, and his hay are only raw products; his eggs, his cream, butter, and live stock are his finished products. Under this system of agriculture it is possible to return 90 per cent of the fertility to the soil, and by a scientific rotation of crops maintain the fertility of the soil for all future time, and thus insure the future prosperity of our Nation. This is not possible under any known system of grain farming. The opponents of reciprocity are laying much stress on the possible competition in wheat.

Our experiment station in Indiana sent a wheat train over our State last fall to demonstrate that wheat is now grown at a loss in Indiana under our present methods. Every farmer knows this to be true, but his only remedy is to turn to increased live-stock farming if he would increase his yields of wheat. Intensive farming would double the present output of our farms. This would add billions of dollars to our national income every year. If some method of extracting annually a billion of dollars from the rocks of our hills could be discovered it would usher in a golden era in the life of our Nation; yet this is a small sum compared to the possible increase in the annual output of our farms; but intense agriculture is impossible, except as it may be based on live-stock industry. There is thus a direct relation between our prohibitive tariff system and our crude agriculture, which is so rapidly exhausting the fertility of our farms and thus depleting our national wealth. We can not go to intense farming without stimulating our live-stock industry; we can not increase our live stock, because we can not sell our meat products in the markets of Continental Europe; and we can not sell in their markets, because we prohibit them from selling in ours. Thus our prohibitive tariff really forms a vicious circle, which is reducing the fertility of our soil, driving the boys from the farms, and is rapidly chang-

ing us from an agricultural nation to a manufacturing nation. Our present high-tariff system is thus actually destroying the tillage of the soil as the most desirable occupation among men, to which all other occupations should be subsidiary.

The gentlemen on the other side of this question are preparing to appeal to the farmers for support at the ballot box. I welcome the test. It has been said that there must be a national revolt against the worship of manufactures and trade as the only forms of progressive activity among our people. Mr. Chairman, this revolt has come and it will be sustained by the deliberate judgment of farmers, whose labors are the very fountain from which all other occupations flow and by which they are nourished and fed. [Loud applause.]

The following is a complete list of all agricultural and live-stock associations which appointed delegates to the national reciprocity conference in Chicago:

National Live Stock Association, American Stock Growers' Association, American Shorthorn Breeders' Association, American Hereford Cattle Breeders' Association, American Polled-Durham Breeders' Association, American Aberdeen-Angus Breeders' Association, American Galloway Breeders' Association, National Polled-Hereford Breeders' Association, Holstein-Friesian Breeders' Association, Ayrshire Breeders' Association, American Clydesdale Association, American Percheron Horse Breeders' Association, French Coach-Horse Society of America, American Saddle-Horse Breeders' Association, Aldie Horse Breeders' Association, American Shetland Pony Club, American Suffolk Horse Association, American Shropshire Sheep Association, American Oxford Down Association, American Suffolk Flock Registry, Dorset Horn Sheep Association, Hampshire Down Breeders' Association of America, the Continental Dorset Club, American Cheviot Sheep Society, American Milch Goat Record Association, Southwest Poland China Record Association, American Yorkshire Association, American Poland China Record Association, American Berkshire Association, National Duroc-Jersey Record Association, Improved Stock Breeders' Association of the Wheat Belt, Cattle Growers' Association of Texas, Indiana Aberdeen-Angus Breeders' Association, Corn-Belt Meat Producers' Association, Wisconsin Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Cattle Growers' Association of New Mexico, Ohio Wool Growers' Association, Ohio Horse Breeders' Association, Oklahoma Improved Breeders' Association, North Dakota Live Stock Association, Pennsylvania Live Stock Association, Kentucky Live Stock Association, Rock County (Minn.) Breeders' Association, Western Live Stock Protective Association, Southeast Missouri Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Southeastern Stock Growers' Association, Shorthorn Breeders' Association of Southeast Virginia, Platte Valley Live Stock Association, North Missouri Combination Cattle Sales Association, Fountain County Hereford Breeders & Feeders' Association, Ray County Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Central Missouri Hereford Breeders' Association, Marion County Improved Live Stock Association, McLean County Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Keokuk County Polled-Durham Breeders' Association, Chicago Live Stock Exchange, Cleveland Live Stock Exchange, East Buffalo Stock Exchange, Indianapolis Stock Exchange, Kansas City Stock Exchange, Louisville Stock Exchange, Milwaukee Stock Exchange, Omaha Stock Exchange, Peoria Stock Exchange, Pittsburg Stock Exchange, St. Joseph Stock Exchange, St. Louis Stock Exchange, Sioux City Stock Exchange, South St. Paul Stock Exchange, Cattle & Horse Growers' Association of Colorado, Indiana State Board of Agriculture, Illinois State Board of Agriculture, Wisconsin State Board of Agriculture, Minnesota State Board of Agriculture, Iowa State Board of Agriculture, Nebraska State Board of Agriculture, West Michigan State Fair Association, Wisconsin Farmers' Institute, Minnesota Farmers' Institute, Illinois Farmers' Institute, Illinois Farmers' Institute of the Third Congressional District, American Society of Equity, Illinois Seed-Corn Growers' Association, Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association, Rob Roy Union American Society of Equity, Cotton Growers' Protective Association, Farmers' National Congress, Kansas Corn Breeders' Association, St. Louis Cotton Exchange, California Fruit Growers' Association, and International Apple Shippers' Association.

Delegations appointed by governors of States:

Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to yield time now?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, before doing that I would like to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to ask considerable time to discuss this measure, but I have received a telegram this morning which will carry me to the State of Kentucky at 2 o'clock to-day, and therefore I shall have a few things to say upon this subject at this time.

This is my first term in Congress. I am inexperienced in tariff legislation; and since the tariff is the paramount issue before the American people between the two dominant political parties in this country, and since the ripened judgment and matured statesmanship of both parties have for years struggled in vain to arrive at any satisfactory settlement of this vexed question, you can readily realize with what trepidation I approach the discussion of any phase of this great problem.

I was opposed to Canadian reciprocity and voted against that measure. After that bill had passed this House, after the farmers' products of our country had through its provisions been exposed to unjust discrimination and injury, both at home and abroad, I had hoped that the farmers' free-list bill, now under discussion, would be presented to this House in such a form as that I could give it my hearty support.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to give some of the reasons why I voted against the reciprocity pact with Canada, and later some reasons why I would gladly support this so-called farmers' free-list bill, if it were modified in such a way as to strip it of at least some of its unjust and unfair provisions.

In my judgment, the high cost of living in this country gave birth to the reciprocity treaty with Canada. It was in the hope of reducing the cost of living and relieving the masses of that burden that the reciprocity measure had its origin. Stripped of all disguise, that was, and is, both its aim and object. The President intimated so much in his measure of January 26 last, when he said:

Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products.

The President was, and is, sincere in his belief that the cost of living in this country is too high and that the great mass of the American people demand a reduction therein.

The Democratic Party, with its ear to the ground and with the hope of ingratiating itself with the American electorate, coupled with a desire, I grant, of being responsive to the public will, came forward as the chief champion and defender of this measure emanating from a Republican President. It is true that the cost of living is too high. I am also free to say that there is a just popular demand for a reduction in prices; but I shall not agree that the farmer should be the hack horse and the burden bearer of these blessings to the rest of humanity. If corn is too high, so is clothing; if potatoes are too high, so is rice and sugar. If cattle are too high, so is beef. If wheat is too high, so is flour. If hogs are too high, so is pork. If the raw materials which the farmer produces and has to sell, are put upon the free list under this bill, why are not the products made out of the raw materials which the farmer produces likewise put upon the free list? Why is the farmer forced to sell his wheat in a free market and then buy back the flour made from that wheat in a protected market? Why protect the manufacturer of flour at the expense of the farmer? If the farmer's cattle and hogs are put upon the free list, why have not beef and pork likewise been put upon the free list? Why protect the great Beef and Pork Trusts at the expense of the farmer? Why protect the trust products and leave the farmer's products unprotected? If the rye and oats which the farmer raises are too high, so is the hat which he wears upon his head and the shoes he wears upon his feet likewise too high. Why have not they been put upon the free list in this bill? You have put upon the protected list the things which the farmer buys; why do you leave off of the protected list the things which he sells? The things which the farmer buys, no less than the things which the farmer sells, go to make up the cost of living.

Under this reciprocity agreement the tariff duty of 25 cents per bushel has been removed from the wheat which the farmer sells, while a duty of 50 cents per barrel has been retained on the flour which the farmer buys. In other words, the great flour mills of Canada are given the opportunity of buying from our farmers their wheat free and then selling to our farmers the flour made from their own free wheat with a protection of 50 cents per barrel.

Under this Canadian pact a tariff duty of 10 cents per bushel has been removed from the oats which the farmer sells, while a duty of 50 cents a hundred pounds has been retained on the oatmeal and rolled oats made out of the oats bought of the farmer free.

Is it right for the Beef Trust and the great packing concerns of the country to buy free live stock from the farmer and then be protected by a duty of 1½ cents on every pound of meat which the farmer buys?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's barley and protect the brewer at the rate of 45 cents per 100 pounds?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's rye and protect the distiller at the rate of $2.60 per gallon on the whisky made therefrom?

Is it fair and just and right to remove protection from the farmer's corn and barley and wheat and rye and oats and tomatoes and other vegetables and protect the manufacturers of these products into articles prepared for the farmer's consumption?

Is it just and fair and right that the Beef Trust and packing concerns, the millers, the bakers, the brewers, and all the rest should be protected in what they make out of the products they buy from the farmer free?

Under this reciprocity agreement things which the farmer produces and has to sell were put upon the free list, but the things which he can not produce, but has to buy, were placed on the protected list. In other words, the manufactured products, in the main, are protected; the farmer's products, in the main, are unprotected. Both Canada and the United States,

under this agreement, propose to protect their factories, but mutually agree that the products of the farmers of both countries may enter the markets of the other free of duty. Is it right that the American manufacturer should be permitted to buy the things he consumes from the Canadian farmer free and go on selling his manufactured and protected products to the unprotected farmer of our own country? Grant that the price of living is too high; is not that which the farmer buys too high as well as that which the farmer sells? And, as a matter of fact, the farmer, in the main, is not getting an exorbitant price for the products of his farm.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his report (1911), shows that the farmer does not get 50 per cent of the price the consumer is forced to pay for agricultural products. He also points out that the prices received by farmers in many instances were even less than the cost of production; and that the middleman, and not the farmer, is the one mostly responsible for the high cost of foods. The trouble lies with the middlemen. The profits are made after the farmer's products leave him and before they reach the table of the consumer. Is there anything in the reciprocity pact designed to remedy this evil? Nothing. Should the farmer be singled out as a victim and made the burden bearer for all other classes? In an effort to reduce the cost of living should the farmer's pocketbook be the only pocketbook called upon to contribute to that end? But the argument has been made here by gentlemen on this floor that the reciprocity agreement with Canada will reduce the cost of living and at the same time will not affect the price of farm products. Since it is conceded by the President, the author of the reciprocity agreement with Canada, that the agreement will chiefly affect the products of the farm, and since the farmer's products are the ones put upon the free list in this bill, it is beyond my conception to understand how the cost of living is going to be reduced without reducing the cost of farm products, and it is equally incomprehensible to me how the farmer's products are going to be reduced in price and the farmer profited thereby. How it is going to help the farmer to sell what he has got to sell in a low market and buy what he has got to buy in a high market is a problem the solution of which the champions of this measure will have to solve, for they solemnly tell us that the farmer is going to be blessed and benefited by the transaction and that he should welcome the day when he sells cheap and buys high.

Canada has a population of about 7,500,000 people; the United States has a population of over 92,000,000. In other words, the United States has about twelve times as many inhabitants as Canada. The advocates of this bill tell us that it is going to be a blessed privilege on the part of the farmer of this country to have the glorious (?) opportunity of selling his farm products to one Canadian in return for the privilege on the part of the one Canadian to sell his farm products to 12 Americans. In other words, that the farmers of this country should welcome the day when they have the right, without tariff interference, to at least partially stop selling their products to 12 Americans in exchange for the privilege of selling them to one Canadian.

Republican protection has built up for our farmers a market here on American soil amounting to $25,000,000,000 a year, and it is now proposed by Canadian reciprocity to turn that over to the Canadian farmer free. We are told that even if our American farmer should get no market of any consequence for the one he gives up, and even if he is forced to sell his products into a foreign market at a reduced price, and even if the Canadian farmers have contributed nothing to build our bridges and roads and churches and schools, or to maintain or keep up our institutions, that the American farmer should look upon this Canadian agreement from a "high plane"; that the things I have just mentioned are sordid considerations; that Canada is our neighbor, and that free intercourse with a neighbor nation is a lofty sentiment and one which should control our actions in this matter. In answer to that argument I want to say that this reciprocity pact with Canada is not a matter of sentiment, but a matter of business; it is a transaction involving the welfare of the American farmer, and the American, not the Canadian, farmer is the one entitled to our sympathy if there is any sentiment at all in this proposed agreement.

Most of the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber have been loud in their praise of the reciprocity pact, because it is a free-trade measure, they say; or, to say the least of it, "a long step in the direction of free trade"; and with that statement I fully agree. This pact is a good deal more than a reciprocal agreement with Canada. It is not a pact for the purpose of exchanging with Canada what we have for what she has not, or what she has for what we have not. It is putting our farm products in open competition with the farm products of Canada. It is not reciprocity; it is free trade. If our farmers are to be exposed to free trade with Canada, why should not our manufacturers be exposed to free trade with Canada? If free trade with Canada is a good thing for the American farmer and the American people generally, why is not free trade with the world a good thing for the American farmer and the American people generally?

I can understand why the Democratic Representatives in this House and the Democratic Party of the Nation seized the opportunity to pass the Canadian reciprocity measure. It was not mainly for the purpose of enlarging our trade with Canada and securing the Canadian market, for we already have that. We now have 60 per cent of Canada's entire foreign trade.

The reason why the Democratic Party embraced with such undisguised delight the opportunity to pass the Canadian pact was that it is a heavy blow to the time-honored doctrine of Republican protection. In fact, it is in many respects a radical free-trade measure. It does not stop with the "tariff for revenue only" doctrine of the Democratic Party. It does not look to revenue at all. Its most earnest advocates admit that we will loose from two to ten million dollars in revenues yearly by reason of the passage of this bill. It would not surprise me if we lost yearly $50,000,000 in revenue.

The central idea in the fertile brains of the Democratic Members of this House, and the motive which actuated their hearts in the passage of the Canadian reciprocity measure, were to strike a body blow to our protective system.

They are not unmindful of the fact that our protective tariff system is a logical whole; that protection must either apply to all industries or apply to none. You can not protect the manufacturers and leave the farmer unprotected. Protection must protect everybody that needs protection or protect nobody.

I have made these observations, Mr. Chairman, explanatory of my vote on the Canadian reciprocity measure and preparatory to a few observations I am now going to make on what is called the farmers' free-list bill now pending before this House.

As I have intimated heretofore, I had hoped to be able to give what some are pleased to call the farmers' free-list bill my hearty support. As an original proposition I would have opposed it in whatever form presented. What I mean to say is, that if the Canadian reciprocity bill had not passed this House and if this misnamed farmers' free-list bill had been introduced as an original proposition, and not as an intended balm (supposed in the minds of some to rehabilitate the status of and compensate for the injury done) the American farmer by the passage of the reciprocity bill, I would have cast my vote against it because of its free-trade provisions. That this measure is a blow at our protective system no one doubts or denies, and that the United States owes her greatness, in a great measure at least, to our protective policy is the belief of many of her citizens.

The truth is that the protective system has been the generally accepted economic policy of the United States. For years our people have been divided as to the amount of protection and about just what should be protected and what should not be protected; but few of our people have been open advocates of free trade. The Republican Party has stood for such duties on imported articles (coming in competition with our own) as would furnish protection to American capital and American labor. The Democratic Party has stood for such rates of duty on imported articles as would furnish us sufficient revenues to run the Government when economically administered, apparently without regard to the effect on American capital and American labor. The "insurgent" and "stand-pat" Republicans differ on matters here and there, but all stand for some sort of protection and none for free trade. The tariff is essentially a selfish question. The Democrats want a tariff for revenue only. The Republicans want a tariff not only for revenue, but a tariff so levied as will protect American capital and American labor. Most everybody wants a tariff levied on the products of foreign countries coming into our own country, in order to raise sufficient revenues to defray the necessary expenses of this great Government. We differ as to just how to get this money; but all agree that it is much to our liking to get it from the pockets of the foreigner, if we can, rather than to take it out of our own. And here at home I find that our views as individuals are much warped by how tariff duties, or the lack of them, on this article or that are going to affect us. The Middle West and their Representatives here, or the most of them, want free lumber and protection on agricultural products. Why? Because they produce the one and do not produce the other. They want to buy as cheap and sell as high as they can. The lumber-producing districts want protection on lumber and would like to see farm products on the free list. Why? Because they want to sell what they have to sell as high as they can and buy what they have got to buy as cheap as they can. The New England manufacturer is interested in having protection on the product he manufactures and apparently would take quite a delight, some of them, in buying products of the farm from the farmer free.

It has been wisely said that the tariff question is a local question, and the author of that saying could have added, with equal truth, "and a selfish question." The tariff will have to stand as a whole, or it can not stand at all.

The Democrats, through their representatives here, have put the products of the American farmer on the free list, so far as Canada is concerned; and Canada is our closest and most dangerous competitor. It seems to me that any unprejudiced mind must admit that great injury has been done the farmer in the passage of the reciprocity agreement with Canada. In fact, the Democratic majority on the Ways and Means Committee, in making a report on the farmers' free-list bill, admitted that the American farmer was getting the worst of it in the reciprocity agreement with Canada, and urged that the farmers' free-list bill be passed to remedy that wrong. In the report just referred to this significant language is used:

> In fact, action on the Canadian agreement involves the necessity of further and immediate action in removing a number of duties on imports from other countries, in order that justice may be done to the great army of our agricultural producers.

The Democratic Party knows that the American farmer has been unfairly dealt with in putting his products in open competition with the products of the Canadian farmer. Canada is a new and undeveloped country, with matchless possibilities and unbounded resources.

It seems that many, if not most, Americans realize this fact, for in the year 1909, $304,000,000 belonging to enterprising inhabitants of the United States were invested in the Dominion of Canada, most of it being put in mines and timber and timber lands.

Ninety thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine residents of the United States left this country in the year 1899 and made their future homes in Canada. North Dakota furnished 16,000 of this number, while Minnesota and the State of Washington each furnished over 11,000.

Canada, in 1910, produced 95,000,000 bushels of wheat available for export. Her total yield that year was 166,744,000 bushels. She, therefore, produced twice as much as she needed for her own consumption, and actually exported that year 57,000,000 bushels of wheat, much of it coming to the United States. In that same year the United States exported only 114,000,000 bushels of wheat. This gives some idea of what Canada will do along this line when her 8,000,000 people reach the 92,000,000 point, which we boast of possessing in this country.

The Canadian wheat lands, of which there are 30,000,000 acres in the Provinces of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan alone, average, when in cultivation, 22 bushels of wheat to the acre, while the average yield of the United States is only 15 bushels per acre. Experts say that Canada is capable of producing as much wheat yearly as is now produced in the United States.

Canada exported to the United States in 1908 $2,582,001 worth of live stock, cattle, hogs, sheep, and horses. In 1909 Canada shipped to the United States $1,847,836 worth of breadstuffs, wheat, rye, beans, and so forth. In the same year she shipped $382,118,000 worth of provisions—beef, cheese, eggs, and so forth—to the United States.

In the year 1909 Canada produced $2,912,509 worth of hogs, $2,705,390 worth of sheep, and $7,234,085 worth of cattle. In the same year she produced 55,398,000 bushels of barley, 166,744,000 bushels of wheat, and 353,466,000 bushels of oats. The total field crops of Canada in 1909 were valued at $552,992,100. In the year 1908 Canada stood tenth among the nations of the world as a wheat producer, and in 1909, one year later, she held the fifth position.

These figures show something of Canada's capacity along agricultural lines and something of her danger to us as a competitor in agricultural products.

For these and other reasons I voted against the reciprocity agreement with Canada and did what I could to avert its passage, believing that great harm and injury would result to the American farmer by reason thereof. But since that bill has passed this House, since the Democratic Party has, through its passage, made this onslaught on the farmers of our country—about one-sixth of our population—in the interest of "cheaper food," and since our farmers are, as far as Canada is concerned, forced to sell the products of their farms in a free market and buy the things they have got to buy in a protected market, I repeat that I much regret that the farmers' free-list bill, now soon to be voted on here, has, what appears to me, so many unwise and unfair provisions in it.

If this free-list bill had been one to benefit and not merely appease the American farmer, it would have had my hearty support. If it had been a bill really to help the American farmer and not to make political capital at his and others' expense, it would have had on the floor of this House no advocate more earnest than I, although, as I have said, I would have been against it as an original proposition.

Now, let us look at some of the provisions of this so-called farmers' free-list bill. It provides that "plows, tooth harrows, disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, cotton gins, farm wagons, farm carts, and all other agricultural implements—whatever that may mean—of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts, * * * shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States."

The gentlemen on the opposite side of this Chamber maintain that they propose to pass this bill in the interest of the American farmer. That being their avowed purpose, it would be well to look dispassionately at the situation and see whether or not this portion of the bill, if passed, will redound to the benefit of the farmers of our country, and to what extent, if any. If this part of the bill, when passed, will greatly benefit our farmers, then it ought to receive the hearty support of all the Members here.

To ascertain whether or not this part of the bill, if enacted into law, will benefit our farmers, it is necessary to determine at least three things: 1. What is the present status of the articles mentioned in this part of the bill relative to tariff duties? 2. What are the prices on these various articles now, in our own country and abroad? 3. And what effect, if any, will the passage of this bill have on the price of the articles mentioned herein?

Addressing myself to the first inquiry I find under section 476 of our present tariff law, which is now in operation, that "plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins, and so forth, shall be imported into this country free of duty," provided "no tax or duty" shall be imposed on us, "on like articles imported from the United States" into other countries, and in the event any foreign country refuses to let us ship our agricultural implements, and so forth, free of duty into it, then we charge that country 15 per cent ad valorem for shipping its like implements into this country and enjoying the privilege of our American markets.

Is there anything radically wrong about these provisions of our present tariff law? We offer to let farming implements of other countries come into this country free of duty if they will let our farming implements go into their country free of duty. Anything unfair about that? Is it right for us to give the various countries of the world a free market for their agricultural implements in this country and, in turn, be denied a free market for our agricultural market in theirs? Should we discriminate against our own industries, or any part of them, in favor of the industries of foreign countries? Should the American manufacturer, simply because he is a manufacturer, who employs well-paid American labor, be discriminated against in favor of another manufacturer, who employs cheap-paid foreign labor? Is it right that American manufacturers of agricultural implements, who employ American labor, should be forced to pay a duty on the agricultural implements which they send to other countries and let the manufacturers of agricultural implements of other countries, who employ foreign labor, send their agricultural implements into this country free of duty? Such a course discriminates against both American capital and American labor. And, besides that, it is my information that the International Harvester Co.—and which is sometimes referred to as the Agricultural Implement Trust—has manufacturing plants not only in America, but in Canada, Sweden, Russia, France, and Germany; and that agricultural implements are as cheap, or about as cheap, in America as they are elsewhere.

If that be true, and if this tariff law, which is soon to be enacted here, is to remain long in force, would it not be a wise idea for the International Harvester Co. and other concerns in the United States engaged in making farm implements to remove their plants to Canada and elsewhere and save the thousands of dollars annually which are now paid this Government in tariff duties for the privilege of shipping and selling agricultural implements into this country.

In that event this Government would not only lose the thousands of dollars paid in tariff duties, but our wage earners would lose $50,000,000 annually now paid American labor in the manufacture of agricultural implements.

In 1905 the United States produced $111,344,975 worth of agricultural implements. There were in the year of 1900 46,582 wage earners employed in the United States in the manufacture of agricultural implements. In that year there was $157,707,951 of American money invested in the manufacture of these implements. The State of Kentucky alone had $1,735,595 invested in this enterprise, and paid Kentucky wage earners over $300,000. The State of Illinois had

$62,202,320 invested in the manufacture of agricultural implements, and paid over $9,000,000, exclusive of officers and clerks' salaries, to American wage earners.

To let the cheaply made agricultural implements be shipped into this country free of duty would be, indeed, an unjust and unfair discrimination against American capital and American labor, especially in view of the fact that tariff duties must be paid by us on all the agricultural implements which we send for sale to other countries.

Since agricultural implements are already as cheap in this country as elsewhere, and since we lose thousands of dollars in revenue for this Government and transfer millions of dollars from American to foreign labor, it is evident, it seems to me, that this section of the farmers' free "fake" bill if enacted into law, will hurt, not help, both the American farmer and the American people generally.

This farmers' free "fake bill" provides also "that on and after the day following the passage of this act beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed and undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner, bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compound and lard substitutes, sausage, sausage meats shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States." Before the passage of this bill I propose to introduce the following amendment:

Provided, That beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and other meats stipulated in this section of the bill, and which are produced in the United States, shall be admitted free of duty into the country or countries, dependency or dependencies, which import any of like articles into this country.

I have no idea that the amendment I will offer will pass this House. The truth is that the Democratic Representatives here have already held a caucus on this bill and have already decided that no amendment, however meritorious, shall have a chance to become incorporated into and made a part of this measure when enacted into law.

The Democrats of this House have decided that this farmers' free-list bill shall pass this House without amendment from anybody. That, however, shall not deter me from offering whatever amendments, which, if enacted into law, would, in my judgment, prove to be beneficial to the country at large, and especially the district I have the privilege and honor of representing. The Democratic Party, through its Ways and Means Committee, said in its report on the farmers' free-list bill that great injury had been done "the great army of our agricultural producers" through and by reason of the passage of the Canadian pact; that "the advantages of the agreement are greater for the people of Canada than for the people of our own country"; and hence the introduction of the farmers' free-list bill to remedy that wrong. But does it remedy it? Will this section of the farmers' free-list bill, which removes the duty on beef, mutton, pork, and so forth, actually help the American farmer—the American producer?

We produced in this country, in the year 1905, $760,764,477 worth of fresh and preserved meats, while only $477,755 worth was imported into this country from other countries for consumption.

In the year 1910 we produced in this country in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,000 worth of fresh and preserved meats, while only $736,165 worth were imported into this country from other countries for consumption and on which $159,865 in duties were paid to us by foreign countries. But they tell us if we will let foreign meats come into this country free of duty that we can well afford to lose $159,865 yearly in duties paid to this country, because they say that if we permit free meats to come to this country it will greatly reduce the price of meats and therefore the cost of living.

If it be true, as contended by Democratic Representatives here, that the importation of meats into this country from foreign countries free of duty will greatly reduce the price of meats, and therefore the cost of living, on whom, I ask, will this burden of reduced cost of meats fall? The American farmer raises cattle and hogs and sheep, and so forth, from which beef and pork and mutton, and so forth, are produced. Now, if the price of beef and pork and mutton, and so forth, are greatly reduced, will not the price of cattle and hogs and sheep, and so forth, be necessarily reduced and will not the American farmer be the great sufferer from this transaction?

We now have over 6,000,000 farmers in the United States, and no legislation should be enacted here or elsewhere that fails to give their interest due consideration.

The interests of the farmers and stock raisers of our country are already greatly imperiled by the importation of cheaply produced frozen meats from other countries. A number of our competitors in such meats are the countries of Canada, New Zealand, Argentina, Australia, Mexico, and other countries, which produce much more of meats than they consume and are already exporting largely to other countries.

Canada, three years ago, shipped $11,000,000 worth of cattle, on the hoof, to Europe; five years ago we shipped $22,000,000 worth of meats to Europe; and last year we shipped only $12,000,000 worth of meats to Europe.

The countries which I have already referred to, which are producing cheaper meat than it is in our power to produce, have already taken much of our foreign markets from us. Argentina, for instance, in 1909 sent $32,000,000 worth of meats to Europe; New Zealand sent $17,000,000 to Europe; other countries were and are heavy meat exporters.

The authors of this free-list bill propose to let all these other countries send their cheaply produced meats to the United States and enjoy the privilege of the American market without paying a cent duty for the privilege of doing so; and in turn our farmers and stock raisers are denied the privilege of sending their meats to other countries without paying, in many instances, heavy tariff duty thereon. But we are told that even if the American farmer does have to sell his farm products cheaper, and, especially his meat products cheaper, by reason of the passage of this free-list bill, that in turn he can buy what he has to buy so much cheaper by reason thereof that he will in the end be greatly benefited. Let us look into that claim for a few moments and see what truth, if any, there is to that statement.

The Democratic Party has for years contended that the price of any given article to the consumer is increased by the amount of the tariff duty levied on that article. In other words, that the consumer pays the tax. I am not saying that that is true; but if it be true, as contended by the Democratic Party, let us see whether or not the American farmer will be benefited by the passage of this farmers' free-list bill. Taking the ad valorem rate of duty in the year 1909 on the articles mentioned in this farmers' free-list bill, which the farmer has to buy, and the farmers' consumption of these articles herein in the year 1905—the only one on which I now have the figures at my command—I find that the farmers of our country under the Democratic theory would save $93,869,914 in buying manufactured articles and other things he has to buy which are enumerated in this free-list bill. But while that is true, the same process of calculation shows that the farmers of this country would lose each year $292,618,285 by the reduction in prices of farm products, or a total loss of $198,758,371, or $33.12 annually to every farmer.

TABLE 1.—*Showing supposed reduction to farmers in manufactured products which the farmer buys, included in H. R. 4413, which is the farmers' free-list bill.*

Articles.	Consumption of article in United States 1905.	Ad valorem duty 1910.	Supposed reduction in price.	Farmers' part of reduction.
Agricultural implements	$90,637,110	20	$18,127,422	$18,127,422
Bagging for cotton sacks, burlaps, etc	26,031,614	28	7,288,851	7,288,851
Cotton ties (hoop or band iron)	12,639,953	36	4,541,373	4,541,373
Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, etc	493,005,263	7	33,510,366	11,170,112
Barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, etc	113,027,205	28	31,647,617	31,647,617
Lumber, laths, and shingles	699,599,293	8	55,963,979	18,654,659
Sewing machines and parts of	8,497,464	30	2,549,239	849,746
Salt	9,540,827	50	4,770,412	1,590,134
Total annual gain to farmers				93,869,914
Average annual gain to each farmer				15.64

In the above table I have assumed that farmers will get the benefit of all the reduction in prices of farm implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, and barbed and other wire for fencing. But leather, boots and shoes, lumber, sewing machines, and salt are used by all classes of citizens. I have therefore assumed that the farmers would consume one-third of these articles, and hence should be credited with only one-third of the reduction in the cost of these articles.

TABLE 2.—*Showing supposed reduction in price of articles manufactured from farm products, which the farmer sells, included in H. R. 4413, which would be a loss to the farmers.*

Articles.	Consumption of article in United States 1905.	Ad valorem duty 1910.	Supposed reduction in price.	Per capita to each farmer.
Fresh and preserved meats	$614,895,219	23	$152,959,564	25.47
Flour and grits, cereals and bread	665,041,533	21	139,658,721	23.27
Total annual loss to farmers			292,618,285	48.74
Average annual loss to each farmer				48.74

In other words, by taking the Democratic contention and figures which I have referred to, it is shown that by the passage of this bill there will be a total loss annually to the farmers of the United States of $198,758,371, or each farmer will incur a net loss of $33.12 yearly.

We exported, in 1910, $106,844,808 worth of fresh and preserved meats to other countries, American markets having first been supplied by the products of the American farmer, all except $736,165 worth of meats, which were shipped into this country from other countries.

Now, it is proposed by the framers of this bill not only to turn over the entire annual American market of about $1,000,000,000 free to all the countries of the world, with a loss in revenue of over $200,000 annually, but at the same time to force us to pay a tariff duty on all the meats, and so forth, we export to other countries.

Under this arrangement all the other countries of the world can have the benefit of the American market without paying a copper for the privilege of selling their meats, and so forth, in this country; but when we seek a market in which to sell our surplus, then we have to pay for it in the shape of tariff duties.

The amendment I have referred to and which I propose to offer will remedy this evil will at least force foreign countries that make us pay a duty for the privilege of selling our meats, and so forth, in their markets likewise pay a duty to us for the privilege of selling their meats, and so forth, in our markets. It is not fair nor just nor right to furnish free markets to the world and in turn be denied by the world free markets for our products.

I will not attempt to discuss at length the leather, boot, and shoe schedule in this bill. The truth is that the American shoe worker is paid from 35 to 90 per cent more for wages than the foreign shoe worker, but he does more work and better work than his colaborers in other countries.

Our present tariff of 10 per cent on shoes made of bovine and calf and 15 per cent on shoes made from other leather fall far short of equalizing the wages paid in foreign countries, which, excepting England, have practically a prohibitive duty. In Canada it is 30 per cent; France, 57 to 95 cents per pair; Belgium, 27 cents per pound; Germany, 25 per cent; Austria, 20 cent per kilo; Japan, 40 per cent, and so on.

If the tariff duty of from 10 to 15 per cent which is now in operation in this country is wiped out, as is proposed in this bill, without requiring a similar concession from other countries, it puts both American capital and American labor at great disadvantage.

According to the last Government report, the United States pays her boot and shoe employees an average of $38.33 per month, or five times as much as they are paid in some of the foreign countries.

Tan bark is used in the manufacture of shoes from hides of cattle, and so forth. We produce in the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky a good deal of tan bark, and if the boot and shoe industry of the United States is crippled, it will greatly cripple that industry in the district I have the honor to represent, injuring both the laborers and owners of tan bark, as well as those owning the timber from which tan bark is taken.

There is another provision in this farmers' free-list bill which ought to defeat its passage. The section of the bill to which I refer provides that—

> Timber, hewed, sided, or squared, or round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, etc.—
>
> Shall be—
>
> exempt from duty when imported into the United States.

We produced in the United States in the year 1910 $724,705,700 worth of lumber, laths, and shingles, and we exported in that same year to other countries $47,504,809 worth of lumber, laths, and shingles. The lumber has been and is yet one of our big industries. At one time the United States was the greatest timber country in the world to its size. There was a time when the forests of the United States covered 850,000,000 acres. It is claimed that we have left something near 550,000,000 acres of timber lands, but great inroads have been made upon the supply of valuable timber in all parts of this country.

We now take from our forests yearly 20,000,000,000 cubic feet of wood, 90,000,000 cords of firewood, 40,000,000 feet of lumber board measure, 118,000,000 hewn ties, and a billion and a half of staves, besides immense quantities of lumber used in other ways, and it is a heavy drain upon the forests of our country.

In my judgment a pretty hard blow was struck at the lumber business of the United States in the passage of the Canadian reciprocity agreement, although a duty of 10 cents per 1,000 pieces was retained on laths, and a duty of 30 cents per 1,000 pieces was retained on shingles, and a duty of 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure, was retained on "sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber planed or finished on one side." It is true, of course, under the reciprocity agreement, that "sawed boards, planks, and other lumber not otherwise manufactured than sawed," as well as "timber hewn, sided, or squared, otherwise than by sawing," and so forth, were put upon the free list with Canada, but not with the rest of the world. In other words, rough lumber, in the main, was put upon the free list with Canada under the reciprocity pact, while lumber partly or at all manufactured was not. But under this free-list bill lumber of all kinds, except mahogany, rosewood, and a few others, are put upon the free list. Shingles and laths were put upon the free list, and while Canada can now ship shingles and laths into this country free of duty, we will have to pay a duty for the privilege of shipping our shingles and laths into Canada.

In lumber, shingles, laths, and so forth, our northern neighbor, Canada, "the lady of the snows," is our closest and most dangerous competitor.

Canada is a vast country in area, containing 700,000 square miles more territory than the United States, leaving out Alaska. It is a country largely undeveloped, with boundless resources. Take British Columbia, for example. That Province possesses the largest compact area of merchantable timber anywhere to be found in the whole of North America. The truth is that western Canada will soon be furnishing lumber for a large part of the world's requirements. The lumber produced in British Columbia now finds a market all over the world, large quantities of it being shipped into the United States.

The Province of Ontario produced $24,399,077 worth of lumber in 1909; the Province of Quebec produced $10,838,608 worth the same year; while other Provinces in Canada rushed the grand total up to $54,439,036. In the same year Canada produced over $1,000,000 worth of laths and over $3,000,000 worth of shingles.

In the month of October, 1909, Canada shipped $1,935,977 worth of planks and boards into the United States, $244,525 worth of laths, palings, and pickets, and $178,119 worth of shingles. If Canada can ship this much stuff into the United States in one month and pay our tariff duties on same, what may we expect now, when she has no tariff duties to pay? Lumbering will for many years be one of the chief industries of Canada. Much of her virgin forests are yet untouched by the hands of man.

To expose to the cheap-paid labor of Canada, and without tariff interference, except to our detriment, the lumber interests of this country, big and little—whether on the country farm and in the tree or at the mill and manufactured into planks, boards, or otherwise—is to me a proposition so preposterous as to merit the condemnation of every fair-minded American.

The reciprocity pact with Canada did give the lumber interest of our country a little protection in that our lumber was put upon an equal footing with Canadian lumber, except we were exposed to the cheaper paid labor of that country; but under the free-list bill, Canada has the privilege of sending practically all of her lumber to this country free of duty, while the United States can not send any of her lumber to Canada that is partly, or at all, manufactured without paying a heavy duty on same. That this is an unfair discrimination against us and in favor of Canada, as well as other countries, it seems to me, no one can either doubt or deny.

In behalf of the lumber owners (not the Lumber Trusts) and the lumber industry of the United States, and especially in the interest of the farmers of the eleventh congressional district of Kentucky, who have tracts of timber on their farms, and others engaged in the lumber industry in that district, I propose to offer an amendment to the lumber section of the farmers' free-list bill, which will provide that no country that charges us duty on our lumber, when shipped into its territory, can ship its lumber into this country free of duty.

The amendment I have prepared and which, at the proper time, I shall offer, is as follows: After the words "cabinet woods," in the section of this bill providing for no tariff to be charged or levied on lumber, and so forth, when shipped into this country, add the following:

> *Provided*, That each and all the articles specified in this section, and produced in the United States, shall be admitted free of duty into all countries, dependency, or dependencies, which imports any of said articles into this country.

This is a fair and just amendment—one that ought to pass this House. No country that charges us a duty for the privilege

of shipping and selling our lumber, and so forth, into its market should be permitted the privilege of shipping and selling its lumber here, in our market, free of duty.

I feel sure that the amendment I have offered will not pass this House. No amendment offered by any Republican will pass this House, because the Democratic majority here have determined to pass this bill without amendment; but I want to enter my protest against its unfair provisions. There are some things in the free-list bill I would be glad to vote for, and would vote for, if presented separately and not coupled with such unfair provisions as the lumber and meat schedules, for instance.

If the southern rice planters and sugar growers or producers are to have the privilege of buying free lumber, those who own timber up in my district, or engaged in its manufacture, would like to have the privilege of buying free rice and free sugar from their neighbors in the South, who are permitted to buy their lumber free.

In the year 1910 there were $79,000,000 worth of beet and cane sugar produced in the United States, and in the same year our neighbors to the south produced 1,000,000,000 pounds of rice. Why did not the framers of this farmers' free-list bill put rice and sugar on the free list? Its authors put ground meal and wheat flour on the free list. They are produced in my district and in the North and West, but lemons, oranges, grapefruit, and rice and rice flour, which are produced in the South, are left on the protected list. Did the framers of this bill put lumber and ground meal and wheat flour, and so forth, on the free list because they are produced in certain sections of the United States, and leave sugar and rice and rice flour and lemons and oranges, and so forth, on the protected list because they are produced in certain other sections of this country—certain Democratic sections of this country?

This is the first time in 16 years that the Democratic Party has had a majority of Representatives on the floor of this House. In the main, for more than a score of years, the Democratic Party here has been a party of obstruction—a party of theory. And the political tidal wave that brought the Democratic Party in the majority in this House was not so much of an expression of confidence in the Democratic Party as a rebuke to what the people thought was a dereliction of duty to them upon the part of the Republican Party, coupled with a lamentable division in its own ranks. The Democratic Party does not now have the confidence of a majority of the American people. The Democratic Party can win that confidence only by wise and constructive statesmanship. It can not win it by striking down an industry here and an industry there. It can not win it by legislating for one class of our people and against another class of our people. It can not win it by legislating for one section of our country and against another section of our country. It can not win it, and it does not deserve to win it, by legislation more favorable to other countries than our own. The championship of the people's rights should be confined by this House to the championship of the rights of Americans. Let foreign countries, except in extreme cases, look after their own. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in the bill which we have before us we see the concrete result of 16 years of Democratic deliberation. I regret that I find myself unable to compliment the majority of my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means on this their first essay in tariff legislation. The product of their deliberations is a bill which they themselves can not explain except in the vaguest terms. If there is one thing desirable in a tariff bill, and particularly in one like this, which affects millions of people and perhaps billions of money, it is clarity, and clarity is a feature of this bill that is conspicuous by its absence. It is utterly impossible for either friend or foe of this measure to more than guess at what it means. Its friends do not seem able to explain what they intend it to mean. Its opponents can form no idea of what it does mean. No one knows, or if he does he has not so far explained, either what industries this measure is intended to affect or what industries, as a matter of fact, it does affect.

We are told in the report of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee that it is hoped that it will not cause a loss of revenue of more than about $10,500,000; but we can not be sure from anything that we have so far heard that it may not amount to millions upon millions more. In their zeal to show that, at least upon its face, this bill is intended to benefit one particular class of the community, its proponents have employed general terms. For instance, the word "agricultural" is used in so loose a way that it is impossible to tell how the provisions in which this word appears shall be construed. In reply to questions asked by some of us on this side who really want to know what we are voting for, we are asked to wait until the courts in the future shall have construed this measure.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my very good friend, and the one man on that side of the House particularly qualified to discuss any question of the tariff, was unable to cite me the other day the paragraph in the existing law to which an item on which I questioned him would apply. And later on, when I happened to hazard the remark that this paragraph might be difficult of construction by the Treasury officials, he replied, with a rather contemptuous reference to the high-priced Republican machinery which we had provided for the construction of tariff measures. I devoutly hope, Mr. Chairman, that this "high-priced Republican machinery" may never be called upon to construe this bill. But in the meantime it occurs to me that the membership of this House is entitled to know what we are voting upon now.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader upon this side of the House, in his speech the other day drilled this measure so full of holes that neither the polished suavity of my friend from New York [Mr. HARRISON] nor the brusque eloquence of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] can make any pretense of stopping them up.

There are such phrases as these:

All other agricultural implements of any kind or description.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will ask not to be interrupted now. I will be glad to yield further on to my colleague.

Also the following:

Other materials suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.
Wire for baling hay, straw, or other agricultural products.
Other kinds of wire suitable for fencing.
All prepared cereal foods.

They all occur in this bill.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and others have asked what these phrases mean. Your answer has been, "They mean what they say." Now, that is no answer, gentlemen. It is no argument to say that we upon this side of the House are unduly technical, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] said the other day. The membership of this House is entitled to know what it is voting on. It does not know to-day, and it can not know under the language in this bill.

We have, at least, the right to know how much revenue we are voting away from the Government, and there is not a man upon this floor that can more than vaguely guess within millions. In the absence of any satisfactory explanation as to how this bill should be construed, in the absence of any amendment or amendments which would clarify its language, it is our duty as Members of this House to vote it down.

This House, intrusted as it is with the origination of tariff legislation, ought not to pass a bill such as this, no matter how unfavorable the ultimate prospect may be of its becoming a law.

In the time at my disposal I do not intend to discuss every feature of this bill, and only one in any great detail. I take up this feature not only because it affects millions of capital and thousands upon thousands of workmen, not only because it is a great industry in the district which I have the honor to represent, but because it is the best example I can imagine as illustrating the present and future policy of the Democratic Party with regard to the treatment of American industries. I mean the shoe and leather schedule.

If I approved of every other feature of this bill, Mr. Chairman, I should oppose it because it undertakes to put shoes and leather made from cattle hides on the free list. This proposition, it seems to me, strikes at the very foundation of the Republican theory of protection. If we are to vote this proposition into the law we might as well forever abandon the thought that we shall in the future give any consideration whatever to American industries or to American labor in making up tariff bills.

We are here asked to wipe out absolutely the meager duty that is still maintained upon leather and shoes, and which is placed there to equalize the difference between their cost of production here and abroad. Not the slightest attempt is made to show that there is no such difference in the cost of production, but we are simply told that if shoes and leather are placed on the free list it may possibly in the end reduce their price in the hands of the consumer.

The interests of the consumer are alone considered. The interests of the producer, both employer and employee, are thrown absolutely to the winds. If there were a high duty on shoes and leather; if it were claimed that there were inordinate profits made in their manufacture; if any one of you would even remotely suggest that there is a combination in the shoe and leather business there might be some excuse for bringing in this proposition at this time. But no such statement has been made. No such statement can be made. The duties on leather and

shoes are the lowest of those on the products of any great American industry in a highly manufactured state; in the one case but 5 per cent, in the other case but 10 per cent.

In the report of the majority of this committee the average duty on the paragraph in this bill is placed at but 7.38 per cent. Does anyone, even the most radical free trader, claim that a duty of 7.38 per cent is prohibitive, or even excessive? Can anyone claim that a duty so small as this adds perceptibly to the cost of an article in the hands of the ultimate consumer?

If there is one industry in which the keenest competition exists and always has existed in every part of this country, it is the shoe and leather industry. If there had been any chance of a combination in a portion of it—that is, the tanning industry—it was killed absolutely by the passage of the Payne law, which placed hides upon the free list.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I voted for free hides, not in the interest of the shoe manufacturer nearly so much as in the interest of the independent tanner. The prospect seemed to be that if hides were not placed upon the free list, if the existing duty was maintained, the Chicago packers would go into the tanning business; and controlling as they would practically the entire American supply of hides, they would have had an advantage over their competitors of not less than 15 per cent, because their competitors would be thrown back upon the foreign market and have to pay a duty where the packers did not.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The placing of hides upon the free list has made free competition among all the tanners of this country, and they have now a duty of only 5 per cent as against all their competitors throughout the world.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will yield for a very brief question.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Did the gentleman take into consideration, when he voted to put hides upon the free list, the interests that the farmer and the stock grower had in the hide industry in this country?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why, I believed at the time I voted to put hides on the free list that it would not reduce the price of cattle to any farmer, and the results seem to have proved that I was right, because the gentleman from Colorado may remember that immediately after the passage of the Payne law hides began to go up in price.

I have always accounted for that by the supposition that the independent tanners were so afraid that a duty would be maintained on hides and that they would be at a disadvantage of 15 per cent, as compared with their big Chicago competitors, that they were not buying in the hide market at all, and when hides were put on the free list all of them at once began to buy their raw material.

Now, in their wildest moments our opponents upon the other side of the aisle have never claimed that there was a combination of the shoe industry. The word "shoe" trust is perhaps the only trust that is absolutely absent from their vocabulary. There are more than 1,300 shoe factories in this country, and they are not confined, as some people seek to prove, to the territory of my friend from Massachusetts. In fact, New England altogether produces probably less than half of the shoes produced in this country. No one has ever claimed that the cloak of combination has been thrown over either few or many of them. On the contrary, their competition admittedly is fierce everywhere. In consideration of giving them their principal raw material—hides—free, Congress a few years ago reduced their protective duty 65 per cent, and it is to-day only 10 per cent. You propose now to wipe this absolutely out, still leaving the existing duties on the many other materials that are used in making shoes. Is this fair? Does this industry deserve the punishment you intend to inflict upon it? You say, "Yes; because some New England shoe manufacturers came before the Ways and Means Committee and said, 'Give us free hides and we will take free shoes.'" Now, my recollection of that incident is that there was just one man who ever made the statement in a public hearing that he was willing to have shoes go on the free list if hides were placed on the free list. But if it be true that anyone from New England advocated free shoes, it is not true, so far as I know, that anyone from any other part of the country did; and it is certainly not true as to any shoe or leather manufacturer in the district which I have the honor to represent.

I am not willing, if I can help it, that legislation should be passed which would wipe out these industries or, at the very least, cause a certain reduction in the wages of the labor employed therein. If you are for free trade in leather and shoes, why not announce it as your policy with regard to all industries? Why do you single out this industry in particular, upon the flimsy excuse either that representatives of this industry ask for free trade, or that a duty of 7.38 per cent is a great burden upon the consumer?

But you say that the American manufacturer is not entitled to any protection at all, because under a duty of 25 per cent he was able to sell largely abroad and practically to control the American market. It is true that with modern machinery and modern methods American genius has been able, with a 25 per cent duty, to beat its competitors abroad in some classes of this trade, and this moderate duty has been sufficient to prevent the flooding of this market with foreign shoes of an inferior grade. But the situation to-day is very different. The shoe manufacturers in every country abroad have adopted our methods. They have installed our machinery in their factories. It will not be many months before practically every large factory abroad will enjoy every advantage, both in method and equipment, which has enabled the American manufacturer to compete with them in the past. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] cited the instance of the factory in Helsingfors, Finland, which is being equipped with precisely the same machinery as that in the largest factory in Haverhill, Mass. Already foreign competition is making itself very substantially felt in our market, and not only that, but our business in every country in Europe is rapidly falling off. It has ceased almost entirely in South America, where a very few years ago we had a large trade, and it has absolutely ceased in Australia, because Australia has just imposed a 30 per cent duty against us, three times our present duty against Australia.

I desire to insert at this point an article from the Boot and Shoe Trade Journal, of London. I will only read a sentence or two now, as it is somewhat long.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN SHOES.

Our readers will receive with some amazement the news that it is the intention of the W. L. Douglas Shoe Co., of Brockton, one of the largest direct shoe-distributing houses in America, to open stores in England. A few years ago we should have hesitated to use so strong a term of astonishment, but many changes have taken place since then and conditions have materially altered. Nevertheless, the pluck displayed by this concern in endeavoring to find a footing in England in the face of the now existing circumstances is worthy of all praise. To the manufacturers of America we owe much, and to those who have opened retail stores here we owe perhaps a little. To the shoe manufacturers of the United States belongs the credit of waking up the shoe manufacturers of England, and we grant it to them in no ungrudging spirit, because we are not only thankful that they came and woke us up, but the awakening has been to the shoe trade of this country a veritable godsend, for we are now fully able to meet their competition at home and, furthermore, carry it with undoubted success into the very heart of America itself. The Douglas Shoe Co., therefore, comes to us under vastly different and vastly more difficult conditions than those firms who established their stores here when the demand for American shoes was at its height and when the makers of American shoes could lay claim to features in their productions which were not to be found in goods of British manufacture. To-day the facts are otherwise. There is no good point in an American shoe that can not be found in British goods of equal value, and there is in addition much that is not to be found in the rival production. If the belief therefore exists that our American friends will again forge ahead and leave us behind, and that the belief is inspiring the new venture and furnishing food for consolation amongst the proprietors of the American stores established here, then the sooner the delusion dies the better. This might not be the case if we were not meeting Brother Jonathan in an open field, if we had not his competition to meet at home and on the Continent, and if we had not to meet the competition of the continental manufacturers, who are waking up to new methods as ours have done. Although the consumption of American shoes is declining in this country and on the Continent, we have no doubt that very considerable quantities will continue to be sold here and there, but such goods will undoubtedly be distributed mainly through the medium of American-owned stores. The more stores of this kind there are the less there will be for each. Few retailers stock the American article, and those who do are carrying it in diminished quantities each year. Looking at the figures just to hand for the last seven months of 1910, we find that America sent us only $799,453 worth of shoes as against $988,762 worth during the same period of 1909. Her shipments to France fell in like manner from $229,028 to $165,814, and to Germany from $371,266 to $300,718. On the other hand, the shipment of English shoes to the continent went on increasing, and indications point to a further increase in the number and extent of the transaction. Let us take the case of Belgium as an example of the influence of the British boot on the Continent. France and Germany are her nearest neighbors, yet England supplies the greatest part of her imported footwear. The following are the principal figures: Great Britain, value of sales last year, £67,400; France, £25,750; Germany, £20,600; Austria, £4,300; United States, £9,000. The reason is not hard to find. We are selling shoes to America, and the world knows it pretty well by now. The continental buyers of foreign shoes know it, too, and doubtless reason with themselves in this way: That if England is selling shoes to America it is because they are better and that it is policy for them to buy English shoes instead. In this way the continental trade in foreign shoes is drifting from America to England. It is, of course, a matter of much gratification to us not only because it brings extra grist to the Britisher's mill, but because this journal was instrumental in getting British shoes onto the American market. It is gratifying to us to know that our pioneering work has been successfully followed up and that a steadily growing trade is being built up in the United States and Canada. This week the representatives of six British firms start out to lay their samples before the buyers of the above-mentioned countries, and in our minds we have no doubt that the results will be pleasant to the firms in question. The interest displayed by both American and Canadian buyers

in British goods is a happy omen. We say this because the American citizen is the most patriotic of all men. He does not change his bootmaker for sentiment; he changes for something better; and, despite every attempt on the part of our ultrapatriotic contemporaries in the States to belittle the merits of English-made footwear, our goods are forging a way for themselves out there, and it is now more readily granted that British boots are best, that they are all we claim for them, and that, money for money, they are, owing to our national economic conditions and cheaper methods of production, of exceedingly better value. (From the Boot and Shoe Trades Journal, London, England.)

I call the English shoe manufacturers themselves to witness that they can produce shoes of the same quality cheaper in England to-day than we can and undersell us in our home market. And yet your proposition is to put boots and shoes, under these conditions, on the free list.

Why can they produce shoes cheaper in England than they can here? This brings me to the very foundation of the question before us. Have the English shoe manufacturers any advantage by way of machinery over us? Not at all, because they have our machinery, or at least machinery manufactured on the same lines, in accordance with their patent laws.

Have they any advantage of method over us? Not at all, because they have adopted our methods. What advantage, then, have they? Simply and solely a lower wage scale. The wages in England are somewhere about one-half—possibly a little more, but in most cases about one-half—what they are in this country.

Now, if it be true that England can produce cheaper than we can, then it is all the more true that other European countries can produce cheaper even than that, because there their wages are lower than England's wages. They are anywhere from two to four times lower than they are in this country. Here, Mr. Chairman, we have an industry competing not only for the foreign, but to-day even for our home market, with every European nation, an industry in which we have no advantage whatever over any one of our foreign competitors and but one marked disadvantage, to wit, the high wage cost here. Here we have the Republican policy of protection reduced to bedrock. We do not have to argue in this case about insuring profit to the manufacturer.

The question here at issue is insuring reasonable wages to American workmen; and that is all there is to it. In your zeal for cheapening cost you propose to do it by reducing wages. You can not get away from it by any high-flown rhetoric or appeal to the farmer or anybody else. Your proposition is to make shoes cheaper by paying less wages to the man that makes them. You propose to reduce his purchasing power to the level of that of the worst paid laborer in any foreign factory. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How about the shoe workers themselves? Do you think they are going to receive this proposition with equanimity? I call your attention to a letter printed in the RECORD of April 24, on page 566. I will only read one sentence of it. This letter is written by Mr. John F. Tobin, general president of the National Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, protesting against the passage of this measure:

> The greater efficiency of labor in the shoe industry in the United States as against any foreign country is not sufficient to offset the lower standards of living in all foreign countries as compared with the United States, notwithstanding cheaper labor prices which prevail in foreign countries. To put shoes and finished leather on the free list, or in any way to reduce the present tariff, would compel the American shoe manufacturers to meet foreign competition through the only avenue open to them, namely, to attack the wages of the shoe workers and thereby bring about a standard of wages lower than at present, and which would result in an industrial warfare, and no doubt eventually would lower the standard of wages and constantly lower the standard of living.

There you have the whole question in a nutshell. It has been one of your stock arguments that although wages were higher here than they were abroad, the increased efficiency of the American workmen more than make up to the manufacturer for the difference in wages. If that is true anywhere it is not true here. Admitting that the American shoe worker may be more intelligent than his competitor abroad, his equipment and his means of production are no better. They are on exactly the same basis. Therefore, what Mr. Tobin says is perfectly true, that if you put shoes on the free list, the only recourse the American manufacturer can take if he desires to retain the American market will be to reduce wages.

My friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] the other day made a witty and eloquent if not a thoroughly convincing speech upon this bill. He devoted much time to the discussion of the free list, and apparently enjoyed himself hugely in enumerating many of the articles that are contained therein. He reveled in the pronouncement of such items as broken bells, dried blood, fossils, and junk. He displayed some familiarity with the humors of this paragraph. He was funny, but he might have been funnier. He spoke of "catgut" and "whip gut," but he forgot their ancient companion, "worm gut." He mentioned "junk," but he forgot its romantic colleague, "punk." He spoke of "fossils," but he forgot "bones." He spoke of "dried blood," but he forgot "pula" and "divi-divi." He mentioned "leeches," but he forgot "unmanufactured lava." He displayed an almost inexcusable unfamiliarity with some of the more abstruse features of the free list—and I call this particularly to the attention of my friend from New York [Mr. HARRISON], because he is an authority upon the chemical schedule and all the products of chemicals—by neglecting to mention, for instance, "amidonaphtolsulfoacids," "binitrochlorbenzol," "diamidostilbendisulfoacid," "dimethylanilin," and other chemicals of the kind which will readily occur to any close student of the free list.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. He did not forget them. He only forgot how to pronounce them; that is all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. His failure to enumerate "beeswax," "burgundy pitch," "cudbear," "cuttlefish," "dragon's blood," "uncleaned horsehair," "jalap," "munjeet," "manna," "myrobolans," "nux vomica," "salep," sometimes called "salop," "skeletons," "turmeric," "witherite," and last, but not least, "zaffer," was to my mind reprehensible, if not inexcusable, in a member of the majority side of the Ways and Means Committee, who was essaying to enlighten this House and the country upon the tariff in general and the Republican free list in particular.

Now, these and many other things upon the free list are funny, and they are always brought in to illuminate the sometimes turgid speeches of Democratic orators upon the tariff question. Why are they funny? Simply and solely because they are not produced in this country. They are unfamiliar to the average man. No American capital is invested in producing them. No American labor is employed in producing them. If American capital and American labor made these things, there would be nothing funny about them. There is no more inherent humor in the word "zaffer" than there is in the word "wool." There is nothing funnier about the word "munjeet" than about the word "shoes." There is nothing more inherently comic about the word "spunk" than there is about the word "leather." And yet the pronouncement of "wool," "leather," and "shoes" does not make people laugh. It is for the reason that shoes and leather and wool are great American industries, and conducted in sharp competition with other nations of the world, that they are not upon any Republican free list, and I hope never will be on any free list.

Our policy is to put noncompetitive articles on the free list, articles which can not be produced here at all. It develops that it is the policy of our opponents to put competitive articles upon the free list, articles which can be and are produced at home. Under our present law about half of everything imported into this country comes in free of duty, and that is because we are unwilling to risk the increasing of the cost of any article to the consumer unless some American industry can be established and maintained and some American workmen given employment. The logical result of the theory of gentlemen upon the other side of a tariff for revenue is that a duty should be placed upon every article which can not be produced in this country, because what can not be produced here must be imported, and must produce revenue if you put a duty upon it. That policy, carried to its logical conclusion, would burden every American consumer without benefiting a single American producer.

We are opposed to a policy which would burden any American unless we are certain thereby to benefit some other American.

Your free list would not be so humorous as ours. You would cut out some of the humor by transferring it to the dutiable list and add to its seriousness by a transfer of serious subjects from the dutiable list. In your desire to make the free list less comic you will undoubtedly succeed if you are elevated to power in the Nation. When you have transferred to it articles well known in the everyday vocabulary of the American people; when you have placed the American producer on an exact level with the foreign producer; when you have placed American labor on an exact equality with the ill-paid labor of the rest of the world, there will be mighty little left to laugh at on the free list. And that is the result of the Democratic policy of a tariff for revenue! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Upon this side of the House we have recently differed slightly as to the true conception of the doctrine of protection. Some of us have evidenced by our votes on the Canadian reciprocity bill that we do not believe that a duty upon any competing article should be abolished or substantially lowered, even in favor of some one country, and whether we get corresponding advantages in the way of lower duties from that country or not. There are others of us, of whom I was one, who evidenced the belief that the ordinary rule does not apply in the case of a

reciprocal arrangement with one other country only, one similarly situated and where industrial conditions are substantially the same, and where, by a mutual policy of give-and-take, whatever possible detriment we may suffer in one direction would seem to be compensated for by corresponding advantages in others. To my mind the difference between a duty fixed by Congress to carry out the terms of a reciprocal agreement negotiated with another country and a similar duty fixed in the general tariff is the difference between black and white. To me the distinction between a free list of competitive articles in a reciprocal agreement and in a general tariff is as clear as day is from night.

If the reciprocity bill which lately passed the House had contained free flour and free meat, I should have been glad to vote for it. I wish it had. I am perfectly willing to give Canada free flour and free meat if she will return the compliment, but I am not willing to put meat and flour on the free list as against every other country in the world whether they make any corresponding reduction to us or not; nor am I willing to give free shoes to Australia when Australia still retains a duty of 30 per cent against us. I am in favor of reciprocity in some cases in competitive articles, but I am opposed to free trade with the world in competitive articles.

But I do not intend to discuss in detail the question of reciprocity now. It is probable that the distinction which seems clear to me is a distinction which may seem to be without a difference to some of my colleagues. But upon the proposition that we are to place on the free list, as applied to every nation in the world, articles which cost more to produce in this country than abroad, and in the production of which American capital is invested and American labor employed, I believe there is no difference among us. We stand together upon the tariff plank in the last Republican platform. We insist that upon every article which we produce in competition with every nation in the world that the duty shall be maintained at least equal to the difference in the cost of production here and there. In this bill you have in one article, at least, an example of the working of this theory of protection in its simplest form. You are asking us to put upon the free list an article which it is proved costs more to produce here than it costs to produce in any country in Europe, by an amount at least equal to the difference in the labor cost there and here. In your alleged zeal in the interest of the consumer you ignore absolutely the interest of the American producer, both employer and employee; you consider only the interest of his foreign competitor. If there were nothing else in your bill that is objectionable, this alone ought to condemn it in the eyes of any man who believes in the Republican theory of protection. Upon such a proposition as this I believe that we upon this side can unite, and if we do, regardless of what may be the ultimate fate of this bill, we shall have done our duty to American industries and to American labor. We shall have been true to the principles and traditions of the Republican Party. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a question before he sits down?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; I will first yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX of Ohio. It is the contention of my colleague that the part of the bill which relates to boots and shoes will be harmful to the shoe industry in Ohio, is it not?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it not true that the largest manufacturer of boots and shoes in Ohio besieged this body two years ago with a request to take the duty off boots and shoes because it was unnecessary?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. COX of Ohio. You do not know whether the Wolf Bros., of Columbus, asked this House to take the duty off boots and shoes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not aware of that fact.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Every Member of this House received a letter.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not.

Mr. COX of Ohio. It is the contention of the gentleman from Ohio that two years ago, if I am correct, boots and shoes might have been placed on the free list, but that since then the foreign manufacturers have adopted modern American machinery. Is that correct?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It would have been safer then than now.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Then, the duty two years ago should not have been put on boots and shoes, because our methods of making them were much more modern than foreign methods?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not discussing now whether a duty of 25 per cent on shoes in consideration of the fact that there was a duty of 15 per cent on hides was the absolutely correct duty or not. I am simply discussing the question as to whether the removal of a duty of 10 per cent would not absolutely destroy the boot and shoe industry. It may be possible that some gentleman in Ohio begged my friend and other Members of Congress to put hides upon the free list, saying, in an excess of enthusiasm, that if hides were placed on the free list the large manufacturer could stand free shoes. That was the statement made by one individual before the Ways and Means Committee. I do not know whether it was correct or not. I do know that the gentleman who made it, and who was representing at that time some of the New England shoe manufacturers, within a very few days came back and withdrew the statement absolutely.

Mr. COX of Ohio. The promise was made to the Ways and Means Committee that if hides were placed on the free list that boots and shoes would be placed on the free list?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No such promise was ever made.

Mr. COX of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, he speaks of the humor of the situation. I think, in our State particularly, if he obtrudes the observation that two years ago shoes could have been placed on the free list, but now they can not, inasmuch as the foreign manufacturer has recently adopted American machinery, he will be contributing considerably to the humor of the situation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman now, I think, is contributing somewhat to the humor of the situation. I said that the humor of the situation consisted in the enumeration by Democratic orators of funny things they found on the Republican free list. Would the gentleman like to have wool on the free list? Would he see any humor in that?

Mr. COX of Ohio. No. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will say frankly that I am not for free wool at this time, favoring a cut of about 50 per cent in the whole woolen schedule. But I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Two years ago he dilated considerably upon the virtues of the maximum and minimum provision. It is significant that you do not refer to it to-day. Why? Has it not worked out well?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has worked out beautifully.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it not true that the maximum is not in operation?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has worked out so well that there is not a country in the world that does not give us as good treatment as it gives to any other country, and there is no occasion for enforcing the maximum.

Mr. COX of Ohio. As a matter of truth, Germany, whose tariff relations with us are not as desirable as with other countries, has been given the minimum provisions, and the gentleman himself knows that the beginning of the Canadian reciprocity movement was inspired by the fact that the maximum and minimum provision had proven an absolute failure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. On the contrary, it has been an eminent success.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

Mr. HELGESEN. In speaking of the position taken by the Republicans in their last national platform you said that we stood for a duty that should equal the difference in the cost of production abroad and at home; is it not also true that they said plus a reasonable profit to the manufacturer?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is quite true, and I said that here was a case where we do not have to haggle about that. It has come down to the absolute labor cost. It is the difference in the wages paid to shoemakers abroad and the shoemakers at home.

Mr. HELGESEN. Was that element taken into consideration when the Canadian reciprocity question was discussed?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have just said that I believe in this distinction—not admitted by some other gentlemen, whose opinion may be worth a good deal more than mine—that there is a substantial difference between placing an article on the free list or reducing it substantially in an agreement with another country, where that country makes the corresponding reduction, and doing the same thing in the general tariff.

Mr. HELGESEN. In all the discussions that have been heard on the floor of this House during the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity question there has not been one man who suggested that under the new arrangement the farmers could make a reasonable profit, and therefore I would like to know whether the gentleman and others who voted for that agreement believed that in the question of guaranteeing profits the manufacturers were the only ones to be considered and not the farmers?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, I will say that that question did not occur to my mind in my vote on reciprocity.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman, in reference to the distinction he makes between reciprocity legislation and tariff agreements, whether he would be willing to have free trade with the entire world provided it should be secured through reciprocal agreements?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, no.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman tell us the particulars of the distinction in that case?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I was speaking simply of this particular reciprocal agreement negotiated by the duly authorized representatives of this country with the authorized representatives of Canada. I do not regard it as a blow aimed at the policy of protection as enunciated in the last Republican platform, even if, perchance, there may be some duty which by that arrangement might be lowered below the competitive point. I hope that in this case there is not. I doubt whether there are many such instances, if any, in the Canadian reciprocity agreement.

Mr. SHERLEY. Following the gentleman's viewpoint on the question of protection and reciprocity, is it his idea that there is no advantage to this country in the lowering of duties on goods from Canada other than that which comes from having the Canadians lower their duties to us?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, no. That is one element in it, but there are a great many other elements.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let us follow that a moment. The gentleman admits that an advantage is obtained from the lowering of the duties, aside from what Canada gives us in the way of a wider market?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, certainly. For instance, Canada at present has a duty of 3 cents a pound on meat. We have a duty of 1½ cents a pound on meat. We are therefore at a marked disadvantage in trading with Canada, with her duty 100 per cent higher than ours. Canada, in consideration of our reducing our duty, reduces hers. I wish they had gone the whole length; I wish they had put meat on the free list.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, we only get an advantage by reason of having the Canadian market made easier of access to us by the lowering of the duties?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is an advantage.

Mr. SHERLEY. And we may or may not get an advantage, from the gentleman's viewpoint, from the lowering of our duties? I would like to ask the gentleman what his idea is as to the effect of our lowering our duties on Canadian products, without regard to the advantage we get in the Canadian market?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I doubt if there is any substantial advantage to us.

Mr. SHERLEY. In other words, then, the gentleman's justification for the reciprocity treaty is simply the opening up to us of the Canadian market?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is a large element.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, that is not the only one?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The proposition in the Canadian reciprocity treaty, which I believe is going to insure to us ultimately the benefit of the pulp wood of Canada, by the removal of the restrictions which now prevail in some of her Provinces, is worth an immense amount.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, the gentleman thinks we can have an advantage by getting imported into this country cheaper something from a foreign country?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not say we would get anything from Canada cheaper.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, well, the gentleman says the great justification of the treaty is the pulp-wood provision.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I said that this is a case of a treaty between two countries which are substantially similarly situated, where the people are of the same kind and where the industrial conditions are substantially the same.

Mr. SHERLEY. Let me put a concrete case to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say this to the gentleman, that I would not be willing to give Canada free entry into our market on anything of which the cost of production was greater in this country than there under any circumstances, unless she would give us a corresponding advantage. That is as far as I am going. I submit that that does not apply in this case, because here the question is of a free list open to the entire world, with no possible reciprocity.

Mr. SHERLEY. If I understand the gentleman aright, then there is no circumstance in the home market that would warrant, in his judgment, the taking off of a duty on any article brought in from another country unless the other country gave us a similar concession?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Not where there is a substantial difference in the cost of production in those articles here and abroad.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not even where the market was absolutely controlled by the home producer and there was a false price exacted?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If it developed that there was no difference in the cost of production here and abroad, I might be willing to put such article on the free list.

Mr. SHERLEY. But suppose there was a difference, and the home market was being absolutely monopolized at a false price?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am opposed to any duty which would offer an opportunity for a monopoly. I would be glad to vote to reduce that duty; and wherever it is shown to me, as long as I am in Congress, that the duty in this country is so much higher on any article than the actual difference between the cost of production of that article here and abroad that it offers opportunity to make monopoly prices I will vote to reduce it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why is not the burden on the gentleman to show that the duty is needed?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The burden on the gentleman, in voting for a bill like this, is to vote according to the platform on which he was elected.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is a very easy way, and I congratulate the gentleman upon finding such an easy method.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is a very pleasant method, and I enjoy it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will permit. Is the pulp-wood feature in connection with the reciprocity bill any different now, so far as Canada is concerned, than it was before?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, decidedly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We have made a reduction, but Canada did not have any tariff on it any more than she has now.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that that involves quite a long discussion, showing what may be involved in the removal of the restrictions of the two Provinces which now impose an export duty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was the same way with lumber. Canada has made no reduction in lumber. It is exactly as it was before, but the United States did give Canada the advantage of lowering her duties, to pay Canada for putting her agricultural products into the United States, to put down the price of the product of the American farmer.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. About one minute more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, I will yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. ANSBERRY].

Mr. ANSBERRY. Did I understand my colleague to say that the reason he was in favor of protection on shoes was due to the fact that American machinery was now being used in Europe for the manufacture of shoes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. For that and other reasons. The other reasons are that our home market is in danger, our foreign market is being taken away from us, and that our exports are falling off every day.

Mr. ANSBERRY. I do not understand that protection will give us the foreign market.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is simply an illustration of the fact that the duty to-day is as low as that industry can possibly stand, and I am not willing to put it lower.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Yes; but I understand the gentleman to take the position he does for the reason that he wants protection against American machinery in Europe, and not against foreign pauper labor, which has been the excuse heretofore.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am not talking about American machinery in Europe. I am simply stating the changed conditions of manufacture over there. Their method of production and their equipment are now as good as ours, and the great advantage they have over us is the reduced cost of labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed.

For the benefit of the membership I wish to inform them that this passage is from the Scripture, and they will find it in the fifth chapter of James and the sixteenth verse. [Laughter.]

I congratulate you—the Ways and Means Committee—for the forthcoming of this bill. It is familiarly known as the farmers' free-list bill. It is a confession that the measure recently passed by the House and denominated "A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," was an inconsiderate blow at the food-producing toilers of our land, and as merciless as their poor and needy condition was undeserving. [Applause.] I hope and trust with you that by the passage of this bill you will heal the wounds you have received and avoid the others these producers had in store for you because of the passage of the other bill. This bill may well be denominated in legal parlance "A bill of confession and avoidance." The bill you passed, called "A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," viewed from the standpoint of these toiling sons is a misnomer. They believe in contractual parlance it should bear another cognomen, namely, "A bill to promote reciprocal trade relations between the people of Canada, parties of the first part, and the metropolitan newspapers and the trust manufacturers of the United States, parties of the second part." [Applause.] Again, reduced to legal parlance, the bill might be more comprehensive should it read, "The metropolitan press, the trust manufacturers of the United States, and the Dominion of Canada on the relation of the President, petitioners, against the farmers and stock growers of the United States, respondents." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I hope that some good friend, either upon the Republican side or upon our side, and I am thankful their name is legion, will remind me before I am through to give my views about what is meant in the bill by the "and for other purposes." Before I go any further, however, allow me to advert to what may be regarded as a matter personal to myself. You know I opposed the reciprocity agreement, and it has been intimated by some one—and doubtless, so far as I know, has been well circulated in this body on our side of the Chamber—that under the caucus rule I could not absolve myself and therefore was not at liberty to vote against the agreement. Upon that I wish to say I was before the campaign, and have been ever since, connected with three great organizations, namely, the Grangers, the Farmers' Union, and the Stock Growers' Association; that at their picnics, county fairs, and all my meetings during the campaign, when honored by members of any of them as auditors, I pointed out the very condition of things which might occur and which has occurred by the presence of that bill in Congress. I took as my text the report of the Massachusetts commission on the high cost of living, which report is found in Senate Document No. 523, Sixty-first Congress, second session, presented by Senator LODGE, and I quote therefrom as follows:

On the other hand, however, it is clear that in a period of rising prices like the present the tariff cuts off possible relief to consumers by closing access to the cheapest sources of food supply in the world's markets. In the past, the duties on the necessities of common consumption, foodstuffs, have been largely inoperative, because the country produced not only its own food supply, but a large surplus for exportation.

The United States appears, however, to be approaching rapidly the turning point when it will become instead of a food-exporting a food-importing country.

Under these conditions, as the duties on foodstuffs become actually operative, their effect must be to increase the cost of living to wage earners and the expenses of production to manufacturers, thus hampering the development of industry and defeating the very purpose of the protective policy.

The commission is therefore of the opinion that when the tariff shall further be revised, the expediency of removing all duties on food products be considered carefully by the National Congress, and it hopes that the Tariff Commission will be equipped with such funds and powers as may be necessary for researches adequate as a basis for future changes, to be founded on a commercial rather than political consideration.

I pledged them that when the time came that the farmers' product was asked to be put upon the free list I would resist to my utmost such action, until all of the articles of consumption purchased by the farmers were simultaneously free listed. [Applause.]

The rule of the caucus I invoked for the purpose of absolving me from being bound by its action is as follows:

7. In deciding upon action in the House involving party policy or principle a two-thirds vote of those present and voting at a caucus meeting shall bind all members of the caucus: *Provided*, The said two-thirds vote is a majority of the full Democratic membership of the House: *And provided further*, That no Member shall be bound upon questions involving a construction of the Constitution of the United States or upon which he made contrary pledges to his constituents prior to his election or received contrary instructions by resolutions or platform from his nominating authority.

8. Whenever any member of the caucus shall determine, by reason of either of the exceptions provided for in the above paragraph, not to be bound by the action of the caucus on those questions, it shall be his duty, if present, so to advise the caucus before the adjournment of the meeting, or if not present at the meeting, to promptly notify the Democratic leader in writing, so that the party may be advised before the matter comes to issue upon the floor of the House.

I complied with the rule. I said to my constituents that the Republican Party had maintained its imperial power by imposing on the credulity of the farmers and stock raisers; that to obtain their votes, and for that reason alone, the party had for years kept on the statute books laws placing high duties on all the flocks of the pasture, the yield of the fields, the products of the garden, and the fruits of the orchards; that for all those years practically everything they consumed was also by these same laws protected by high duties; that the difference, however, was that the laws in the one case were inoperative and useless to them, in the other actively operative against them. The duties on the things he produced came not into competition with those of any other country, and therefore these duties were mere "make believes," or, in other words, "fakes," and deliberately calculated to deceive. [Applause.]

I recalled to them that the Republican Party had always attributed their improvement to these duties on their products; that they well remembered improvement in their condition was never omitted to be mentioned by the advocates of high protection; that if one thing above all others was indelibly traced upon their memories it was that one word "improvement."

I told them that, reading between the lines, I could see from the tenor of the report of this Massachusetts commission that if the Republican Party should be returned to power a knock would soon be heard at the doors of Congress, demanding that now, since those old fake laws were about to become operative and the farmers and stock growers might receive a benefit, the time had arrived for their repeal. And I begged of them, if they would avoid such a calamity, to dethrone the party of false pretenses and bring back to power the grand old Democratic Party—their tried and true friend. I told them that in the revision of the tariff its first main effort would be to lift the yoke from their bowed necks and unburden their stooped shoulders from excessive taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in the main I am for the present bill. It has the merit of a good name. Without its passage, however, I am afraid the farmers would liken it and the reciprocity bill to an incident occurring in one of the villages in my district where lived an old German and his wife. She was taken ill and sent to a hospital. Hans, as he passed from day to day to and fro from his work, would ask the attendant, "How is mine vife to-day?" The attendant would answer, "Improving." This went on for many days, and the last time he asked "Vell, how is mine vife to-day?" the attendant answered: "We discharged the old doctor, and before the new one could quite understand the case she suddenly passed away." Hans, rushing off to the first saloon to assuage his grief, said to the barkeeper: "Mine Gott in himmel, gif me von glass of beer; mine poor vife, she pass avay." "Why," said the barkeeper, "Hans, this is very sudden." "Yah," answered Hans, "sudden vass vot de new doctor dit, but she had von bad disease unter the old doctor." "Why, Hans, what was that?" asked the barkeeper. Hans answered, "Vy, dot disease vot dey calls 'imbrovements.'" [Laughter and applause.]

As I am in duty bound as a good Democrat, I propose to go back to my old farmer friends and tell them that they were right in discharging the old doctor; that the improvement of their condition claimed by the Republican Party was in a truthful sense but an imperfect cauterization of a cancerous growth; that the disease was complex as well as chronic; and, therefore, no wonder the new doctor got confused in his diagnosis and gave the patient at first the wrong dose, but it had no sooner been given than he saw the black shadow approaching and immediately administered the antidote, and, now, thanks to a wise Providence, the patient is in reality improving. [Applause.]

I am happy to bear back these glad tidings, but if they say to me, "The reciprocity bill passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President, but the farmers' free-list bill did not pass the Senate," I shall say to them that the Democrats on this floor who voted to send the two measures to the Senate separately—all of them, with the possible exception of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], whom I believe gave the excuse that he was not under oath, or something of the kind—swore they believed both measures would pass the Senate and be signed by the President. I do not want to be compelled to tell them—and I am assured by my friends on this side that I will not—after their long wait upon sore feet without a shade from the broiling sun, begrimed with soil of the farm, or upon frozen ground with gloveless fingers benumbed, and frost-bitten feet, shod in worn-out but costly brogans, shivering in their

shoddy and threadbare common clothes, unsheltered by any friendly windbreak from the cold blasts—no; I do not want to tell them that the cars on this route do not carry a trailer; that the only car is loaded with the well-to-do city folks, and they must walk. No; I must tell them that the trailer is surely attached and it is especially reserved for them; that the conductor has been directed under penalty of instant discharge to collect only the usual fare, and not to side switch the trailer. [Applause.]

No, my fellow Democrats, do not have any misgivings but what I will make doubly plain to them that you are sincere and that if anything happens to these measures, either at the other end of the Capitol or at the other end of the Avenue, it will not be chargeable to any intentional blunder on your part.

It is proven beyond cavil that, considering the high prices of things the farmer consumes, the increase of wages, and so forth, he is not making a profit beyond his due. Even the Massachusetts commission, the Senate committee, and the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as the arguments in the debates on the subject in these Halls, concede that fact and with one accord they all agree that the middleman gets the profit; that such profit measures the increase of cost to the consumer.

The following food bill of New York City for last year tells this story:

	Received by farmer.	Paid by consumer.
Onions	$821,000	$8,212,000
Potatoes	8,437,000	60,000,000
Coffee	2,402,000	12,009,000
Rice	1,354,000	6,191,000
Cabbages	1,825,000	9,125,000
Milk	22,912,000	48,880,000
Eggs	17,238,000	28,730,000
Meat and poultry	219,300,000	291,000,000
	274,289,000	464,147,000

From the foregoing table it will be observed that of the products enumerated the middle man received of the sum expended for onions, ten-elevenths; of potatoes, seven-eighths; of coffee, nearly five-sixths; of rice, more than four-fifths; of cabbages, five-sixths; of milk, more than two-thirds; of eggs, more than three-fifths; and of that expended for meat and poultry, more than one-half.

Therefore, why reduce the farmers' price? If he is not getting more than his just allowance, why not strike at the middle man and make him yield a part of his profits? [Applause.]

But some of these economists tell us that to tear down the wall between Canada and this country and allow their farm products to come into competition with the products of our farmers can not hurt the latter, because, forsooth, that country is bleak and cold and its soil of short-lived productiveness. Why then tear down the wall at all? If the farmer is not to be injured and the consumer is not to be benefited, does it not appear an unnecessary performance? Economists of another school tell us that our farmers are a shiftless lot—they do not work hard enough, their methods of farming are antiquated, they ought to produce more, and if they would only rise a little earlier in the morning and work a little later at night, perspire a little more, and so forth, they could produce enough to fully satisfy the middle man and cheaper food would pass on to the consumer. Others tell us the farmer is rolling in wealth and is spending his time in idle luxury. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] emphasizes this idea by his good-natured sarcasm when he referred to the old farmer cheerily sitting before his blazing fire, produced by corn fuel, smoking his cob pipe, and his sons rejoicing they did not have to chop wood. [Laughter.]

When the gentleman from Massachusetts was thus demonstrating his utter ignorance of the present-day condition of the farmer, I not only recalled that it was also but a piece of the same cloth of indifference shown by the Massachusetts commission, to which I have referred, but I was also reminded of a boy I once knew whose father lived on the opposite side of the creek from where I did. His father was taken very ill, and being solicitous concerning his condition, I often hallooed across asking the boy how his father was. After his illness had lasted quite a while, on making another inquiry of the boy one morning, he answered, "Oh, dad's dead, but I've got his jackknife!" [Laughter and applause.]

I will not diverge further to express my disapproval of the sentiment of derision at the expense of the farmer, revealed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], than to observe that he and his colleague Mr. PETERS appear in entire accord in their sympathy with the manufacturers of their State, and are equally oblivious to the heavy burden the farmers have carried and are still carrying, and view with equanimity the revenues derived by their constituents at the expense of the farmers through the high protective duties under the present tariff system. [Applause.] It will serve no purpose to refer further to the many other scholars of the other economic schools whose equally divergent views are spread on the RECORD. Suffice it to say that, in my judgment, the reader of these pages in years to come will cease to regard the degree of confusion that fell upon the tongues of the plainsmen of Shi-nar as at all marvelous. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, denuded of veneer, subterfuge, sophistry, and demagogy, what are the simple facts, and how are the interests of that third of our population constituting the staff of the Nation to be affected by the reciprocity measure?

The Dominion of Canada occupies a space to our north extending from one ocean to the other, a distance of 3,200 miles. The five great western Provinces have a domain equal to that of the combined States of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado. The prairie Provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, equal the domain of England, France, Germany, and Italy combined, and therein are over 200,000,000 acres of land upon which a furrow has not yet been made, capable of growing wheat of a production of 3,000,000,000 bushels annually—five times as much as we produced last year. Besides that, these Provinces have an acreage of over 250,000,000 of the best grazing land now known. It is only within the last 10 years that any considerable attention has been given to the development of the section, yet the production of wheat from the whole area last year was approximately one-third of our own. A false impression has gone abroad to the effect that in the three great Canadian Provinces the cold is so intense that production of crops and stock raising is impossible. Yet the facts are that stock are turned out on the range in early March and are not rounded up until October, and fall plowing is carried on up to the last of November.

I know it must appear strange to this membership that I am so dense upon such questions as the cost of the manufacture of eyelets and shoestrings, that enormous product of the State of Massachusetts [laughter], but they should not start in amazement when I tell them the rigors of the late spring and fall months, even in Colorado—a place of perennial sunshine and a mile or more nearer Heaven—forbids the growing of crops and the raising of stock as economically as appears to be done in Canada.

Those who prophesy that these Western Provinces will never be settled up and their products come in competition with the American producer should take warning if they would only remember that such statesmen as Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, opposed the Louisiana purchase on the ground that it was only inhabited by blanket Indians and half-breeds and never would be settled by white men, and threatened secession on the part of Massachusetts if the purchase was consummated. He, by the way, was the original secessionist of this country, and when called to order by the presiding officer was compelled to retract the threat. The same may be said to have been the opinion of another great statesman from that Commonwealth, Daniel Webster, who entertained the same views. Even that great statesman of a much later period, Horace Greeley, enjoyed the same opinion respecting that portion of the purchase lying west of the Mississippi River. After his visit to Colorado in the sixties, he advised the readers of his paper not to go west in search of the precious minerals, and yet the sod had hardly grown firm upon his grave—at least, his great personality and ability as a journalist and statesman was still fresh and green in memory—when the State of Colorado alone up to 1908 contributed to the wealth of the world in precious minerals the grand total of $1,052,303,180.36; and from that time forward has maintained its average contribution. [Applause.]

You all remember that side-splitting speech of Proctor Knott, of Kentucky, delivered in this House 40 years ago last February, known as the Duluth speech. When a measure was before Congress for the granting of certain lands to build a railroad whose terminus would be Duluth, such a place could not be found on the map. He opposed the bill, not so much because it was paternalistic, but because no one, as he said, would ever ride on a railroad to such a far-off, unknown, and uninhabitable country, and that we were not in special need in this country of pine bushes, the only product, he asserted, that could be found there for a back haul. [Laughter.]

And yet we behold, contrary to these early as well as these modern prophets, that within the borders of the Louisiana

Purchase is contained practically one-third of the population of the United States; that the little village of Duluth, which was not on the map 40 years ago, has added to its population 2,000 every year since Proctor Knott made that speech, and the population of that shrubbery State in which it is located has increased until it is now close to seventh in rank among the States of the Union and produces one-eighth of the wheat crop. Its metropolis, Minneapolis, has increased from 13,066 in 1870 to 301,408 in 1910, and its capital, St. Paul, has grown from a population of 20,030 in 1870 to 214,744, as shown by the recent census report.

Further than that, they should remember that in 1790 our population was under 4,000,000 and the population of Canada was 180,000. Basing our population at 90,000,000 to-day and that of Canada at 8,000,000, the advance of Canada's population is nearly double ours, and based on the increase of latter years the population of Canada in the next generation will equal the number we have to-day.

These lands in Canada, according to statistics, yield more than 5 bushels per acre more than the average of ours; their farm lands are selling from one-third to one-half less than ours; normal wages are from 25 to 30 per cent less than ours; that country enjoys the benefit of the preferential duty with the mother country to our disadvantage of from 25 to 35 per cent.

The following is a table which speaks for itself:

Comparison of Canadian and United States tariff.

	Canadian tariff.	United States tariff.
Earthenware	15 per cent	60 per cent.
Tin plate	Free	45 per cent.
Tinware	15 per cent	Do.
Wire:		
Some kinds	Free	
None over	10 per cent	75 cents per 100 pounds.
Hats	20 per cent	55 per cent.
Sugar	35 per cent	80 per cent.
Carpets	17½ per cent	60 per cent.
Oilcloth	25 per cent	45 per cent.
Furniture	20 per cent	35 per cent.
Cotton cloth	25 per cent	50 to 60 per cent.
Soap	65 cents per 100 pounds	50 per cent.
Gloves and mitts	22½ per cent	60 per cent.
Hose	25 per cent	70 cents per dozen pairs and 15 per cent, to $5 per dozen pairs and 55 per cent.
Dress goods	15 per cent	60 per cent.
Automobile farm trucks	22 per cent	45 per cent.
Pianos	20 per cent	Do.
Celluloid goods:		
Some kinds	Free	
None over	5 per cent	60 per cent.
Cement	do	10 per cent.
Underclothing	22½ per cent	45 per cent.
Salt	Free	11 cents per 100 pounds.
Axes	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Shovels	20 per cent	Do.
Scythes	15 per cent	Do.
Stoves	do	Do.
Chains (iron)	5 per cent	45 per cent and up.
Knives and forks	20 per cent	50 to 65 per cent.
Agate ware	22½ per cent	40 per cent.
Sewing machines	20 per cent	30 per cent.
Oranges	Free	1 cent per pound and 30 per cent on the package.
Lemons	do	1½ cents per pound and and 30 per cent on the package.
Window glass	7½ per cent	60 to 75 per cent.
Rice	50 per cent per 100 pounds.	$2 per 100 pounds.
Figs	40 cents per 100 pounds	$1 per 100 pounds and 35 per cent.
Jute bags	15 per cent	45 per cent.
Cotton thread	17½ per cent	Do.
Glassware	15 per cent	60 to 100 per cent.
Lamp chimneys	20 per cent	60 per cent.
Brass goods	do	45 per cent.
Lamps	do	45 to 60 per cent.
Baskets	Free	40 to 60 per cent.
Rubber coats	15 per cent	35 per cent.
Rubber boots and shoes	do	Do.
Books	do	25 per cent.
Lead	Free	2½ cents per pound.
Clocks and watches	20 per cent	40 to 60 per cent.
Bicycles	do	45 per cent.

Much is said about the place where the price of wheat is fixed. Let us assume alone, for the sake of argument, that the President is right, and the time is fast approaching when we will become importers of foodstuffs instead of exporters, then it follows we borrow the day by the passage of the reciprocity agreement to not only shut out our wheat, as can be demonstrated, from the Liverpool market, but bring the products from Canada into our home-market place to compete with ours.

If the figures given are correct, and they are if the Government reports are to be relied upon, then, by the terms of the agreement, the prediction of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] will come true that we of the West and Middle West must soon turn our wheat fields into "truck-garden patches." [Laughter.]

The following is a table showing the wheat statistics of Canada and the United States for the years 1909 and 1910 on wheat production, home consumption, and exports, together with average yield per acre for 1909:

Wheat statistics.		Bushels.
Wheat produced in United States, 1910		691,767,000
Wheat exported	bushels 24,257,392	
Flour exported (8,370,251 barrels)	do 35,666,129	
		59,923,521
Wheat consumed in United States		631,843,479
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909		166,744,000
Wheat exported	bushels 49,000,000	
Flour exported (1,000,000 barrels)	do 4,500,000	
		53,500,000
Wheat consumed in Canada		113,244,000
Wheat produced in Canada, 1909		166,744,000
Wheat produced in Manitoba	bushels 52,706,000	
Wheat produced in Saskatchewan	do 85,197,000	
Wheat produced in Alberta	do 9,579,000	
		147,482,000
Wheat produced in remainder of Canada		19,262,000

The three Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta produced this yield of wheat with less than 12,000,000 acres under cultivation. They have an available area suited to the cultivation of wheat of 220,000,000 acres.

	Bushels.
Average yield of wheat per acre, Canada, 1909	21⅛
Average yield of wheat per acre, United States, 1909	15⅛

A fair idea may be gained as to what the future will bring forth under free-cereal exchange between the two countries by observing what was the relative position of the two countries last year respecting the principal cereals, wheat and oats. It is as follows:

	Bushels.
Wheat imported into Canada	54,964
Wheat imported into the United States	152,383
Oats imported into Canada	23,361
Oats imported into the United States	946,479

The merest tyro in economics will correctly solve the problem that if the world's consumption amounts to only so many bushels, that the production of a bushel more will lower the price. If Canada can take away from us even a part of the foreign market, it lowers our price, and when she goes beyond that and invades our home market, she will indeed drive our farmers out of the business of growing wheat at a profit. [Applause.]

But, it is said in answer, only the border States and near-by markets will be immediately involved. We reply that our interests are interwoven; that the same degree of patriotism abides in our hearts as it did in the hearts of the founders of this Government when they were confronted with the situation that moved them to resolve to hang together to avoid being hanged separately. [Applause.]

All I have said applies to the oat, barley, potato, and milk production of that country. But, it is said, admitting these things you say are true, the time of their fruition is a long way off. Even if this were true, in behalf of the toiling third of the Nation I say that Congress is charged with the duty not only of passing laws for the welfare of its present citizens, but for the future ones as well, and at all times the overflow of the cornucopia should be allowed to remain at home.

But, to continue. Already the flower of our country has been robbed of from 500,000 to 1,000,000 emigrants, and "the end is not yet." I find in my mail this morning the latest advice on this subject:

CANADIAN IMMIGRATION RETURNS.

The minister of the interior at Ottawa states that the immigrants into Canada from April, 1910, to February last numbered 275,000. The number of British immigrants was 104,000, the arrivals from the Continent numbered 60,000, and those from the United States 107,000. The increase in British immigration over the corresponding period of the previous year was 109 per cent. Continental immigrants increased by 53 per cent, and United States 24 per cent. The increase in the total immigration in the same period was 54 per cent. Immigration from the United States during March showed a large increase over the same month last year.

We offer the bounties I have only barely suggested for these people to run away. We lose not only the personnel of their citizenship, but the help they owe us to pay off our immense war and other debts. We, moreover, enable them to build up an alien empire, whose citizens will soon come into sharp competition with their kindred at home. Their expatriation serves as well also to exempt them from the duty of shouldering a musket for our national defense should the occasion ever arise. But it is objected that these Canadian lands will be, neverthe-

less, some day occupied. This may be conceded, but why borrow the day by the giving of these immense advantages to this foreign country at such a frightful expense to our own prosperity? Many forget that our own country is not yet fully occupied; that knowledge of the soils and their adaptability is yet in its infancy; that improved farming methods have not yet been fully adopted so as to insure a maximum production which will for years to come be sufficient for our home consumption, and, but for this untoward event, enable us to compete in the open markets of the world with our surplus.

Let me call your attention for a moment to the fact that we have in this country, untouched by the plow, 711,986,409 acres of unappropriated and unsurveyed lands, and in addition thereto, in round numbers, about 200,000,000 acres of agricultural, timber, grazing, and mineral lands in the forest reserves.

I want to point out that, together with bounties offered for the occupation of the Canadian lands, there is a corresponding discouragement to the occupation and development of our own. Our Government has, contrary to all precedent, gone into the business of capitalizing for revenue purposes every natural product of the undisposed part of the public domain. This is illustrated by the separation of estates of coal land—leasing the coal right and enforcing new and such burdensome regulations for obtaining titles to the surface as well as title to the balance of the agricultural domain, and a legion of other innovations and obstacles, such as leasing the grazing land, selling the timber right—all operating to drive the homeseeker away. In my State alone last year it is estimated that 75,000 homeseekers were so discouraged at the prospect of a successful contest with the Government to obtain a home that they turned back and went to Canada. The same restrictions are thrown around obtaining title to mineral land, and the development of that portion of the public domain has ceased.

Why drive our citizens to a foreign country instead of giving them a home in their own? Why exempt this vast domain from the taxing power? Why keep in hiding its great mineral resources? [Applause.] But this is another story, to which I expect shortly, on another occasion, to draw the attention of the House.

Some economists of the altruistic type point to the fact that Canada is a great and growing country—is largely now and will continue to be a field for the expansion of our trade. They do not see in this argument a contradiction of their brother helpers in the passage of this agreement, whose main claim is that the farmers can not be hurt because of the inability of Canada to produce anything that would come into competition with their products; and along this line an appeal has been made to the farmers of the Middle West to cease their complaining for the present, because the agreement will afford immediate market for their live stock.

The figures of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] have been juggled with for that purpose, but, in this connection, it should be borne in mind the exportation of live stock in that direction could of necessity be only of short duration, such as is temporarily incident to the settlement of all new countries. And the figures are misleading, because the tide has already set in the other way, for last year the value of horses shipped from Canada into the United States was $484,560, or $86,657 more than the value of those we sent into Canada, the tariff of both countries being the same. How about cattle? The exports are $25,150; the imports, $109,772, or $84,622 more than the value of those we sent to Canada, the tariff of both countries being the same.

Therefore the outlook for the expansion of trade so far as stock raisers are concerned is "nipped in the bud" at the threshold. But when we come to the interests of the manufacturer there seems to be a firm foundation for the argument that the agreement will offer the means of great expansion for their trade. The great Steel Trust is given absolute free trade with Canada; the great Agricultural Implement Trust and the Automobile Trust have favorable reciprocal tariff duties on their goods. The exports into Canada last year by the Steel Trust amounted to $2,476,930 in value. The imports of these products from Canada for the same year in value was only $15,088. Agricultural implements exported last year to Canada amounted to $5,151,870, and there was only imported into this country from Canada $84,618 in value. Of automobiles there was exported $1,764,089 worth and none imported.

Based upon last year's exportation of agricultural implements, with the reduction in duty fixed by this agreement, the great Agricultural Implement Trust is presented with the nice little sum of over $250,000, and the automobile manufacturers, with the reduced duty fixed by the agreement, is presented with the nice little sum of over $80,000, and the list, when followed through, results in finding like benefits to other manufacturers.

We remit to Canada, based on last year's importations, the round sum of approximately $5,000,000, which sum must be recouped in some way to be devised by the Ways and Means Committee, in order to relieve the taxpayers of this country for the loss of that revenue. On the other hand, Canada remits in round numbers only $2,500,000. This is in the ratio of one to two, and yet it is called "reciprocity." [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I must hasten along, and I shall not, I observe, have the time I would like to go into detail explaining how our stock growers are affected by the trade agreement. I know something of their condition—what they have had to contend with in the past and the problems confronting them now. They do not belong to a trust; they are the victims of a trust. They have felt the fangs of that trust as well as the ultimate consumer of their product. You did the stock grower a grievous wrong when you robbed him of from $1.50 to $2.50 (aggregating millions of dollars) upon every cow or steer that met its death either in the bog or on the block by taking the duty off of hides. He told you then, through me on this floor, that the blow, although aimed at the trust, would be received by him. He tells you now, through me, that your letting into this country from Canada live stock free of duty, although aimed at the trusts, will be nevertheless received by him. [Applause.]

In proof of this let me digress to ask you if any of you have received a single letter from, or inspired by, the Beef Trust protesting against the measure, and how many basketfuls the janitors of your offices have emptied of letters in protest from the stock growers? And whilst on this subject of letters and petitions received by you, let me ask you how many letters in protest did you receive from the Harvester Trust, the Steel Trust, the Automobile Trust, the metropolitan press, the oatmeal mills, the middle men, and, lastly, the maltsters. Yes; did you hear the brewers' voice in protest? No; and can it be possible that the Democratic Party, under the leadership of a Republican President, likewise is about to forsake another of its tried and true friends for the malted kind? Alas, what misfortunes have fallen athwart our pathway! [Laughter and applause.]

You seek to parry the blow by allowing the free importation of live stock only from Canada, but have you thought out the possibility of the building of packing houses on the opposite side of the Rio Grande by the great Meat Trust and availing itself of the free-meat clause of the pending bill, bringing into competition indirectly the cattle of Mexico, and the very same may be said of Argentina and Australasia.

The Massachusetts commission said something on this subject also. After quieting the fears of those engaged in manufacturing in its State, and demonstrating that Canada could not compete with them, it said:

> These will at least not be discouraged if we can make it possible for our people to buy their food in the cheapest market. If Canada chances to profit by supplying our needs to some small extent, so much the better both for Canada and for ourselves. But there is no reason why we should restrict our new purchases to Canada. If Mexico, or Argentina, or Australasia can help us out, let us turn to them as well.

There is not a syllable of sentiment, not a thought of kind remembrance for that third of our population which year in and year out have lo these many years meekly suffered under the fleecing knife to fill the exchequer of protected interests, not a word of sympathy accompanying this adieu. The "jackknife" is theirs. Out, out, I say, upon such marble, cursed be the quality of such greed, ingratitude, and inordinate avarice! [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of a revision of the tariff—a downward revision, to a revenue basis. But the burdens of taxation must be equally distributed, it must not be spotted; and I am not entirely enamored with the beginning under the direction of the Ways and Means Committee, for I am curious to know what is going to become of the hindmost man. The thought of the farmer is: "What will the harvest be?"

We have thus far seen that the Canadians have been presented with $5,000,000 of our revenue. The cotton States will be given under the pending bill more than half of the $10,000,000 in revenue we lose by this bill. Scarcely any of the benefits of the reduced duties provided in this bill will reach the other farming population.

I know you say they will get the benefits of the reduction in the products of leather, but we say that benefit was sought to be discounted when you took the duty off of hides, and neither you nor we received any. And, what is more, the revenue we are deprived of by the Canadian agreement and the present bill must be raised by increasing the taxes upon other imports, and the farmer is anxiously waiting and watching to see if in the end he is not again to be made the victim. I warn you here and now, I will stand as a rock against any further invasion of their rights. [Applause.]

We know that the export trade of meat, and especially the hoof exportation, is practically monopolized by frozen meats from Australasia and Argentina, and you seem to forget that the great beef trusts own and operate plants there, so why not in Mexico? Meat can be frozen in the Tropics as well as in the frozen north and as cheaply. What, then, will become of our cattle growers when you let in from Canada the live animals and from the other countries the dead ones? You will simply catch the stock raiser a-coming and a-going. [Laughter.]

The distinguished gentlemen who have spoken in favor of the agreement, and especially the gentlemen from Massachusetts, were kind enough to tell us what would become of the farmer, what he could turn his hand to, namely, "truck farming," but they have not essayed to advise the millions of stock raisers what we may have the liberty to do for a livelihood. I object to this reckless oversight on the part of our Massachusetts friends. [Laughter.]

But, it is said, you have no occasion to be alarmed about the cattle business of Canada. The country is too cold, the seasons are too short, corn will not grow, and so forth; hence, cattle raising can not be successfully carried on. I admit that the emblem of the Republican Party, with its loss at the last election of its few remaining hairs, would not enjoy the climate and might stray from the reservation, but the emblem of Democracy, I take it, would don a new coat in as short a time as the party itself has since the election shown such an inclination to do. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have imported cattle from Canada for personal use for breeding purposes. I know their value, and the thick coat of hair, a resistant to the severe cold of that region, nature has abundantly provided. I also know how quickly nature in this respect provides for animals exported to that country, and that calves can be shipped from Mexico by rail to Canada, and when they are 3 years old they will have taken on as much as 300 pounds more than they would have in their old environment—more than enough to pay for the freight and their keeping. These cattle will come into free competition with the cattle grown in this country, either in the home or European market.

In concluding this subject, I want to remind you that you have been told the corn-belt section of our country will be benefited by the free importation of cattle. I do not believe such will be the case. It is cheaper to fatten cattle upon grass than upon grain, and Canada can fatten her cattle upon grass even for export. Last year she exported $11,000,000 worth of grass-fattened cattle. She can ship from export points to Liverpool cheaper than corn-fed cattle can be shipped from Illinois to New York, and if she can do this, can she not take our market here from our own cattle growers?

I am here reminded that I promised you to give my views on what was meant by the words "and for other purposes." I will now make a shadowy stagger in that direction. Many men upon both sides have essayed to give a reason why the reciprocity agreement was brought before this House at this time and from what source it really emanated, and why it should be adopted. It will be remembered that the treaty of 1854 was before the American people three years before the Senate passed upon it. I want to call further attention to the fact that this is not called a treaty. Mr. Fielding and Mr. Patterson, the envoys on the part of the Dominion of Canada, took care to warn the President and Secretary Knox not to call it a treaty; not to undertake to pass a treaty. They said, "The desired tariff change shall not take the formal shape of a treaty." And I may say, by way of parenthesis, if this has the force and effect of a treaty, though not in form such, then all you have done amounts to nothing, because section 2 of Article II of the Constitution provides that treaties can only be made by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. They were correctly advised at this end of the line that a two-thirds vote of the Senate could not be obtained for a treaty.

But it came here within 14 days after the envoys came from Ottawa. They had only 14 days of discussion upon it. The President, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Fielding, and the Secretary of State took care to take no one here into their confidences, and that such a program was on foot was unknown outside of the President and the Secretary of State until the President's message came to this House within five days after they had concluded the conference. I put it up to anyone of you Members if you were able to digest this instrument as you would like to in that time. It came like a meteor from ethereal space, the only difference in the analogy being that we know the substance of this but we do not know the substance of the meteor nor from whence it was gathered.

Now, some say it was incubated by the Massachusetts commission, and I told my people back in my country that the findings of that commission would become the forerunner of such a measure. But others have said it was inspired by the great trust manufacturing interests. Others have said that it was the metropolitan press; and there has been the confusion of tongues on this subject to which I have already referred.

I have a notion of firing the other barrel of my shotgun—I am sometimes known as "Shotgun RUCKER." [Laughter and applause.] I fired one of the barrels out in Colorado before the election. I am going to undertake to pull the trigger of the other. After a very formal shaking of hands and a perfunctory passing of the compliments of the day Uncle Jonathan said, "Now, wily, winsome, but willful, Willie, don't say anything more about that peace treaty. I am not going to talk about that now. You went off over there into that new country"—— [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like 10 minutes more.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. "But you went off over there into that country and declared you would never engage in entangling alliances with any other nation. You took over that Monroe doctrine, contrary to my advice. You went into the colonial business, thinking you were as smart as your old daddy, and you got into all sorts of trouble. And now your Mexico difficulty. But, my son, I am not bereft of all filial affection, so I will tell you what I will do. I will just extend one of those due bills of Japan, and get her promise that she will not take the Philippines away from you—for a while yet, at least, until you get the Mexico troubles off your hands. [Laughter.] Now, I won't do anything more at present, and you needn't say another word, but I will tell you what you must do: Now, don't say anything more about a treaty, because that word 'treaty' is becoming a very, very delicate and serious subject all over the world, and especially with me with all those past-due bills of Japan on hand; but you have some cousins over there—those Canadian people—and we want to get some stuff over here to live on cheaper than you Americans are letting us have it for, and we want you to let those trusts of yours have a free hand among them; let your farmers go over there and settle up the country, and then I will talk to you later about the peace treaty. But, be quiet about it, Willie, because you know what a thinking and inflammable people you Americans are, and they may get it into their heads that they may have to sell us cheaper stuff, too; therefore, don't breathe a word of this before you have everything cocked and primed, for if you do, Willie, you can't carry it through. Don't detain me any longer, sonny; the roof of the east wing of the old house has sprung a leak and I must go up and put a plug in it. So, good day." [Laughter and applause.]

And, Mr. Chairman, I am in hopes, for the sake of the country, and especially for the Democratic Party, that the agreement will fail at the other end of this Capitol. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I regret my colleagues from my State were not at liberty to avail themselves of the caucus rule that was open to me, but for them I will say they will always be found on the side of the right when afforded the opportunity. Each of them is not only a true representative of our State and ever on the alert to serve its interests, but the peer of any in this body in knowing the demands of the country and in having the courage to evidence their convictions on this floor. [Applause.]

I have not time to read the hundreds of demands made by the organizations in which I have the honor of membership to oppose the Canadian agreement, nor the hundreds of compliments I have received for my devotion to their interests; but beyond that, in conclusion, I will say my conscience has been the mentor controlling me in this as it ever has and will continue to be in all my votes. I will continue to put in practice the teachings of our distinguished Speaker: "He serves his party best who serves his country best." [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the interest manifest in this debate is truly marvelous. With all of the seats filled and every gentleman listening attentively, I fully believe that when the time comes to vote upon the bill every Member of the House will be able to vote intelligently, assuming, of course, that the discussion upon the bill is along lines that are calculated to enlighten the membership of the House on the merits of the question. It is encouraging to realize that an opportunity is given to me to present the case from my standpoint under such favorable auspices. I am inspired with the enthusiasm and attention of the audience [applause], and I have no doubt that because of the interest manifested I will be able to tell those gentlemen who are present something which they will be glad to take home with them and think about. [Applause.]

I voted for the reciprocity bill when it was presented by the Republican House in the last Congress, and I am glad of it. I have no apology for having done so. I voted for the bill, which is practically equivalent to that, presented by the House now controlled by the Democrats. I doubt very much whether I would have voted for the reciprocity bill in either House had I believed that the farming communities of Canada were able to compete with the farmers of America.

I realize that the farm lands of Canada are not capable of raising the diversified crops that the farm lands of the United States are capable of raising, and I never had any serious idea that Canada had the ability to come into very sharp competition with the farmer of the United States. We have farm lands in this country where we can raise tropical and temperate zone cereals in the same fields, and no such conditions exist anywhere else on earth. The farm lands of Canada are devoted largely to the production of wheat, and the farmer engaged in this enterprise can only employ his time and his capital a very short period of every year, whereas a farmer of the United States, having the prolific soil and the magnificent climate to enable him to raise diversified crops, is able to employ his time and his capital nearly every day of the year. So, with these advantageous conditions in favor of the American farmer, I have no fear of any serious detriment coming to him as the result of legislation allowing the Canadian farm products to enter the United States free. The people of the United States and the people of Canada are substantially the same. Their hopes and their fears and their disappointments and their ambitions are alike.

They live along the same lines, they speak the same tongue, they think the same thoughts, and the only difference between them and ourselves is that we live in a land where every citizen is a sovereign, where every man is free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, where labor is exalted to comfortable homes, where the printing press and the church follow close upon the march of empire, where caste is ignored, and where the humblest child of poverty may aspire unrebuked to the highest place in the gift of the Nation; whereas they live in a land where no such opportunities prevail, and my hope is that if we can have close commercial relations with this homogeneous people that some day this close commercial relationship may blend the two people into one harmonious whole, and that the territory lying north of the northern boundary line of the United States may become a part of the United States, as it should be. And that is no idle dream with me. I have always believed we should be one people, under one flag, under one form of government; and it will be better for us all when such a thing happens, if it ever does. But, however that may be, I believe we should have not only reciprocity with Canada because of the conditions which I have attempted to describe, but I really believe that if the question related alone to Canada and the United States that we should have absolute free trade between the two nations. But the question of free trade with the world is quite another proposition.

I am not prepared to believe that we should open the American market to the products of the world. We have had some experience with Democratic legislation along tariff lines even during my short existence, and I can recollect very well when in the great cities of the country we were obliged to establish soup houses on the street corners in order to be able in a measure to appease the hunger of those who were willing to work but were unable to find it. The people of the country are beginning to think about what you Democrats are attempting to do, and I warn you that they are going to think seriously upon this subject; and when they realize, as they must soon, that you are going to do the things which have always been done under Democratic rule, namely, to close the American workshops while you open the workshops of Europe, they are going to come back to the grand old Republican Party and vote for that kind of prosperity which every Democrat as well as every Republican loves to enjoy. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Republicans claim no patent right to the enjoyment of prosperity. All they claim a patent right to is the creation of prosperity; and we have that right, but we are always glad to invite our Democratic brethren to come in with us and enjoy a good square meal at a well-spread table. What we object to in the Democratic program is the fact that while they create a condition of adversity, they compel us to participate in that adversity.

I hope the time is not far distant when the people will realize the importance and the necessity of coming back into the fold of that grand old party which has always given the country prosperity, whereas Democratic policy and Democratic legislation has always created a condition of adversity throughout every section of the land. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman, speaking for the Republican Party, recall a single time in the history of the country where we have had prosperity under Republican rule that Democrats, Prohibitionists, and Socialists alike have not benefited equally with Republicans under that rule?

Mr. MADDEN. The glory of the Republican Party policy is that it has always been able to create prosperity and every class, Democrats, Republicans, and Socialists, have participated in that prosperity.

The present bill under consideration, being H. R. 4413, to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the leader of the majority side of this House, is an entirely different proposition. It is an out-and-out free-trade measure and, if enacted into law, will open our doors to free-trade Europe and glut our markets with the products of poorly paid European labor, and bring about a business stagnation such as we have always experienced whenever the Democrats undertake to revise or amend a Republican tariff bill.

I thought, Mr. Chairman, when I learned that the gentleman from Alabama intended to introduce this measure that the people would regard it as a joke; that it would not be considered seriously; that it could not possibly pass the Senate of the United States as now organized, and that it would serve simply as an excuse for the elimination, by certain Members, of a surplusage of bile and hot air, thereby bringing them back to their normal condition; and that that would be the end of it. Not so, however. According to the newspapers—and concerning such matters the newspapers are usually right—the business people as well as the laboring people are regarding this proposed legislation as a very serious matter. The cry of alarm comes not only from one locality, but from every section of our country. From the gentleman's [Mr. UNDERWOOD] own district there comes the word that if this bill is enacted into law the doors of the great steel works there will be closed and that thousands of men will be thrown out of employment. If this be true, and I doubt it not, the suffering of the families of these employees will become distressing beyond measure, and the entire business community will suffer irreparable injury.

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is no joke after all. The mere mention of Democratic tariff tinkering causes widespread alarm, and is a just warning for all classes of intelligent business men to run to cover, and it is going to be very difficult, in my opinion, for the press, having, as it does, great faith in the Senate of the United States, composed as it is by a Republican majority, to educate the people up to the belief that this bill is, after all, nothing but a joke, that the Senate will never concur in its provisions, and even though it should, the President, unless he be intoxicated with the idea of universal reciprocity, will never sign it. All power to the press, if it can calm the people and restore temporary confidence until they can have a chance to undo the evil they were guilty of in electing a Democratic majority of this body.

This is my first opportunity to watch at close range a Democratic operation on a tariff bill, and I do not wonder at the alarm evinced by the old-timers as they observe the recklessness with which the knife is manipulated as they slash in and about its vitals. They do not seem to have received their early training in a school which teaches that the best way to build up a system in order to save the patient is to gradually cut away the affected parts, but rather in one which teaches that the way to cure what is believed to be a sick body is to cut off its head, and that, Mr. Chairman, is what these Democratic surgeons are going to do.

I do not know whether the Speaker of this House personally favors this decapitation process or not, although I heard him make a speech on the floor of this House that he would, could he have his own way about it, tear down every customhouse in the United States. So I take it that he not only favors the lopping off of the head of the protection giant, but will take a prominent part in the grand lopping-off act. No one who has had the great pleasure of hearing his gentle voice or has been privileged to observe the meekness with which he handles his political adversaries would ever believe it, and I will not believe it until I hear him in one of his incomparable speeches deny it, or until I hear him vote aye on the passage of this measure.

Democrats say that this bill and the reciprocity bill will reduce the revenue of the Treasury $15,000,000 annually; and

if so, that the price to the consumer will be reduced by the amount of the reduction in the tax. If that be true, the cost of living would be reduced exactly 15 cents per person per annum, because if you divide $15,000,000 into 90,000,000 you get 6, and one-sixth of 90 is 15, which means 15 cents to every individual in the United States. So, even if they do carry out the plan which they propose, and the tariff is a tax, and the price of the article is reduced by the amount of the tax when the tax is taken off, the total saving to each individual in the United States on the cost of living will be 15 cents per annum. Marvelous! Marvelous!

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman submit to an inquiry?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly; I will be delighted to do so.

Mr. SIMS. As I understand you, the reduction of the revenue paid into the Treasury will be 15 cents per person; but what about the cost of the domestic article which the home people consume?

Mr. MADDEN. If the tariff is a tax and the tax is added to the price of the article, as the Democrats claim it is, and if that tax is taken off the article and therefore taken off the price of the article when the tax is reduced, the reduction in the cost of the article will be exactly the amount of the tax taken off, and you can not reduce the cost of living any more than the difference between the tax when it is on and the tax when it is off.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. With pleasure, in a moment. I think, Mr. Chairman, before I yield that I should say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] that if we open our markets to free-trade Europe and let them open their mills to make goods for American consumption, we must close our mills in order to be able to consume the goods shipped here by Europe, and if we do that, even though the price be reduced by reason of the fact that the goods are made abroad under the free-trade rate of wages and shipped into America for consumption by the American people, it would reduce the ability of the Americans to buy; and the result would be that it would not make any difference, even if the price is lowered, if we have nothing with which to pay the lower price.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. I do, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Last week, in the city of Philadelphia, was sold the machinery of the Southwark Woolen Mills, which had formerly employed upward of a thousand workingmen and women. The sale was completed on Saturday, and it is reported that many of the purchasers had come over from Canada, and that the machinery, in large part, will now be transported to that country. Does not the gentleman, in carrying out his discussion with regard to wages, observe that this would answer the question of the gentleman from Tennessee, and that there will be no reduction in the cost of living here if we decrease the wage-earning power of the people?

Mr. MADDEN. Without doubt, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman, using the Democratic argument that the price is increased to the consumer by precisely the amount of the duty exacted, and then reversing that, estimates that the cost of living to the 92,000,000 people of this country will be reduced by 15 cents per head, saying he arrived at that conclusion by adding together the effect of the reciprocity measure and this so-called free-trade bill. I ask the gentleman if in the course of his compilation he has ascertained just how much the consumer will gain from the effect of reciprocity, separated from this free-trade bill?

Mr. MADDEN. It would be one-third of the 15 cents—5 cents [laughter on the Republican side]—if we assume that the logic of the Democrats be true. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the entire revenue of the country derived from the tariff for the last fiscal year—1910—was approximately $331,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; or, in other words, $3 per capita.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Three dollars and seventy-five cents per capita, was it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; about $3, in round figures.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If one of our friends on the other side would abstain from at least one theater party, would not his portion of the tax be paid, so far as he is concerned?

Mr. MADDEN. It would not be fair to assume that he indulges in such a luxurious privilege as going to the theater. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman that it is a fact that I saw the other day on one of the broad highways of Washington, flanked on either side by magnificent buildings, a real, live Democrat riding in an automobile. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Well, we have some plutocrats among the Democrats, who are always railing against the so-called trusts, while at the same time they are indulging in the privileges and luxuries of the dividends derived from the so-called trusts. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the wages derived from the industries of this country could be put upon a free-trade basis, and manufacturers given time in which to adjust their business matters accordingly, and if the laboring men and mechanics and artisans and everybody interested would be agreeable to the change, the pending measure would be popular. But for how many more years will we be compelled to tell you that the American workingman will tolerate no such change by his own consent? What American bricklayer, for instance, would consent to work for $1.68 a day? That is the wage paid in Great Britain to bricklayers. Or what American bricklayer would work for $1.04 a day, which is the amount paid in Germany and France? In Belgium the bricklayer receives only 64 cents a day.

If you were to insult an American bricklayer by handing him on Saturday night $3.84 as his pay for a week's work, someone else would pay off the next week. [Applause on the Republican side.] The American bricklayer receives for one day's work more than that. As a matter of fact, the average wage paid to American bricklayers is $4.40 a day.

I will print here, Mr. Chairman, some interesting tables, showing the difference between the wages received here and in foreign countries, also a comparison of the cost of production of certain articles in the United States, Great Britain, and Belgium, and a comparison of the wages of labor employed in woolen manufacture in the United States, France, and Italy:

	United States.		Great Britain.		Germany.		France.		Belgium.	
	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.
Bricklayers	$0.55	$4.40	$0.21	$1.68	$0.13	$1.04	$0.13	$1.04	$0.08	$0.64
Stonecutters	.42	3.36	.20	1.60	.12	.96	.14	1.12	.07	.56
Stonemasons	.46	3.68	.21	1.68	.13	1.04	.14	1.12	.08	.64
Hod carriers	.29	2.32	.13	1.04	.08	.64	.10	.80	No data.	
Carpenters	.36	2.88	.20	1.60	.13	1.04	.15	1.20	.07	.56
Painters	.35	2.80	.18	1.44	.12	.96	.13	1.04	.07	.56
Plumbers	.44	3.52	.20	1.60	.11	.88	.15	1.20	.08	.64
Machinists	.27	2.16	.17	1.36	.13	1.04	.13	1.04	No data.	
General laborers	.17	1.36	.10	.80	.08	.64	.10	.80	.05	.40

A comparison of the cost of production of certain articles in the United States, Great Britain and Belgium.

Articles.	United States.		Great Britain.		Belgium.	
	Labor cost.	All other expense.	Labor cost.	All other expense.	Labor cost.	All other expense.
1 yard cashmere cloth of cotton and low botany wool of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost)	$0.064	$0.126	$0.013	$0.143	.....	.....
1 yard cashmere cloth of cotton and botany worsted of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost)	.064	.135	.015	.163	.....	.....
1 yard all-wool sateen of botany wool of equal weight and quality. (Weaving wage given as labor cost)	.058	.65	.014	.30	.....	.....
1,000 common red building brick	2.33	1.91	.....	.....	$0.66	$0.69
1 dozen ivory-handled table knives, practically same size, American make best English steel, English make ordinary steel	.94	7.18	.85	3.65	.....	.....
1 dozen knife blades used for above knives	.63	.55	.445	.40	.....	.....
1 gross green glass spirit bottles, equal capacity and weight	1.88	2.25	1.15	1.91	.....	.....
1 ton (2,240 pounds) Hematite pig iron	1.23	9.43	.79	11.25	.....	.....
1 dozen plain ironstone-china plates equal size, American make half ounce heavier	.22	.24	.15	.21	.....	.....
1 dozen plain cups and saucers same size, style, and weight	.23	.25	.12	.36	.....	.....

A comparison of the wages of labor employed in woolen manufacture in the United States, England, France, and Italy.

	Italy.	France.	England.	United States.
Sorters	$4.60	$6.40	$7.30	$12.50
Washers or dyers	3.00	4.25	5.00	7.00
Carders	2.30	4.00	3.90	6.00
Gill boxes	2.30	3.70	3.00	6.00
Comb minders	2.30	3.70	3.00	6.00
Boss spinner	7.00	9.25	12.60	18.00
Mule spinner	5.80	6.20	7.30	9.50
Ring spinner	2.30	4.00	3.00	6.00
Weavers	3.00	4.60	4.00	9.00
Fullers and pressers	3.50	4.25	6.00	7.00

The above tables tell the truth, Mr. Chairman; and being true, it is beyond my understanding how any intelligent legislator can have the hardihood to tell the American laboring man that it is to his interest to support a party which is in favor of reducing the wage scale to the level of that adopted by free-trade Europe. They do not tell him that in so many words, but it is exactly the condition they will bring him to if they succeed in enacting into law the bill now under consideration.

This bill provides that certain articles are to come into the United States free of duty.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman a moment ago referred to "free-trade Europe." Just so that the record may be kept straight and his speech properly illuminated, is it not a fact that "free-trade Europe" means free trade with America and protection in Europe, in every country thereof?

Mr. MADDEN. Without any doubt.

Mr. SIMS. Except England.

Mr. MADDEN. While we under this bill admit free everything made in Europe or grown in Europe, we are obliged to pay the tariff tax imposed by the European countries on everything that we sell to them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And then is not that substantially the situation with regard to Canada—that most of their duties are retained, whereas many of ours are being taken off?

Mr. MADDEN. That is true; and if I had had my way when the reciprocity bill was under consideration I would like to have amended it in very many particulars. Take, for example, the raw materials entering into the manufacture of agricultural implements, farm wagons, hoop and band iron, cotton ties, wire for baling, fence wire, and sewing machines. Listen to the absurdity of this. This bill now under consideration provides that all the things I have enumerated are to be admitted into this country free, whereas the materials which enter into their construction bear a tariff tax; and here is a list of the taxes that are to be paid on the materials which enter into the construction of these articles, if the materials are to be imported by a man who manufactures the same kind of articles in this country:

Dutiable raw materials entering into the manufacture of agricultural implements, farm wagons, hoop or band iron, cotton ties, wire for baling, fence wire, and sewing machines.

Par.	Articles.	Rate of duty.
117	Iron ore	15 cents per ton.
118	Iron in pigs	$2.50 per ton.
	Wrought and cast scrap iron, and scrap steel	$1 per ton.
119	Bar iron	$\frac{1}{8}$ cent per pound.
123	Ball bearings and roller bearings	45 per cent ad valorem.
127	Sheets of iron or steel, black:	
	Valued at 3 cents per pound or less	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent to $\frac{1}{8}$ cent per pound.
	Valued at more than 3 cents per pound	30 per cent ad valorem.
129	Sheets of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced.	1½ cents per pound.
131	Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs; billets and bars; hammered molds; mill shafting; alloys used as substitutes for steel in the manufacture of tools; steel castings:	
	If valued at 40 cents per pound or less	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent to 7 cents per pound.
	If valued above 40 cents per pound	20 per cent ad valorem.
142	Axles or parts thereof	¾ cent per pound.
144	Bolts	1½ cents per pound.
148	Castings of malleable iron	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound.
206	Hubs for wheels, and wagon blocks	20 per cent ad valorem.

Does anyone imagine for a moment that a man engaged in manufacturing these parts of agricultural implements in American factories can continue in the business in which he is engaged if by legislation we allow the finished article to come into this country free? Does anybody suppose that the men employed in making the parts which enter into the construction of these agricultural implements in this country can compete with the men who make agricultural implements abroad under such conditions? It is absurd. This bill is a fraud and a humbug. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman suppose we are going to stop at this little free-list bill and not make reductions all along the line when we have time?

Mr. MADDEN. I was not educated in the school which gives me the ability to see into the minds of Democrats, and I am only talking about the thing which they present to me for consideration. If the gentleman from Tennessee can tell me what his party is going to do on any given subject for any given hour of any given day, I will say to him that he has more information than any other member of his party.

Mr. SIMS. We are going to pass this bill, and then we are going to make other reductions.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. It is fair to assume that they are going on in the exuberance of destruction which they have started.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, for example, let us consider the raw materials entering into the manufacture of cotton bagging, burlaps, and bags, which, I assume, the gentleman from Tennessee is interested in having put on the free list. For example, the dutiable raw materials entering into the manufacture of burlaps and bags are as follows:

Dutiable raw materials entering into the manufacture of cotton bagging, burlaps, and bags.

Par.	Articles.	Rate of duty.
333	Flax straw	$5 per ton.
334	Flax, not hackled or dressed	1 cent per pound.
335	Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line"	3 cents per pound.
336	Flax, tow of	$20 per ton.
337	Hemp	$22.50 per ton.
	Hemp, hackled, known as line of hemp	$45 per ton.
338	Single yarns made of jute	1 cent per pound and 10 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.
340	Threads and twine made from yarn of flax, hemp, or ramie:	
	Not finer than 5 lea	10 cents per pound.
	Finer than 5 lea	12 cents per pound and ½ cent per pound for each additional lea.
341	Single yarns in the gray, made of flax, hemp, or ramie:	
	Not finer than 8 lea	6 cents per pound.
	Finer than 8 lea	15 per cent to 40 per cent ad valorem.

Will anybody tell me how the American manufacturer of these commodities can compete with the people of India, who make these same commodities and pay labor at the rate of 50 cents or less per week, when the materials which enter into the construction of the things you are putting on the free list are taxed so that the American manufacturer is put in the position of being unable to continue in the business in which he is engaged?

Now, here are some raw materials entering into the production of meats, flour, and cereal food:

Par.	Articles.	Rate of duty.
225	Cattle:	
	If valued at not more than $14 per head	$2 to $3.75 per head.
	If valued at more than $14 per head	27½ per cent ad valorem.
226	Swine	$1.50 per head.
228	Sheep	75 cents to $1.50 per head.
229	All other live animals	20 per cent ad valorem.
334	Buckwheat, per bushel of 48 pounds	15 cents.
335	Corn or maize, per bushel of 56 pounds	15 cents.
238	Oats	15 cents per bushel.
240	Rice	1½ cents to 2 cents per pound.
241	Rye	10 cents per bushel.
242	Wheat	25 cents per bushel.

We are proposing to admit free all the meat products and food products, whereas the things that enter into them are subject to pay a high tariff in order to enter this country. Oh Democratic consistency! [Laughter on the Republican side.] You are going to reduce the cost of living. Yes; you are going to reduce the opportunity for men to earn a living. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] You are going to put the men of the country on a starvation basis. You are going to close the factories and the workshops; you are going to reduce the price of property. You are going to reduce the possibility of the sale of property. Under Democratic rule there never was sale for property in this land except sales by the sheriff. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] No sound of the hammer to be heard anywhere except the sound of the auctioneer's hammer selling farms under mortgage. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] But the Democratic policy reduces the cost of living! Better give us an opportunity to make a living. We all need it. The more opportunity you can give the people of this land to make a living, the more contented and happy homes you will have in the land. [Applause on the Republican side.] I would like to have some Democrat

tell me or tell the country how we can afford to admit free of duty the commodities; that is, the finished products enumerated in this bill, while the material which enters into their construction is dutiable. If the American manufacturer is required to use any of these materials in the construction of his product, and the European manufacturer is permitted to send his product in free, how can the American manufacturer continue in business? If the American manufacturer requires any of these materials in the manufacture of his products he is compelled to pay a duty on them. He can not possibly compete with the foreign manufacturer who under this bill is permitted to ship into the United States free the finished product made of these materials.

It may be well to consider this fact for a moment. It is a fact, and you can not get away from it, the logic of events will prove the truth of what I say, and I am appealing now to the men who work with their hands and their brains in this country. I am not talking to the men who are sitting in these seats; I am appealing to the men who toil, the men who are engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements, for example. The International Harvester Co., whose great plants are in Chicago, the city from which I come, have plants in Russia, in Germany, in France, in Canada. If they are allowed to bring their products free into the United States, what would prevent them from forcing a strike in their American shops, locking their men out, closing the shops, and making their agricultural implements abroad, with free-trade labor at one-quarter the price paid in the American shop? What guaranty would the American workman have that these American shops would ever be opened again? What right have we to believe that this harvester company will not do this? They are mercenary; they are anxious to make more dividends than they make now. If they can increase their dividends by employing European labor and shipping the product of that labor into the American markets for American consumption, I fear, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, that every man employed in this great industry in this country will, if this bill becomes a law, sooner or later be thrown out of employment and be cast out on the street in search of a job, with no opportunity to follow the vocation to which he has given his life.

This is a serious proposition, Mr. Chairman. We ought not to overlook the seriousness of it. It is a propositon we can not afford to overlook. It is a thing that will be done, and I warn you Democrats—I would like to save you from your own folly, for I like you personally, but you do not seem to exercise good judgment in the matter of legislation.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly; the gentleman is always gracious.

Mr. SULZER. Had the gentleman from Illinois better not tell us the heavens will fall if we touch the sacred doctrine of protection?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, the gentleman's question is hardly apropos. You know the God of the universe made the heavens, and in the order of His wisdom He has seen fit to keep them from falling upon us in the past, and I hope in the future He will have as much mercy upon us as He has for all time gone. [Applause.] I would not like to see anything fall on the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. In that connection I might say that if the gentleman pursues his line of argument I am afraid something will fall on him in his district at the next election.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say to the gentleman in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that if he does not need his job in this House any more than I need mine it will not worry him if he does not come back. I have always had the courage to express my views on public questions. I have had my own opinions and have had the courage to express them, and I have never waited for anybody to tell me what they were. If as a public functionary I am to be so restricted in the expression of my views as to be obliged to wait until I find out whether they please the people of my district or not, I would infinitely rather go back to private life and become a private citizen, with the right to express my views untrammeled and unquestioned by anybody on earth, with the right to try to formulate public sentiment along the lines of my ideas, than to hold any public office in the gift of the American people. [Applause.] I am not here looking for a job. I am here to express my views, and to represent my people as I think they should be represented, and I am not pandering to any maudlin sentiment or trying to trim my sails to every wind that blows that I may have a popular feeling among the people in my district for my attitude as a public functionary. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have a number of documents here that I would like to have the Clerk read in my time. First, a lot of protected articles that enter into construction of boots and shoes, and some other papers. I will ask the Clerk to read them in my time as a part of my remarks.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota (interrupting). Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman's argument sounds good to Republican ears, but I would like to ask him whether that would not have been a good argument against opening up free trade with Canada in farm products?

Mr. MADDEN. If I thought, as I said in opening my remarks, that the Canadian farmer could in any wise compete with the American farmer, I would have voted against the reciprocity bill. I have the idea in my mind, from information which I was able to gather from something of an investigation, that the productiveness of the Canadian farm is so much less than the productiveness of the American farm that I fear no danger from the competition which may arise between them.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Without going into that question of fact, I would like the judgment of the gentleman as to whether the American manufacturers are any less able to compete with Canadian manufacturers than the American farmers with Canadian farmers.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman very frankly that if I had my way I would favor an even interchange between the two countries on every commodity, both agricultural and manufactures.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course, that is indirectly an answer to the question, but is not it true, speaking generally, that the American manufacturer is quite as well able, considering our natural resources and all that enters into manufacturing, to compete with the manufacturing enterprises of the world as the American farmer is to compete with the agricultural products of the world?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I would not like to admit that, because while the wages between the American farmer and the Canadian farmer are almost equivalent there may be a shade the best of it in favor of the Canadian farmer. The wages as between the American manufacturer and the European manufacturer is as two to five or as one is to five in some cases, and as two is to four in others; so that the American manufacturer pays from two to five times the wages that the European manufacturer pays.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman consider that the American farmer is not an employer as well as the manufacturer?

Mr. MADDEN. They are; but there is not that difference.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There are about 10,000,000 laborers that have their entire employment in farming, about one-third of the laboring population of this country. Do I understand the gentleman's idea to be, if he will pardon me, from his statement, that while we will conclude that the American employer ought to be protected against the employer of other countries the American farmer can afford to compete with the farm products of other countries?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I am against the free admission of farm products from other countries into the United States, while I am in favor of the free admission of the products of the Canadian farmer. I consider that the free admission of the product of the Canadian farmers into the American market is equivalent to admitting the products of Indiana into the State of Illinois or the products of the State of Illinois into the State of Ohio.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Which is only another way of saying that the Canadian farmer is the only one who is in the position really to compete with the American farmer in this market.

Mr. MADDEN. We are a homogeneous people; we live on the same plane, we think alike, we talk alike, and our ambitions are alike, our hopes are alike, and I hope some day we will all be in one country and under one flag.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I was very much enlightened by the gentleman's statement that our population of 92,000,000 people might possibly be benefited to the extent of 5 cents a head as the effect of reciprocity. Now, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if he thinks that it is worth while to assess the agricultural part of our population for the benefit of all the rest of our population in order to get the problematical 5 cents per head for the 92,000,000 people?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I think it is absurd to allow the products provided for in this bill to come into this country free——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is not the gentleman affected somewhat by his city environment in relation to reciprocity?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all. I do not recognize the city as paramount to the country or the country as paramount to the

city. I believe we should legislate along broad lines and along lines which are patriotic.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I applauded the gentleman when he gave utterance to that sentiment, but he seemed to have slipped a cog on reciprocity.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. The gentleman's environment makes him ask these questions along narrow lines.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman's environment makes him answer this question along certain lines. I will not say "narrow lines."

Mr. MADDEN. I ask the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That is all right.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent to include the papers which I asked previously to have read by the Clerk printed without being read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has general leave to do that.

The papers are as follows:

Alphabetical list of articles entering into the manufacture of boots and shoes and the import duty thereon.

Articles.	Rates of duty.
Blacking	25 per cent ad valorem.
Box toes, of sole leather cut in form	15 per cent ad valorem.
Buttons, shoe:	
If made of paper, board, papier-mâché, pulp, or other similar material, valued at not exceeding 3 cents per gross.	1 cent per gross.
If made of metal, horn, or glass	¾ cent per line per gross and 15 per cent ad valorem.
Calfskins	15 per cent ad valorem.
Counters	15 per cent ad valorem.
Cement, rubber	20 per cent ad valorem.
Cordivan, upper leather	15 per cent ad valorem.
Duck	2½ cents per square yard.
Dressing for shoes	25 per cent ad valorem.
Enamel and patent leather:	
If weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins.	27 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.
If weighing over 10 and not over 25 pounds per dozen skins.	27 cents per pound and 8 per cent ad valorem.
If weighing over 25 pounds per dozen skins.	20 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.
Eyelets:	
Brass or steel	45 per cent ad valorem.
Enameled	45 per cent ad valorem.
Celluloid covered	65 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem.
Flannel	3½ cents per square yard.
Goring:	
If made of cotton, flax, or other vegetable fiber.	60 per cent ad valorem.
If made of silk	60 per cent ad valorem.
Glue, if valued over 10 cents and not over 35 cents per pound.	25 per cent ad valorem.
Horsehide, upper leather	15 per cent ad valorem.
Hemlock, sole leather	5 per cent ad valorem.
Heels, of sole leather, cut in form	15 per cent ad valorem.
Hooks	45 per cent ad valorem.
Insoles, of sole leather, cut in form	15 per cent ad valorem.
Kip, upper leather	15 per cent ad valorem.
Kid, upper leather	15 per cent ad valorem.
Kangaroo, upper leather	15 per cent ad valorem.
Lifting for heels, of sole leather, cut in form	15 per cent ad valorem.
Laces:	
If made of leather	50 cents per gross pairs and 10 per cent ad valorem.
If made of cotton or other vegetable fiber	25 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem.
If made of silk	50 per cent ad valorem.
Nails:	
Cut	⅛ cent per pound.
Hob	1½ cents per pound.
Needles:	
Hand-sewing needles	Free.
Sewing-machine needles	$1 per M and 25 per cent ad valorem.
Oak, sole leather	5 per cent ad valorem.
Oilcloth	3 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem.
Outsoles, of sole leather, cut in form	15 per cent ad valorem.
Patent leather. *See* Enamel leather.	
Rands, of sole leather, cut in form	15 per cent ad valorem.
Rivets	45 per cent ad valorem.
Side leather, upper leather	15 per cent ad valorem.
Shanks:	
Of steel	45 per cent ad valorem.
Of wood	35 per cent ad valorem.
Of leather board	40 per cent ad valorem.
Shellac, bleached or white, in rolls	½ cent per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.
Silk, for facings	50 per cent ad valorem.
Stays:	
Cloth, if made of flax or cotton	45 per cent ad valorem.
Leather	40 per cent ad valorem.
Skivers, sheepskin leather:	
If raw	Free.
If tanned	15 per cent ad valorem.
Sole thread, per sample	22½ cents per pound.
Stain	30 per cent ad valorem.
Top pieces, of sole leather, cut in form	15 per cent ad valorem.
Twill	2½ cents per square yard.
Twine	23½ cents per pound.
Nut tacks not exceeding 16 ounces per M	¼ cent per M.

Alphabetical list of articles entering into the manufacture of boots and shoes and the import duty thereon—Continued.

Articles.	Rates of duty.
Cut tacks exceeding 16 ounces per M	¼ cent per pound.
Wrought tacks	45 per cent ad valorem.
Thread:	
Cotton, white and black, in skeins	½ cent per 100 yards.
Silk	$1.50 per pound.
Union, sole leather	5 per cent ad valorem.
Velvet	47½ per cent ad valorem.
Viscol, waterproof liquid	25 per cent ad valorem.
Welting	25 per cent ad valorem.
Wax	20 per cent ad valorem.
Webbing:	
If made of cotton, flax, or other vegetable fiber.	60 per cent ad valorem.
If containing wool	50 cents per pound and 60 per cent ad valorem.
Wire:	
Brass	45 per cent ad valorem.
Steel	35 per cent ad valorem.

CAROLINA BAGGING CO.,
Henderson, N. C., April 24, 1911.

DEAR SIR: The farmers' free-list bill just introduced in Congress proposes to admit jute into this country free. We believe everyone should interest himself with his Congressman and Senator to prevent this part of the bill becoming a law. We ask you to do so. This product grows in India and nowhere else. Conditions there require payment by jute manufacturers of an average of about 50 cents per week to their laborers. This is very shocking, but it is taken from their Government report for the year 1909.

The duty on cotton bagging, which is made of jute, is about 30 cents per roll. With this small amount of protection manufacturers of bagging and other jute products have had a hard time to live for the last few years. Several factories have failed and gone out of business.

But there are now seven bagging factories in North Carolina, three in South Carolina, three in Virginia, and three in Georgia. Large amounts of capital are invested in these. Admitting jute into this country free of duty would ruin and close these factories and throw all their labor out of employment. Our factory employs 200 operators, who receive from $4 to $40 per week, on which they and their families live. The duty on our annual output of 100,000 rolls is about 30 cents per roll, or $30,000. Take this from our earnings and we could not go on at all, and would close our factory. May God forbid such a result. We and and our help all cry to Congress to forbid it.

Take another view of it. A few years ago there was much talk of using cotton for cotton bagging. At the present prices of cotton, of course, the farmers can not afford that.

But millions of yards of cotton bagging are used yearly for cement, grain, flour, beans, and other such purposes. If the duty on jute is removed the great and immediate inflow of the manufactured product would supply jute for all these and many other uses now supplied by cotton goods. We would thus in return for the pitiful sum of about 4 cents a bale duty now paid by the farmer on cotton bagging, have to be taxed in some other way to supply that loss of revenue to the Government, lose our factories to their owners, our wages to the laborers, and sustain a considerable reduction in the use and price of cotton. Thus the prophesy of Bret Harte will be fulfilled: "We are ruined by Chinese cheap labor." We pray you, dear sir, to aid in averting such a calamity. Aid by writing your Representative to vote against free jute. Aid by asking your neighbor to do so. And pray with us that such a calamity may be averted.

We write not as Democrats or Republicans, but as business men who protest against being prevented from making a living for ourselves and those working with us for the same purpose.

Yours, very truly,

CAROLINA BAGGING CO.,
S. S. PARHAM, *Vice President.*

CHICAGO, *April 17, 1911.*

Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MARTIN: I am somewhat concerned about the bill introduced by Congressman UNDERWOOD placing a number of items on the free list. If there is, in your opinion, any chance of the passage of this bill, I request that you advise me of it promptly, so that the shoe manufacturers may have a chance to make the fight of their lives to prevent the removal of the duty on shoes.

While we are not in possession of complete information about the cost of producing shoes in Germany, Austria, England, and other European countries, yet we believe we know enough to warrant the claim that we can not compete with the cheap labor of those countries. Only recently it has been developed by English investigators that American wages are, on the average, two and one-fourth times as high as English. While the United States has led the world in the style and appearance of its footwear, and has been able to export shoes to some countries on this account, nevertheless this exportation has been chiefly in the higher grades, the shoes worn by the better classes, who are willing to pay for style and appearance. In the cheaper grades we have been entirely unable to compete with any of those countries; as a matter of fact, cheap English shoes have been brought into this country since the duty was lowered under the Payne-Aldrich bill.

The European countries, especially Germany, are importing our lasts, patterns, and shoe machinery where it is superior to their own and sending young men over here to learn the American system of shoe manufacturing. It is only fair to assume that with their splendid industrial equipment they will soon invade this market.

We shoe manufacturers probably should not object to free shoes, provided this country went on a free-trade basis, so that wages throughout all the industries could be adjusted to the changed conditions. However, to remove the duty on one article like shoes and leave it on other articles would prevent us from lowering our wages to the foreign level, for if we did it we would lose our help, and therefore there is only the other alternative, that we should lose our business to the foreigners. If we had all of our raw materials free and free shoe machinery, so that we could get the cheapest materials and the cheapest and best machinery to manufacture our product, we might stand a chance, but with duties on the raw materials that we use ranging from 5 to almost 50

per cent and an entirely prohibitive duty on shoe machinery we are handicapped too heavily to hold our business if shoes are admitted free.

Another thing that should be investigated before the duty is removed on shoes is the shoe-machinery trust and the difference between the terms it makes in this country and in foreign countries, where it has some effective competition. In this country it has none, and the shoe manufacturers have no choice but to use its machinery on its own terms.

Yours, very truly,

SELZ, SCHWAB & CO.,
J. HARRY SELZ,
Second Vice President.

SPRATT'S PATENT (AMERICA) (LTD.),
Newark, N. J., April 18, 1911.

Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Your attention is earnestly and respectfully requested:

We are manufacturers of dog cakes and other biscuits and foods for domestic animals generally, but our chief business is dog cakes. If our reading of bill H. R. 4413 is correct, it would, if passed, allow these foods to come into the United States free of duty.

We in this State, and similar industries in other States, have laboriously, and at first with great loss, built up a business under the protection of a 20 per cent tariff. It has been barely enough. We alone have invested some hundreds of thousands of dollars in an expensive plant and in the purchase of patent rights from an English company. We have felt reasonably sure of a continuous moderate protection, and, at least, that it would not be suddenly withdrawn.

If this measure becomes law, it will be disastrous to us and to a considerable number of wage earners. No class in the United States deals with us less than the farmer. To put dog biscuits on the free list would scarcely benefit him.

Very respectfully,

SPRATT'S PATENT (LTD.).

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 27, 1911.*

Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. D.:

Foreign shoe manufacturers have free material, pay no royalty on machinery, and get labor at about half paid in this country. How can we Illinois manufacturers and wholesalers of shoes compete under these conditions if shoes are admitted free? Tariff on shoes is only 10 per cent; on all other wearing apparel averages 60 per cent. Why should shoes bear all the burden in the plan to reduce the cost of living? We earnestly protest against the removal of duty on shoes under existing conditions.

Selz, Schwab & Co.; J. P. Smith Shoe Co.; Florsheim Shoe Co.; Smith-Wallace Shoe Co.; Guthman Carpenter & Telling; Watson Plummer Shoe Co.; J. E. Tilt Shoe Co.; H. F. C. Dovenmuehle & Son; Fargo & Phelps; A. A. Putnam & Son; The Rice & Hutchinson Chicago Shoe Co.; R. P. Smith & Sons Co.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Democrats are trying to play politics. They are not trying to give the American any advantage. They talk about a reduction of the cost of living that will result from the enactment of this bill into law, but nobody will claim that you can reduce the cost of living without reducing the standard of living, unless you reduce the wage scale, and when you do that you reduce the standard of living, because you reduce the power to buy; and when you reduce the power to buy you necessarily compel the man who buys to live on a lower grade.

God forbid that the American laborer will ever be compelled to face the awful conditions which confront the foreign laborer, and which he will be compelled to face if the Democratic Party succeeds in its desire to open the doors of the United States to the markets of free-trade Europe. If that ever happens—and happen it will if the Democrats have their way about it—a condition of distress and poverty will confront us such as I hope I may never live to see.

I have read with much interest in a book recently published by Samuel Gompers something of the conditions that confront the laboring man in England, France, Germany, Belgium, and Holland.

Mr. Gompers says that—

> Twenty-two thousand dock laborers report in Liverpool at the gates alongshore every day seeking a job, and, on the average, only 15,000 find employment.

He refers feelingly to the degree of poverty written on the faces of this great army of unemployed. He refers to the physical weakness of the men in the crowd, and declares them to be the smallest people in stature he had ever seen in an English community. He says that the deepest impression made upon his mind in England came from its poverty—that poverty and misery are everywhere in England, and that the reason for wan faces, tattered clothing, and unshod feet is to be found in the number of the constantly unemployed. The sights made such an impression upon Mr. Gompers that he sees from time to time since—

> Those numbers of demoralized, degraded objects which ought to be men and women have formed in my mind's eye a procession moving along together past me, mournful, hopeless, repellent, a disgrace to our boasted civilization.

Mr. Gompers says that in Holland and Belgium a degree of poverty exists such as hardly can be conceived by a dweller in an American city.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. I only have about two minutes left.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that in the harvest time in Canada, when they are badly in need of labor, the British Government sends over to Canada on special vessels and sends through Canada on special trains this very product of the great cities of Liverpool, London, and Manchester which you are describing now?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Now, is it not true that this phase of humanity which Mr. Gompers so luridly and so truthfully describes is the kind of labor which in the harvest time in Canada comes in contact with Canadian labor and with the American labor that we send across the border—with the schoolboys and the farm boys of the United States who go over there to do work in their fields?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not say. I am not familiar with the situation, and of course I would not undertake to speak without knowledge.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Let me say, then, that I was in Canada when a trainload came into the Alberta and Saskatchewan country, which has been so much discussed in this debate.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman not know that this class of labor which is described in England, Belgium, and other European countries is the same class of labor that comes to this country in million lots annually in competition with American labor? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. The difference between conditions in this country and conditions abroad are that when men come to this country they are employed in accordance with the American standard of wages and they live in accordance with the American standards of living. [Applause on the Republican side.] Either we or our forefathers came to this country from abroad, and if it were not for the fact that our forefathers were permitted to come here we would not have the opportunity of sitting here and legislating for the American people to-day.

And I am glad to see the opportunity afforded the people of downtrodden Europe to be admitted to the shores of this free land, where every man has an opportunity to rise and where opportunity is the one thing in which we glory. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I began work carrying water at 50 cents a day in the institution of which I am now the head. Does anybody suppose that a boy beginning to carry water at 50 cents a day in any institution in any country in Europe would ever rise to a place where he would have a right to vote upon legislation for 90,000,000 people? No! I say, give them an opportunity to come. Treat them right when they come. Pay them the best wages that can be paid. Give them the best opportunity to live as human beings should live. The glory of this country is that we afford every man who comes to our shores that opportunity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Is not this the same class of people that are to-day being employed in the great steel plants of our country for from 12 to 13 hours per day at the miserable pittance of 12½ cents an hour?

Mr. MADDEN. If that is true, the steel people ought to be brought to account for it, and I am ashamed if we have such an institution in this country. But I do not think that is so. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman believe that the American workingman should have to come in contact and into competition with this class of labor?

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I have been a large employer of labor, and my experience is that the first generation of foreign labor that comes here educates its children in the public schools of America, where they are taught to love our institutions, and among the second generation comes the best citizens in the land. Sometimes we may have to submit to the competition, which affords the opportunity to bring men up to the standard which the second generation reaches, and I hope that we will continue to hold out the right hand of fellowship to the downtrodden people of the world and give them

the opportunity to become men in a free land and under a free flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We have extended the right hand of fellowship to the downtrodden of all the world, welcomed them to our shores, clothed them with the dignity of citizenship, enabled them to enjoy the blessings of liberty, opened our public schools to their children, taught them to love our institutions, and encouraged them to assimilate with our people. The result is that we have developed a Nation of patriotic and liberty-loving people, through whose veins course the blood of all the nations, but whose every impulse is strictly American. We have thus proved to the world that under the beneficent influence of Republican policies we have been able to make men as well as merchandise. These deeds of the Republican Party in the interest of humanity, written on the pages of the Nation's history, will be handed down to a grateful posterity and applauded by the generations yet to come as the acme of devotion to the welfare of our common country.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to Senate Document 521, a report of the Bureau of Labor, of the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works, where he will find that thousands of these foreign workingmen are employed from 12 to 13 hours a day at 12½ cents an hour in competition with the American workingmen. I will refer the gentleman also to the Pittsburg Survey, where he will find the same condition exists in the great iron and steel industries in the neighborhood of Pittsburg, Pa. And I would like to say to the gentleman that in Pennsylvania 62 per cent of those engaged in bituminous coal mining are of foreign-speaking nationalities, and 51 per cent of those engaged in anthracite coal mining are of foreign-speaking nationalities, and the result is that the producers of bituminous coal in some parts of Pennsylvania are the lowest paid miners of any coal produced anywhere in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for 10 minutes more time.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania going to vote for this so-called farmers' free-list bill?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I am.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to do the very thing against which he argues. He is going to place the American workingman on the basis of European starvation wages by giving an opportunity to the European manufacturers to send their products into this country free and shut out the American workingman from the opportunity of earning American wages here. [Applause on the Republican side.]

When I was talking about this labor proposition, about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WILSON] interrupted me, I was quoting Mr. Gompers, the leader of the American Federation of Labor. I was not making the statement. Mr. Gompers was making the statement, and I believe he was stating the truth.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked the question whether there had not been a large number of undesirable persons brought in from the European countries to the United States to work in American mills. We concede that there have been a large number of these undesirable immigrants. But I want to ask the gentleman whether there was not a time when both this undesirable and the desirable labor left the United States because it could not procure work, and because conditions here were more appalling than those described in Europe by Mr. Gompers, and whether that time was not under the late Democratic administration?

Mr. MADDEN. There never was a Democratic administration in power for any length of time that the emigration was not about as much going from this country the other way as was the immigration coming this way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Gompers says that agricultural laborers in the eastern central part of England receive compensation at the rate of $2.88 per week; motor car drivers receive, after paying for their gasoline, something like 2 shillings for 15 hours' work. In London the union scale for men in the binding department in printing offices is 34 shillings for 54 hours; for cutters, 30 shillings; for girl folders, 15 shillings. In Berlin saddlers earn from $6.50 to $7 per week. In Hungary the pay for skilled millers is less than 80 cents a day. The best-paid workmen in Budapest are bricklayers; they receive from $1 to $1.20 per day. This fabulous price, however, is paid only in the summer time. In winter they receive 60 cents a day for unskilled work.

I have wondered if, while looking upon the poverty stricken laboring men and women of free-trade Europe, Mr. Gompers did not frequently thank God that he was an American citizen and represented an organization in this country where under a wise and beneficent Constitution they do not have to tolerate parties which by unwise legislation can bring about such distressing conditions.

The laboring man who remembers the doleful years from 1893 to 1897 will not look with favor upon the pending bill, Mr. Chairman. Conditions in this country became almost as distressing to the laboring men during that gloomy period as those existing to-day in free-trade Europe, so graphically described by Mr. Gompers in his book I have just referred to.

The hum of the wheels in the factories and the rumbling of the machinery in the mills will never become odious to those men, nor will the smell of the smoke of commercial activity make them wish for a repetition of a like period of idleness.

The American laboring man knows he is the best paid, the best housed, the best clad, and the most contented wage earner on the face of the earth. He knows that he receives from two to five times as much for his hire as is received by any like person in this broad universe. He wants to continue to receive such compensation, but he knows—and no Democratic politician can make him understand otherwise—that the adoption of this bill into law will not better his condition, but will, in fact, bring back those days of '93 to '97 which were a curse to American manhood and American womanhood.

Tariff-for-revenue bills—I refer to general tariff-for-revenue bills—have always caused our country to suffer commercial paralysis. What will a free trade measure like the pending bill do to us? There never was a time, however, following the adoption of a Republican protective tariff measure that the country did not, under its stimulating and invigorating effect, take on new and increased activity.

The way to keep America prosperous is not by passing free-trade legislation and by opening our markets to European products. You can not employ European factories to make goods for American consumption without throwing American workmen out of employment. That is exactly what you are trying to do now. What advantage is there in being able to buy foreign-made goods cheap if to do so we are first compelled to shut off the forge and the loom? What would it profit us to have Europe take our market while we are looking for theirs? Do you want to give up the home market and take a chance on the foreign market? If so, pass this bill. I do not want to give up the home market and am therefore opposed to this bill and shall vote against it when the roll is called upon its passage, and I hope that in the other legislative branch of this country a halt will be called upon the enactment of this infamous, nefarious humbug into a law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine myself to one item in this bill, the item of cotton bagging. It is hardly necessary for me to suggest that my special interest in this one item is because it is manufactured in my district. We have there a prosperous factory, and I can see absolutely no reason and no excuse for putting cotton bagging on the free list, except the desire that the cotton planter of the South may buy the covering for his bale a little cheaper; and to accomplish that you are willing to take away the manufacture from operatives in the United States and transfer it to the underfed, undereducated, underclothed, underpaid natives of India. That must be the result; that must be the purpose of this clause of the bill. From a protective standpoint it is indefensible, from a tariff-for-revenue standpoint it is indefensible, from an American standpoint it is indefensible. Its only defense is a narrow sectional class advantage.

I believe the policy is as shortsighted as it is unfair. It is shortsighted because if we once drive the manufacture out of the United States, drive it to India entirely, extinguish it here, then, of course, the Indian manufacturer will have absolute control of the market, and it is not very probable that his prices will be made with any special regard to the feelings of the cotton planter of the South; they will have a monopoly and will not fail to use it; so I believe, even from your own interest, it is not wise.

But I suppose you have got to show that the Democratic Party is in power. You have got to show your gratitude for the votes of the South; you have got to cater to that section and do some-

thing to show that the South is in the saddle and the Democratic Party is caring for its own, and so you are striking off cotton bagging from the protected list. I think I can show that there is no fair argument why we ought not to give the present rate of duty to this article.

What are the facts? It was about 40 years ago that the manufacture of this article commenced in the United States. I think the first mill that started was the Ludlow Manufacturing Co., in my district.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that cotton bagging is controlled by a trust?

Mr. GILLETT. It is not; I will come to that later.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that it is manufactured practically by one concern?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Where is it made?

Mr. GILLETT. It is made in a half a dozen different places. I will come to that, and after I get through the gentleman can ask me more about it if he wishes.

When we began 40 years ago all cotton bagging was imported and sold for 35 cents per yard. We at once cut the price to 18 cents and have sold it as low as 5 cents. Inasmuch as it only takes about 6 yards of bagging to cover a bale of cotton, duty on that 6 yards would be between 3 and 4 cents. A bale of cotton is worth $60 or $70. So that simply to save—even if the whole duty was added to the price—simply to save 3 or 4 cents for the cotton planter on each bale, you are going to strike down an industry that is scattered over the United States and has been established by a determined policy.

Now, where is it that the imported bagging is made? Where is our main competition? It used to be in Dundee, Scotland, but by the tariff that was put on cotton bagging the American manufacturers were able to compete with Dundee, and we would be willing to compete with England, even with the present low duty, although all our machinery has to be imported from England, because there is none made in the United States, and we have to pay a 45 per cent duty on that machinery. Yet, with that imported machinery and with the tax that we pay on it, and with the duty on cotton bagging less than 10 per cent ad valorem, we are willing to compete with the manufacturers of England.

But unfortunately the Scotland manufacturers, when they could not compete successfully with us, moved their machinery and their foremen and their business to Calcutta, and there, on the banks of the Hoogly River, where the jute grows and is brought right into their mills, they have the same machinery that we have here, paying no duty on it, and instead of the labor that we have here they have Indian labor, for which they pay about 50 cents per week.

Now, let me read from the United States Consular and Trade Report of 1907, showing what the competition is that we have to meet, against what class of labor it is that you are unwilling to protect us by a duty of even 10 per cent.

Let me read you from United States Consular and Trade Report No. 2897, 1907:

> The wages paid to men in the mills range from $2 to $3 per month, women from $1.50 to $2, and boys and girls from $1 to $1.75. These people subsist principally on rice and vegetables made up in the form of curry, which is a peppery and sweetish mixture of rice and vegetables, with now and then chicken, duck, or goat meat.
>
> They all chew betel nut constantly as a stimulant. They eat two meals a day as a rule, one before beginning work and one after the day's work is done. The men and boys wear breechclouts, or dhooties, and the women and girls saris, which consists of 40 yards of thin muslin wrapped in a peculiar way about the loins and shoulders.
>
> The people of a mill, or several mills if the mills are nearly located together, occupy a village, which is made up of huts made of mud, bricks, and palm leaves woven into sheets and tacked onto bamboo poles. All are thatched with a long, tough grass used throughout India for covering huts and bungalows, and which makes a tight, cool, and durable roof. The floor is made of clay tamped down hard, which makes a very good floor. On this floor is spread in places matting made of bamboo grass. On this matting many of the natives throw down a cotton blanket, or possibly a thin mattress, for beds.
>
> Some have a rude bed made of four posts 16 inches high, with crosshead and sidepieces pinned together, and then crisscrossed with bedcords. There may be a few rude benches, but little or no furniture is to be seen in the huts. The natives eat on the floor, squatted around a pot or pan containing the food. The men and boys eat first and the women and girls afterwards, taking what is left. The mode of life is thoroughly primitive. No knives, spoons, or forks are used in eating, the fingers answering all purposes.

Now, those are the persons that are manufacturing the cotton bagging in competition with that made in the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I remember reading in the consular report that same account, and it is said they begin to work at 6 o'clock in the morning, take one-half an hour for noon, and work 14 hours a day, and that there was an attempt then being made to cut the day down to 12 hours; and they were working for $2.50 and $3 a month, 14 hours a day.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes. Here, of course, in the United States—in Massachusetts at least—they are limited to 55 hours of work a week. As the gentleman said, they work 14 hours a day and at wages about one-tenth of what we pay.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, does that report show what the unit of value of each one of these men is?

Mr. GILLETT. No; this report does not show that; but I read an English report which did show it, and my recollection is that they thought the unit of work was about one-third. The gentleman will recognize that this is about the simplest, the lowest form of work in manufacture, that there can be. It requires very slight intelligence and requires only manual dexterity. The operators of India, therefore, are better able to compete with us in this than they would be in almost any other manufacture.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I want to ask the gentleman before he gets through, and I would like to have him tell us, why it was that this combination that is commonly called the Bagging Trust was trying to keep out goods that were coming in competition with it and had them classified here at the rate of 45 per cent instead of the ordinary rate on cotton bagging.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know where the gentleman gets his facts. I presume he gets them from the same circular that was sent to me. I dispute those facts. They say that this Bagging Trust has done so and so. Why, there is no trust at all, as I shall show later.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that a decision was made that even though they did have it classified, and they did bring the goods in, and they did claim they wanted to pay a higher rate than was necessary, yet they had a right to pay an even higher rate, if they desired, if the classification was correctly higher?

Mr. GILLETT. No; it is not a fact. This is what I am told. They brought in some bagging which was not made of jute, but of certain grasses, and not being classified as jute they were classified under the general class where they ought to go.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Did not the Bagging Trust have to appeal this——

Mr. GILLETT. There is no Bagging Trust.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Well, the persons bringing that in, did they not have to appeal in order to get themselves assessed higher?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know anything about that, but I do not see what difference it makes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Then the gentleman did not read the circular.

Mr. GILLETT. If the gentleman thinks this bagging made out of these grasses ought to be brought in at the same rate of duty as the jute bagging instead of 45 per cent, which is the unclassified rate, let his party say it shall come in at the same rate as jute, at 10 per cent. I have no objection to that; but that is not jute bagging. They try to bring it in as jute instead of grass, and so naturally those that were competing with it tried to make it pay the highest price they could.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman deny that that was a fabricated case——

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know.

Mr. BURLESON (continuing). And that those behind it were the American Manufacturing Co. and the Ludlow Manufacturing Co.?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know anything about it. Yes, I do; I deny it was the Ludlow Co.; I know it was not.

Mr. BURLESON. Does not the gentleman know that there was a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee in the tariff hearings of 1909 showing that the sale of the output of bagging made in the United States was divided between the American Manufacturing Co. and the Ludlow Manufacturing Co. upon the basis of 82 per cent to the American Manufacturing Co. and 18 per cent to the Ludlow Co., and that that arrangement had been in existence for years?

Mr. GILLETT. A great deal of testimony may have been presented; I do not know whether it was or not; but I deny it was true, if it was.

Mr. BURLESON. Upon what authority does the gentleman deny it?

Mr. GILLETT. Upon the authority of the Ludlow Co.

Mr. BURLESON. They were before the committee. Why did not they themselves deny it? Why should the gentleman

come now and deny something that the Ludlow Co. did not then deny?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know whether they denied it or not, but——

Mr. BURLESON. I invite the gentleman to an inspection of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means and challenge him to point out to this committee any testimony from the Ludlow Manufacturing Co. wherein a denial was made that this agreement existed.

Mr. GILLETT. I did not even know they were before the committee, but I venture to say you will not find anything where they admitted it was true, because they told me it was not so.

Mr. BURLESON. No; of course they would not admit it, because it is a violation of the law.

Mr. GILLETT. They denied it, undoubtedly.

Mr. BURLESON. They failed to deny it.

Mr. GILLETT. I read the testimony at the time, I remember, but I do not remember anything about it. Now that we are on that subject, I will say this: You talk about trusts and have doubtless received circulars, as I have, from men who are engaged in the business of importing this foreign bagging, and consequently are interested to drive the American manufacturer, their rival, out of the business. I have received circulars, and they claim there is a trust. There is no evidence of it, and I have a statement from the president of my company, a man in whose integrity I have absolute confidence, who tells me that there has not been, either directly or indirectly, any combination of the Ludlow Co. with any other manufacturers in the United States. Why, you talk about a trust when 20 per cent of the cotton bagging that is used in the United States is imported now and has been for many years. The tariff is a little less than 10 per cent ad valorem and has been for years. Is that an exorbitant duty, is that an extravagant duty, to keep out foreign manufacturers and particularly the manufacturers employing such labor as that to which I have alluded? No; it seems to me that fact in and of itself proves that the tariff is not high enough to allow any monopoly in this country. I notice the Committee on Ways and Means states in their report that we give free binding twine to the western farmer, and therefore why should we not give free cotton bagging to the southern farmer. That argument and the imaginary trust are the only excuses offered. You know that is not a fair analogy.

When binding twine was put on the free list there had not been any importations of binding twine for years. It was apparent that the tariff was prohibitory, and it was put on the free list. What was the result? Still there were no importations of binding twine. Apparently there was not any made that could compete with us, even without a duty, and from that day to within a very few years ago there was no competition on binding twine, and it could well afford to have that duty taken off.

Recently there has been a little importation, and from whom? Has it come from countries like India, where labor is employed at 50 cents a week? Why, no. The only place that binding twine has been imported from in any amount was from the only nation that I think we do not need to have any protective tariff against—from Canada. And it was produced there, I presume, simply because the agricultural-implement industry moved over there from the United States, and in that connection they made binding twine and sometimes dumped their surplus into the United States. So I claim that that has no analogy at all. It differs from this in the fact that when that was put on there was no importion of binding twine, whereas now in cotton bagging there is an annual importation of 20 per cent of all that is used, and the only nation that ever has made binding twine in competition is a nation where the standards of labor and living are almost like those in the United States, and not, as in the case of cotton bagging, so low and inferior that no one will pretend that there can be equal competition between us.

So, I say, I am assured by the president of this company that it has never been in any combination, that the price has not been fixed between them, and that they have entirely different agents. It seems to be the policy of my friends on the other side, inasmuch as they are short of other arguments, to accuse this company of being a trust. I remember when I was in the law school I was told if I had not any case, to pitch into the lawyer on the other side. And just as in different eras of the world, it has been the practice, if you wanted to hurt your enemy, to call him a Christian, or a Jew, or a witch, or heretic, so the demagogue to-day denounces every opponent as the friend of trusts and monopolies. I would like to see some evidence that this is a trust. The president of this company, which manufactures, I think, about 20 per cent of the cotton manufactured in the United States, a man interested, of course, but in whose integrity I have implicit confidence, assures me that there is no combination in prices or sales, and the fact that about 20 per cent of all that is used is imported from India is itself proof that there is no monopoly. How much must be imported to satisfy you that there is no monopoly? Apparently you want 100 per cent.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Is the gentleman prepared to state what proportion or per cent of the cotton bagging used in the United States is produced here, and what per cent is imported?

Mr. GILLETT. I say about 20 per cent is imported from India, and consequently 80 per cent of it is produced here. Some of it is produced in Ludlow; there is a large mill in Brooklyn, N. Y., and there are mills in many other States. I suppose that what originally started this talk of a trust was that a good many years ago there was apparently an attempt made to make a consolidation of all the bagging manufactories.

Mr. BURLESON. Does not the gentleman know that certain bagging mills in the South were bought by the American Manufacturing Co., dismantled and closed, and stockholders in these local concerns received as their purchase price stock of the American Manufacturing Co., and has not that condition continued ever since?

Mr. GILLETT. That is what I was going on to say. I understand there was an attempt years ago to make a large combination. A good many mills were bought out and they were formed under the title you mentioned, of the American Manufacturing Co., into one large concern, and that absorbed a number of mills. Some of them were dismantled and some kept on. But they did not absorb all; they did not acquire a monopoly.

Mr. BURLESON. I will admit that they did not absorb the Ludlow concern. But I want to know if—because all we want to know is the truth—the gentleman denies that the Ludlow concern manufactures more than 18 per cent of the American product?

Mr. GILLETT. I deny the manufacture in any specific per cent; indeed, I do.

Mr. BURLESON. You say you have no knowledge of their understanding with the American Manufacturing Co., of Brooklyn? Do you deny that through a series of years the Ludlow Co. manufactured about 18 per cent of the product that is supplied of the American product and never more?

Mr. GILLETT. The mill makes, I think, about 20 per cent. Probably the mill in Peru, Ind., is capable of making some certain per cent, and it is not always exactly the same per cent. There are at least these three different independent concerns that are now manufacturing.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman say that the Peru concern is entirely independent of the American Manufacturing Co.?

Mr. GILLETT. I think so. There is one other that is independent, and I think it is this Peru one. But if the gentleman means to intimate that they prescribe a certain percentage to each concern, I do deny it.

Mr. BURLESON. I call the attention of the gentleman to the emphatic statement made by a former employee of the American Manufacturing Co. before the Committee on Ways and Means, tariff hearings, in 1909. The gentleman can only have his information at second hand.

Mr. GILLETT. I have it at first hand from a gentleman who is in a position to know.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman must know that such testimony is only hearsay. Mr. Ludlow has not come here or before the committee to say so.

Mr. GILLETT. There never was any Mr. Ludlow, so far as I know.

Mr. BURLESON. Whoever the proprietor is, or the general manager, or some one having first-hand knowledge of the fact.

Mr. GILLETT. Whether this former employee that the gentleman refers to is a man of integrity or not I do not know. The gentleman apparently is depending upon the word of a former employee to lay a foundation for the charge of a trust, which is emphatically denied by one man, at least, who does know. And, as I say, it is very easy for the gentleman from Texas to cry "trust" and to try to make out that there is a wicked combination, in order to make unpopular the persons who are manufacturing the bagging which he wants to be able to buy cheaper. He wants it all imported. He wants it to be made in India, does he?

Mr. BURLESON. Does not the gentleman speak from hearsay? Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman answer my question first? [Laughter.]

Mr. BURLESON. I want to see the southern producer who raises cotton relieved of the tribute exacted of him and which he has been paying for so many years.

Mr. GILLETT. What tribute?

Mr. BURLESON. The tribute he pays to this Bagging Trust or combination.

Mr. GILLETT. Three-fourths of a cent tariff?

Mr. BURLESON. Now, under the fabricated case and decision of the customs appraisers, it is proposed to make it 45 per cent.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is mistaken. That applies to grass, not to the jute bagging.

Mr. BURLESON. It is sought to be made to apply to the bagging imported for use in the coming cotton crop. I would like to ask the gentleman how many people are employed in the Ludlow mill in making cotton bagging, not in making cordage and other products?

Mr. GILLETT. About 600.

Now, apparently the only claim they can make is that this manufacture is controlled by a trust; and yet, as I say, the most complete answer to that is that the tariff is now so low that 20 per cent is imported, so that there can be no monopoly. Apparently the gentleman wants to see the whole 100 per cent imported. If 20 per cent is not enough to make competition, to prevent a trust from having a monopoly, how much does the gentleman want to see imported? If a tariff of less than 10 per cent against the coolie employees of India is too much, then I agree that you might as well have nothing. If you strike out this, it simply drives the business, the manufacture, from the United States to India; and that, apparently, is the intention of the Democratic Party. They apparently want to drive these employees in Ludlow and in Brooklyn and in Indiana into some other employment.

Mr. AUSTIN. And there are also establishments in North Carolina and Georgia and Tennessee.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; in many other States, as the gentleman says. American mills will have this machinery, which was imported, paying a high duty, made useless and turned into worthless junk in order that the cotton planter may save about 3 cents on each bale of cotton that is worth $60 or $70 a bale.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman said that a bale of cotton is worth from $65 to $70 and the bagging worth only 3 cents?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. My recollection is that the recent value of a bale of cotton has been $80 or $90 a bale, whereas under the Democratic administration some years ago it was worth only $23 or $24 a bale. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma claim that any tariff on cotton fixed under the Payne-Aldrich bill is the cause of the present high price of cotton?

Mr. GILLETT. I should say it would be even a little more ridiculous now to try to save 3 cents on a bale than it was when a bale of cotton was worth only $20.

Mr. BURLESON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma again whether he thinks the present high price of cotton is caused by the existing tariff law?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I am making no claim. I am simply stating the facts as to what the conditions were under the Democratic administration as compared with what the conditions were under a Republican administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURLESON. But answer. Is it caused by the tariff?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. There is no doubt but that the high price was made possible by the policy of the Republican Party when it was in power and that the depression referred to was caused by the policy of the Democratic Party when it was in power. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I am sorry I can not let you have a discussion with the gentleman from Oklahoma in my time.

Mr. SIMS. Does not the gentleman know that the price of cotton was lower in 1898 than at any prior time?

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Under the Wilson bill was the tariff on cotton bagging taken off?

Mr. GILLETT. It was.

Mr. ESCH. And, if so, what effect had it upon the industry at that time?

Mr. GILLETT. We had, as I remember, under the McKinley bill practically the whole market to ourselves, and when the duty was taken off in the Wilson bill the importations immediately leaped up from practically nothing to 16,000,000 yards the last year, and then the Dingley bill again put on this small duty.

Mr. ESCH. That was a much smaller duty than the former duty under the McKinley bill?

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, yes.

Mr. PAYNE. Right in that connection, Mr. Pierce, who represented the district from St. Louis, came before the Dingley Ways and Means Committee. He was a manufacturer of cotton bagging, and he had been on a tour round the world for two or three years and had examined the conditions in every mill in Egypt, and had also been to Dundee and examined the conditions there; and when he got through he explained the matter to the committee and stated the facts that he had ascertained, and suggested this very low duty. Some of the other manufacturers thought it was not enough to put the business again on its feet. He said he wanted as low a duty as he could get and still do the business or do a portion of it; and that is the reason that that very low duty was made in the Dingley bill. I forget what the former duty was under the McKinley bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The duty on these articles was fixed in accordance with the Republican platform, was it not, in the Payne bill?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know whether it was or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the presumption—that the duties in the Payne bill were fixed in accordance with the Republican platform.

Mr. GILLETT. I think this was a good deal less. This is the most extreme case you could get.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The theory upon which the Payne bill was framed was the declaration in the Republican platform that the duty ought to cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad and afford a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. Now, was this duty fixed in accordance with the Republican platform, or was the promise of the Republican platform repudiated in this case?

Mr. GILLETT. Neither one. I do not suppose the gentleman imagines that every schedule in the bill is exactly and accurately matched to that platform. I think myself that this is too low to give an adequate protection against the coolie labor of India.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to ask the gentleman if he can tell the wages that are paid in the mills in his district which manufacture this cotton bagging.

Mr. GILLETT. As I remember the wages of the 600 men, women, and children who are engaged in this industry average about $11 a week.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Ten dollars is the maximum wage paid in Brooklyn, except for machinists; and what I wanted to know was whether, in the opinion of the gentleman, $10 a week is a living wage under a Republican tariff in any industry, when the tariff is fixed in accordance with the Republican platform.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts 10 minutes more.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, as I say, I think that this is too low to accord with that principle. It is one of the lowest duties in the tariff, and that is one of the strong arguments against its repeal. It is only about 10 per cent, or a little less, ad valorem, and yet the gentlemen on that side say that 10 per cent is too high against this oriental labor. Now, if the gentleman had been here before, he would have heard me say that this is an exceedingly simple and easily learned kind of labor. It is about the crudest labor that there is. Women and children are employed in it. I agree that $10 a week is very low.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Ten dollars is the wages paid to the men. The women and children get lower wages.

Mr. GILLETT. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The women get $6.15, and the children get various sums.

Mr. GILLETT. I think the wages of the whole number average $10 a week.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; that can not be, because outside of foremen, assistant foremen, and machinists——

Mr. GILLETT. I included them in the average.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Machinists get $21 a week and assistant foremen $14.50.

Mr. GILLETT. They are a part of the employment. They bring up the average.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; but you might include the compensation of the officials of the corporations.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. When you are getting an average, you include both the high paid and the low paid.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The maximum salary or compensation paid a man is $10 a week. Can the gentleman state how many hours a day the employees in these mills work?

Mr. GILLETT. They work 55 hours a week—that is the limit—whereas over there they work 15 hours a day. If the gentleman's complaint is that these wages are too low, is that a reason for their doing away with the duty? Is that a reason for taking off the duty and sending the manufacture out of the country?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman's inference is hardly correct. We will discuss that when we come to the profits that have been made by those engaged in the work.

Mr. GILLETT. We can not tell what the profits are, for they have other branches of manufacture.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will put in the RECORD, if I can get it, the information which the Secretary of the Treasury has in hand under the corporation-tax act.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman can, of course, put in the RECORD what he pleases.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the Secretary does not wish to give it to me, of course I can not put it in.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman not know that many of the employees in the constituent plants of the so-called Cotton Bag Trust are paid the miserable pittance of 60 cents a day?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know; it may be so. It is the simplest and crudest and lowest form of labor that there is. It is obliged to compete with Indian labor, and doubtless the employers get the cheapest labor they can, and now you gentlemen want to wipe away the tariff of 10 per cent under which they are just able to live. If the gentleman is correct, we employ the cheapest labor there is, and now the gentleman wants to wipe that off and drive it into some other employment.

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman will pardon me, can the gentleman tell us what is the labor cost compared to the total cost of production?

Mr. GILLETT. I can not tell the gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman, I claim that this stands as a very clear case of an industry which has the lowest protection under which it can exist—less than 10 per cent ad valorem protection, one of the lowest in the whole list. Its competitor is the cheap labor of India, labor to whose standard no one wants us to descend, but what the gentlemen on the other side of the House are trying to do apparently is to drive out this industry from the United States. They want us to wind up our factories and send the work to India. I hope it is not a fair specimen of the spirit which animates the Democratic Party. You want us to abandon the American manufacture, you want to throw out of work the American laborer, and you want it done in order that you may save the magnificent sum of 3 cents a bale on cotton.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Is it not a fact that under this splendid system of protection of the Republican administration the employers now employ labor wherever they can get it cheapest; and is it not a fact that they are bringing about a million of foreign pauper laborers into this country every year to compete with American labor?

Mr. GILLETT. That is not a very pertinent question to this matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think it is. The gentleman said he wanted to protect the American workman against foreign competition.

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman from Illinois want to keep out foreign labor; is that his argument?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not making any argument at all.

Mr. GILLETT. That seemed to be the result of the gentleman's question, and I want to find out what he is driving at.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts answer the question I asked?

Mr. GILLETT. I first want to find out what the gentleman from Illinois is driving at.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the foreign workman would come here of his own volition under a condition where he could exercise his freedom with the American workman, I would say let the foreigner come in, but I do object to the working people of this country being misled by the statement that they are protected by the tariff, when, in fact, there is no protection against the foreign workingman at all; they have to compete with the foreign workman.

Mr. GILLETT. Of course they do, and the gentleman's argument would seem to be that they ought not to. But what we are using here in competition with the ridiculously cheap labor of India is the cheapest labor that can be procured in this country.

It seems to me there is no tariff in our whole law which presents a stronger case than cotton bagging. The duty is low—less than 10 per cent. The foreign competition is not labor of the same class, but Orientals whose wages are only a tenth of ours and whose standards of living are as different. The present tariff is not high enough to allow a monopoly, as is proved by the fact that there has been for years an increasing importation, amounting to 20 per cent of the consumption. It is now a revenue duty, and in abolishing it you are losing revenue.

You Democrats have the power, and for the sake of the cotton planters you may strike down this American industry, turn some thousands of American operatives out of work, and hand it over to the Indian coolies; but you are demonstrating your true attitude toward labor, are showing who your real masters are, and are revealing the political principles which have so long kept you from power and which will again turn you out of power.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I send to the Clerk's desk to have read an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on yesterday, a newspaper owned and controlled, as I understand, by the Hon. John R. McLean, one of the Democratic leaders and also the proprietor of the Democratic organ of the State of Ohio—the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman on what authority he says that Mr. McLean is a Democratic leader?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is a well-understood proposition in Ohio and in the West. He came very near coming to the United States Senate as a representative of the gentleman's party from Ohio.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. How near did he come?

Mr. CONNELL. Does the gentleman mean to say that because he may be a Democratic leader his newspaper is necessarily a Democratic newspaper?

Mr. AUSTIN. In this case the paper is Democratic and its owner a Democrat in good standing.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would like to have my friends on the other side listen to this editorial first and then, if I have any time, I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, I have read the editorial. I would like to have some information from the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GIVE BUSINESS A CHANCE!

If statesmen of high and low degree are anxious to do something that will meet the approval of an overwhelming majority of the American people and immensely promote the general welfare, let them wind up political agitation and give business a chance.

By business we mean the man with the hoe and the man with the check book; the manager at the desk and the engineer in the cab; the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker; everybody, in short, outside of the halls of legislation.

Every man in the United States who is willing to work ought to have a chance to work. All would have that chance if it were not for unnecessary obstructions and threatened assaults upon business. Most of the people are only too anxious to get busy and keep busy. Why can't they have the chance?

The earth is fruitful, the people are healthy, the machinery of production and distribution is all in place. The United States at this moment should be the busiest, most prosperous, happiest country on the globe. But it is halting and stumbling along, a gigantic weakling, suffering from the infantile paralysis of too much politics.

We do not believe for a moment that a majority of the people are in favor of the continual monkeying with the mechanism of industry. They are not demanding an overhauling of the country by political doctors and legislative tinkers. They are attending to their own business and they wish lawmakers would shut up shop and quit interfering with the business of breadwinning and home making.

Big business is no more vitally affected than little business, except for the fact that more persons are concerned in big business than in little business. The same influence that halts a railroad system paralyzes merchants and builders and farmers along the line, to say nothing of the mechanics and laborers directly employed by the railroad.

Injury or interruption of one business injures and interrupts others. The delay in deciding the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trust cases by the United States Supreme Court does no more harm to those concerns than it does to all other business. The harm does not lie in fear of an adverse decision, but in the delay. If the worst were known business would go ahead, but uncertainty paralyzes the will of business from the Atlantic to the Pacific. No engagements can be made for future de-

velopment or extensions. Everybody marks time—not because he is a stockholder in Standard Oil, but because his business is a thread in the complicated web of American industry.

The Government can do nothing better for the people than to permit them to attend to their own affairs. The legislative branch can help by refraining from making or threatening to enact new and experimental laws. The judicial branch can help by telling corporations where they stand.

Give the plain, everyday business man a chance!

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I have been immensely interested as well as greatly benefited by the very able discussion which has been carried on upon this question on both sides of this Chamber, and I fear I can add little to what has already been said upon the important questions and items of which I would speak. I plead in defense of rising at all to speak upon the question the great interest the people of my district have in this bill. I represent, in the twelfth district of Missouri, one of the most important districts in this country from the standpoint of the tariff and of protection. The district that I represent is the second wealthiest district in this country. It has engaged thousands of men in various lines of pursuits, especially of manufacturing, and it is only to express to this House and to this country their ideas upon this bill that I rise at all.

It has been said upon this floor that this proposed law is for the benefit of certain sections of the country and will be to the harm and detriment of other sections. While I believe that to be true, I do not charge that the majority have had such in view in their proposal of this law. The only trouble that there is with the people of my district is not because they have not plenty of work to do, but their only complaint is that the cost of living is too high. I voted for the reciprocity bill, believing that that would, in a large measure, reduce the cost of living; and I still believe that it will. I agree on that question with what the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] said in his address, when discussing this matter. He said:

I think I demonstrated beyond dispute, for no reply has yet been made by anybody to the proposition, that the higher cost of living which now obtains in this country was due to an enormously increased demand for food products and a proportionately decreased productive power on our part, and that this great change, due largely to immigration and a transition from agriculture to manufacturing, had begun on the Atlantic coast and was steadily moving westward, until now its influence was effective and controlling in the Central West.

I pointed out also that the transference of millions upon millions of the food-producing classes from the nations of Europe into the manufacturing industries of this country had made the tendency to a higher cost of living world-wide; and I expressed my sincere belief that the continuation of high prices for food products was inevitable and that the only possible effect of complete freedom of exchange of all natural products between the United States and Canada would be to temporarily retard the rapid advances and to steady the fluctuations of the prices of the fast-diminishing export surplus of many of the food products of both countries, and that a considerable period of time would be necessary for a permanent readjustment of the present world-wide conditions of the cost of living.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that that is the only solution of the question of the high cost of living, that the production has not been equal to the demand, and it is only by opening up the agricultural markets of Canada, which I do not believe will hurt materially any section of this country, as has been charged upon this floor, that we will get relief.

In voting for reciprocity with Canada I did not vote for free trade with the world. Free trade and reciprocity are not twins, as has been charged upon this floor. Some one has stated here that they were twin sisters—reciprocity and this free-list bill. I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that they are any relation at all, not even fifty-first cousins. Protection and reciprocity have been the handiwork of the party that has developed this country's wonderful resources and made it a great country.

It is these policies of the Republican Party which has made and protected American workingmen in the factories and the mills. There is more work to-day for the laboring man in this country than there has ever been before. He is not crying for work to-day. He wants more to eat and for less money. I am with him on that, and hope he gets it through this reciprocity with Canada. One thing is certain, the relief must come through and by the Republican Party, as the Democratic Party is not now and never has been equal to the occasion. Democracy is good at tearing down, but not good at building.

Mr. Chairman, I could not, in the short time allotted to me, discuss the various items of this bill, but would speak especially of two industries, which thrive in my district, as examples of the unfairness of this bill:

First, let me call your attention to the second page of this bill and the articles it puts on the free-trade basis, if it becomes a law, beginning with line 3 and ending with line 10, and being in words as follows:

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

In the city of St. Louis we have hundreds of men and women who are working in the manufacture of various kinds of bagging. Should this bill become a law, this industry in my district would be ruined and the mills closed. This business has been crippled already by the present low tariff on the material from which bagging, and so forth, is manufactured. To show that the conditions in regard to this bagging business exists not only in my city but in other places, I call your attention to a statement that has been issued by the Carolina Bagging Co., at Henderson, N. C., under date of April 24, and which is as follows, in part:

The "farmers' free-list bill" just introduced in Congress proposes to admit jute into this country free. This product grows in India and nowhere else. Conditions there require payment by jute manufacturers of an average of about 50 cents per week to their laborers. This is very shocking, but it is taken from their government report for the year 1910.

The duty on cotton bagging, which is made of jute, is about 30 cents per roll. With this small amount of protection manufacturers of bagging and other jute products have had a hard time to live for the last few years. Several factories have failed and gone out of business.

But there are now seven bagging factories in North Carolina, three in South Carolina, three in Virginia, and three in Georgia. Large amounts of capital are invested in these. Admitting jute into this country free of duty would ruin and close these factories, and throw all their labor out of employment. Our factory employs 200 operators, who receive from $4 to $40 per week, on which they and their families live. The duty on our annual output of 100,000 rolls is about 30 cents per roll, or $30,000. Take this from our earnings and we could not go on at all, and would close our factory. May God forbid such a result. We and our help all cry to Congress to forbid it.

Take another view of it. A few years ago there was much talk of using cotton for cotton bagging. At the present prices of cotton of course the farmers can not afford that.

But millions of yards of cotton bagging are used yearly for cement, grain, flour, beans, and other such purposes. If the duty on jute is removed the great and immediate inflow of the manufactured product would supply jute for all these and many other uses now supplied by cotton goods. We would thus, in return for the pitiful sum of about 4 cents a bale duty now paid by the farmer on cotton bagging, have to be taxed in some other way to supply that loss of revenue to the Government, lose our factories to their owners, our wages to the laborers, and sustain a considerable reduction in the use and price of cotton. Thus the prophecy of Bret Harte will be fulfilled: "We are ruined by Chinese cheap labor." We pray that such a calamity may be averted.

That, Mr. Chairman, is from North Carolina, where industries have grown up, such as these and others in the manufacturing line through the Southern States, by reason of this protective tariff that the Republican Party has enacted.

From the conditions prevailing in this industry in my own city, and the facts and figures that have come to me from them, I am satisfied that the statement from the Carolina Bagging Co. is true, and I will not burden the RECORD with a statement as to the figures and conditions that prevail in this industry in my own city, as it is substantially the same as that of the Carolina Bagging Co., and of all the factories engaged in that business in this country, including the Brooklyn mills that turn out a great deal of the jute bagging for cotton baling that is used in this country. Already about 20 per cent of jute bagging is imported from Calcutta, and if you admit it free they will import all, and the ruinous results of free trade, as applied to this industry, will be seen in the extinguishing of the fires of the mills and the idleness of American laborers engaged in this work.

I have a telegram here, Mr. Chairman, and a letter from H. & L. Chase Bag Co., of St. Louis, making substantially the same complaint and objecting to the passage of this bill as that which I have read into the RECORD from the Carolina Bagging Co., of Henderson, N. C., and I ask leave to insert it in the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

H. & L. CHASE BAG CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., April 24, 1911.

Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Learning that the Underwood bill was likely to come up for discussion to-day in your honorable body, and being vitally affected in the jute industry, we confirm our telegram sent you this morning reading as follows:

"Before voting on change affecting jute goods, schedule J, please give opportunity for a committee representing this industry to appear before the Ways and Means Committee."

We trust that through your efforts we may at least have chance to be heard.

Yours, respectfully, H. & L. CHASE BAG CO.

There is another item in this bill that is vitally important to the St. Louis district that I represent, and that is the one which refers to the boot and shoe industry. I call your attention to the second page of said bill, beginning with line 17 and ending with line 24 of said page, as follows:

Grain, buff, split, rough, and sole leather; hand, belt, or belting leather; boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery,

in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

I will not go into the details of this industry, as it has ably and minutely been discussed in this House in the last few days by several Members of this House, and I ask you to carefully read and consider what they said upon this matter before you vote to take the duty off of this class of goods.

Just for a moment, to give you an idea of the importance of this industry as it applies only to my district, I will state that the boot and shoe manufacturers in that district, with American labor, in the year 1910, made 26,300,000 pairs of shoes; that the cost of the manufacture of these shoes was $40,000,000; wages paid were $8,100,000; the average net profits were under 5 per cent; a very small portion of these shoes were shipped to foreign countries, but practically all were sold in this country. The average wages paid to shoe cutters in the city of St. Louis were $16 a week. For the same class of work the shoe cutters in foreign countries receive about $7 a week. Reduce the tariff, if you will, on these goods, and the products necessary in the manufacture thereof, and you will cripple these industries, probably close some of the factories, and surely reduce the price of wages paid to the American workmen.

And not only, Mr. Chairman, does this industry affect this district in the importance I have called to your attention, but you all know there are men engaged in the sale of these shoes, retail and otherwise, throughout the various States of this country. It not only affects the shoe companies which are in my district, but it also affects them in their relation with the States of Missouri and Illinois. Some of these shoe companies have factories in those States.

It has been said to-day here on the floor of this House by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], and it has been repeatedly charged and stated here, that there never has been any claim of a trust or a combination in the shoe industry. Then why would you tear them down? Why would you even cripple them? And why would you take away from them this small pittance of protection that they now have? Do you want to reduce the prices they are now paying to the workmen engaged in this industry? Do you think $16 a week for shoe cutters is too much? Would you have them receive the same as the foreign cutters in foreign lands now get, of about $7 a week? That is not the way to reduce the price of living and the cost of living.

It has been only a few years back, Mr. Chairman, when it was cheap to live, if you only had the money to buy. I remember the time, not many years ago, when I was upon my father's farm in Missouri, when we could not get anything for the products that we raised. It was because of the tariff legislation that had been enacted by the Democratic Party, and because of the harmful effects on American industries. Idleness was in the cities, and there was no market for the goods, and you could then truly say that the cost of living was cheap. But they had nothing with which to buy the products.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, to free shoes, etc., that this bill would bring into this country free, there is a long list of materials that every shoe manufacturer must use, but which this committee has not included in this bill. This list includes many kinds of leather and tanning materials used in producing leather, such as cloth for linings, canvas, threads, blackings, cement, nails, tacks, wire, and so forth, all of which are free to the manufacturers of England, however, and of some other countries. This gives the foreign manufacturers an unfair advantage.

The reduction of the tariff on shoes to the present 10 per cent has reached the danger limit, and I sincerely hope that the intelligence and patriotism of this House will allow its best judgment to prevail in their refusal to pass this bill, and that it will forget, if such is possible here, political issues and political campaigns of the future and fix our minds and our attention upon that which is for the best interests of this whole country.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the laws that are enacted should be laws that are best for the majority of the people and not for any particular portion of them or any particular section of them.

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would call the attention of this House to, and that is a statement prepared by the New England Shoe and Leather Association at a meeting of their board of directors held on the 22d of April of this year. It is as follows:

The proposal to put leather and boots and shoes on the free list seems to make it necessary to consider conditions as now existing in this industry.

At the time of the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill a very thorough investigation of these conditions, both at home and abroad, was made. It will be remembered that certain manufacturers of shoes stated at that time that if hides and other necessary materials were made free no protection for shoes would be needed.

This statement aroused a very earnest discussion, and inquiries were made in the principal markets of Europe; samples were obtained, examined, and appraised; labor costs were ascertained; and the decision seemed to be thoroughly established that certain grades of American shoes, value of which was given chiefly by their style and finish, could successfully compete with foreign productions. On other grades, where the American ideas in regard to style and fit were not as important, it was found that the shoes abroad were being sold at somewhat less than prices current in this country, and that without a moderately protective tariff manufacturers in this country would be subjected to unfair competition, and the wages of labor would necessarily be somewhat reduced.

It was also found that the German tanners had made great progress in the tanning and finishing of calfskins and upper leather, and that, owing to the lower cost of labor, chemicals, and tanning materials generally, upper leather was being produced in foreign countries at less than the cost in America.

The shoe and leather industry has never claimed the protection of high tariff rates, and in accordance with its traditional policy it freely consented to very important reductions in the rates on all classes of leather and shoes at the time of the enactment of the last tariff bill. The rates established were intentionally made as low as possible without jeopardizing the manufacturing interests and the wages of the employees.

The duties as they now stand are so low as to be on practically a revenue basis.

Since these rates were established, such changes as have occurred in the situation have been against rather than in favor of the domestic manufacturer.

Modern machinery and factory methods have been rapidly introduced, and the foreign manufacturer of shoes now stands more nearly on the American level of efficiency than ever before. Under these circumstances and in view of the added cost of tanning material in this country on account of the tariff and the consequent higher cost of leather, and in view of the fact that the shoe workers in the United States obtain from two to four times the wages paid in European countries, the proposal to make shoes and leather free must be considered as without reasonable cause or excuse.

The shoe and leather industry asks no favors of Congress. They claim to have developed a much higher condition of comparative efficiency than has been established by other and kindred industries, and desire simply a fair chance to continue their development under such conditions as are in every way to the advantage of the American consumer. The products of their tanneries and factories have established the standard for equality the world over, and have been distributed to the consumers at prices at least as low as those current anywhere on earth. The tariff on shoes has never cost the wearer of shoes in the United States one cent, and free trade in shoes will do nothing toward cheapening the footwear of the farmer or lessening by one cent his necessary expenses.

Shoes made either at home or abroad must pay the producer a small margin of profit. The shoes produced in the United States under conditions of the most intense competition do not pay the manufacturer an average profit of more than about 4 per cent. The foreign manufacturer certainly would not work for less. The lower cost of labor, machinery, and materials abroad is only partially offset in this country by production on a larger scale and more efficient and systematic handling of the machinery and materials employed. The cost of the finished product is to-day slightly less on most grades in Europe than in America, and in some styles, where handwork is largely employed, the margin in favor of Europe is very wide.

For the past 10 years Europe has been constantly studying our methods and adopting our machinery. To-day she is fully on an equality with us in the production of machinery, and is organizing her industry to secure for her manufacturers the benefit of the larger production and more systematic and efficient methods which we now enjoy. At the present moment there are in the shoe factories of this country at least five representatives of the largest shoe manufacturing companies in Europe, sent here by their employers for the purpose of study and investigation of American methods.

Under conditions as they exist at the present time there can be no doubt that the advantage of European manufacturers will continue to increase for the present, and the result of the removal of the very slight protection now afforded would be to divide the market between the domestic and foreign manufacturers without result in material saving in cost to the consumer.

I also have here, Mr. Chairman, a telegram and a letter from the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis, begging that this tariff be not disturbed. They say that foreign manufacturers have free material and nonroyalty machinery, and labor about half that paid in this country. The tariff on shoes is only 10 per cent, whereas on other wearing apparel it is much more. Why should shoes bear all the burden in the plan to reduce the cost of living? Why not reduce the tariff upon sugar? They earnestly protest against the removal of duty on shoes under existing conditions. That is signed, Mr. Chairman, by the Brown Shoe Co., the Carruthers-Jones Shoe Co., and 11 other big shoe manufacturers of the city of St. Louis, including the Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co., which company, I want to state here, has the contract for furnishing shoes to the Army, and it was not the company that was charged here upon the floor the other day, with headquarters in Boston, that has a monopoly upon it. The shoe companies of St. Louis have been having these contracts for years and have been supplying most of the shoes that have been worn by the soldiers, and it is because, Mr. Chairman, the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis produce the best shoes in the land.

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a telegram and letter from them upon this subject:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 26, 1911.*

Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Foreign manufacturers have free material and nonroyalty machinery and labor at about one-half paid in this country. Can we compete under these conditions if shoes are free? The tariff on shoes is only 10 per

cent, whereas all other wearing apparel averages about 60 per cent. Why should shoes bear all the burden in the plan to reduce the cost of living? We earnestly protest against the removal of duty on shoes under existing conditions.

Brown Shoe Co., Carruthers-Jones Shoe Co., Geo. F. Dittmann Boot & Shoe Co., Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co., John Meier Shoe Co., Roberts, Johnson, Rand Shoe Co., Burrow-Jones Dyer Shoe Co., Desnoyers Shoe Co., Friedman-Shelby Shoe Co., Johansen Bros. Shoe Co., Peters Shoe Co., Wertheimer-Swarts Shoe Co.

Also the following letter from a shoe manufacturer of St. Louis:

MY DEAR MR. DYER: Your night telegram, asking for data regarding shoe industry of St. Louis, received. We appreciate very much your interest and have sent you night telegram, reading as follows:

"Answering your telegram, the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis made last year about 26,300,000 pairs of shoes. Producing cost, $40,000,000; wages, $8,100,000; average net profits under 5 per cent. Very small portion shipped foreign countries. Shoe cutters have received average $16 weekly; same work some foreign countries, $7 weekly. We believe free shoes would result in a large reduction in wages or closed factories."

The figures given were obtained from the publishers of the Shoe Trade Paper in St. Louis, and we believe they are approximately correct.

The undersigned has visited representative shoe factories in Europe within the last year, when he investigated the question of foreign shoes being shipped to this country, and it is his judgment that free shoes would be a very serious matter to the shoe workers, as well as the shoe manufacturers, of this country.

BROWN SHOE CO.,
J. H. ROBLEE, *Vice President.*

Hon. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

St. Louis is in the State of Missouri, and Missouri is the greatest State in the Union, as my Democratic friends of this House have testified to by selecting for its Speaker our distinguished son and our first citizen, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK. [Applause.] While I am not a prophet, and never had any experience in prophecy, I will say this, Mr. Chairman, which is a little away from my subject, that if the Democracy of this country wants the ablest and the best and the greatest Democrat in the country for the White House they will nominate and try their best to elect him to that position. [Applause.]

I have other letters and telegrams here, Mr. Chairman, from the shoe-manufacturing industries of St. Louis and from the district which I have the honor to represent here in this House. One of those letters, which I have read in part, has given to you the names of those men who are engaged in that industry, and they are interested, and all of the people of St. Louis are interested, in this subject.

We are not here, Mr. Chairman, pleading for capital especially, but we are here pleading for the interests of the workingmen. One of the shoe manufacturers of St. Louis stated to me that last year he visited all the representative shoe factories in Europe, where he investigated the question of foreign shoes that are being shipped to this country, and it is his judgment that free shoes would be a very serious matter to the shoe workers as well as to the shoe manufacturers of this country.

A letter addressed to me from another large manufacturer in my district is as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *April 26, 1911.*

Hon. L. C. DYER, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You are going to be asked to take off the present 10 per cent duty on shoes, and we trust that you will not do so.

Our American workmen can compete with the English, the French, and the Germans, and, on an equal basis, they can beat them, but the difference in the cost of living over there and the cost of living here is so great that if we had to meet European conditions it would mean disaster to the trade.

The duty, before the last change, we think was 20 per cent, and they cut it down to 10 per cent, which is as little as it ought to be, when you consider the fact that wages in this country average about 100 per cent more than they do over on the other side. This difference in wages can not come out of the manufacturers' profits, because, with one or two exceptions, there is hardly a shoe house in the country to-day that is making more than a living.

Conditions are exceedingly discouraging in the shoe-manufacturing trade and any further burden, such as is proposed by this increased reduction of tariff, would be the "straw to break the camel's back." To the shoe industry of your State this constitutes an exceedingly important item, and we hope you will give it your very earnest and careful consideration.

DESNOYERS SHOE CO.,
By W. L. DESNOYERS, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, I would also, with your permission and with the permission of the House, call your attention to the following figures on imports and exports to show to you that there is already being imported into this country millions of dollars' worth of goods in the bagging and shoe industries:

Imports and exports for 12 months ending December, 1910.

(Compiled from the Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance, December, 1910.)

	Imports.	Exports of domestic merchandise.
Manufactures of—		
Bagging, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton	$3,383,171	.....
Burlaps or plain woven fabrics of single jute yarn	21,329,239	.....
Hides and skins, other than fur skins, raw or uncured	86,107,728	.....
Leather and tanned skins and manufactures thereof	16,558,059	$53,511,761

As to the number of establishments and number of wage earners engaged in the boot and shoe industry in my district and of the value of their products, I will read a statement of the preliminary totals of 1909, compared with 1904, showing also the progress that this industry has been making in St. Louis, as prepared from the records of the Bureau of United States Census, to wit:

Preliminary totals for 1909, compared with 1904.

	Census.	Number of establishments.	Average number of wage earners.	Value of products.
Boots and shoes	1909	28	11,081	$27,779,000
	1904	18	9,234	19,101,000
Boot and shoe uppers, cut stock, and findings	1909	5	1,057	6,192,000
	1904	4	97	561,000
Leather, tanned, curried, and finished	1909	9	220	2,035,000
	1904	7	211	1,107,000

I also invite your attention to some figures from the Bureau of the Census as to number of manufacturing establishments, men employed therein, and so forth, in city of St. Louis, to wit:

Census of manufactures, city of St. Louis, Mo. Preliminary totals.
(Comparative summary, 1899, 1904, and 1909.)

	Census.			Per cent of increase.		
	1909	1904	1899	1904 to 1909	1899 to 1904	1899 to 1909
Number of establishments	2,667	2,482	2,646	7	[1]6	1
Capital	$268,491,000	$265,937,000	$150,526,000	1	77	78
Cost of materials used	$187,599,000	$137,740,000	$101,838,000	36	35	84
Salaries and wages	$68,105,000	$56,117,000	$39,224,000	21	43	74
Miscellaneous expenses	$40,821,000	$37,183,000	$27,404,000	10	36	49
Value of products	$327,676,000	$267,307,000	$193,733,000	23	38	69
Value added by manufacture (products, less cost of materials)	$140,077,000	$129,567,000	$91,895,000	8	41	52
Employees:						
Number of salaried officials and clerks	15,349	11,381	8,867	35	28	73
Average number of wage earners employed during the year	87,097	82,698	64,832	5	28	34

[1] Decrease.

St. Louis, as the above figures show, has become the great manufacturing city it has through the Republican policy of protection. Free trade will retard its progress and ruin many of its industries.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to this Democratic House and its leaders that what I have presented here have been facts and figures in support of the protective duty now upon these articles, as against the free-trade theories and doctrines that you gentlemen have been advocating for many years, but which I hope you will never be able to again write into laws in this country. The country remembers well the last Democratic tariff law. Some one has aptly said that in its workings the law was a

"nightmare of calamity for wage earners and business men." It has been intimated upon this floor during this debate that the Democratic majority is engaged in the ripping up of the protective tariff, and the dealing with the subject in such a way as to promote the chances of the party to carry the country next year. While I do not charge your party with that in this House, I trust you will let me call your attention to the year 1893. Then you were about to take charge of all branches of the Government. You had convinced the people of that day that your principles of free trade and tariff for revenue only were for their best interests. Your lease of power was, however, brief, for the people soon revoked the power which they had given to you. Your theories and the putting of some of them into law caused a halting in business enterprises and the loss of confidence, and at the first opportunity the people turned again to the Republican Party, that party which has protected American wages and American industries, and which has made this country great in agriculture, great in manufacturing, and great in mining. You gentlemen of the majority in this House may by your votes here establish free trade upon the various items mentioned in this bill, so far as you have the power to do so, but remember that you are attacking a policy which the great American people have many times favored, and which has brought them happiness, prosperity, and contentment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that after the members of this committee remain in this Hall another hour, if any of them do, they need have no fear that they may not be able to get insurance on their lives hereafter. [Laughter.]

The subject of taxation is an interesting one from many viewpoints. There are two well-defined schools in this country in regard to the use of the taxing power of the Government, one believing that a tax should be laid upon imports for the sole purpose of raising revenue to support the Government, and that it should be laid as lightly as possible upon the prime necessities of life, to the end that the burdens of labor may be lightened, the other believing that taxes should be levied for the purpose of protecting American industries without regard to raising revenue or the articles upon which it should be levied. Certain classes of people may differ as to what constitutes prime necessities of life, but the people at large no longer differ as to what constitutes these things. They have learned by the school of experience that those things are necessaries that enable them to live and pursue their daily toil. Among them may be mentioned food, raiment, and shelter.

While it is impossible in this day of "greed and graft" to equitably adjust these differences, but as far as possible I deem it our duty to attempt it. I recognize that almost all legislation here must of necessity be a compromise, either in the committee framing it or in Congress passing it. This must be so in the very nature of things, where nearly 400 men, representing all walks and stations in life—from the farm, factory, bank, and courthouse—come men not only from continental United States but our Territories and foreign possessions, in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, all having an equal voice in shaping legislation. In 1908 the Republican Party swept the country by an unprecedented majority in both the electoral college and popular vote. It gained its victory by a solemn promise to revise the tariff and to revise it downward.

In March, 1909, it undertook the redemption of its promise, and on August 5 of that year concluded its labor by bringing forth a measure worse than the "tariff of abominations" passed by the forefathers of the Republican Party in 1828; and as the people in righteous indignation rose up then and rebuked the party for imposing burdens upon them greater than they could bear, the people last fall rose in the power of their might and with their ballots smote the giant interests of the country "hip and thigh," with the result that to-day there are hardly enough Members on the Republican side of the Chamber to be pallbearers to the funeral of the "lame-duck" brigade who quit making tariff laws on the 4th of last March.

I recognize that no party can accept power without accepting responsibility, and the Democratic Party now gladly accepts the responsibility, so far as this branch of Congress is concerned. After legislation leaves here the responsibility is yours, not ours. We propose to give the people some relief, and if you block it, either at the other end of this Capitol or at the western end of the Avenue, the responsibility is yours. The Canadian trade agreement, initiated by a Republican President and negotiated by a Republican Secretary of State, passed this House the other day with 289 votes for and 67 votes against it. Most of the votes against it were cast by the old Napoleonic "stand-pat guard," men who see no good in anything that tends to reduce the cost of living or that lightens the burden of labor, men who would apply the rule of exclusion, excluding from our markets any foreign manufactured goods which by any process could be manufactured in this country, regardless of the effect it may have on the millions of consumers of manufactured goods, were it not for the revenue involved, and men who no doubt have aided in enacting tariff laws in the past the rates of duty of which have been so high as to become prohibitory in their effect.

The opponents of that measure directed the bulk of their argument against placing wheat on the free list; hoisting the signal of despair, predicting dire ruin to all our farmers should the agreement be enacted into law, the moment they come in competition with the wheat fields of Canada. If it brings ruination to our farmers, then it is radically wrong. If it does not affect them, then out of your own mouths you will stand condemned. Let us see. There has been a rate of duty of some kind almost for half a century on wheat, the rate varying from 25 to 50 cents per bushel. Has this rate of duty had anything to do with keeping up the price of wheat in this country? If so, why has its price fluctuated up and down? Within the memory of all here the price of wheat has ranged from 75 cents to $1.50 per bushel. Does anyone believe for a moment that a rate of duty on wheat can keep the price of it up in this country while we continue to raise more than 100,000,000 bushels per year than we consume, and which must find a market abroad?

What has kept up the price of wheat? Has it been the rate of duty of 25 cents per bushel upon it, or has it been the demand made upon us for our wheat surplus? If it has been the demand, I care not whether it be a home or a foreign demand, the principle is the same. If the price of wheat is kept up by the demand for it, then the argument against the trade agreement proposing to take the duty off of wheat falls to the ground of is own weight and needs no answer. To the man who answers that the price of wheat has been kept up by a rate of duty, I then ask him the question, Why has this price fluctuated? Why has the price not been stable in this country, one and the same price every day in the year since the duty was placed upon it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There has been no variation in the rate of duty; it has been one and the same rate since its adoption. In the last analysis, the opponents of the Canadian trade agreement are driven to the admission that the price of wheat has been kept up in this country, not by reason of a rate of duty upon it, but by a demand for the commodity. In other words, its price has been kept up by the inevitable law of supply and demand.

Suppose all these years that we have had a duty on wheat we would have had an embargo duty against its exportation; if our farmers had gone on raising a hundred million surplus each year more than we consumed, does anyone believe a tariff on wheat at the rate of $25 per bushel under these conditions could or would have kept up its price in this country? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every sane man answers this question "No." Then every honest man whose desire is to enlighten the people should admit that a tariff on wheat in this country adds nothing to the selling price as long as we continue to be heavy exporters of it. While we have been raising and exporting wheat for decades in the past where has the surplus of both nations gone during these years? Canada's surplus has not come to this country nor has ours gone to Canada, but the surplus of both countries has gone to the empty granaries of the world. It has gone to the countries paying the most for it. If this agreement becomes a law, will our farmers quit raising wheat? Canada can not find a market for her surplus wheat in this country unless our farmers, contrary to all their past splendid history, yield up the battle and retire from the field in dishonor, something I am sure they will not do. If placed on an equal footing with the Canadian farmer in getting cheaper farming implements, I entertain no doubt but what the American farmer can and will compete with his Canadian brother in raising and selling wheat in any of the world's markets.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I will yield for a question.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman asserts that the surplus fixes the price of wheat.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Oh, the gentleman does not get the force of my statement. I said the demand fixed the price of wheat.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Well, will the gentleman answer this question: If Canada raises the same quality of wheat that

we do—that the Northwestern States raise, No. 1 hard wheat—and the surplus goes into the empty granaries of the world and the demand fixed the price, why is it that for the last 10 or 20 years there has been a difference in the price in the United States and across the border for the same grade of wheat; why has it been higher in this country than in Canada?

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman's question answers itself. If he means by this question that the price of wheat during this period of time has been higher in this country than in Canada, then he need have no fear whatever about Canadian wheat being shipped into this country and driving its price down. On the other hand, if he means that the price during this period of time has been higher in Canada than in the United States, this condition may be due to local conditions; it may be due to transportation. Local demands may enter into the question. I have seen in my own county, on the same line of railroad, in towns not more than 15 miles apart, the price of wheat vary on the same day from 2 to 5 cents per bushel. This is due entirely to local conditions.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. But the Canadian methods of exports are better than those from Minneapolis, with cheaper freight rates.

Mr. COX of Indiana. That may be due entirely to local conditions. Does the gentleman believe that the farmers of Minnesota will stop raising wheat if the Canadian trade agreement will become a law?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; but they will have to sell it at the Canadian price.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Oh, yes; your howl about the farmers of the country and the destruction of the price of wheat is nothing but the wail of the old standpatter, who sees the mountain of protection giving way under ceaseless and constant hammering on the part of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I assure the gentleman that does not apply to me, because I am not a standpatter.

Mr. COX of Indiana. You see plainly the handwriting on the wall; you see the strong citadel of protection yielding and giving way. I am glad to see you repent of your sins once in awhile. "While the lamp holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return." The latest convert we have on the proposition of a downward revision of the tariff is none other than President Taft himself. [Applause on the Democratic side.] At last he has come over to our way of thinking, and if he and some more of his brethren on that side of the Chamber will come over with a contrite heart we will welcome them to our fold.

Mr. Chairman, what I have said about wheat applies with equal force to cattle and sheep, hogs and horses. For more than a quarter of a century we have had a duty from $2 to $10 per head on cattle, and on hogs and sheep $1.50 per head, and during this same period of time we have observed the price of these fluctuate up and down. The price of hogs prior to the panic of 1907 ranged from 7 to 8 cents per pound; immediately following the panic the price of hogs dropped to 4 cents per pound, and last year (1910) we saw the price soar to 10 cents per pound, with the same rate of tariff on hogs during this same period of time. If the rate of duty upon hogs had anything to do with bringing the price of hogs up to 10 cents per pound, the same rate of duty certainly brought it down to 4 cents per pound. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. The price of wheat commodities, like the price of wheat, is governed by the immutable law of supply and demand. When the demand is strong and the supply limited, the price goes up; when the demand is limited and the supply is strong, the price goes down, tariff or no tariff, duty or no duty. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that cotton grown in this country without any tariff upon it is a complete answer to those who oppose the Canadian trade agreement for fear it would drive the price of wheat down in this country. The reports of the Secretary of Agriculture say we raised last year 691,767,000 bushels of wheat valued at $625,000,000, and every bushel of this wheat was protected by a rate of duty of 25 cents per bushel; and he reports during this same year we raised in this country $900,000,000 worth of cotton, and not a pound of cotton was protected by any rate of duty or any tariff whatever, and for the preceding five years we raised upon an average of $685,000,000 worth of cotton, a total in value in these six years of $4,325,000,000, representing more than four and one-half times the total capitalization of all the national banks in the country, and nearly one-third of the value of the 250,000 miles of steam railroads in the country, with cotton all these years upon the free list.

The planter of the South in these short years, though unprotected by way of duty upon his cotton, was meeting and competing with millions of Hindus of India engaged in raising cotton on land where the fertility of the soil is unsurpassed in the world and where pauper labor subsists on a very small rate of wages. Nor is this all; he was competing with Chinese coolie labor, millions strong, where our friends on that side of the Chamber are wont to tell us that labor subsists on rats and mice. Nor is this all; he was competing with the fellahs of Egypt tilling the valley of the Nile, famed for its cotton and biblical lore, where pauper labor in all of its ghost-like specter stalks abroad in the land. This commodity, unprotected as it is, has brought into the country in the past six years more than $2,000,000,000 worth of foreign gold, and every pound of it, the moment it found a foreign market, had to and did meet in open competition cotton raised by the truly pauper labor of the world. You may ask me how he was able to do it. The question is easily answered. The price of cotton, like the price of wheat and corn, barley and oats, is governed by the ever-unchanging law of supply and demand. The price of cotton during the same years, though having no rate of duty upon it, like the price of wheat, corn, oats, barley, and other commodities having a rate of duty upon them, has continued to fluctuate in price exactly as the price of these other commodities has fluctuated. Last year the combined value of the farmers' products reached the appalling and startling figures of $8,926,000,000, a sum representing one-fifteenth of the total wealth of the United States; and this vast sum of money was made upon the great staple commodities upon which a rate of duty existed, except cotton.

The farmer has been prosperous no more than he deserves. His prosperity has come to him by dint of his own energy, economy, and thrift, aided by God Almighty's rain and sunshine, together with a heavy demand for his commodities. He has accomplished this in spite of conditions surrounding him, being compelled to pay exorbitant prices for the things he bought from the manufacturers.

Did you ever hear of a multimillionaire farmer in your life? I never heard of but one; he was from Missouri and died last year. [Applause.] For over 40 years the farmer has been the toadstool beneath the harrow of protection, and from his back and the backs of the toiling millions of laboring men and women in this country the high priests of protection have harrowed their millions, until to-day our country from ocean to ocean is filled by multimillionaires, able to pay $50,000 for a Guttenberg Bible, not for the purpose of learning the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," but for the purpose of having an ancient relic in his library. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Another can pay $250,000 for the world-famed Hope diamond, others can buy flying machines to sail in the air, and others yachts to ride upon the sea. I can not believe that this professed friendship for the farmer is sincere by men who opposed the Canadian trade agreement, or who oppose the free-list bill now under consideration. The wail of these men reminds me of the old, old song I used to hear, "Hark, from the tomb the doleful sound, mine ears attend the cry." It is the wail of the old standpatter, who plainly sees the handwriting on the wall against protection, needing no Daniel to interpret it, with countless thousands of people in this country daily crying, "Down with protection and up with the equality of right." [Applause on the Democratic side.] You see the ramparts of protection being stormed by a determined host of men and women, who do not propose to capitulate for terms, but who propose to pursue the fight until equality of taxation is restored in this country.

You see its outposts giving way, its picket lines driven in under the splendid leadership of the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which reports this bill, and who, like a patriot, stands undaunted and unmoved by the threats of the great Steel Trust, that was strong and powerful enough to bring a man once President of the United States, and who later braved the lion in its lair amidst the jungles of Africa, to his knees and compelled him to allow it to buy out its only competitor, the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., when everybody knew this to be a violation of law. This man has been threatened by this same monster. It should be the duty not only of Congress but of the people to uphold his hand and support him without regard to party affiliation in a revision of the tariff outlined by him. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that six months ago I was very much in doubt about the wisdom of revising the tariff, a schedule at a time, but I am thoroughly convinced that this is the only safe and sane way to revise it. It is the only way a revision can be brought about in the interest of the people, and I believe that the real downright consternation on the other side of the aisle is due to the cry of the special interests that must soon capitulate and let the people come into their own. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This leads me to a discussion of House bill 4413, known as the free-list bill. I voted for the Canadian reciprocity, because I believed it was right in principle. I intend to vote for this bill because I believe this is right. I am not going to vote for this bill upon the principle that it is a compensatory measure designed to compensate the farmers for any loss that they may sustain by means of the Canadian trade agreement being enacted into law, because I do not think they have or will sustain any loss. Therefore I am going to vote for it because I believe it is right in principle. The Republican Party put forward its heaviest gun, Mr. MANN, of Illinois, to assail the free-list bill. For two hours he discussed the question, not with a view of meeting the facts in the case, but with the hope that he might laugh the case out of court. Let us see what we propose to do in this bill. We propose to put "plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons, and farm carts on the free list."

Is there any controversy about the language in the bill down to this point? The language contained in it so far is so plain "that a fool, though a wayfaring man, need not err as to its meaning." The remaining part of the bill, reading as follows, "And all other agricultural implements of every kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in part, including repair parts," seems to disturb the equilibrium of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], because they say it is hard to tell what is meant by the language contained in this part of the bill. Mr. MANN, while assaulting this part of the bill frequently turned to gentlemen on this side of the Chamber and to gentlemen on his own side and on several occasions facetiously asked the question, "What are agricultural implements?" "What constitutes agricultural implements?" And for 30 minutes he read into the record from a catalogue published by Peter Henderson & Co. containing different items, and asked the question, as to whether or not these things—saws, pruning knives, axes, and so forth—were agricultural implements. Does the real fear of the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber consist in the fact that they are in doubt as to the true meaning of the bill, or does their fear consist in the fact that possibly under this part of the bill things may be admitted free of duty that gentlemen on that side of the Chamber do not want admitted free of duty? If the language of the bill under consideration or any part of it is doubtful of construction, I will remind the gentlemen that when the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill became a law you established a customs court to try and determine questions relating to imports, and before the special session of Congress adjourned you put through an appropriation of $100,000 for the purpose of equipping this court, providing it with five judges, a marshal, a clerk, and all paraphernalia necessary to a complete equipment of the court.

If there be any doubt in the language in any part of the bill under consideration, let the customs court decide exactly what is meant by the language contained in the bill. While the gentleman from Illinois may be in doubt as to what are agricultural implements, I desire to say to him that a few years ago a class of men were wise enough to determine what are agricultural implements, and as a result of their combined wisdom they immediately began to form great trusts in the agricultural-implement trade. One of the first of these trusts was the Allis-Chalmers Co., known as the Machinery Trust, an alliance of the Steel Corporation, incorporated in May, 1901. Capitalized for $36,250,000, the market value of this stock is $10,600,000; the watered stock, $25,650,000. It has a monopoly in this line of trade. The farmers of the country are annually assessed not less than 7 per cent in order to pay a dividend upon this watered stock, which represents no value and having no property whatever behind it.

The next trust formed by these wise men was the American Fork & Hoe Co., known as the Farming Tool Trust, organized in 1902, and controls 80 per cent of this line of trade throughout the country, having all the elements of a monopoly in it. It was capitalized for $4,336,000, and the market value of the stock $2,000,000, having in it $2,336,000 of watered stock, on which the farmers of the country are again assessed to pay dividends at the rate of 7 per cent. The next, International Harvester Co., known as the Harvester Trust, under Morgan's influence. This great trust was organized in 1902. The next was the American Seeding Machine Co., known as the Seeding Machine Trust. Capital stock issued, $15,000,000; market value of this stock, $3,500,000; watered stock, $11,500,000.

As compared with this monster all the other trusts relating to farming implements of any kind sink into obscurity. It will be remembered that this huge concern, allied with the steel corporation, was conceived and brought forth by that astute and able financier, Mr. Morgan, of New York. It is capitalized for $120,000,000. The market value of this stock is only $20,000,000, representing $100,000,000 of watered stock. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This concern controls 70 per cent of the output of farming implements in the country, elements of monopoly large. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What is the result of these four trusts engaged in a complete monopoly in the manufacture, sale, and distribution of agricultural implements of all kinds? Our total capitalization is $175,586,000, and in that capitalization there is $135,486,000 of watered stock of no value whatever, leaving the true value of the stock of these four concerns only $40,000,000; yet gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber quibble about the language contained in the bill. Their fear does not consist of the bare fact that the language contained in the bill is not explicit, but it consists in the fact that they are afraid that it might be broad enough to admit free of duty some of the things covered by some or all of these trusts. At the time of the formation of the American Harvester Trust it issued a statement as follows:

The company is capitalized on an exceptionally conservative basis of its assets $80,000,000 are in cash working capital. The company will require no financing, and there will be no offer of its stock to the public, all the cash required having been provided by its stockholders. The company has five fully equipped manufacturing plants in the United States—the largest and most complete of their kind in the world—and one plant now in process of construction in Canada. Through its warehouses in various parts of the country it will be able to make the most economical distribution of its manufactured product. It also owns Cumberland, coal, ore, blast furnace and steel property, by means of which it ought to be able to accomplish important economy in the cost of raw material.

Like Alexander of old, this one trust has conquered 45,000,000 people in this country. It has gone to the Dominion of Canada. It has crossed the Atlantic Ocean, and is to-day bearding the Russian bear in his den. And in less than 10 years it will be compelling the peasants of southern Russia and Siberia to pay a tribute to it, exactly as it is levying its tribute upon 90,000,000 of people in this country to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] By reason of its combination, it may be able to economically build these machines and to economically distribute them, but has that economy inured to the benefit of the American farmer? Before this trust was organized, in 1902, the farmers of the country bought their binders at prices not to exceed $110, or $115 at most, but since the organization of this trust every farmer to-day is charged a uniform price for his binder of not less than $125.

But this is not all. Reading from the speech of my friend Mr. MANN, a letter written to him by the International Harvester Co., in which they object to taking the duty off of farming implements in the way in which we propose to do it, by a general bill, instead of by reciprocity, this great trust substantially says in its letter, from which I have quoted, "Let the Government of the United States trade with some other Government some other commodity not manufactured by us, and take the duty off of the other commodity, thereby letting the other Governments take our commodity with our rate of duty in force in this country upon agricultural implements." The statement has been repeatedly made here in the last few days by gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber that we have free trade with other nations in farming implements.

I want to read a part of a letter, dated April 25, 1911, from Mr. Curtis, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, to me. In speaking about reciprocal trade between this country and other nations in agricultural instruments, he says:

I have the honor to advise you that the principal countries which admit free all or part of the implements there mentioned are the United Kingdom, Argentine Republic, and Russia.

In their letter to Mr. MANN they complain of the high rate of duty Russia has against the American agricultural implements, yet the Secretary of the Treasury informs me that as between the United States and Russia we have free trade in farming implements. What is the purpose of the Harvester Trust in going to Russia and there building its plant? Can it be that they want to employ cheap labor?

Another paragraph of the bill under consideration proposes to put "grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, belt, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather, made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weights of cattle, of the bovine specie, including calfskins, and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers, or vamps, or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles," upon the free list. The gentleman on the other side assaulted this paragraph of the bill upon the ground that it would be unfair to the tanners of the country to put leather upon the free list because a rate of

duty was upon tanner's extracts, and that to put these goods upon the free list would strike down the leather industry, together with the boot and shoe industry of the country. Grant that tanning extracts used by the tanners are upon the dutiable list, what have the tanners been compelling us to do since 1902?

Who constitutes the tanners? It is composed and made up of the Leather Trusts. The statement was made on the floor this morning that there is no such thing as a Boot and Shoe Trust in this country. I know nothing about this; but I do know that there is such a thing in this country as a Leather Trust, and that this trust has been in full force and operation for the past 8 or 10 years, and that it has levied a tribute upon everyone who buys and uses leather in any of its forms to pay a dividend upon its watered stock. The American Hide & Leather Co., known as the Upper Leather Trust, incorporated May 3, 1899, controls 55 per cent of the leather products of the country. Capital stock issued, par value, $32,716,000; market value of this stock, $7,500,000; watered stock, $25,216,000. This is not all.

The United States Leather Co., known as the Leather Trust, total capital issued, par value $130,444,600; the market value of this stock, $60,000,000; watered stock, $70,444,600. It controls from 60 to 75 per cent of the leather business of the country. The watered stock in these two trusts alone amounts to $95,660,600, upon which every man who buys a pair of shoes for his wife and children must pay tribute to the end that dividends may be paid upon this watered stock. I answer the gentlemen on that side of the Chamber who cry "an unfair deal" because of the fact that tanning extracts used by tanners are upon the dutiable list, that more than 90,000,000 of people are annually assessed an enormous rate of duty to enable these trusts to pay a dividend upon stock issued by them having no value whatever. This same benevolent Leather Trust came to Congress two years ago, pledged the people far and wide that if Congress would put hides upon the free list that the people would be able to buy the finished leather commodity cheaper. They wrote every Member of Congress asking that hides be put on the free list; they procured the merchants throughout our districts to write letters asking us to vote for free hides, and telling us that if we would do so the people would get cheaper boots, shoes, leather, and so forth. Hides went upon the free list. The Government lost annually something like $2,000,000 which had gone into the Treasury of the United States annually by reason of a duty of 15 per cent on hides. But did the people get cheaper boots, shoes, and leather goods after hides had been placed on the free list? Not so. The Leather Trust had decreed otherwise. Instead of the people getting cheaper finished leather goods, the Leather Trust by means of controlling the hide market immediately increased the price of the finished commodity to the consumer. My judgment is before the price of finished leather goods comes down to the consumer these things must be put upon the free list.

Instead of defending the Leather Trust in this country, as gentlemen on that side have attempted to do, I want to defend the 90,000,000 of people in this country who consume in some way the finished commodity of the hide. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. COX of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman claim that this bill puts women's and children's shoes upon the free list?

Mr. COX of Indiana. No; I did not say that. But I will say to the gentleman very frankly that if I had the writing of this bill I would put the leather schedule on the free list. But I recognize that we can not accomplish all in one measure. We can not rectify a wrong that has been 40 years in building by one bill. We can only accomplish it piecemeal at a time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We propose to put "barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands, or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples," upon the free list. My friend, Mr. MANN, is very much afraid of the language contained in this part of the bill; afraid the language is broad enough to admit free of duty certain kinds of wire not plainly contained in this paragraph.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. A clothesline, for example.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes; a clothesline. But my only fear, Mr. Chairman, is that it will not be broad enough to admit things into this country under the wire schedule that ought to come in free of duty. This part of the bill under consideration strikes a blow at the great Steel Trust. This trust was organized and capitalized for $1,100,000,000, $550,000,000 preferred stock and $550,000,000 common stock, representing water. The market value of this stock in December, 1903, was $760,000,000; watered stock, $340,000,000. The farmers of the country are annually assessed not less than 7 per cent upon this watered stock, for the sole purpose of enabling the Steel Trust to pay a dividend upon stock having no value whatever and represented by no tangible property. The bill under consideration proposes to put "buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour, and semiolins, rye flour, bran, middlings and other offals of grain, oatmeal, and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods, and biscuit, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened" upon the free list.

This paragraph of the bill seems to worry my Republican friends, especially the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. He called particular attention to the language, "all prepared cereal foods," and repeatedly asked the question as to what was meant by cereal foods, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] seemed to be very much perturbed over the same language as to what was meant by it.

I may not know myself, Mr. Chairman, exactly what is meant by the language "cereal food." But there was a class of men in this country a few years ago who knew exactly what was covered by the language cereal food, and they were quick to discover that the people of the country were getting these necessities of life too cheap, and in order to increase their profits, they began the creation of a food trust, until to-day we have in operation four large food trusts, all engaged in increasing the price of these necessities of life to the people.

One of these, known as the "Hominy Trust," capital stock issued $4,500,000, market value of this stock $2,000,000, watered stock issued $2,500,000. The Western Cereal Co., known as the "Oatmeal Trust," total capital stock issued $4,344,000, market value of stock issued $2,355,000, watered stock issued $2,000,000. The Quaker Oats Co., known as the "Cereal Trust," capital stock issued $12,446,050, market value of stock issued $8,350,000, watered stock issued $4,096,050. National Biscuit Co., known as the "Cracker Trust," capital stock issued $56,524,000, market value $37,500,000, watered stock $19,024,000. The bill further proposes to put "beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compound, and lard substitutes; and sausage, and sausage meats" upon the free list. This part of the bill likewise creates consternation in the camp of the gentleman across the aisle for fear that it may have some effect upon the great Meat Trust of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have no data later than 1904 as to the total capitalization of the Meat Trust in this country. But I submit the following data:

Meat Trust.

NATIONAL PACKING CO.		
Authorized capital stock		$15,000,000
ARMOUR & CO.		
Capital stock authorized		20,000,000
SWIFT & CO.		
Authorized capital stock		35,000,000
NORTH PACKING & PROVISION CO.		
Authorized capital stock issued		2,400,000
JOHN P. SQUIRES & CO.		
(Capital stock authorized.)		
Cumulative preferred	$1,500,000	
Common stock	6,000,000	
Total stock issued		7,500,000
SCHWARZSCHILD & SULZBERGER CO.		
(Capital stock authorized.)		
Capital stock issued		5,000,000
ST. LOUIS DRESSED BEEF & PROVISION CO.		
Capital stock		1,125,000
LIBBY, M'NEIL & LIBBY.		
Capital stock issued		2,000,000
Total capitalization of all the Meat Trust		88,025,000

I have no doubt but what the total capitalization of the Meat Trusts is two or three times larger than the above figures, and all the people of the country are to-day being taxed for the benefit of these trusts to the end that they may be able to pay a dividend upon watered stock. These figures show a startling condition of affairs in this country. The overcapitalization of these great trusts, the watered stock issued by them, upon which the people are annually assessed an enormous amount of money for the sole purpose of paying dividends upon stock having no tangible value whatever is, indeed, a subject to which the people may well turn their attention. I think this is one of the prime causes of the increased cost of living. The data I have given shows that in these trusts alone the market value of the stock is $987,125,000, while the watered stock represents $738,677,650.

The people are assessed 7 per cent upon this watered stock, representing no value whatever, and it means taking from them each year more than $50,000,000 of their money to pay dividends upon no tangible property whatever, and the trusts and capitalization of the same here given by me represents a very small per cent of the total capitalization of all the trusts in the country. It is this, and this alone, that is making the burdens of the people greater than they can bear; and if by putting these things on the free list it will even tend toward restoring competition in the trade in which these trusts are engaged, it will have served its purpose and served it well. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4413) placing agricultural implements and other articles on the free list, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, when he proposes to close the general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state that I have a number of requests yet for time, and it looks like the debate would run several days longer. I have no desire to cut off general debate, and I am unable to answer the gentleman exactly.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are quite a number of gentlemen absent who would like to be present, of course, when the vote is taken. Does the gentleman think he will finish this week?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope so. I hope to get through by Thursday, but I want every man who wants to make a speech to have the opportunity to do so.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, reference of the bill H. R. 2936 was changed from the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers with the bill (H. R. 25823) providing payment of the volunteers in the Cayuse Indian War, Sixty-first Congress, second session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. LOUD, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of George H. Keating, Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Daniel Hilliard, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse reporting having been made thereon.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that until this bill H. R. 4413, the tariff bill, is disposed of, the daily hour of meeting of the House shall be at 11 a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that until the tariff bill, H. R. 4413, is disposed of the daily hour of meeting of the House shall be at 11 a. m. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. That is with the understanding that, ordinarily, the House will adjourn about 5 o'clock?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; my idea is that instead of running until 6 at night, it is better to convene at 11 in the morning and adjourn about 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1911.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6733) to accept and fund the bequest of Gertrude M. Hubbard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 15), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8137) authorizing the taking of depositions in any district or circuit court of the United States in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 8138) to establish Ashtabula, Ohio, a subport of entry in the customs collection district of Cuyahoga, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 8139) providing for purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Martins Ferry, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8140) to amend the act of February 6, 1907, of the pension laws so as to include artisans and members of the construction corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 8141) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8142) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8143) granting pensions to members of the military organization of 1862 known as "Squirrel Hunters"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 8144) to regulate and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the United States Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8145) to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate memorial and burial place of Maj. Gen. Arthur Saint Clair; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 8146) to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8147) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Utah; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 8148) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bangor, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8149) to increase the pensions of those who have lost one eye or have become totally blind in one eye from causes occurring in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 8150) authorizing the improvement of the Government road in Lauderdale County, Ala., from the Muscle Shoals Canal to the Huntsville Road, and the extension of the same from the intersection of the Government Road, Florence and Huntsville Roads, to Florence, a distance of 8 miles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8151) providing for the adjustment of the grant of lands in aid of the construction of the Corvallis and Yaquina Bay military wagon road and of conflicting claims to lands within the limits of said grant; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8152) to provide for entering the surfaces of certain mineral lands in Alabama; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8153) granting certain lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Alabama to the State of Alabama for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8154) to amend section 13 of the naturalization law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8155) to further regulate the exclusion of undesirable aliens from admission into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8156) to pay rural mail carriers the sum of 10 cents per mile per day for each mile and fraction of a mile on routes of over 24 miles; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8157) giving rural mail carriers holiday on the 25th day of December of each year; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8158) to prevent graft by prohibiting the giving or receiving of gifts, employment, or compensation from certain corporations by Senators, Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioners in the Congress of the United States, or Senators, Representatives, Delegates, or Resident Commissioners elect, and the judges and

justices of the United States courts, and prescribing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 8159) to regulate the business of insurance within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8160) providing for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a building thereon for the accommodation of the United States post office at Reading, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 142) in favor of closer trade relations with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8161) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Whitelaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8162) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Koch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8163) granting an increase of pension to John Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8164) granting an increase of pension to Moses Goldstein; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 8165) granting an increase of pension to John O'Connell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8166) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Holtham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8167) granting a pension to Joseph Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8168) granting an increase of pension to Etta A. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8169) granting an increase of pension to James Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8170) granting an increase of pension to John W. Dempsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8171) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDonough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8172) granting an increase of pension to William A. Winslow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8173) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8174) granting an increase of pension to Alden Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8175) granting an increase of pension to Marcus M. Bancroft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8176) granting an increase of pension to David Curran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8177) granting an increase of pension to William H. Courser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8178) granting an increase of pension to John O'Connell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8179) granting an increase of pension to Helena M. Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8180) granting an increase of pension to Fannie S. Livers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8181) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Deverix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8182) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Zaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8183) granting an increase of pension to Frank W. Buxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8184) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8185) granting an increase of pension to Mary Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8186) granting an increase of pension to William E. Golden; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8187) granting an increase of pension to Fannie A. Nowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8188) granting an increase of pension to Harriet F. McGinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8189) granting an increase of pension to Mark Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8190) granting an increase of pension to John S. Cochrane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8191) granting an increase of pension to Alma E. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8192) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Coburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8193) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8194) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hastings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8195) granting an increase of pension to George H. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8196) granting an increase of pension to Kirk F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Lucy W. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8198) granting an increase of pension to William Duffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8199) granting an increase of pension to Walter White; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8200) granting an increase of pension to Annie G. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8201) granting an increase of pension to Louis S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8202) granting an increase of pension to Mark Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8203) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lonergan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8204) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McIntire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8205) granting an increase of pension to Michael E. Breck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8206) granting an increase of pension to James W. Grayson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8207) granting an increase of pension to William Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8208) granting an increase of pension to William D. Lamb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8209) granting an increase of pension to Winslow Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8210) granting an increase of pension to Fannie L. Edgerton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8211) granting an increase of pension to James E. Curtis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8212) granting an increase of pension to Martin Larney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8213) granting an increase of pension to Mary Eaton Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8214) granting an increase of pension to John W. McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8215) granting an increase of pension to Emma Thurston; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8216) granting an increase of pension to Levi J. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8217) granting an increase of pension to Walter H. Farwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8218) granting an increase of pension to Josiah B. Kinsman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8219) granting an increase of pension to William J. Bastian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8220) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8221) granting an increase of pension to Kate T. Dimon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8222) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel R. Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8223) granting an increase of pension to William I. Bastian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8224) granting a pension to Peter Breen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8225) granting a pension to Inez M. Brigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8226) granting a pension to John Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8227) granting a pension to George S. Kittredge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8228) granting a pension to John Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8229) granting a pension to Frank Maguire; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8230) granting a pension to Algernon Weymouth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8231) granting a pension to Dennis H. Finn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8232) granting a pension to Frank Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8233) granting a pension to Michael Lanergan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8234) granting a pension to Thomas H. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8235) granting a pension to Eleanor Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8236) granting a pension to Marcella E. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8237) granting a pension to Charles J. Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8238) granting a pension to James Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8239) granting a pension to James E. McKenna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8240) granting a pension to Margaret E. Canty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8241) granting a pension to Arthur Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8242) granting a pension to Josephine McFarland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8243) granting a pension to Henry Reilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8244) granting a pension to Winfield S. Hunter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8245) granting a pension to Michael Dolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8246) granting a pension to William Fairbrother; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8247) correcting the military record of Edward McLaughlin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8248) to correct the military record of Orlando Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8249) to correct the military record of Alonzo Vining; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8250) for the relief of Charles M. Peirce; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8251) for the relief of Daniel Walsh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8252) for the relief of Hercules Vancourt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8253) for the relief of Henry C. Bliss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8254) for the relief of Michael H. Farrell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8255) for the relief of Matthew Hogan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8256) for the relief of Patrick McGarry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8257) for the relief of Charles Bates; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8258) for the relief of Orlando Lawrence; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8259) for the relief of Dennis E. White, administrator of the estate of Buckner and Sarah Henderson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8260) for the relief of the estate of Mark S. Gorrill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8261) in the interest of Gilbert P. Cotton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8262) to remove charge of desertion against Lawrence Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8263) granting permission to Col. John P. Wisser to accept a photograph of the Emperor of Germany, presented by the German Empire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8264) to correct the military record of Samuel Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8265) to correct the military record of James L. Bowers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8266) to correct the military record of James Burroes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8267) to correct the military record of William H. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8268) to correct the military record of Lyman Knapp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8269) to correct the military record of John M. Bassler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8270) to correct the military record of Charles Beach; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8271) to correct the military record of John Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8272) to correct the military record of Charles E. Creager; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8273) to correct the military record of George W. Ball; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8274) to correct the military record of Charles Hotelling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8275) to correct the military record of Lewis Corfman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8276) for the relief of Samuel Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8277) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Samuel Zellner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8278) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Benjamin F. Church; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8279) granting an increase of pension to William T. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8280) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8281) granting a pension to Catharine Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8282) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Steffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8283) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8284) granting an increase of pension to Emma H. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8285) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8286) granting an increase of pension to William Murdock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8287) granting an increase of pension to Amos L. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8288) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8289) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Reid; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8290) granting an increase of pension to Frances Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8291) granting an increase of pension to George F. Amos; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8292) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Minton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8293) granting a pension to Samuel D. Minor; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8294) granting a pension to Annie Abney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8295) granting a pension to Jesse G. Lott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8296) granting a pension to Pauline E. Hauk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8297) granting a pension to John H. Pepper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8298) granting a pension to Robert A. Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8299) granting a pension to Posey Dobbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8300) granting a pension to Lawson L. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8301) granting a pension to William F. Hass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8302) granting a pension to Daniel T. Youngblood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8303) granting a pension to P. J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8304) granting a pension to Seborn Fassett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8305) granting a pension to Mary Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8306) granting a pension to Susan M. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8307) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hullett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8308) granting a pension to Jerry Wildman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8309) granting a pension to John F. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8310) granting a pension to Henry Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8311) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Driskell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8312) granting a pension to J. L. Marbut, alias John Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8313) granting a pension to Alexander Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8314) granting a pension to Daniel B. Norwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8315) granting a pension to James M. Ledbetter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8316) granting a pension to Nancy L. Kirby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8317) granting a pension to Mary Walls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8318) for the relief of D. W. Jarrett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8319) for the relief of Mary Trayler; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8320) for the relief of Nathan Whitaker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8321) for the relief of Mrs. S. V. Burks, late postmaster at Vinemont, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8322) for the relief of A. L. Hays; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8323) for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Willoughby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8324) for the relief of James D. Evans; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8325) for the relief of W. D. Clay and others, heirs of James W. Clay, deceased; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8326) for the relief of Jesse J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8327) for the relief of the estate of Allen T. Estes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8328) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Blakemore, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8329) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Robert A. Godsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8330) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of F. M. Bruce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8331) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Joseph A. Choate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8332) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James W. Gutherie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8333) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Denson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8334) to authorize James Pitts to select lands in lieu of lands lost by reason of the act of June 3, 1856, granting lands to certain railroad companies; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8335) for the relief of the heirs of A. M. Harton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8336) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oak Bowery, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8337) granting an increase of pension to Aylette F. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8338) granting a pension to Jacob Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8339) for the relief of Ella H. Candy; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 8340) for the relief of Felix Scott Chambers; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8341) for the relief of Richard J. Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8342) for the relief of J. V. Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 8343) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Trustees of Walnut Grove Baptist Church, of Gibson County, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 8344) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George T. Silvers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8345) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Solomon Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8346) granting an increase of pension to Nathan S. Parson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8347) granting an increase of pension to William Briney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8348) granting an increase of pension to Orin Haworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8349) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus B. Manahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8350) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8351) granting a pension to Mary L. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8352) granting a pension to Henry O. Hyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8353) granting an increase of pension to William Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 8354) granting an increase of pension to Rosaline V. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8355) to reimburse George Heiner, postmaster at Morgan, Utah, for loss of postage stamps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 8356) granting a pension to Virgil Gunnells; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8357) granting a pension to Margaret L. Pistole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8358) granting an increase of pension to William Gladman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8359) granting an increase of pension to James W. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8360) granting an increase of pension to Ade Hayes Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8361) granting an increase of pension to Dock Keeton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8362) granting an increase of pension to William D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8363) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Guy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8364) granting a pension to Julian F. Toney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 8365) granting two acres of land to school district No. 44, Chelan County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 8366) granting a pension to John Aldrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8367) granting an increase of pension to Leroy S. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8368) granting an increase of pension to John J. Kane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8369) granting an increase of pension to Peter S. E. Hansen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8370) granting a pension to Ann Rees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8371) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Keck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8372) granting an increase of pension to Minnie A. Piety; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 8373) granting an increase of pension to Maria Hanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8374) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Waldron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8375) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8376) for the relief of William F. Stewart, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 8377) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of the trustees of Decatur Lodge, No. 52, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8378) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Bivens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 8379) granting an increase of pension to Jasper W. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8380) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8381) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Iliff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 8382) to provide for the refunding of certain moneys illegally assessed and collected in the district of Utah; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of Dr. A. Ravogli and other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, to have lemons placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Homming & Rice and 6 other merchants of Malvern, Ohio, in opposition to the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany H. R. 3298, for an increase of pension for Ira McDonald, of Sheboygan County, State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of Pfister & Vogel Leather Co., Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the establishment of a permanent Tariff Commission; Wood Commission Co., Milwaukee Stockyards Co., Milwaukee Live Stock Exchange, and Graham Bros., all of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the placing of meats on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of Commercial Club, Winthrop, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Desnoyers Shoe Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against placing shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of John Morrow and 36 others, of Mapleton, Minn., protesting against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of the State of North Dakota against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of citizens of Jamestown, N. Dak., against parcels post law; citizens of Edmore, N. Dak., favoring H. R. 2651, known as the Hanna bill, providing for paying additional compensation to the rural free delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HEALD: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 4, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Wilmington, Del., in favor of stricter laws relating to immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolution of General Guy V. Henry Camp, No. 3, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring the repeal of the anticanteen law of February 2, 1901; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Central Labor Union of Woonsocket, R. I., insisting upon having the battleship *New York* built in a Government navy yard in compliance with the law of 1910; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: Resolutions of Millmen's Local No. 5, American Brotherhood of Slate Workers, Bangor, Pa., favoring amendment of oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the classified civil-service employees of the Boston Navy Yard, favoring the enactment into law of the so-called Austin bill, and known as H. R. 32840; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the Parnell Club, of Roxbury district, Boston, Mass., against the new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of D. C. Collier, director general Panama-California Exposition, San Francisco, Cal., relative to the exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of citizens of Brainerd, Minn., against arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Excelsior Chapter of the American Women's League, favoring the parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bills granting increase of pension to Alpheus Iliff and Thomas L. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May 2, 1911.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Eternal God, source of all wisdom, strength, and purity, help us with increasing faith and confidence to draw copiously upon Thee for light to guide, strength to sustain, and purity to shield us from the polluting hand of sin, that we may love mercy, do justly, and walk humbly with Thee our Father as faithful servants, and bring forth the fruits of the spirit abundantly, to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INCOME TAX.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the secretary of state of Tennessee, and directed that it be printed in the RECORD and Journal and that it do lie upon the Speaker's table:

STATE OF TENNESSEE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Nashville, April 28, 1911.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In accordance with the provisions of Senate joint resolution No. 14 of the Fifty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, and by request of his excellency the governor of Tennessee, I have the honor to transmit to you herewith a duly certified copy of said resolution, the same being the action of the General Assembly of Tennessee in ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to lay and collect taxes on incomes.

Very respectfully,

HALLUM W. GOODLOE,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TENNESSEE,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Tennessee, ss:*

I, Ben W. Hooper, governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify that the following is a full, true, and correct copy of Senate joint resolution No. 14 of the Fifty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed.

Done at Nashville, the capital, this 18th day of April, A. D. 1911.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

BEN W. HOOPER.
HALLUM W. GOODLOE,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution 14.

Whereas the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America at its first session, begun and holden at Washington, in the District of Columbia, on Monday, the 15th day of March, 1909, by joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in words and figures as follows, to wit:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid in all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution:

"ART. XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration."

Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, That said amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and is hereby, ratified; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by his excellency the governor of Tennessee to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively.

Adopted April 7, 1911.

N. BAXTER, Jr.,
Speaker of the Senate.
A. M. LEACH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, April 11, 1911.

BEN W. HOOPER, *Governor.*

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, the free-list bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the free-list bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] closing the debate on the Canadian reciprocity

bill, in which he declared it to be the policy of the Democratic Party to levy customs duties for revenue purposes only and referred to the policy of protection as "a dead and unnecessary economic system that creates false standards," without which, in his opinion, "we would be universal masters of production and industry in every land where free competition could be obtained." Having thus declared his opposition to the protective system and the intention of his party to destroy it, he proceeded to pay a most eloquent tribute to the splendid victories of our protected industries in the following language:

Our agricultural implements supply the farmers' wants beyond the seas. Our boots and shoes are worn by people who speak many foreign languages and who tread the highways of the Occident and the Orient. The looms of our factories clothe the people of distant lands. The freight of our foreign rivals is carried to market on American rails, drawn by American engines across chasms spanned by American-built bridges.

It seems not to have occurred to the gifted leader of the majority that his denunciation of the protective policy, which he reminded us our party had maintained for 50 years, sounded strangely illogical and incongruous uttered in the same breath with his tribute to the magnificent conquest we have made of foreign markets under that system.

Perhaps we should not expect the gentlemen on the other side to be either logical or consistent in their discussions of tariff questions. They have gotten so accustomed to substituting theory for fact, declamation for logic, in the years they have wandered in the wilderness as a minority that they can scarcely be expected to become entirely practical and logical immediately on being confronted with responsibility.

Had the gentleman from Alabama been describing, not the glorious condition of American trade and commerce after 50 years of protection, but its condition at the beginning of that period, his language would have been far different. To paint a faithful picture he would then have been compelled to say something like this:

No agricultural implements fashioned by our artisans till the soil or harvest the crops of any foreign land; no foreign tongues speak the virtues or foreign highways resound with the tread of American-made shoes; the products of our looms are unknown to the markets of the world; a few American locomotives wake the echoes of the hills of Europe, but they only serve to haul over English rails to the seaports of our commercial rivals' foreign goods for export to swell the trade balance of the world against us. On the contrary, our fields are largely tilled and our harvests gathered with implements of foreign manufacture; many of our people wear boots and shoes of foreign make. In the main, only the coarsest and cheapest of the cloths we use and wear are the product of American looms. Our railways are built with English shovels and laid with English rails and are largely occupied in transporting through the land the products of European mills and factories.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

What a blessed thing it is for the gentleman from Alabama that 50 years of protective tariff has enabled him to paint so glorious a word picture as he has of the triumph of American industry and saved him from the painful necessity of repeating the doleful tale of depression and disaster which was told in a message to Congress by the last Democratic President who preceded the inauguration of the era of protection. Mr. Buchanan, speaking of those good old Democratic revenue tariff times, said:

In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all of the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.

And this is the happy condition of affairs to which the gentleman from Alabama apparently desires to return. I have no doubt but what he and his party will produce a most excellent imitation of those conditions in a very brief space of time if they have an opportunity to write their tariff views into law.

FARMERS' FREE LIST.

The measure before us is widely heralded as the farmers' free-list bill. It proposes to put on the free list agricultural implements, bagging and burlap, cotton ties, heavy leather, boots and shoes made from cattle hides, harness, saddles, barbed wire, fresh and salt meats, flour and certain products thereof, timber and lumber, sewing machines, and salt. It is intended to be a sop to the farmers to recompense them for their losses under the Canadian reciprocity bill, and is expected to have a quieting effect on the nerves of the gentlemen on the Democratic side who, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], "are shaking in their boots because of their vote for the Canadian reciprocity measure."

DEMOCRATIC ESTIMATE OF FARMER.

I fear our Democratic friends have formed their estimate of the American farmer from stories they have read in comic journals of "hayseeds from way back" who have purchased gold bricks. Whether any real American farmer ever bought a gold brick I do not know. I have never known one who did; but certain it is that this is the first time that a great political party has ever attempted to hand the farmers en masse a legislative gold brick. [Applause on the Republican side.] But I have not been so much surprised at this since I listened to the estimate of the American farmer, voiced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], when he lapsed into poetry in his speech the other day and referred to the American farmer as one who has "the emptiness of ages in his face." That may possibly be the kind of farmers they have in the gentleman's district, at least we have his word for it; but it is not the kind of farmers that we on this side of the Chamber are acquainted with. That the Democratic majority accepts the definition of the gentleman from Kentucky of the American farmer as one who has "the emptiness of ages in his face" is evidenced by their attempt to make him believe that the bill they have presented for our consideration will prove beneficial to him. Are the gentlemen attempting to transfer the emptiness which they profess to see in the farmer's face to his pocketbook and his stomach? [Applause on the Republican side.]

BURDEN OF THE WORLD.

The gentleman from Kentucky, who is ordinarily anything but poetic, though he sometimes indulges in poetic license, in the enthusiasm of his speech the other day lapsed still further into poetry touching the American farmer and referred to him as one who has "on his back the burden of the world." The gentleman is evidently still troubled with the haunting memory of those dreadful days under the Wilson bill when the American farmer had the burden of the world upon his back in the shape of the Democratic Party.

I am not surprised that the gentleman from Kentucky, while attempting to convince the American farmer of what his party proposes to do for him, should have lapsed into poetry as he, shuddering, recalled what they did to him the last time they amended the tariff laws of the country.

Those were such fearsome days that we would fain blot them from our memory forever, and would do so if it were not for the fact that the temporarily triumphant Democracy, unrepentant of its faults and uncured of its errors, recalls them to us in the haunting poetry of the gentleman from Kentucky. As they insist upon our doing so, perhaps it will not be altogether labor lost to recall that when the Democratic Party won its victory in 1894, and proceeded to put the Wilson bill upon the statute books of the Nation, the farmers of the United States owned in round numbers 47,000,000 head of sheep, valued at $124,000,000, and, before they had an opportunity to return the party of protection to power and repeal that calamitous legislation, the number of their sheep had dwindled to 36,000,000 and their value to $67,000,000, a loss to the sheep owners of the country of $55,000,000, to which must be added the loss of about $20,000,000 in wool clip of four years, making a total loss of over $100,000,000 to the sheep and wool growers of the country. In three years under the Wilson bill the value of the horses on the farms of the United States decreased from $992,000,000 to $453,000,000, or a loss of $539,000,000. Even the Missouri mule, tough as he is, was crushed under the burden of the Democratic Party; his tribe decreased in numbers over 200,000 and his value over $72,000,000 in that short period of Democratic control. And yet the gentleman from Kentucky has the effrontery to claim the virtues of the mule for his party. We have always understood that his party had all the other characteristics of that noble animal. [Applause on the Republican side.] The decrease in the value of stock cattle in the period referred to above was over $39,000,000, and altogether the American farmer and stockman lost, in live stock alone the last time the Democratic Party attempted to do something for him, over $800,000,000. No wonder the gentleman from Kentucky refers to it feelingly as the "burden of the world."

But the farmer's loss in live stock during the last period of Democratic tariff tinkering was but a small portion of his aggregate loss, for as the factory doors closed and the family savings dwindled and disappeared and care and want clouded the faces and pinched the cheeks of the mothers and children 4,000,000 stalwart American workingmen, in the words of a great labor leader—

went up and down the highways and byways of the land seeking work and finding it not.

The farmer, suffering the loss of his markets, forced to sell his produce below the price of production, began to fear the mortgage, the proceeds of which he had used to improve his farm and home; then the same party that had despoiled him came to him with a weird tale of financial legerdemain war-

ranted to rescue him from the condition in which the mischievous policies of the party had plunged him, but he had quite enough of Democratic theory by that time, and, as Kipling says, "that is another story"—a story told in the triumphant election of McKinley and the return to power of the party of sound industrial policy and sound finance. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A SECTIONAL BILL.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] in his speech the other day grew quite sarcastic in his denunciation of what he was pleased to call an attempt on the part of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] to arouse "sectionalism" in connection with the consideration of this bill, and yet, in his attempt to explain that the bill was not sectional in its pretended benefits, he entirely forgot or overlooked the fact that of the estimated reduction in import duties which would result from the enactment of the legislation on the basis of last year's importations, amounting in all to $8,375,676, according to the statement contained in the report on the bill, $6,877,667 was duty on cotton bagging, burlap, and so forth, which, it is stated in the same report, on page 5, is "chiefly used for the covering of cotton."

Of course it is not true that the cotton planter would, under the provisions of the bill, receive anything like that amount of relief in the lower price of bagging for his cotton. I doubt if he would obtain his cotton bagging in the long run any cheaper; but accepting, for the sake of argument, the claim made by the gentleman on the other side that the amount of duty now paid on the articles which it is proposed to place on the free list would all be distributed among the users of these articles, then the cotton producer would receive 82 per cent of all of the benefits of the legislation. If this is not sectional legislation, then the gentleman will have to invent some other name for it. It is not only sectional, but according to the claims advanced for the legislation by its friends and sponsors its benefits go almost entirely to one industry of one section.

If the Democratic majority really want to be relieved from the charge of sectionalism and do something for the farmers and those classes of people to whom the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] refers as "those to whom the necessities of life mean so much," why do not they put sugar and rice on the free list? Why do they not do something for the poor boys of the country by putting peanuts on the free list? If their claim of solicitude for the people is anything more than a hollow mockery and a sham and they want to treat all sections of the country alike, why do they not put articles on the free list the price of which will be reduced by their action? This free list of theirs will not reduce the price of a single American product to any American citizen. The free list I suggest would unquestionably reduce the price of commodities of general consumption.

BLOW TO THE PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

This measure is frankly intended as a blow to the protective system [applause on the Democratic side], so announced by its friends and supporters on the other side, all of whom seem to have now arrayed themselves either under the banner of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who declares for a tariff for revenue only, or under the banner of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GEORGE], who, not having been coached in the school of caution, has boldly announced himself what others on that side are too cautious to profess, a free trader.

It is exceedingly fortunate for the country and for this side of the House which, though temporarily in the minority, is still the safeguard and defender of American labor and industries, of American standards and ideals [applause on the Republican side], that the lines are thus clearly drawn, and that we know that it is not a question of what might be properly or safely or wisely done with regard to any particular item if presented as a part of a general tariff revision, but whether or not the Republican minority on this side of the House, representing that political faith and those economic principles under which we have had the most phenomenal development and the most widely and generally diffused prosperity ever known in the history of the world, shall open the gates of the citadel of prosperity to the Trojan horse of free trade and be deceived by the ancient enemy, the "tariff for revenue" Greeks, claiming to bear gifts.

THE LESSON OF EXPERIENCE.

It is an unfortunate fact that there are some things which each generation of men must learn for themselves, oftentimes through bitter experience. It was a wise matron who once said "The way to reach some men's hearts is through their stomachs." It seems to be equally true that that is the only way to reach some people's heads. The Democratic Party is and always has been the party of opportunism. Its opportunity has generally come through public disaster. Sometimes its opportunity has arrived through the almost universal human longing to eat one's cake and still retain it on the pantry shelf. I sometimes think that nothing but disastrous experience will bring some people to realize that it is the part of wisdom to cling to the good things we have and endeavor to make them better, rather than to recklessly cast them aside in the hope of capturing a bauble temptingly dangled before our gaze by political slight-of-hand performers.

CAUSES OF DEMOCRATIC VICTORY.

The gentlemen on the other side of the House have deluded themselves into believing that their temporary majority over there represents a repudiation by the American people of the policy of protection. Never was a political majority more profoundly mistaken, and the rudeness and shock of their coming awakening will be as profound as the depth of their present delusion.

The gentlemen on the other side owe their majority to the natural accretion of minor grouches and grievances accumulating through 16 years of responsibility on this side; to the effect of some mistakes of a minor character, which are inevitable in a long lease of power; to some considerable temporary disagreement and dissension among ourselves, part of which arose over matters of policy and more through personal ambitions; to the rather undefined and indefinable feeling of unrest and desire for a change which ever so often prevades the body politic; to the fact that for reasons we were in no way responsible for except that prosperity brings high prices, the cost of living as Americans desire to live was high; to the fact that our progressive legislation regulating railroads and along other lines gave the Democrats the support of certain powerful special interests. All these exaggerated, intensified, and fomented by a powerful press, sympathizing somewhat with the disturbing forces, but more largely actuated by a determination to have its way with regard to at least one schedule of the tariff—that which affects the product which is the raw material of their trade. And out of this has come a majority on the other side, which is temporarily deluding itself into the belief that the American people, who have had a longer and more successful experience with a protective tariff than any other people, and who have established and maintained under it more satisfactory conditions than have ever been enjoyed by any other people who have ever inhabited the globe, are prepared to turn their backs upon the policy which all of our commercial rivals claim, and we ourselves know, has been responsible to a greater extent than anything else for the temporal blessings which we as a people enjoy.

FREE TRADE VERSUS PROTECTION.

I love a free trader, or a tariff-for-revenue man—which is the same thing under another name—individually and personally. They are such optimistic people with regard to their particular lunacy. They are so childlike in their persistent ignoring of the laws of trade and the lessons of experience. However pessimistic they may be with regard to the other affairs of life; however wise, discreet, or profound they may be with regard to other matters, on this one proposition they illustrate better than any people I have ever met the saying that "Where ignorance is bliss 'tis folly to be wise." If they alone were to suffer for their blissful ignorance, I should be the last to deny them the pleasure of its enjoyment; but unfortunately for us, fortunately for them, they can not bring upon themselves the fruits of their folly without involving us all in the common catastrophe.

SHEEP AND WOOL FROM CANADA.

We had a beautiful illustration in the House the other day of that delightful condition of innocence of knowledge which leads men to blindly pursue economic heresies without regard to consequences. During the reading of the Canadian reciprocity bill for amendment, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] offered a very sensible amendment and explained its purpose, which was to prevent the driving of sheep across the Canadian border to be shorn on the American side and then driven back and the wool sold here, thus securing our market without paying our duty of 11 cents a pound. The vociferous jeers which greeted this amendment and its explanation would have really been funny, if it were not for the fact that they brought vividly to mind the dangers to which American industries are now exposed.

Of course, the gentlemen who joined in these jeers do not know—I suppose they ought not to be expected to know—that there are in the United States over 25,000,000 head of sheep, which are bred and grazed on the open range in large flocks, which are constantly on the move; whose summer and winter ranges and lambing and shearing grounds are oftentimes sep-

arated by 50, 75, 100, and 150 miles. There is no difficulty whatever and no appreciable additional expense in moving such flocks 50 or 100 miles or more to shear. Ten millions or more of such sheep occupy the territory immediately contiguous to the Canadian line, west of the Great Lakes, in a region having similar climatic conditions to those of the adjacent regions of Canada. It does not pay under free wool to raise sheep in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia, but the Canadian reciprocity bill allows the free importation of sheep from Canada into the United States, and under that provision the sheep business along the Canadian border for 1,500 miles can be carried on just as it is in the same territory south of the line, and sheep grazing within 100 miles or more of the border can without difficulty or considerable expense be driven over the line into the United States, shorn, and the wool enter our markets without the payment of duty.

The duty on this class of wool is 11 cents a pound, and about 7½ pounds per head is the average clip per sheep in that region. That means a saving in duty of over 80 cents on the fleece of each sheep, and who is bold enough to say that with the American market for Canadian mutton, with a saving in duty of 80 cents on each animal per annum, the next few years will not see at least 10,000,000 sheep along the border in Canada?

I am not a prophet; I am not prophesying that this will occur, but I know of no reason why it should not. It is one of the probable effects of the passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill. The loss to our Treasury on the fleeces of that number of sheep would be $8,000,000, to say nothing of the loss to the American farmer by having that quantity of wool, duty free, brought into competition with his production. And yet, in the face of the probability—the certainty, to an extent at least—of the very operation to which I have referred, the very proper and reasonable amendment of the gentleman from Washington met only the jeers of ignorance on that side. [Applause on the Republican side.] What assurance have we that the same lack of knowledge which exists on that side with regard to the effect of that legislation does not exist with regard to the effect of this and other legislation which will be proposed here having to do with the multiplied industries of a great people? The trouble with the free trader and the tariff-for-revenue advocate is, as I have pointed out, he goes blindly in ignorance or in defiance of the facts which control the commerce and industry of the world.

WAR APPROPRIATIONS.

We are spending this year upon our Army and Navy and fortifications over $250,000,000. Why this enormous outlay? Are not all the people of the earth our friends, our brethren? Are we not peaceably disposed toward all; and is it not our duty to take it for granted they are peaceably disposed toward us? Why, then, this waste of treasure? Why this burdening of the people with the cost of military establishments, upon which we have expended over $2,000,000,000 in the last 10 years?

I take it that this expenditure is for defense. Against what? Against the ambitions and encroachments of foreign powers; and the gentlemen on that side, free trader and tariff-for-revenue man alike, voted for these enormous outlays, and some, like the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], would have largely increased them. And yet, while gentlemen are so suspicious of foreign peoples that our coast lines must bristle with 13-inch guns and our leviathans of war churn the waters of every sea, they can not understand that there is any reason for defense against the infinitely more active and insidious commercial ambitions of other nations. While insisting in taxing our people to maintain armaments to ward off political ambitions, they propose to throw our ports wide open to the commercial exploitation of the peoples who are maintaining enormous armaments hostile to us, without even charging them a license fee for the opportunity of doing business in the best market in the world. Gentlemen on the other side harangue us in favor of a larger Navy and for formidable coast defense against a phantom yellow political peril, while they insist that we shall tear down our tariff wall, which protects us against a real and threatening yellow industrial peril. [Applause.]

AMERICAN STANDARDS AND WAGE SCALE.

I confess I have never been able to fathom the profound depths of the fallacy of the Democratic tariff position. We have here a standard of living and a wage scale far higher than that of any other people of the world, under which all of our people—with the exception of a small minority who insist on crowding the tenement districts of great cities and thereby subject themselves to the conditions inevitable in the intense labor competition of such localities—are better clothed, better fed, housed, educated, work fewer hours, enjoy more comforts, participate in more luxuries, are better cared for when destitute, injured, and afflicted, than any people who inhabit or have inhabited the face of the earth.

I find it hard to believe that gentlemen really expect that these conditions can be maintained under free competition with the products of the cheap labor of other lands, much of which is performed by men and women and little children, who live and die amid conditions of hopelessness and squalor we can scarcely realize; who never hope for, much less enjoy, the comforts and the blessings that are practically the universal heritage of the American people.

THE CASE OF ENGLAND.

But England, say the advocates of free trade and tariff for revenue only, has, next to us, the best-paid labor in the world. She has, because she has been the workshop of the world; because a wide-flung colonial empire, vast accumulations of capital, and generations of trained artisans enabled her to secure to a large extent the markets of the world for her manufactured products. She could not live unto herself; she must live as a manufacturing nation or perish utterly. And yet who desires to establish English conditions in the United States, with her army of paupers, her impoverished farming class, her constantly increasing struggle to maintain her commercial position among the nations of the world? We can not adopt her policy and do as well as she does, and if we did we would invite a condition which to the American workingman and the American farmer would be utterly intolerable.

All the balance of the world has proven the wisdom of the protective system—Germany, with her marvelous progress and development; France, with her people busy and, from their standards, prosperous; and the other nations of the world who have applied with wisdom the policy of protection to their industries.

To hear our Democratic friends talk one would imagine that the matter of government is the simplest thing in the world; that all that need be done in the matter of tariff is to place duties on a few articles without much regard to what they are, being careful that none of them protect any citizen in labor or enterprise, then go fishing, and everything would be lovely. I have heard of men who were said to be able to successfully set their mouths to going and go off and leave them, and I have sometimes wondered if experiences of that kind do not lead some gentlemen to think that the commercial and industrial enterprises of a great nation could be conducted on the same simple plan.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

So much for the general proposition. Now, how about this bill? It is not necessary for anyone to analyze it. After the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] got through with it the other day it was as full of holes as a peekaboo shirt waist. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MONDELL. My time is limited, and I prefer that the gentleman should wait until I conclude; but I will yield to him.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not a fact that every protective law is a law in restraint of trade?

Mr. MONDELL. No; a protective law is not necessarily a law in restraint of trade. Most protective laws we have had have vastly increased trade. When we were buying rails in England at $120 a ton and laying them on American railways there was mighty little business in steel rails anywhere, but after we put a protective tariff on them we increased the output of rails and vastly decreased the price. My friend from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] calls my attention to the wonderful expansion of trade through the influence of a tariff on tin. Our history is full of illustrations of that kind.

The bill proposes to put agricultural implements on the free list, and that is supposed to be the master stroke to catch the farmer. The gentleman from Kentucky, after describing the glorious conquest of foreign markets by American products, including grain, said:

> Why does he ship it abroad? Because of the fact that he gets a better price for it abroad or as good a price abroad after deducting the freight.

If the American gets as good or a better price abroad, then how is the American farmer or any American citizen to be benefited by placing upon the free list articles of which we sell vast quantities abroad at as high or a higher price than they are sold here and which no one believes would be imported in any quantity, even though placed on the free list?

Mr. CARLIN. How is anybody hurt?

Mr. MONDELL. One of those hurt is the farmer.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. For a question

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman in good faith contend that agricultural implements manufactured in this country are shipped abroad and sold at a higher price there than they are here?

Mr. MONDELL. I do. That was proved by an official investigation. The gentleman from Illinois placed the evidence of it in the RECORD, and I propose to place the same evidence in the RECORD—an official record gathered by the Department of Commerce and Labor, through its agents—showing the cost of binders, reapers, mowers, and rakes in the United States and in Europe, and effectually exploding that old and time-honored Democratic error that these goods are sold cheaper abroad than here.

Mr. CARLIN. If the gentleman's statement be true, then there can certainly be no longer need for the protection of these industries.

Mr. MONDELL. I will answer the gentleman's question a little further along. If I do not, I will thank him to remind me of it.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to ask if the gentleman from Wyoming is willing to rest his case on the allegation that agricultural implements sell higher abroad than at home?

Mr. MONDELL. I am willing to accept the truth, wherever I find it.

Mr. CARLIN. Then you ought to take the tariff off these articles.

Mr. MONDELL. I am willing to take the word of the official agents of the United States Government.

Mr. CARLIN. Then you ought to take the tariff off.

Mr. MONDELL. The following table gives the price of certain farm implements at home and abroad:

Comparative statement of the retail prices of binders, mowers, reapers, and rakes in the United States and the principal European countries, as shown by the reports of the Bureau of Manufactures, United States Department of Commerce and Labor.

	Binders.	Reapers.	Mowers.	Rakes.
United States	$125.00	$75.00	$50.00	$22.00
Great Britain	135.16	81.22	55.80	26.70
France	173.70	105.18	63.69	29.91
Germany	203.00	113.00	67.50	27.00
Denmark	167.50	91.12	60.30	30.82
Sweden	160.80	80.04	60.30	24.12
Hungary	243.60	121.80	81.20	36.54
South Russia	169.95	96.82	66.95	27.29
North Russia	180.25	91.70	66.95	29.05
West Siberia	187.98	101.97	72.10	30.90

NOTE.—The foreign prices are taken from the official reports published in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports:
French prices, issue of Feb. 23, 1909 (No. 3413).
Prices for Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary, Russia, and west Siberia, issue of Mar. 3, 1909 (No. 3420).
Prices in Great Britain, issue of Apr. 8, 1909 (No. 3450).

BAGGING, BURLAP, ETC.

It is proposed to put cotton bagging, burlap, and so forth, on which a duty of over $6,750,000 was collected last year on the free list, for the benefit, we are to assume, of the cotton planter, as the report accompanying the bill informs us that this material is chiefly used for covering cotton. Whether the placing of this material on the free list will furnish any American consumer with the product cheaper is a question; that it will reduce the national revenues by a little less than $7,000,000 is quite certain. Judging from a letter I received from the Carolina Bagging Co., of Henderson, N. C., I should be inclined to think that it will also have the usual effect of Democratic tariff legislation of closing down American factories.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. COLLIER. I understand you to say that it would reduce the revenue on cotton bagging six millions and something?

Mr. MONDELL. The revenue last year was between six and seven millions.

Mr. COLLIER. Why, on a 12,000,000-bale crop at 5 cents a bale, it amounts to only $625,000.

Mr. MONDELL. I am giving the gentleman the figures as I obtained them from the report made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in which he states that the revenues obtained last year in this class of imports—cotton bagging, sacks, burlaps, and so forth, 1910—was $6,877,000.

Mr. COLLIER. Oh, that includes sacks, and so forth. I was talking about cotton bagging. I wish to ask the gentleman this question. He seems to have gone very deeply into the subject——

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all. I have only touched the surface, though I hope that I have gone deeper into it than some of the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. COLLIER. If it takes so much revenue from the Government to take the tax off cotton bagging, which is used by the southern farmer to wrap the product of his soil, why is it that there has been given to the western farmer binding twine, made out of the same vegetable that cotton bagging is made of, absolutely free, with which to wrap the products of his soil?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to a speech. The gentleman's question is hardly a question. It is rather an argument based on the same false premises on which they base all of the other arguments relative to the tariff, and that is that placing an article upon the free list or reducing the duty on an article necessarily makes it cheap, when as a matter of fact the reverse is often true. [Applause on Republican side.] If the gentleman would study the facts more and theorize less, he would understand how that occurs.

In a circular which I have here it is stated that there are seven bagging factories in North Carolina, three in South Carolina, three in Virginia, and three in Georgia, and our attention is called to the fact that in India, where jute, which is the principal product of which this material is made and manufactured, is grown, the manufacturers pay an average of 50 cents a week to their laborers. But of course the fact that American labor is to be brought into competition with Asiatic labor living and dying under conditions degraded, hopeless, and comfortless almost beyond belief will cause no pause in the program of the gentlemen on the other side. It is unfortunate that those people should live under the condition they do, but we must not reduce our people to their level. What we do will be in the direction of raising them to ours. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman for a second——

Mr. MONDELL. Even the professions of loyalty to the policy of a tariff for revenue, which ought to apply in the face of the awful competition with the Asiatic labor on these lines, will not, I imagine, cause gentlemen to hesitate a moment to fix things so that the cotton planter will never vote anything but the Democratic ticket.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. BARTLETT. Can the gentleman state how much cotton bagging is manufactured in India? Does not the gentleman know it to be a fact—I will call it that, because I think it will be established—that the Cotton Bagging Trust not only sells what it manufactures, but purchases this cotton bagging, made in India by cheap labor, and sells it in this country to the cotton planter at an increased price by reason of the tariff?

Mr. MONDELL. I presume people who deal in cotton bagging have to buy from the people who make it——

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). And we manufacture but a small proportion of the cotton bagging of the world now; and how much of it will we produce when cotton bagging is placed upon the free list? Now the Asiatic must pay a little something for our market; then the Asiatic will receive the benefits of our market free, and if there be a trust, such as the gentleman from Georgia states, the trust will gobble up the difference, and the cotton planter will never know what has happened to the benefits he was promised. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MONDELL. I can not yield further.

Mr. BARTLETT. But the gentleman is simply mistaken in his facts—that the majority of our cotton bagging is made abroad; it is not, not a third, not a fourth is made——

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman is mistaken, but if he is not that is all the greater reason why we should not put bagging on the free list. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] so thoroughly dissected this bill it is absolutely cruel to refer further to its crudities, but we might for a moment call attention to the fact that while the gentlemen have put burlap and bagging on the free list, the duty on linoleum and on wall coverings and other goods made of burlap still remains, so that while reducing the tariff on one article they increase the tariff on a dozen others, and still the gentlemen claim and say that the Payne bill was too high. Why, they are raising the duty in the Payne bill by reducing the duty on the raw material and not changing it on the finished product.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I can not yield now, because I fear I will not have time enough to conclude. After I conclude——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I simply want to call the gentleman's attention——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield for a moment.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to say that he would yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman finally yielded.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago, referring to a speech of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], that he, Mr. JAMES, said that manufactured articles were sold abroad for a higher price than they are here.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not read the gentleman's speech. I am quoting from memory. Possibly the gentleman only intended to apply his remarks to agricultural products.

COTTON TIES, BARBED WIRE, ETC.

It is proposed to put cotton ties, baling wire, and barbed wire on the free list, with the expectation that the American farmer will imagine he is going to be vastly benefited thereby. If all the duties remitted under these items were to go into the pockets of the farmers of the country, it might furnish them with enough for one 5-cent cigar per annum.

LEATHER AND BOOTS AND SHOES.

Next to the agricultural-implement item, the one that is confidently expected will most appeal to the farmer is that which places heavy leather, boots and shoes, harness and saddlery on the free list. We imported these articles in the year 1910 to the amount of $1,319,622, while we exported like articles of the value of $37,178,938.

That being the case how is anyone going to be benefited by placing on the free list articles of which we only import one and one-third million dollars per annum while we export at a higher price or as good a price to the amount of nearly $140,000,000? In the eloquent words of the gentleman from Alabama, "We shoe the world," and he might have added "saddle the universe." What benefit, then, to any American citizen by placing the articles on the free list? What is there to it but a little cheap buncombe?

LUMBER.

A few days ago the House passed the Canadian reciprocity bill, and in defense you on the other side claimed that it was a most excellent trade, a fine bargain that we were driving with Canada. You said, among other things, we were to get the inestimable benefits of free lumber, the granting of which you assured us gave us valuable concessions in the Canadian market. And yet, before that pact becomes a law, you offer a bill which proposes to give all the world, without any consideration whatever, a wider free market than the Canadians were given in the reciprocity agreement. I was not expecting overmuch in the way of consistency from our friends on the other side, but I did expect that they would, at least for a few days, keep faith with Canada touching the matters treated of in the so-called reciprocity agreement.

SEWING MACHINES.

Last year we imported $76,000 worth of sewing machines and exported sewing machines of the value of $7,500,000. In other words, we exported one hundred times as many as we imported. We sent them to the ends of the earth, and in the manufacture, sale, and price of these machines we have no rivals worthy of the name. And yet our Democratic friends expect some people to believe that they are going to get sewing machines cheaper because they are placed on the free list.

SALT.

The American farmer is expected to be duly thankful to the Democratic Party for the proposition contained in this bill to put salt on the free list. Of course everyone knows that there is probably not a farmer in all the land who will ever purchase salt any cheaper on account of the removal of the duty. Salt is one of those articles which we produce cheaper and better than any people on earth, and the only place in all of our territory where salt can be imported with or without the duty is at some port where an occasional cargo might come in as ballast or some very limited region along our borders. And yet the American farmer and the American workingman will hear it from the hustings all over the land that the cost of living has been wonderfully reduced by the reduction of the duty on salt. Of course the farmer will not get his salt any cheaper, but the game may work through one campaign, particularly among the class of people, if there be any such, described in poetry by the gentleman from Kentucky.

MEATS ON FREE LIST.

This is the farmers' free list, so our friends on the other side say. It might very properly be described as an attempt to farm the farmer. It has been referred to in the minority report on the bill as "political soothing sirup." This is a most apt designation for most of its provisions. But soothing sirup is lulling in its effects, and there are some provisions in this bill that in the long run will, in my opinion, act on the farmer more after the manner of an emetic.

It is proposed to put fresh and cured meats on the free list, and this in the name and under the claim of benefit to the farmer. Ah! here is where our friends on the other side get in their fervid denunciation of the Beef Trust, and with fine frenzy declare that this will strike a fatal blow, in behalf of the people, at this infamous octopus.

There is a legend that centuries ago in China pigs were kept only as pets, and a Chinaman, who was very poor, kept one lone porker in the corner of his one-roomed cabin. One day, to his consternation, his home caught fire and was entirely consumed and the pet pig burned to death. In raking over the embers of his domicile the nostrils of the man with the cue were assailed by the savory odor of roast pig. So appealing was it that he immediately fell to, and all his neighbors with him, and devoured the toothsome porker, which had been done to a turn in the embers of the cabin. Thereupon and thereafter in all the region round about there ensued a perfect epidemic of house burning, with the accompaniment of roast-pig eating, and it is said that centuries passed, in which unnumbered dwellings were consumed, before it was discovered among the Chinese that a pig could be roasted without burning down a house. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 30 minutes more. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Now, I presume there may be a Meat Trust—at least a gentleman's agreement in the packing business—and I am inclined to believe the great firms engaged in that business do squeeze both the producer of live stock and the consumer of meat, and nothing should be left undone to prevent the packers from manipulating the market. But I do not think the farmer has ever called upon the Democratic Party to burn down his house to secure him the benefit of better treatment at the hands of the Beef Trust.

We are not the cheapest producers of meats in the world by any manner of means. The Argentine, with its limitless grazing lands under the control of a comparatively few men, with its semipeon labor, can and does undersell us in certain classes of meats in the markets of the world. New Zealand and, to a certain extent Australia, with cheaper labor and free grass lands, can and do sell meats of certain classes in the markets of the world cheaper than we can, particularly grass-fed fresh beef and mutton. And does the Democratic Party imagine that it can persuade the American farmer that they are benefiting him by throwing open our markets to the finished product of that which he produces?

OUR COMPETITORS.

Last year we exported fresh beef valued at a little over $7,000,000, Argentina over $12,000,000, and New Zealand's exports were valued at over $18,000,000. Last year Argentina exported 77,000 head of sheep and over 165,000,000 pounds of frozen mutton, while we exported less than 2,000,000 pounds of mutton, all of which illustrates the capacity of the countries mentioned to grow meats cheaply.

THE STOCKMAN, NOT THE PACKER, INJURED.

Assuming that the packers do not always pay a fair price for cattle and sheep, and I do not believe they do, the price they do pay, be it great or small, bears a certain fixed relation to and is regulated by the price which they obtain for their products and the extent of the market which they can find for them. If the packer controls the market, what difficulty will he have in reducing the price he pays for live stock in the amount he may be compelled to reduce the price for which he sells the finished product? Even though he may not be required to reduce his price in order to meet competition of foreign meats—he may simply divide some of his seacoast markets with them—the very fact that meats are brought into our country without duty gives an additional argument and leverage for beating down the price of live stock. And yet this extraordinary proposition is advanced in the name of the farmers of the country. Ah, gentlemen, remember the live-stock slump from 1894 to 1897, and remember what followed it—the transfer of the majority from that side to this.

WHY NOT FREE TRADE?

Now, I am reaching the question raised by the gentleman from Virginia a short time ago. Gentlemen on the other side say that so far as the items in this bill, such as agricultural implements, leather, boots and shoes, sewing machines, and barbed wire, which we now manufacture and sell in competition with all the world, are concerned, why not place them on

the free list? It by no means follows that because we can, as to the major portion of the country and as to most of the items on a certain schedule, meet the competition of all the world, we should surrender without any consideration whatever the greatest market in all the world to the alien and the stranger.

NO RECIPROCAL ADVANTAGE.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says that if we will only abandon our protective policy we can capture the markets of the world in every land where free competition can be obtained. We have already captured many of them and his promise of further conquest is perfectly safe as he has qualified it. No attempt is made in the bill to establish that condition of free competition on which he predicates his promise of further markets. This bill simply surrenders our market, leaving us confronted by high and in some cases with discriminating tariffs when we seek the markets of any country in the world except England for the same classes of goods it is proposed to place on the free list. In agricultural implements we now give a free market to every country which treats us likewise, but France, Germany, and the balance of Europe confront us with high duties on these goods. Even Canada still retains a duty of about 20 per cent against us in the reciprocity arrangement.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] talked yesterday of the virtues of reciprocity and of the importance of seeking wider markets for American meats abroad. One would have imagined, to listen to him, that this was a reciprocity measure, that we were not surrendering our markets without receiving anything in return, but that we were actually proposing to obtain some reciprocal benefits. Ah, gentlemen, if we were, it would be a very different story. For myself I do not believe much in a free list anyway. If I were framing a tariff, I should put mighty few articles on the free list, though on articles of necessity or common use I would make the duties very low, and I would then use those duties as a basis for securing preferential treatment with our foreign competitors.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], in his speech the other day, grew facetious, almost funny, as he described certain articles which he said were on the free list in the Payne bill. Well, I felt somewhat crushed under that criticism, because I realize that my party is a proper subject of criticism and of ridicule whenever it follows a Democratic precedent. The articles over which he had so much joy were on the free list in the Wilson bill, and we adopted them. Of course, there was more reason for putting a variety of weird articles on the free list in the Wilson bill than there was in putting like articles on our tariff bill, but there were some things put on the free list in the Wilson bill the placing of which on that list was an entirely unnecessary act. For instance, they put asafœtida on the free list. Did not the Wilson bill smell loud enough without any asafœtida? [Laughter on the Republican side.] They also, if I recollect rightly, put nux vomica on the free list. Why, the American people did not need any imported emetic. The bill furnished a sufficient amount of that without having emetics free.

There were other articles that they placed on the free list very appropriately. They placed rags on the free list. Rags were entirely proper on a Democratic free list, because they were the fashionable clothing at the time that bill was in operation. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They also put spunk on the free list, and that was fortunate, for the American people surely did need all the spunk they could get during those days to hold their heads above water. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I do not know why they put teeth on the free list, for they did not furnish us with anything in particular to eat, but perhaps it was due to the fact that they knew the times were going to be mighty tough and the chewing would be hard. [Applause on the Republican side.] And they were.

There are certain classes of articles which we do not produce, such as tea and coffee. There are many other articles which by reason of our natural resources, the marvelous efficiency of our people, the wonderful development of our industries, we can produce as cheap or more cheaply than any people on earth. As to all these which are articles of necessity and of common use, I should under no circumstances make the duty burdensome, but I should at least make the foreigner pay something, be it ever so little, for the privilege of our markets.

THE HAND THAT PROTECTS.

Every hand that produces and fashions these articles at home is a hand of defense and support to the Republic and makes its contribution to the Government and society. Every hand that produces and fashions an article abroad is a neutral and may become a hostile hand, and contributes naught to either the support of Government or of institutions. It is the experience of the world that at least in the case of low tariffs the foreigner in the main pays the tax. Having placed most articles on the dutiable list, though many of them at a low rate, I should then use that list and those articles as the basis of reciprocity agreements.

Even though it were true that in a general revision of the tariff, with all the schedules before us, with the opportunity of weighing, comparing, adjusting, and dovetailing one with another, it might be held that some of the articles in the bill before us could be placed on the free list without harm to American industries and with possible slight advantage to the American people, would we be justified in doing it without an attempt to secure reciprocal advantages?

OPPORTUNITY FOR RECIPROCITY.

Here are many articles, occupying a large place in the commerce of the Nation, taken from the dutiable list and placed on the free list with all of the recklessness and disregard of the sources of income or of the ultimate effect with which a drunken sailor squanders his wages. Is there nothing in this list of articles for which France, Germany, Austria, Italy—now barring the extension of our trade by high tariffs and burdensome regulations—will grant preferential treatment to some of our products? If the Democratic Party wants to do something for the American people, instead of ruthlessly tearing down tariff walls, opening the gates to the flood of foreign importations, without recompense or return, why not do something for the American farmer and stockman by securing him a wider market in France or Germany, or both, for American meats and farm products?

Of course, the gentlemen on the other side will say they are not in position to enter into negotiations of that sort, therefore they place the articles on the free list without receiving any reciprocal advantages. Why place them on the free list at all? The reasons given will neither satisfy nor convince the American people.

ATTITUDE OF A PROTECTIONIST.

There are, I understand, some Republicans who, now that the Canadian reciprocity bill, which largely deprives the farmer and stockman of some of the benefits of protection, has passed the House, are inclined to vote for this bill or some of its schedules. I am unable to follow the reasoning which justifies such action on the part of a protectionist. Few on either side of the Chamber, in my opinion, believe all the provisions of the bill are good. Certainly no one on this side does, and yet the Democratic majority are bound by caucus action to take it as it stands, and therefore it can not be amended. The caucus binds, though the bill does not reflect the views of many Members on that side. How can any believer in protection under such circumstances vote for a bill treating of a few schedules brought in by the enemies of protection and proclaimed the first step, not of lower protection duties, but for abolition of all protection duties?

In some parts of the world they play a game with cards, I am told—coming from a proper community myself, I know nothing of it except from hearsay [laughter]—in which all the cards save one, the hole card, are dealt face up. This looks to me like such a game, in which the Democratic dealer, having seen the other fellow's hand, calls on him to play, while he, the dealer, still has his hole card face down. Does anybody on this side know what that hidden card is? Is it free wool, free Mexican cattle, a revenue duty only on all industries, and we to have no hand in the determination of them? That is the best guess we can make, and is any Republican ready to buy into a brace game of that sort?

WHAT IS THE FUTURE POLICY TO BE?

If any argument were needed to show the utter fallacy, the absurdity, the viciousness, of a schedule-by-schedule revision, this bill furnishes it. What if the bill should pass? What other popgun bills are to follow? No one knows whether they will iron out the bumps this bill creates; no one knows what the revision will be like in its entirety, if ever completed; no one knows whether the proposed revision will proceed along the free-trade lines of this bill or will in spots reflect the tariff-for-revenue views of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], or in spots the "tear-the-customhouses-down-from-turret-to-foundation-stone" views of our honored Speaker, or in other spots the "save-my-industries-and-swat-all-others" tariff views of some of our friends on both sides of the Chamber. Nobody knows.

There is and can be but one sane, sound, and sensible way to legislate on the tariff, and that is to adopt a policy in regard to it and bring every schedule into harmony with that policy

and into harmony with every other schedule. Under that plan a tariff is a mosaic; under the procedure now invoked it is a grab bag. The southern Members have grabbed cotton ties and bagging. I suppose they are expected to hold the bag the next time while some of their colleagues grab something for their districts. They talk about logrolling in tariff revision. Logrolling is a necessary preliminary to house building. This procedure is purse snatching. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

TARIFF-FOR-REVENUE ADVOCATES.

Where are the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who have been clamoring for tariff for revenue? If the articles now proposed to be placed on the free list are not proper and legitimate subjects for revenue tariff, what articles are? If we are to throw away 10 millions of revenue in this measure, 5 millions of revenue in another measure, 20 millions of revenue next week on the wool schedule, Uncle Sam will soon be going around, hat in hand, taking up a collection to run the Government.

BELIEVER IN A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

Mr. Chairman, I am a believer in the protective-tariff system. I do not believe you can maintain here a wage scale and a standard of living far above that of the balance of the world and at the same time open the floodgates to the importation of the products of the underpaid labor such as is found, unfortunately, in many regions of the earth. The protective-tariff system needs no defense. No argument ought to be required in support of it in this country. The greatest story of temporal things that the world has ever heard or witnessed in its unfolding is the story of the growth, progress, advancement, and prosperity of the American people under the protective system. [Applause on the Republican side.] The bill before us is the product of the enemies of that system, announced as an attempt to break it down. It requires centuries for wise men to create, plan, rear, and adorn the magnificent works of art in architecture which a yokel and a vandal, given an opportunity and a little dynamite, can destroy in the twinkling of an eye. It has taken generations to lay the foundations, build, and develop the mighty industries of this great Nation.

In this great work we have had the benefit of the marvelous skill and energy of some of the greatest captains of industry and of the most efficient army of artisans the world has ever known. To frame and execute the laws which have wisely encouraged this development has been the life work of a long line of patriots and statesmen.

There was Abraham Lincoln, who said:

I do not know much about the tariff, but I know that if you buy a ton of steel rails abroad you have the rails and the foreigner has the money; if you make a ton of rails here, you have both the rails and the money.

There was Grant, great captain, returning from the fields of war to encourage the arts of peace; Blaine, teacher of true reciprocity; Reed, stalwart champion of American industries; Dingley, master of tariff schedules; and McKinley, high priest of protection. Their names and the names of those who labored with them glorify and illuminate the pages of American history. The story of their lives comprises all that is best in the history of the past two generations. What about those who preached and, when they had the opportunity, practiced the doctrines now proclaimed by the gentlemen on the other side? They are forgotten except as they are remembered as misguided teachers of false economic doctrines and perhaps for virtues that in part offset their errors and follies touching these things. Which policy, then, shall we pursue—the policy which has brought prosperity or the policy which has led to disaster? Which leaders shall we follow—those who have immortalized themselves or those who have been discredited? As for me, I shall follow the banner of protection to American labor and American industries, and I shall vote against the bill not only because it is hastily and crudely drawn and scantily considered, though it is all that; not only because its proposals are either vain, visionary, or vicious; but more because, being all these, it is a blow at the policy of protection and therefore a menace to the well-being and happiness of our people. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if I can get the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], I want to call his attention to one or two matters for the sake of accuracy. A familiar quotation from Lord Byron, slightly paraphrased, would run thus: "Now, I like Republicans, because they can't or won't do otherwise than misstate facts; but they do it so well the truth seems falsehood to it." [Applause on the Democratic side.] If I understood the gentleman correctly a few minutes ago, he said that the Democratic charge, frequently made, that American manufacturers ship their products to foreign countries and sell them there at lower prices than American consumers are required to pay for the same kind of goods has been exploded, and that he would put in the RECORD official figures and statistics showing it, and that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], in a recent speech, gave "the whole snap away" when he said:

Why do they ship goods abroad? Because they get better prices, or as good a price, abroad for them as they do at home.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MONDELL. I quoted the gentleman from Kentucky accurately, and the gentleman should quote me accurately. I recall the gentleman's words very clearly. I have not read the speech, because I made a memorandum of it, and his words were these—after referring to the enormous export of leather and boots and shoes, he said:

Why are these goods exported in these quantities? Because they are sold for a higher or as high a price as they bring here.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman is accurate in his statement, but only in a technical way. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. JAMES used language similar to that the gentleman quotes, but it was after he had ceased talking about manufactured products—boots and shoes and other leather goods—and it was while he was talking about wheat and not about boots and shoes, as the gentleman must know, and will know if he will read the speech referred to. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will yield for a moment.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Just a moment.

Mr. MONDELL. My recollection still is, and I was listening with a great deal of attention, that the gentleman from Kentucky was discussing the exports of leather when he made the statement; and I am inclined to think you will find it there in his speech.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have the speech here. Let me read to the gentleman and to the House what Mr. JAMES said. Mr. JAMES, in the speech quoted by the gentleman—and he has the speech before him—said:

The boot and shoe makers of this country sent abroad boots and shoes to the extent of $13,216,000, or an increase of $3,500,000 in the sale of boots and shoes as compared with last year. Why can they not sell them to the American consumer as cheaply as they can ship them across the ocean and sell them in competition with the world?

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is what he said. Then, again, he said:

Now, the question I want answered, and you must answer it to justify your system that you are pursuing here, is this: If these men can ship this amount of goods, and they gladly do it, into foreign countries and sell $51,000,000 in competition with the world, why can they not sell here to the American consumer without any protective tariff at all?

Further—and I will ask the gentleman's attention, because I think he will correct his speech when he puts it in the RECORD—Mr. JAMES said:

It will not do to undertake to answer this argument by saying that they are sold as cheaply here as abroad. That statement is untrue; that you have fought and are now fighting for a protective tariff shows it to be untrue.

That is what the gentleman from Kentucky said, but it is not what the gentleman from Wyoming says he said.

Continuing, Mr. JAMES said:

If they were sold as cheaply here as they are abroad, why would you ask for a protective tariff?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I would like about two minutes more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield that much time to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. When discussing the exportation of one of our great staple crops, the surplus of American wheat, Mr. JAMES said:

When the American farmer is forced to send abroad 100,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn, he does it because he can not sell it here, and he can not sell it here because our people can not consume it.

He argued that the surplus of wheat and corn shipped abroad commands as good a price, or a better price, than here, because we can not consume it here, but he expressly said that manufactured articles protected by a tariff wall are sold in foreign countries, and, I assert, in every market of the world, at a less price than American citizens are required to pay for them.

Again, Mr. JAMES said:

I know the Republican Party has tried to fool the farmer for years upon this question of a protective tariff upon his wheat and corn.

Now, to be fair to the gentleman from Kentucky, who is not here, I will say that I am not his champion. He needs none. He can stand alone and meet every Republican orator on that

side and sustain himself before the great body of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But in the interest of fairness I make these remarks, and I challenge the gentleman now to correct his speech before he puts it in the RECORD, and let it conform to the facts. And if he finds it a hard road to travel, if he finds this tariff wall, this protective tariff which robs the people he represents, the producer and the wage earner as well—and if I had time, I could show that it does—he should repent and go down into the waters and be baptized into the living faith of Democracy, and then he would not have to appeal to error to sustain his position. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Among the tenderfoot Congressmen whose names have been added to the directory at this session I presume I am the youngest and the tenderest.

Tenderfoot that I am naturally, I have been touched and by nothing have I been so deeply touched and at the same time edified as by the solicitude, the love, and esteem evidenced by the gentlemen on the Republican side of this House, especially those hailing from the New England cities, for my good friends the farmers. With tears in their voices as well as their eyes, they have pleaded for the farmers during the consideration of the reciprocity bill, and I hoped and almost believed that the farmer was at last coming into his own. A little skeptical I was as to the protestations that the farmer would be hurt by that bill, but satisfied entirely was I that even though it should prove injurious to the farmers of the Northwest, justice would be meted unto them by these Republican Representatives when they had an opportunity to vote for the farmers' free-list bill, and firmly did I believe that their wonderful intellects would be exerted and musical voices raised in behalf of that bill. But now I find it was all a mistake. Mr. DALZELL, who does not live within 150 miles of a farm, but earnestly pleads that the farmers be not hurt by the passage of the reciprocity bill, now reports that this farmers' free-list bill is but soothing sirup offered to the farmers. If he is correct, and we must presume he is, then how can he, after protesting last week that "my brotherly love is for my own kin, for the American farmer, not for his Canadian competitor," now refuse to give even soothing sirup to the object of his affections. [Applause.]

And then the minority leader [Mr. MANN], after having pleaded for the farmers during the consideration of the reciprocity bill, now opposes the passage of this bill, criticizing its form more than anything else. After listening to him I agreed with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], that if the Democratic Party proposed for adoption the Ten Commandments, he would so criticize them as to cause even Mr. HEFLIN to fear that it would be unwise to adopt them. His strained construction of the provisions of this bill is equaled only by the construction Finnegan placed upon the tax laws when, soon after his election as auditor, he sent his friend Dooley a notice that there was due the county $8 taxes on his goat. Dooley forthwith presented himself, his Irish up, and said, "Finnegan, what does it mean? I've owned that durn goat for three years and never paid tax on it, and sure I'm satisfied there's no law for it." "Indade, there is," says Finnegan. "I've read the tax laws, and it provides that all property *abutting* and abounding on the public highway shall be taxed at the rate of $2 per foot, and, sure, yez can't deny that your goat has four feet." [Applause and laughter.] In much the same manner does Mr. MANN construe the provisions of this bill, alleging that it is vague and uncertain, because it fails to define what an agricultural implement is. It is sufficiently definite, however, to admit free of taxation those implements used by agriculturists in the tillage of the soil, and that is its purpose. [Applause.]

The discussion of this and the preceding bill has covered a wide range, and several gentlemen on the other side who do not apparently approve of the efforts to deceive the farmer resort to an effort to arouse prejudice against these bills by styling them sectional legislation or intimating that such is the fact. When the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] was addressing this House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] asked him to tell him something of the class of labor employed in the cotton mills of the South, and give some information as to educational statistics among the operatives of the cotton mills, and also state whether child labor is employed. Had the gentleman been acquainted with conditions and with the laws he would have known that wise and humane legislation prohibits the employment of child labor and limits the hours of labor of all operatives to 10 hours a day. In comparison with the salary and mileage of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the operatives are poorly paid, but for the class of work demanded of them their wages are fair. Their complaint, and a just one it is, is that while wages have not been increased the cost of living under Republican misrule has increased. [Applause.]

As a class they are of the highest order, pure-blooded Americans, most of them living in the counties and States wherein their great grandfathers were born—intelligent, patriotic, loyal citizens—poor, possibly, but proud, and not seeking sympathy from any man or set of men. They have come to the mills from the farms, as a rule, and this fact would indicate that the boasted prosperity of the farmers which Mr. CANNON attributes to the policies of the Republican Party is not as general as it might be. In that most entertaining speech delivered by Mr. CANNON he pictured the wonderful improvement of conditions in North Carolina, attributing it, of course, to Republican legislation, but in the next breath he stated that the farmer now living on his old place in North Carolina told him that the old gullies had been removed by throwing up dams, and that he had learned the use of clover and cowpeas, thus disproving the statement of Mr. CANNON that the farmer's prosperity is due to legislation, Republican or Democratic, and proving conclusively that it is due to his own unaided exertions, his adoption of new methods of farming, applying intelligence to his labors, the only way in which the farmer has ever prospered or will ever prosper.

Out of the wave of general prosperity extending over the country the farmer has now and again received a small touch of it, but it has never been due to legislation here. Not long since a citizen of Ohio summarized the situation in this manner:

Nearly $1,000,000 a day is being spent by the Government for war purposes in the Army, in the Navy, and for pensions, or 67½ per cent of all Government expenses are incurred for war purposes, yet in time of war, as has ever been the case, the volunteer soldier from the farm has to be the Nation's reliance for national defense and aggressiveness. For education, 3 per cent represents the expenditure, and for agriculture 1½ per cent; for feed, $1; for fight, $37; for brains, $1; for bullets, $22; to encourage production, $1; to encourage idleness, $37; to shoot brains in, $1; to shoot brains out, $22; for culture, refinement, and education, $1; for shotgun business in time of peace, $22; Army increasing, food supply decreasing.

[Applause.]

Because of the item in this bill removing the duty on cotton bagging and ties, Republican Members of this House charge that the entire bill is sectional legislation. While the bill removes duties upon articles consumed and used by people of the entire country, this is the only item offering relief to the cotton growers alone, and in all fairness I ask if it be not time that the interests of the cotton grower be given a little consideration? Half a century has passed since the echo of the last cannon died in silence. Half a century has elapsed since the soldiers of the Northern and of the Southern armies returned to their homes, the one flushed and elated with victory and with hope; the other almost in despair, having suffered endless privation and having lost all but the proud consciousness that they had shown their readiness and willingness to suffer and die in a cause they honestly believed to be right and just. Returning to their homes they found that after the cessation of hostilities agents of this Government were seizing cotton lawfully the property of the people of the South, at a time when they were in poverty and distress. According to the records on file in the Treasury Department, 33,638 bales of cotton were seized and sold, and after deducting alleged expenses of $2,160,434.86, there was turned into the Treasury of the United States the sum of $4,886,671, the proceeds of the cotton belonging to the cotton growers of the South. By acts of Congress of 1862, 1864, 1866, and 1867, a direct tax was levied upon raw cotton, a tax now commonly known as the illegal cotton tax, because by all lawyers it is conceded, and by the Supreme Court has it been decided, to be unconstitutional. According to the records in the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, there was collected by the levying of this tax from the farmers of the South $68,072,388.90, more than $4,000,000 being collected from the cotton growers of the State of South Carolina alone. Notwithstanding that this tax has in effect been decided by the Supreme Court to have been unconstitutional, the Government has had the use of this $68,000,000, the money of the cotton growers of the South, for 50 years, and this Congress has never given even serious consideration to the just pleas of the victims of this unconstitutional legislation for reimbursement. Unfair and unjust as has been the policy of the Government in these two matters, the people of the South, and especially the cotton growers of the South, have never wavered in their loyalty and devotion to this great Government of ours.

When the call to arms was sounded in 1898 these same cotton growers were among the first to volunteer to risk their lives in the cause of our country, and to-day I plead for the blotting out of sectional lines in legislation, for the harmonizing of all

sections of this country, for the cementing together by the ties of common interest, brotherly love and affection all the people of this great country of ours, and earnestly plead that this or any other legislation be considered upon its merits and without regard to the section of the country it may perchance offer relief to.

This bill is in thorough accord with Democratic principles because it equalizes the benefits distributed under its provisions. The protected industries of the country have apparently believed that the people can not be robbed unless deceived, and that to deceive them they must be persuaded that they are robbed for their own advantage, and through the Republican policy of protection they have to a great extent accomplished their ends by convincing the people that in order to protect some one industry in a district benefiting a few people, they must consent to the rest of the inhabitants of the district being robbed by thousands of protected industries located in other sections. The Democratic Party, on the other hand, stands for a tariff for revenue only, this policy being determined in the councils of the party and declared in its platforms. It stands for a tariff for revenue as against the policy of the Republican Party of a tariff for protection with incidental revenue. The Democratic Party not believing in absolute free trade it is not to be expected that the committee intrusted with the consideration of a tariff legislation should propose for passage here a bill placing on the free list all the articles that the ardent free trader believes should be included. As you can not make an omelet without an egg, so you can not run this Government without money. The removal of duties from the articles specified in this bill will, according to the statement of Mr. UNDERWOOD, reduce the revenue $10,000,000, and until we have an income tax or some other source from which we can secure revenue it would be the sheerest folly to extend this free list and reduce the revenue to any greater extent. It is true that it is proposed after the passage of this bill to reduce the prohibitive duties now levied on one or two articles in most general use by the people, but a reduction on such articles instead of further reducing the revenue will increase it by the increased importations it will make possible.

The provision for the removal of the duty upon cotton bagging and ties, which is the object of special attack, I ask to consider first for a few moments. The cotton crop of the South is a great crop, averaging 12,000,000 bales a year, approximately five-eighths of which is exported and exchanged for foreign gold, amounting to $500,000,000. By the operation of the present tariff duty on the cotton ties necessary in marketing the crop, the farmer is made to pay a tax of 0.027 cent a bale, which on the total crop amounts to $324,000 a year. On his cotton bagging he is by the operation of the tariff forced to pay a tax of 5¼ cents a bale, amounting on the entire crop to $630,000, making a total of $954,000 annually paid by the cotton growers to the Bagging and Tie Trust for the enrichment of their stockholders. In South Carolina last year 1,210,968 bales of cotton were produced, and in marketing this crop the farmers paid through the duty on bagging and ties $63,575.82, and in my own district the tax paid by the farmers to these manufacturers through the operation of this duty amounted to $13,374.80, or almost $2 to every farmer. Now, under these circumstances, having been the victim of direct taxation immediately after the war, and the victim of this indirect taxation on his bagging and ties for years, is it not fair and just that if a free list is to be introduced here that the cotton grower should be the beneficiary of some legislation?

Daily do we receive letters and petitions from the manufacturers of bagging and ties, to whose success the farmers have been contributing for years, beseeching us not to vote to remove this tax from the farmers. The farmers, on the other hand, are not so organized as to present their complaints and petitions to this body, but in the performance of our duties no better guide could be asked for than that offered by Speaker CLARK on the opening day of this session when the said:

> No man is fit to be a lawgiver for a mighty people who yields to the demands and solicitations of the few having access to his ear but is forgetful of that vast multitude who may never hear his voice or look into his face.

[Applause.]

The farmer receives and asks for no protection upon his products. He sells in an unprotected market and buys in a protected market, and it is not fair that he should be made eternally to take money out of his pockets and transfer it to the pockets of the manufacturers as a contribution to their continued prosperity. The wheat farmer of the Northern and Northwestern States pays no tax on his binding twine. Then why should the cotton grower be made to pay it on his bagging and ties? Understand me, I do not mean that a duty should be levied on binding twine. On the contrary, I think it in accord with Democratic principles in equalizing the benefits as well as the taxation that there should be no duty on it, and I think I am safe in saying that if an effort were made to place a tax upon the binding twine of the wheat farmer of the North and Northwest that the Representatives of the cotton-growing States in the Democratic Party would be found opposing such effort. We want them to have their binding twine on the free list and ask only for the same privilege for the cotton grower of the South.

So much for that provision in the bill. It does benefit the cotton grower by the removal of the duty on bagging and ties and on hides. It benefits the farmers of the entire Nation by the removal of the duties on agricultural implements. It benefits the wage earner of the great cities of New England as well as the rest of the country by the removal of the duty on meat, cereals, flour, and breadstuffs of all kinds. It benefits the people generally, and especially those along the Canadian border by the removal of the duty on lumber, in accordance with the pledge of the Democratic platform. It benefits the wage earner by the removal of the duty on leather, boots, and shoes, and it benefits the people of the entire country by the removal of the duty on salt, sewing machines, and other articles. It is legislation in the interest of the people generally, and especially the agriculturalists. Helping the farmers, as it does, at this day it may be considered tardy justice, but it is justice, nevertheless, and it is better late than never. Its passage will be in accord with the character of legislation already passed by this House at this session under the able leadership of Chairman UNDERWOOD. The bill providing for the direct election of United States Senators, in view of the widespread demand for such legislation, is certain to meet with the approval of the people.

The passage of the bill providing for the publication of campaign funds before as well as after the election is but carrying out the preelection promises of the Democratic Party. The passage of the reciprocity bill—a Democratic measure, though proposed by a Republican President—was made possible only by Democratic votes in this House, and for its passage our party must and will receive the credit, distasteful though it be to the President. As a result of its passage there will be an awakening of the northern farmer to a realization of the fact that the protection he has been given by the Republican Party for years has, after all, been only an imaginary benefit; and, once awakened, he will realize that by the passage of the pending bill, proposed by the Democratic Party, he is offered substantial relief, and no longer will he be found joined to his idols. At the very organization of this House the Democratic Party showed its sincerity in redeeming its campaign pledges. Believing that retrenchment should begin at home, this majority, in pursuance of our promise to economize in the expenditures of the Government, abolished useless offices, sinecures established for the perpetuation of the Republican Party, thus saving to the Government in this matter alone $180,000 a year. This but gives an indication of the manner in which the investigations of the various departments will be conducted, with a view to cutting down the enormous expenditures now incurred, and, though not a prophet or the son of a prophet, I venture to predict that the conduct of the Democratic Party in this House will so justify the confidence of the people that when the battle of ballots is fought in November, 1912, that their majority in this House will be retained, the Republicans will be ousted from their control of the Senate, driven from the executive offices, Democracy be enthroned, and the people rule once more. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield the gentleman from South Carolina time enough for me to ask him a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sorry, but we want to get on in this debate. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] 45 minutes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I hope my friends will not all go to dinner now, although the provocation is quite sufficient. [Laughter.] Our friends over on that side have been repudiated by their own people, the protectionists, and I am here to make a talk, not so much a speech or oration, but a simple talk. I will touch on a few subjects that I think will be of interest within themselves even if not so well presented.

It looks like, in this day, after we have had 50 years of uninterrupted protection, that all speeches and discussions have been along the line of protection as a policy so long that the country has forgotten fundamentals.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in this discussion I am not representing the Democratic Party. I am not authorized to speak for it. I am not undertaking to bind anybody to follow my views; but I will give my reasons why I hold the views I

do, and if the reasons do not appeal to you, you need not accept my views. I am not trying to bind the Democratic Party. It is composed of people who think independently.

According to my own belief, and according to what I think is fundamental, every man has, or he ought to have, the unrestricted right as an individual to purchase the necessaries of life where he can get the largest amount of the same for the least amount of money or other thing of value. Is not that axiomatic? Should not the individual citizen have the unrestrained right to purchase where he can get the greatest amount of the thing purchased for the least amount of money or other thing of value? Is there anything wrong in that abstractly considered? Let us see the other side of it. A man, as an individual, has, or ought to have, the unrestrained right of selling what he produces as the result of his labor or capital, or both, where he can get the highest price for the same. Is there anything wrong about that? Is that not axiomatic? Is that not fundamentally correct? Any law, regulation, or custom, which interferes with the full and free exercise of these two fundamental laws of trade and commerce can be tolerated only upon the supposition that some indirect or unnatural benefit is to be derived therefrom of such general character as to warrant depriving the individual of some of his rights or benefits in behalf of the public or for the general welfare.

Taxation, per se, can not possibly confer a direct or personal benefit upon the individual subject to taxation. Taxation must be justified by the indirect or impersonal benefits conferred on organized society as a whole. Taxes should never be levied upon or collected from the whole people except for purposes of benefiting, either directly or indirectly, the whole people.

Is there any objection to these statements I am making? When a tax is levied for the benefit, direct or indirect, of a limited number or class of citizens, those only who are to receive such benefits directly or incidentally should be compelled to pay such tax. Is there anything wrong about that?

When you levy a tax to build a street in your city, do you not charge up the special or local benefits to the abutting property owners? Is it not right? Is it not right that they who get the benefits should pay for those benefits? It seems like we have lost all sight of right and justice or of the moral question involved in levying taxes under a protective tariff. Why, my friends, down in Mississippi, in the Delta region, where they are shutting off the Mississippi River overflows by levees, they have a tax levied upon the people whose lands are protected, upon the cotton raised at so much per bale, and is that not right? Would it not be wrong to levy a tax on the hill farms of Mississippi to build a levee to protect the river-bottom farms, the Delta lands? Yet they all get an indirect benefit from the fact that the Delta lands are increased in value and in productivity, and the State as a whole is benefited. Nobody, however, would tolerate the thought for a moment of levying a tax upon the whole State of Mississippi to protect the Delta farms.

But when it comes to levying a tax upon the whole people through a tariff in order that some portion of the people may pocket a profit they otherwise could not get, gentlemen of high morals defend in theory such a practice on the idea that it is indirectly beneficial. It is no more general and indirect than the levy taxes I have just mentioned.

A protective tariff tax has none of the usual objects and purposes of an ordinary tax levy. The object of protection is not to raise revenue, but to raise prices of domestic products manufactured within the tariff wall. Is that not true? It would not be protective if it did not, and you would not want it if it did not do so; you would not favor it if it did not do so. It does not fall within the category of ordinary levies of taxes. Taxes are levied to pay public expenditures, and public expenditures are those incurred for the benefit of the public. Profits to individuals or companies engaged in certain lines of industries are not the concern of the public taxpayer.

It is in reality a law in restraint of trade, and should be and is an unconstitutional enactment and ought to be and would be so held by the courts if the real object and purpose of the levy was stated on the face of the statute. Our friends talk about raising revenue and say we have to raise a revenue. It is true we have to raise revenue to run the Government. I want to say to you, however, we are under no compulsion or constraint to collect taxes by a tariff, hence even a tariff for revenue only is purely voluntary. Is that not true? Why, if we have other sources of taxation by which we can raise revenue and are not compelled to resort to duties on imports, but if we do as a matter of policy resort to such duties, should that resort not be justified by the revenue to be derived therefrom? Now, are not these truths? Are not they axiomatic? Does anybody controvert them? The whole basic claim of the protective tariff is for indirect purposes.

Protection is a matter of intent and does not depend upon the amount or the percentage of the levy. Why, we sometimes find gentlemen calling themselves Democrats, and they are—I do not question that—who have the belief that if the levy on an article is only 10 per cent or 15 per cent or 20 per cent that it is a revenue duty simply because the amount of the percentage of the levy is small. Why, a 10 per cent duty might be prohibitive on some articles, while 100 per cent might not be prohibitive on others. What is the object and purpose of my Democratic friends and my Republican friends in seeking a levy? Is it to get money or produce an increase in the value of the domestic product by reason of the levy, and if the intent and purpose of the levy is to increase the price of the domestic product—natural, agricultural, manufactured or otherwise—it is protective. The percentage is only a question of degree in the crime, if it is a crime. Now, my friends, gentlemen talk of the Robert J. Walker tariff and say the average was 25 per cent, if that was the average—I am only saying this, of course, as a matter of illustration—and they come to the conclusion that a tariff on anything that does not exceed the Walker rate is per se a revenue tariff. Why, sometimes I hear my friends scoring Republicans for levying only a 10 per cent tariff on diamonds. I have not investigated that subject, but I think gentlemen who have say that this is the greatest diamond-using country on earth, and if we put a levy much higher than that they will not come here at all, and so even 10 per cent becomes in the nature of things a revenue duty, as a higher rate would bring less revenue.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me——

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. The Republican Ways and Means Committee, in the last revision, considered the question of raising the duty on diamonds as a matter of revenue and was informed emphatically by the Board of Appraisers at New York that an increase over and above 10 per cent would be only an encouragement to smuggling, and it is purely on that ground that it was fixed at that rate. Not but that they are luxuries and the duty should be raised if it could be enforced, but the probabilities are we would collect less. Raising the duty above 10 per cent would put it at the point of diminishing returns rather than increasing them. That was solely the ground upon which the duty was fixed.

Mr. SIMS. I accept the gentleman's statement as correct. I want to say to the gentleman right now, however, if diamonds were being mined in this country the mine owners in this country would come to your committee and say they could not mine diamonds with American labor in competition with the mine owner of Africa unless you gave them a duty on diamonds sufficient to compensate for the difference in cost of production here and in Africa.

Mr. HILL. I hardly think it is true. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to follow, as I always like to follow, the gentleman's remarks because they are always intelligent, and I would like to ask him this question: Would not the principles which the gentleman is now laying down compel absolute free trade, with no duties at all, but the revenue collected in some other way——

Mr. SIMS. Oh, not at all, not at all; the tariff on diamonds is a revenue tariff, because they are not produced here.

Mr. HILL. I am referring to the general principles which the gentleman has been laying down.

Mr. SIMS. I will refer to that when I come to it.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. SIMS. But my Republican friends have decided that the tariff should be equal to the difference in the cost of production abroad and here, with an additional protection that guarantees a reasonable profit on the investment, as I understand it. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is the language, of course, but it does not amount to anything, for, as I have said three or four times on this floor, it makes no difference in determining the difference in the cost of production abroad and at home whether you add a profit or deduct a like profit from the foreigner; it is simply a question of equalization in their cost.

Mr. SIMS. Well, the idea, as I understand it, is that the American manufacturer should be enabled to manufacture his goods in competition with foreign labor——

Mr. HILL. That is it, exactly.

Mr. SIMS. Or the foreign cost of production, whatever it may be.

Mr. HILL. Equalizing the difference in the cost of production.

Mr. SIMS. And it must be such that he can follow the business profitably in this country, and, naturally, that includes the interest on his capital.

Mr. HILL. In both cases.

Mr. SIMS. In both cases. If interest on borrowed money is lower abroad on the average than it is here, then the Republican theory means that we levy a tariff to equalize the difference in the interest cost of borrowed capital abroad and here. Is that true?

Mr. HILL. That is my doctrine.

Mr. SIMS. That is the gentleman's doctrine, and nobody knows protection doctrine better than does the gentleman. Now, my friends, do you tolerate such a doctrine? Do you believe in such a doctrine? Do you believe in the doctrine that banking capital per se must be made more profitable here by reason of a protective-tariff tax? Is that sound doctrine? I certainly think not.

But I want to say that such a doctrine or such a platform, literally and practically carried out, becomes practically prohibitive. If the tariff equals the difference in the cost of production abroad and here, including the difference in the cost of capital invested, including interest, then no foreign goods will come here at all, except when they are sold at a loss, because we make them equal to start on, and the foreigner has got to pay the freight, insurance, and other incidental expenses necessary to putting his goods here in competition with ours. So you have a doctrine that, if literally carried out, becomes prohibitive.

Why, discriminations in freight rates on heavy materials have absolutely destroyed some towns while building up others. I certainly think that when a great party gets away from fundamentals and adopts expedients, and nothing but expedients, and does not regard principle as binding and paramount in action, such a condition is much to be deplored.

Well, my friends on both sides are awfully in love with the farmer. And do you know why? In the first place, he is a very lovable citizen. They are the very best element, taken as a whole, of our population. They should be encouraged in doing what they have always done—being independent, self-sustaining, self-thinking, self-voting, self-governing. [Applause.] The pity I have heard poured out here in behalf of the farmer I do not believe is appreciated by him. I represent an agricultural district. Every county in my district is an agricultural county, and up to this time I have not even had a postal card from any farmer or anybody else in opposition to Canadian reciprocity. And yet the whole argument, or largely so—that is, the effective argument or the one that is intended to be effective—has been that the agreement will hurt the farmer.

Here is an article that I want to read to you myself, because I wish to comment a little upon it as I read, that I cut from the Washington Post of yesterday. It is not an editorial in that paper, but an interview with a gentleman who ought to know. It says:

TWENTY-SIX THOUSAND AUTOS TO FARMERS.

The Reo Motor Co.'s president quotes interesting figures.

Listen about these impoverished, down-trodden farmers, on account of whom you do not dare open the gates of Canada, because of their inability to compete with wheat grown in the frozen zones of the North, where they say it is sometimes 10 cents a bushel cheaper than it is over here. Listen to what this gentleman says about the condition of the farmer. I am glad it is true. He says:

That the farmer should eventually have come to his own in this country, as disclosed by the latest report of the United States Bureau of Statistics, is a matter of natural rejoicing, for to him we look principally for our food and for the raw material from which our wearing material is made.

Says Mr. R. E. Olds, president of the Reo Motor Car Co.:

A careful compilation of all the available returns at this time shows that during the year 1910 approximately 26,000 automobiles were purchased by American farmers, which is an increase over 1909 of 85 per cent and 400 per cent over the motor cars which farmers purchased during 1908.

I see my lovable friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who dealt in jeremiads the other day about the farmers of Pennsylvania, who have railroads at their doors and a market for their products, but who were here bemoaning what would be their awful condition because Canada might sell a bushel of oats here in competition with them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly; for a talk, but not for a speech.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Tennessee a moment ago said he represented a district which was wholly a farming district. The gentleman knows, for I have stated it here, that I represent a district that is wholly industrial, there not being a single acre of ground, unless it be a park, that is not improved; and I say to the gentleman, in view of the statement that he has made, that no Representative in Congress nor any individual delights more to observe that the farmer is coming into his own and is able to ride in automobiles than the gentleman who represents in part that great industrial district of Philadelphia. I believe it is time for the farmer to have automobiles. I am glad he is getting them, because we make them for him, and I wish the day would come when he might have them to pass down to his children, because we get the raw material from him with which to build them and then turn them back to him. Surely he ought to have the opportunity to use them. The regret I have is that possibly, by reason of a change in political conditions, we may not be able in our community to earn sufficient to buy from the farmer that which he now produces, so as to enable him to buy from us the automobiles that he uses.

Mr. SIMS. You represent those who manufacture these automobiles?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very largely, yes; and we get our raw materials from you.

Mr. SIMS. No; you do not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My dear friend from Tennessee, there is not a thing that enters into the construction of an automobile, which we turn into the thing of beauty and utility that it is, that does not come out of the soil which your farmers till. We get the wood, we get the ore, we get the leather. We get all those things from you——

Mr. SIMS. Now, the gentleman from Philadelphia is making a beautiful speech, which will damage mine by way of comparison of his beautiful language with mine; but, my friend, are not your manufacturers willing to let us reduce the tariff on the materials entering into an automobile so that the farmer can buy them still lower? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If there is any inequality in the price or any unfair charge, I shall be glad to have that regulated.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman is dodging the question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at all.

Mr. SIMS. Yes. Is the gentleman willing to reduce the tariff on the parts of automobiles and the materials out of which they are made, to the end that the farmer may buy them cheaper?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not if it reduces the wages of the people who make them in my district.

Mr. SIMS. We will come to that in a few minutes, and I will ask the gentleman a few questions about that. Now, let me read further what this gentleman says:

These facts indicate that the American farmer is raising maximum crops, which he can readily market at the highest prices known in several decades, if, indeed, not in our entire history. In fact, his income for 1910 will aggregate fully $9,200,000,000, which is the largest amount of farm products raised in one year by any country in the world.

Where are my insurgent friends from the Northwest? Will they hold their heads up for a moment? Nine billion two hundred million dollars in one year, and yet you are afraid they will be put out of business by the cold, frozen regions of the north that can not raise anything except wheat. Now do not you feel as though you were trying to humbug us? But our people will not be humbugged and they will not be misled. I have not had one letter expressing any fears of that kind. If there happened to be some protected industry interested in opposing this legislation that would cultivate the fears of the farmers of my district, or create those fears where they do not exist, I would have been loaded down with literature, just as some of you gentlemen have been. The gentleman from Philadelphia represents in part one of the first manufacturing cities in the world, and I want to say, I think, financially one of the best cities in the world. They make their money there. They do not gamble for it on the cotton and stock exchanges, unless they go over to New York to do it. They have practically nothing of that sort at home; but there are gentlemen there who are interested in every form of manufacture that is protected in the gentleman's district, and so the gentleman is bemoaning the condition of the farmers of his State. But my friend I am sure does not want to deceive them. They are the best-off people on the face of the earth to-day and who have not received any benefit from protection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman always intends to be fair and just.

Mr. SIMS. I want to be.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Tennessee did not hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania bemoan the condition of the farmers in his State. If there was one thing that I endeavored to prove, it was that the farmers in Pennsylvania were prosperous, and that their prosperity depended largely upon the prosperity of the men in the mills. We are proud of our farmers.

Mr. SIMS. Let me read further from what this gentleman says:

Being a well-read man on all subjects that pertain to the management, progress, and development of his farm, it was but natural that the American farmer early began to study the relative merits and advantages of the horse and the automobile, and now that his verdict is overwhelmingly in favor of mechanical power as against animal power, it would seem that the motor-car industry is certain to gain a new impetus therefrom that it could gain in no other way.

I suppose our Kansas friends are all out praying for more help for bleeding Kansas. [Laughter.]

Fifteen years ago the gross incomes from the Kansas farms were $113,000,000; 10 years ago they amounted to $180,000,000; and in 1910 to $323,000,000.

And yet Canada is going to swamp Kansas if it gets a chance.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMS. I will.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman understand that the first clause in this bill covering farm wagons, farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of every kind or character, including tools, whether specified or not, would include the motor carts for farm purposes?

Mr. SIMS. I do not know and—that is not all—I do not care. Being opposed to the principle of protection per se, I do not care how many things come in by construction of this language.

Mr. HILL. I am a good deal interested in the question of revenue, and I want to know whether it is going to take these things in. I ask the gentleman the question in good faith, to get the gentleman's understanding of it.

Mr. SIMS. To give the gentleman an honest answer, I will say that I have not studied the bill.

Mr. HILL. But the gentleman is going to vote for it?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is going to vote for it, anyway?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Whether it has any effect on the revenue or not?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I would like to ask the gentleman whether this bill is a bill for a tariff for revenue or a tariff for protection or a tariff for free trade?

Mr. SIMS. The present bill? Why, on its face it is a free-trade bill, as far as it goes.

Mr. HILL. I did not know whether the Democratic Party had abandoned the tariff for revenue only.

Mr. SIMS (reading):

While these figures indicate that Kansas and her sister States are prosperous, the best evidence of wealth of the farmer is found in his bank deposits, which to-day challenge the admiration of every financier in the country. These conditions certainly testify to the American farmer's intelligence, industry, thrift, progress, and business acumen.

Where are my friends on that side who have been scared to death about wheat coming over from Canada? The only gentleman I see present is my distinguished friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and he is almost out of hearing distance. Now, let him listen:

I recall how a score or more of wealthy wheat farmers living near the village of Hardtner, Kans., not so long ago raised the money with which to grade and equip a 10-mile road to connect with a point reached by two big railroad systems. This they did after one or two appeals to the railroads had failed. It cost them $100,000, and their trains are now hauling their wheat and other produce to market. It is one of the few independent railroads in this country free from bonds or debt of any kind. And now, I am reliably informed, the two big systems with which it connects are dickering with the farmers for the purchase of their line.

With brains, push, and pluck of this sort among our farmers it never has surprised me that our sales have increased so phenomenally in the prosperous agricultural sections of this country during the past three or four years.

Now, I know that if these gentlemen had been here listening they would all go away happy. When they see by the statistics from their own bureau, by the statements and comments on the same by the president of a large manufacturing company that their condition is unparalleled, and you must admit that so far the tariff has not benefited agricultural products because a large surplus is sold abroad. I asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who is a candid man and tells the truth as he understands it, when he undertook to show that wheat was higher across the line from Canada than it was in the United States, if it was due to the existing tariff on wheat and he said it was.

Now, I want to ask anybody, inasmuch as a farm is not a manufactured product, inasmuch as wheat is an annual growth of the soil, cultivated by machinery, with perhaps the least labor cost of any crop grown on the farm, if that 10 cents a bushel—if that is what it was—higher in the United States than Canada is due to law, what do you think about such law? What do you think of a law that will tax the bread of life, the crumbs of poverty, in order to raise the price of wheat 10 cents a bushel as an advantage to the most prosperous farmers in the country? What do you think of the morals involved in such a doctrine?

My friends, such morals would lead to the levy of a tax on the crumbs from Dives's table in order to make Lazarus buy bread and not eat crumbs. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] What do you think of this when you go to church and accept your Sunday-school assignment? What do you think of coming here and undertaking to raise the price on an essential and prime necessity of life in order that the property owner, the capitalist, and the manufacturer may pinch the stomach of hunger by taking an additional penny by way of tariff profits? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If there was no other reason under heaven for voting for Canadian reciprocity than that it may make bread cheaper—which I am afraid it will not—it should command the support of every man who believes in doing unto others as he would have others do unto him.

One gentleman somewhere out in the Northwest—I do not remember his name—said that he lived in a town one-half of which was in Canada and the other half in the United States, and he knew that wheat was 10 cents higher on the American side than it was on the Canadian. Well, I suppose the boarding houses in that town are all on the Canadian side, as there is nothing to prevent people from going across and eating their dinner and lunches on the other side and coming back. My friends, you are going to keep a tariff wall raised equal to the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and applied without regard to the character of the production—to coal in the mine, to iron ore in the mine, to hides on the backs of the cattle. It was through the efforts of President Taft that we have free hides. He is entitled to the credit for it. He would not sign the bill unless we brought in a resolution putting hides on the free list. But let us carry this to its logical sequence. Let us suppose that we are in this town in Minnesota, one-half of which is in Canada—if that is where it is——

Mr. LOBECK. It is in North Dakota.

Mr. SIMS. In North Dakota; and let us suppose that there was a waterworks system on the American side and a waterworks system on the Canadian side. On account of labor on the American side being higher than on the Canadian side, and on account of the interest of capital being higher on the American than on the Canadian side, that water would be 10 or 15 per cent higher to the consumers on the American side than on the Canadian side. Suppose the Canadian water company goes over and proposes to the municipality on the American side that it serve them with water, just as good water as the American company serves, and that it will reduce the water rates 10 or 15 or 25 per cent, whatever the difference may be. Then the water company on the American side comes up and says: "Look here; we have to employ American labor, we pump our water with American labor, and we have got to pay a tariff upon the piping and upon the machinery. The American scale of wages is higher and the interest on our capital is higher, and in order to equal the difference in the cost of production of water in Canada and the United States you must not let the water come in without a tax, without a license fee that will equal this difference." What do you think of the morals involved in such a proposition as that? Is there a gentleman here who would vote against the Canadian company serving water in the United States, providing the company on the side of the United States would not reduce its prices? Is water more of a necessity than bread? You can not live without either, or some substitute. Is it any more necessary than the necessary food products of life? Yet, if gentlemen had the political power to influence that, they would put a tax on the Canadian water, all for the benefit of the laboring man—nothing for the drinking man.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the case the gentleman has described there, he never heard any of our protection friends speak of putting any protection on labor, has he? Is it not a fact that labor could go across the line from Canada and the Canadians could come across and work for the American manufacturer at any price they thought fit?

Mr. SIMS. I understand that to be the case, but all excuses so far for a protective tariff have been based on labor. Nobody pays labor any more than labor asks. As a rule nobody pays any more for labor than they can get it for, and the farmer—although he is the bone and sinew of the country—if he rents his land at a certain rental value and the price of products goes up he raises the rent, does he not? Why, down in Mississippi, in the cotton-producing sections, they used to rent the land at

so many pounds of lint cotton per acre. The low prices of cotton that came in with the McKinley administration in 1898, when cotton sold lower than at any other time before or since, the farmers made a change from a quantity of product produced to a money rent. What did they do it for? To help labor? No; to help themselves. Cotton had gone so low that the number of pounds of rent cotton did not bring what they regarded as a reasonable rent. They put a money rent on their lands, and if it took the whole crop to raise the money rent they had to pay it just the same. That is what the farmer did, and that is what the manufacturer will do. That is what all men will do generally. Cotton has now gone up very high, and instead of renting the land out at the usual money rent they used to get, they have raised the money rent from $5 or $6 per acre to as high as $10 per acre. Now, the manufacturer does the same thing. Nearly everybody will do the same thing under the same conditions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SIMS. My time is nearly out; I have not got a great deal more time, otherwise I would yield to the gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman, I see my time is going faster than I would like. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will give me a little more time, because I have something else that I desire to say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. SIMS. That is in addition to what I have, as my time has not yet expired. Mr. Chairman, we might as well speak of the facts that are now present and are going to be present. Whenever there is a prospect or probability of reducing tariff levies naturally imports are retarded, and consequently collections through the customhouses are always less when there is a possibility of reduced duties. That is perfectly natural. On the other hand, if there is tariff legislation passed like there was in 1897, which was to increase duties, imports are tremendous, and consequently customs revenues are very large. Now, the fact is that the people have said by their votes that the existing tariff law is too high and they want it reduced, and we are going to try to do it.

Naturally the importers are going to hesitate and not bring in goods, and revenues will go down temporarily and will remain so for a certain length of time, naturally, after the law takes effect, until after what is called a business adjustment takes place. So our receipts from duties are going to be less. We can not help it; it works that way naturally and can not be avoided. How are we going to meet the situation?

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman, on that point, answer this question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Revenues will go down because duties are going to be reduced. How are you going to increase the revenues on these articles in this bill?

Mr. SIMS. We are not trying to increase them.

Mr. HILL. They never will increase; no matter if the importations increase, you could not get any revenue out of——

Mr. SIMS. That is, on this bill.

Mr. HILL. And this bill covers two or three billions of consumption.

Mr. SIMS. We are proposing to reduce duties all along the line. This is only a beginning.

Mr. HILL. Of course, you get no revenue on the free list.

Mr. SIMS. I want to discuss the revenue question. Now, we all know that receipts from present sources are going to be reduced. My Democratic friends, I want you to think about this thing, as you have to meet it. I started out a moment ago by saying my friend from Connecticut does not play politics, but nothing would be better politically for the other side than to force a bond issue during a Democratic administration or Democratic rule in this House following a Democratic tariff bill. How are we going to avoid it? We can not reduce the tariff without at least temporarily reducing the income. What must we do? We must reduce the expenditures temporarily at least. Now, my friends, the little reduction we made here, a large one in the way of a percentage, in reducing the expenses of this House has been favorably received and commented upon throughout the country.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. We will increase the revenues by reducing duties on other articles. The revenues now being prohibitive, we get no revenues, but by reducing the tariff on other articles we will increase the revenues.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman is entirely correct, but it takes time. In the first place, we can not get any additional revenue due to reduced taxes until the law is passed, and not then until business is adjusted to the new conditions. What we have done in reducing expenses is only an indication of what we will do if we do what we ought to.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman permit one suggestion there? Do just what Senator Aldrich said ought to be done—reduce the expenditures of the Government $300,000,000 a year, or 30 per cent of the whole cost of the Government as now administered. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SIMS. That is just what I am going to talk about. But we can not and ought not to cripple any necessary arm of the Government service. If we do, we will get crippled ourselves.

Now, there are four sources from which reductions can be made, but they must be made by the millions of dollars and not by a few hundred thousand. What are they? We may just as well face the situation. We have got to reduce the expenses of the military establishment by millions of dollars. Let the Democratic chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs begin to reduce his next military bill so as to save millions of dollars in his next appropriation. What next? We have got to save millions of dollars in naval appropriations. Nothing is going to hurt the Democratic Party worse than a bond issue to follow our control here. What else? You can reduce by millions of dollars the next river and harbor bill, and we have got to do it. We can reduce by many millions the next public-buildings bill, and we have got to do it. We can temporarily do without an enormous increase in the naval establishment in battleships and other forms of useless war equipment. We can reduce the military establishment. But there came knocking at this door in the last session of the last Congress a bill to put the National Guard on the national payroll, and I saw Democrats run from it like they would from a bear. They were afraid of the National Guard.

My friends, whatever the merit might be in the proposition, considered as a proposition, it is not the time to add the National Guard to the Army pay roll. Whenever the Democratic experiment of tariff reduction is put to actual test, into working order, and business relations have been established, and additional money comes in, we can then talk about liberal appropriations, because we will have something to appropriate.

But, as I said when I started out, we are not limited to a tariff tax. We can resort to other taxes, as we have resorted to other taxes. Internal revenue brings, I believe, something over $300,000,000. The corporation tax brought over $25,000,000 last year. Now, my friends, there is going to be a demand, I suppose, for the passage of a general pension bill to increase the pensions of the soldiers, which will run into many millions of dollars. I have no criticism to make of the motives behind it. There were not enough gentlemen to get an aye-and-no vote in opposition to the bill that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] presented in the last Congress. If we are going to increase any kind of an expenditure by millions of dollars, we have got to raise revenue by millions of dollars to meet it.

Now, there is going to come business stagnation; it will be impossible to avoid it. Now, my friends, I want to say to every one of you here on both sides of this House that if we pass a pension bill increasing the expenditures of the Government by millions of dollars, we have got to increase internal-revenue receipts. You may just as well get ready for it. If you want to pay the soldiers more than they are now getting, you will have to tax beer more than you are now taxing it.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SIMS. In just a moment. Let me finish this first. You will have to tax intoxicating liquors more than you now tax them. You will have to tax incomes of corporations more than you are now taxing them. You will have to resort, possibly, and perhaps very justly, to a stamp tax. You may just as well get ready for it.

Now I will yield.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I want to ask you if you really say that you are giving this money to the soldiers? Is that the proposition?

Mr. SIMS. It is in legal effect a gift. It is in the nature of a gratuity. In other words, the soldier is not rendering any contemporaneous service for it.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I want to say to the gentleman that I do not consider it a gift. This is the first time I have heard it so stated.

Mr. SIMS. In legal contemplation it is in the nature of a gratuity and not an enforceable vested right.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is making an argument here that is going to lead us against the pension proposition? Does he argue for a revision of the revenue laws in order to prevent any change in the pension laws?

Mr. SIMS. I want to say to the gentleman from Indiana, in order to have a general pension bill passed and to be received in good faith we ought to have the money with which to pay the pensions, and we have got to get it by an increase in the internal revenues.

And, if we have a bond issue, the votes that will be controlled one way or the other by a pension bill will not amount to enough to offset those that we lose by the bond issue. I will not vote for it. Let me tell you why.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. If the gentleman is speaking in his own behalf, I do not care to continue the discussion. If he is speaking for the Democratic Party, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. SIMS. Everything I have said is for myself.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman should vote any way he wants to.

Mr. SIMS. I know as a rule it has been the policy here to avoid saying anything about pensions by gentlemen from the South. The reason was that we were afraid our motives would be misunderstood. My friends, the South, in so far as the consumers pay the tax, are being taxed just like the North to pay these pensions. Is not that true? In addition to that we have locally the entire burden of the Confederate pensions to bear, as you do not help to bear any of it. I do not blame you for it. I would vote against a law to put Confederate soldiers on the pension roll to-day; but we have got that burden to bear and it takes money to do it. We have to bear that burden all by ourselves and we have to help you equally to bear your burden, when you get practically all of the benefit of it. Do you blame me for saying that if we pass a pension bill we must provide additional internal-revenue taxes with which to meet the charge, because you can not do it by a reduced tariff in time to meet the additional increased pension burdens?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SIMS. I am sorry, because my subject has not half expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield one hour to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the tariff in this country is and has been always a political question. There has been more or less suggestion of taking it out of politics and dealing with it scientifically. It is possible and probable that we will gradually adopt a more perfect and scientific method of determining schedules, so as to more correctly represent the difference in cost of production in this country and abroad, but the question will continue to be a political one for at least during this generation, and the two old parties will, as they have done heretofore, differ materially and fundamentally, one standing for protection, the other for free trade or a tariff for revenue only.

Both parties believe in raising at least a portion of the revenues for the support of the Government by imposing duties on products brought in from foreign countries. We differ somewhat, upon the class of articles upon which duties shall be levied and as to the rate of duty. The Democratic Party says that duties can only be levied for the purpose of raising revenue, while the Republican Party favors a tariff that will not only yield revenue for the support of the Government, but also that it shall be so adjusted as to promote the establishment and maintenance of our industries and to protect our labor against the cheap labor of foreign countries.

The platform of the Democratic Party adopted in 1892 I think correctly states the position of that party upon the tariff question. It is as follows:

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud. We declare it to be a fundamental principal of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue only.

In our last platform we limited the rate of duty to be levied so that it should be measured by the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, allowing for a reasonable profit. For myself, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Republican Party has the advantage of position, and for one I propose to resist to the last any proposition that suggests free trade.

I care not from whence it comes or by what name it may be labeled, whether it be so-called Canadian reciprocity or a farmers' free-trade bill, confident that the ultimate judgment of the intelligent people that I have the honor in part to represent in this body will sustain me in that position, and that the people of the whole country will again declare in favor of the Republican policy of protection, as they have always done when the issue has been between protection and free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am a Republican because I am a protectionist. I believe in protection and in its fundamental principles. I am one of those who believe in the doctrine of protection as taught and advocated by William McKinley, who for so many years honorably and ably served as a Member of this body, and who later filled the high office of President with great distinction, giving to the people an administration that inspired confidence and restored prosperity to the country, and it can probably be reliably stated that in his official utterances and acts he contributed more to establish permanently the Republican policy of protection in this country than any other man during the last 50 years.

It happens, Mr. Chairman, that 21 years ago, in the Fifty-first Congress, there was being debated in this Chamber a bill known as the McKinley bill. Mr. McKinley, as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported that bill. In debating it on the floor of the House he said some things that it seems to me should be repeated and injected into this debate, because he described a condition that prevailed after 29 years of a policy of protection that still continues. He defined what protection does and what it is, and I think it very appropriate to quote briefly from that speech. Speaking of what protection has done, Mr. McKinley said:

We have now enjoyed 29 years continuously of protective-tariff laws—the longest uninterrupted period in which that policy has prevailed since the formation of the Federal Government—and we find ourselves at the end of that period in a condition of independence and prosperity the like of which has never been witnessed at any other period in the history of our country, and the like of which has no parallel in the recorded history of the world. In all that goes to make a nation great and strong and independent, we have made extraordinary strides. In arts, in science, in literature, in manufactures, in invention, in scientific principles applied to manufacture and agriculture, in wealth and credit and national honor, we are at the very front, abreast with the best and behind none.

In 1860, after 14 years of a revenue tariff, just the kind of a tariff that our political adversaries are advocating to-day, the business of the country was prostrated, agriculture was deplorably depressed, manufacturing was on the decline, and the poverty of the Government itself made this Nation a byword in the financial centers of the world.

We had neither money nor credit. Both are essential; a nation can get on if it has abundant revenues; but if it has none, it must have credit. We had neither as the legacy of the Democratic revenue tariff. We have both now. We have a surplus revenue and a spotless credit.

* * * * * * *

We lead all nations in agriculture, we lead all nations in mining, and we lead all nations in manufacturing. These are the trophies which we bring after 29 years of a protective tariff. Can any other system furnish such evidences of prosperity? Yet in the presence of such a showing of progress there are men everywhere found who talk about the restraints we put upon trade and the burdens we put upon the enterprise and energy of our people. There is no country in the world where individual enterprise has such wide and varied range and where the inventive genius of man has such encouragement.

There is no nation in the world under any system where the same reward is given to the labor of men's hands and the work of their brains as in the United States. We have widened the sphere of human endeavor and given to every man a fair chance in the race of life and in the attainment of the highest possibilities of human destiny.

WHAT FREE TRADE WILL DO.

To reverse this system means to stop the progress of the Republic and reduce the masses to small rewards for their labor, to longer hours and less pay, to the simple question of bread and butter. It means to turn them from ambition, courage, and hope to dependence, degradation, and despair. No sane man will give up what he has got, what he is in possession of, what he can count on for himself and his children for what is promised by your theories.

Free trade, or, as you are pleased to call it, "revenue tariff," means the opening up of this market, which is admitted to be the best in the world, to the free entry of the products of the world. It means more, it means that the labor of this country is to be remitted to its earlier condition, and that the condition of our people is to be leveled down to the condition of rival countries, because under it every element of cost, every item of production, including wages, must be brought down to the level of the lowest paid labor of the world. No other result can follow, and no other result is anticipated or expected by those who intelligently advocate a revenue tariff. We can not maintain ourselves against unequal conditions without the tariff, and no man of affairs believes we can.

Under the system of unrestricted trade which you gentlemen recommend we will have to reduce every element of cost down to or below that of our commercial rivals or surrender to them our own market. No one will dispute that statement, and to go into the domestic market of our rivals would mean that production here must be so reduced that with transportation added we could undersell them in their own market, and to meet them in neutral markets and divide the trade with them would mean that we could profitably sell side by side with them at their minimum price.

First, then, to retain our own market under the Democratic system of raising revenue by removing all protection, would require our producers to sell at as low a price and upon as favorable terms as our foreign competitors. How could that be done? In one way only, by producing as cheaply as those who would seek our markets.

What would then entail? An entire revolution in the methods and condition and conduct of business here, a leveling down through every channel to the lowest line of our competitors; our habits of living would have to be changed, our wage cut down 50 per cent, or upwards, our comfortable homes exchanged for hovels, our independence yielded up, our citizenship demoralized.

These are conditions inseparable from free trade; these would be necessary if we would command our own market among our own people, and if we would invade the world's markets harsher conditions and greater sacrifices would be demanded of the masses. Talk about depression, we would then have it in its fullness. We would revel in unrestrained trade. Everything would, indeed, be cheap, but how costly when measured by the degradation that would ensue. When merchandise is cheapest, men are the poorest, and the most distressing experiences in the history of our country—aye, in all human history—have been when everything was the lowest and cheapest measured by gold, for everything was the highest and the dearest measured by labor. We want no return of cheap times in our own country. We have no wish to adopt the conditions of other nations. Experience has demonstrated that for us and ours and for the present and for the future the protective system meets our wants, our conditions, promotes the national design, and will work out our destiny better than any other.

With me this position is a deep conviction, not a theory. I believe in it, and thus warmly advocate it, because enveloped in it are my country's highest development and greatest prosperity; out of it come the greatest gains to the people, the greatest comforts to the masses, the widest encouragement for manly aspirations, with the highest rewards, dignifying and elevating our citizenship, upon which the safety and purity and permanency of our political system depend.

Mr. Chairman, I stated that it seemed to me to be appropriate and proper to inject into this debate so much of the speech of Mr. McKinley as I have just read, because after the lapse of 21 years the words uttered at that time apply with the same force to-day as they did then. A little later in our history we had another discussion in this Chamber when the question at issue was the tariff. In 1897, just 14 years ago now, that debate took place. We had in that Congress and on this side of the Chamber a gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who was a great student of the principle of protection, Mr. Dingley, of Maine. Mr. Dingley, as the chairman of that committee, reported the Dingley bill and opened the debate in the House.

I am going to read a very brief statement from his speech, because it will apply with the same force now that it did when the speech was delivered 14 years ago.

Under the heading of "The problem before us," he said:

It is "a condition and not a theory which confronts us." Our problem is to provide adequate revenue from duties on imports to carry on the Government, and in imposing duties to secure this result to so adjust them as to secure to our own people the production and manufacture of such articles as we can produce or make for ourselves without natural disadvantage, and thus provide more abundant opportunities for our labor. For rest assured that no economic policy will prove a success unless it shall in some manner contribute to opening up employment to the masses of our people at good wages. When this shall be accomplished, and thus the purchasing power of the masses is restored, then, and not until then, will prices cease to feel the depressing effect of underconsumption, and the prosperity of our people rise to the standard of 1892.

The great secret of the prosperity of the United States up to 1893, especially after the resumption of specie payments in 1879, was the fact that our people were all at work at good wages, and thus had large purchasing power. It was this large consuming and purchasing power that made our markets the best in the world, that maintained prices at fair rates—in short, that made this country the admiration and envy of the world.

When, by first the anticipated and then partially realized overthrow of protection, industries were arrested, machinery stopped, wages reduced, and employees discharged through the transfer of the producing and making of part of what we had previously made to other lands, then the purchasing power of the masses was diminished and the demand for products decreased, and this gorged the markets, abnormally lowered prices, and prostrated industries and business.

He further said:

WISDOM GAINED IN THE HARD SCHOOL OF EXPERIENCE.

Mr. Chairman, the past four years have been enlightening, especially to candid investigators of economic problems. We have been attending a kindergarten on a gigantic scale. The tuition has come high, but no people ever learned so much in so brief a time. Hereafter theories, preached in however captivating language, will have to give way to the teachings of experience.

In observing this debate and in listening to the predictions that have been made on that side of the Chamber it has occurred to me that before you can get very far with the American people you must demonstrate by experience or by practice that your theories will do what you say they will. In some respects I wish that you could have your way at present and enact your theories into law, so far as the tariff question is concerned. The results would temporarily be a little hard on those of us who do not agree with you, but, in my judgment, it would again demonstrate that your theories are impracticable and that they would produce nothing but disaster to the industrial prosperity of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the same theories have been exploited, the same prophecies, the same declarations, and the same predictions have been made time and time again on that side of the House in years past that we have been listening to in this debate. In order that you may know what has been said on former occasions, I will furnish you with a few choice quotations from speeches delivered by one or two Democratic statesmen who are still preaching the doctrine of free trade; and in selecting speeches made in this Chamber when the question of the tariff was being debated I want to give you a few quotations from the speech of one who to-day is the recognized leader of his party—at least he is occupying a public position that is in importance next to the Presidency. I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the present Speaker of this House. He has been a Member of Congress for a great many years, and unless he shall be successful in being promoted to a higher place, to which, I understand, he and his friends at present aspire, I hope he may continue to be a Member for a great many years to come.

Back in 1894 the Democratic Party was in control of this House, and for the first and only time in the history of the country for a period of 50 years your party was not only in control of this House, but in control of both branches of Congress and also the Executive. You were in a position to do what you desired to do; you had it your own way. During the Congress that met in 1894 your party in control brought into the House a bill proposing to repeal the McKinley Act and to enact in its place what subsequently became known as the Wilson-Gorman Act. The distinguished Speaker of the present House took quite a prominent part in the debate on that occasion, and for fear some of you gentlemen may become too much excited over the prophecies that are being made on that side of the House in this debate that are so generously applauded, apparently laboring under the impression that they are original, I want to give you some of the prophecies and predictions made by your distinguished Speaker in 1894, and I am going to do so for the purpose of suggesting to you that if he was mistaken in the predictions that he made and that you are now repeating, possibly you may be mistaken. Referring to the Wilson bill, he said:

Its free-trade portion is its saving grace.

In other words, he declared in favor of actual free trade. Then he stated—and I apprehend from his speech there must have been something said about this Wilson bill on this side of the House, just as there has been in this debate with reference to the pending bill:

With all the faults which gentlemen have pointed out, the Wilson bill is the best revenue measure since the days of Robert J. Walker. The Republicans offered the American people a continuation of the McKinley bill, with all the miseries which it entails. On the other hand, we offer them cheaper clothing, cheaper fuel, cheaper homes, cheaper medicines, cheaper furniture, and cheaper necessaries of life.

In this debate we have substantially these statements about the benefits from free trade and how the cost to the consumer is going to be lowered without affecting the price to the producer. Referring to those who have to labor, he stated:

To them we offer steadier employment at more remunerative wages.

Well, you passed this bill and it became a law. How did it operate in practice; how did it affect the laborer; how did it affect the wages that he received, if he was fortunate enough to get any employment and receive any wages?

In the same speech he said:

I am in favor of the Wilson bill because it will unseal the fountains of our prosperity, unfetter the wheels of our factories, rekindle the fires in our furnaces, lift a heavy load from agriculture, set the woodman's ax to ringing, start the plow in fields now lying fallow, revive the music of the mechanic's hammer, and unfurl the sails of our commerce.

I am in favor of the Wilson bill because it will render our laborers independent freemen and the eager patrons of our merchants and our farmers, which God intended them to be, and not the ragged habitues of soup houses, to which pitiable condition a protective tariff has reduced them.

Why, my friends, do you think that you are the discoverers of the declarations which you have been making in this debate? They have been made in this House time and time and time again.

There is nothing new in them. You can not fool the American people any longer by such declarations and predictions.

And then he stated:

I am in favor of the Wilson bill, not because it is all my fancy had painted a Democratic revenue measure, but because it contains much that is good and forever rids us of much that is bad.

After we had had three or four years of that law which he was eulogizing, the American people were very glad of the opportunity to repudiate it, and they did repudiate it, and for all the years that have passed they have not shown any desire to want to return to such times as prevailed during the existence of the Wilson-Gorman Act.

He said further:

I am in favor of the Wilson bill because it will carry increased comfort and joy to 13,000,000 homes and ameliorate the condition of 65,000,000 American citizens.

What do you think of that prediction?

I want you to note this ridiculous statement that he made:

We put every constituent element of a house on the free list or cut it down materially. Suppose it reduces the cost of houses by one-third or one-fifth the present cost? What then? As certain as two

and two make four, there will be more houses built, for we are a home-loving, home-making people. That means more employment to architects, carpenters, bricklayers, plasterers, quarrymen, stonemasons, hod carriers, painters, glaziers, paper hangers, decorators, teamsters, lightning-rod men, and insurance agents.

That, my Democratic friends, was the prediction of your distinguished Speaker as to the effect the Wilson bill would have in encouraging home building and the employment of labor, and instead of working out in practice as he predicted, it had exactly the opposite effect.

And then he went on and said:

The people thoroughly detest the system which has made enforced idlers, unwilling loungers, and discontented tramps of brave, honest, industrious men, who naturally shrink from beggary as from the smallpox or the black pleague.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to quote further from the speech of the distinguished gentleman, made in 1894, on the Wilson bill, because I want to quote from some of his speeches made a little later, in March, 1897, when the Dingley bill was under consideration. He had considerable to say in that debate, and I will quote a few expressions therefrom:

Mr. Chairman, as an American citizen, in sympathy with the great body of the people and with five persons whom it is my duty and pleasure to support—

I assume that he was a member of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means—

I am dead against this bill. It is a vicious, a monstrous, and an unnecessary measure. As a Democratic politician, I rejoice at its passage. You are delivering yourselves into our hands. This bill in the days to come will compel every merchant in the land, Democrat, Republican, or Populist, to make a Democratic stump speech every time he sells an article over the bargain counter. And unless the Senate amends this bill largely for the better, I have no doubt that in the next Congress we will have a hundred majority in this House, and that in 1900 we will elect our candidate for the Presidency, and the people will come into their own again.

That was in 1897. He made the prophecy that in 1900 there would be 100 Democratic majority in this House, that the Democratic Party would succeed in electing a President, and yet they did not succeed in electing either the House or a President until the election of 1910, when they did succeed in getting a majority in this House. In other words, 13 years passed, and yet that prediction failed to come true, and it has not come true yet as to the election of a President.

Referring to the Wilson-Gorman bill, he said:

The trouble with the Wilson-Gorman bill was not that it contained too much free trade, but that it did not contain free trade enough.

Have you ever thought, my friends, what we would have had had that bill contained more than it did of free trade?

The thing that condemned it in public estimation was that it fell far short of the promises of the Democratic platform in 1892. The free traders in the Fifty-third Congress voted for it, with all its sins upon its head, holding our noses while we voted. We voted for it for an all-sufficient reason that, bad as it was, it was an improvement on the McKinley bill of abominations.

I suppose that when he made that statement he had reference to the bill as it came from the Senate, with some 600 to 800 amendments, which the House accepted by adopting a motion to concur. He says they held their noses when they did so, and yet his objection to it was that it did not contain enough free trade.

In that speech he predicted disaster to the country if the Dingley law should be enacted, and he denounced in pathetic terms the effect it would have upon the farmers of the country, and stated it would mean a raise of 25 per cent on everything the farmer uses in his business.

I want to particularly call your attention to the following statement of his, with reference to the farmer and how he gloried in his free-trade belief and boasted of the record of his party made in the House in 1894. It is as follows:

He can not raise wheat, corn, oats, barley, and hay now at a profit. In what condition will he find himself when he gets no more for his products, for, tariff or no tariff bill, he must still sell his stuff in the open markets of the world in competition with pauper labor.

I do not propose for any protectionists to define the principles of free traders. I am a free trader and I glory in the fact. I rejoice in the record that we free traders made in the House in 1894, in the Fifty-third Congress. I repeat, so that all men may hear, that I am a free trader and proudly take my stand with Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright, and Henry George. I may be an humble member of that illustrious company, but it is better to be a doorkeeper in the house of honest free traders than to dwell in the tents of wicked protectionists.

In describing what happened to the Wilson bill after it left the House and went to the Senate, he said:

But when it reached the other end of the Capitol it was so cut, carved, mangled, disfigured, and doctored that its granddaddy would not have recognized it had he met it face to face in the big road.

And yet he and his Democratic colleagues in the House voted to accept it in its mangled condition. In his speech of March 26, 1897, he referred to President Cleveland, the only Democratic President his party has had in 50 years, and denounced him as not being a Democrat. I can not imagine why he should have repudiated him, unless it was that he did not approve the Wilson-Gorman bill, and perhaps it was because he denominated it an act of "perfidy and dishonor." Speaking of Mr. Cleveland, he said:

Grover Cleveland is not a Democrat. As a Democrat, bred and born, understanding its tenets, loving its traditions, ready always and everywhere to battle for its principles, I solemnly declare that he never was a Democrat.

On the 6th of March, 1893, in his first official act, he startled all the Democrats in the land, and a great many Republicans, by appointing to the highest office within his gift a soreheaded Republican.

On March 31, 1897, during the discussion of the McKinley bill, he made the statement that has so often been quoted in the House as defining his position relative to the customhouses, and which I think was quoted by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in his speech this afternoon. I refer to this statement:

If I had my way to-day, sir, I would tear them all down from turret to foundation stone, for from the beginning they have been nothing but dens of robbers.

In that same speech, referring to the Republicans on this side of the Chamber, he stated:

But you will be brought to your senses when the people again get a shot at you in the year of our Lord and Master 1898.

The RECORD shows that when he made that statement there was loud laughter and demonstration on the Democratic side of the House, just as there has been applause when many declarations of a similar character have been made on that side in this debate. He concluded his speech of denunciation in the following words:

By the eye of faith I can see a million bicyclers, with pneumatic tires, riding down protection liars, because you are putting up the price of bicycles 35 per cent. The women of the land, God bless them, will make their husbands, sons, brothers, and sweethearts vote against you, because under the Dingley bill they have only one dress where they had two under the Wilson-Gorman bill.

Seven million farmers will dig you up with their hoes, plow you up with their plows, beat you with their mauls, hackle you with their harrows, hammer you with their sledges, rake you with their curry-combs, pulverize you with their disks, cut you down with their axes, split you to pieces with their frows, ride you on their barbed-wire fences, toss you with their pitchforks, grind you through their sausage mills, mow you down with their reapers, bind you up in great bundles, run you through their thrashing machines, and scatter you as worthless chaff because you are raising the price of all farming implements by 45 per cent.

Every patient forced to endure a surgical operation will loathe you because you have increased the tax on anæsthetics. Every lover of learning will detest you because you have laid a prohibitive tariff on books, thereby shutting the gates of knowledge so far as was in your power. Every child that dies of diphtheria will pass away pronouncing on you its lasting curse because you have put up the price of antitoxin. You are arraying against you every right-thinking man and woman in the land.

Since he, miscalled the Morning Star,
Nor man nor fiend hath fallen so far—

as you will fall when the people of the United States find out the numerous monstrosities contained in this bill.

Whatever you may think of your distinguished Speaker, my Democratic friends, you must admit that he has not been much of a success as a political prophet.

Another, more conservative, but able and distinguished Democratic statesman, during the debate on the Dingley bill in 1897, in predicting the result of the enactment of the measure, and I refer to Mr. BAILEY, of Texas, now a Senator from that State, said:

If it can produce the good results which its authors prophesy it will, then the people ought to have the benefit of it as speedily as possible; and if it can not produce those results, then the sooner it is tried and found wanting the sooner it will be repealed and the sooner the people will be relieved of its unjust exactions. I warn you now, that if this bill fails—as fail it will—to bring the prosperity which the Republicans have promised, you will not live long enough to obtain a patient audience with the American people upon the absurd proposition that you can make them prosperous by increasing their taxes.

Looking at the question purely as one of partisan advantage, I have every confidence that the Democratic Party will profit by the bill which you have determined to pass, because I am confident that its enactment will not bring the relief which you have promised to the people.

Now, I say to you, my Democratic brethren, you have been false prophets in the past. In a period of 50 years you have only been in full control of the affairs of this Nation for one four-year term, namely, from 1893 to 1897. With the utter failure on your part to demonstrate that your theories would work out in practice in any particular, and in view of the great disaster that resulted from the enactment into law of your theories, it seems to me as if you had better be a little more conservative in declaring what you are able to do, and you had better wait until you have demonstrated that you can successfully administer the affairs of the country, and until you do so, in my opinion, you will be unable to obtain the confidence of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I am now going to refer just briefly to the pending bill and also to the bill which was passed in the House a few days ago known as the Canadian reciprocity measure. I opposed that measure not so much because it did not go far

enough or because it is unjust and unfair to the agricultural interests of the country, but because I believed it to be un-Republican. I believed it to be, as that side of the House, I think, has admitted, a Democratic measure. In any event, in the language of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, it is the first step, as he says, toward the destruction of the principle of protection.

I am not going to repeat what I said when that bill was pending in the House, but I do want to refer to some speeches that have been made in this debate on this present bill by gentlemen who supported the Canadian reciprocity measure. Some of these gentlemen I congratulate. They are going to have the advantage of some of us regulars, because they are going to have an opportunity to distribute two speeches. In the next campaign they can circulate one speech among the farmers and another speech in the cities. In other words, they can go to their farmer constituents with the speech which they made against this bill, and then they can go to their city constituents with the speech that they made on the Canadian reciprocity measure.

There has been one speech made on the pending bill that I listened to with a great deal of interest, and it was a very able speech indeed. It was made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HARRIS]. I have listened to a good deal of the debate since this bill has been under discussion, and I do not know of any speech that impressed me more than that of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I congratulate him thereon. As I sat listening to his speech somebody remarked that he voted for Canadian reciprocity. I did not think that that could be possible, so I got the RECORD and referred to the vote, and, sure enough, it was shown that the gentleman voted for Canadian reciprocity.

Now, let me quote just a little from his speech and refer to two or three statements that I indorse. He said:

Mr. Speaker, I did not rise to engage in a general debate on the question of protection versus free trade. I content myself with saying that I am a protectionist, and desire to foster every industry that needs it in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

He said also:

I rose to say a few words, present a few figures, and show why the products of one industry should not be included in this or any other free list.

Now, my friends, that is not very consistent with his position in view of his vote on Canadian reciprocity. He said further:

If you destroy or seriously injure so great an industry, if you send our manufacturers to Canada and Germany and England, to make there, with the same machinery but with cheaper labor, and send in here free of all duty that which has been made here and has supported so many, what answer will you make to the abandoned and desperate body of workers, and what will you say to the farmer who loses so great a food market here at home when they ask you why you have done this thing? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I wonder if our Republican Massachusetts friends imagine that they can enjoy the benefits of protection on everything they produce and still take away every bit of protection that the farmers of the country have, and then expect that the farmers will continue to support them in giving protection to their industries on the mere suggestion that if our manufacturing industries are prospering then the farmer will have a good market and he does not need any protection on his products.

I want to serve notice on these gentlemen from some of these protected districts and some of these Republicans who come from Massachusetts who, I think, have been denominated as "Foss Republicans," that they have got to keep the faith in the future. I say to them you have got to meet us half way, or at least you have got to come part way, if you expect us to keep in the game. I want to remind you that you never would have had any McKinley law nor any Dingley law nor any Payne law if it had not been for the farmers of this country.

I appeal to you gentlemen who are advocating protection on what you manufacture to reciprocate if you want the farmers of the country to stand by your industries. Two years ago, when we had the Payne tariff bill under consideration, you wanted free hides. You had been clamoring for free hides for so many years that finally you brought about a revision of the tariff, and you got free hides, and the farmers and stock raisers of the country accepted it. They have gotten along; they have taken a little less price for their hides and shoes have advanced in price. And now what do you propose? You propose to take from the farmers the only protection they have on what they produce, and still you expect us here to vote with you to keep the protection upon what you manufacture. I want to give you one little quotation in regard to reciprocity, and what I think real reciprocity is.

In the earlier part of my remarks I quoted from the great speech made by Mr. McKinley in the Fifty-first Congress. I want to quote just a word that he said at that time for the reflection of some of our friends from these manufacturing districts:

No prosperity is possible to other industries if agriculture languish.

And then in that same speech he says on the subject of reciprocity:

From 1854 to 1866—12 years with reciprocity with Canada—we bought of them twice as much as they bought of us. Ninety-five per cent of their products came into the United States free of duty, while only 42 per cent of ours went into Canada free of duty. Mr. Chairman, what these other countries want is a free and open market with the United States. What we want, if we ever have reciprocity, must be reciprocity with equality, reciprocity that shall be fair, reciprocity that shall be just, reciprocity that shall give us our share in the trade or arrangement that we make with the other nations of the world.

It seems to me that is a very different kind of reciprocity than is proposed in the bill that we passed the other day.

I listened to the very able speech of my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] yesterday, and he stated that these Canadian people were very much like us; that they live as we live; that they have the same thoughts; they think as we think; they speak the same language, and therefore we ought to extend to them the same advantages that we enjoy.

It has been stated by the friends of reciprocity and by the President, I may say, that conditions in this country and in Canada are similar. In other words, he says there is no substantial difference. Now, we maintain that there is a very substantial difference, both in the value of land, in the cost of labor, and in tariff advantages that Canada enjoys. I will not stop to enumerate them. They say that because there is no substantial difference we do not need any protection on agricultural products between this country and Canada. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], or some other gentleman that is in favor of reciprocity, if through the Tariff Board you should find that the cost of producing boots and shoes in the United States is substantially the same as in some foreign country—in other words, that there is no difference, either in the cost of labor or the cost of production; that it is just about a stand-off; in other words, no substantial difference—would you then say, you gentlemen from Massachusetts, that you would remove the duty on boots and shoes? Why, certainly not. And why not? Because you would call attention to the Republican platform adopted in 1908 and you would say that the proper measure of duty is the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with a reasonable profit. Now, you do not seem to think the farmer needs any profit, just so long as everything is about equal between Canada and the United States. They think the same, they speak the same language, they have the same ambitions, they are, as the gentleman from Illinois says, very much one and the same kind of people; therefore there ought not to be any more protection between us and them than there would be between Indiana and Illinois.

I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] and to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] and to every other gentleman who made a speech or voted in favor of Canadian reciprocity and now comes in here and makes a speech against this bill and says he is going to vote against it, that, so far as I am concerned, I hope there may be unanimous consent that their apologies may be accepted. [Applause on the Republican side.] In other words, if some of these gentlemen have seen the error of their way, you on this side of the House who voted for reciprocity in the last Congress, and who voted for reciprocity in the present Congress, being a minority of your party and for the time being insurgents—I believe that has been the term applied heretofore when some Republicans have refused to follow a majority of their party—it is proper, it seems to me, to say that you were insurgents, at least so far as your action on the reciprocity pact is concerned. Now, some of you voted for reciprocity who did not believe in it. You did not hesitate at all in private conversation to say that you were opposed to it. You even went so far as to denounce it. Many of you regretted that the subject was up for consideration and that you had to vote upon it, and you so stated.

So far as these persons are concerned, I am going to forgive them, regretting, of course, that they did not possess the courage of their convictions. To those who were seriously assaulting protection by supporting the Canadian reciprocity measure, speaking for myself, you can come back into the fold. Because you left and deserted the cause in one contest is not sufficient to justify me in abandoning my principles and my ideas on this question and voting for any free-trade measure. I may say, however, that if you persist in your efforts to take from the farmers that I have the honor of representing in this body their protection, you can very soon expect retaliation on my part, and we will try to see that you get a little of your own medicine.

Mr. Chairman, we are already realizing one effect from this so-called Canadian reciprocity, and that is the effect it is having by causing a large number of our farmers to leave this country and go to Canada. It seems to me that we had better legislate to encourage our own people to remain here and settle up and develop the unoccupied lands of the West and the abandoned farms of the East and South. Only this morning I saw in a leading daily newspaper published in Minneapolis, Minn., a dispatch from Winnipeg, stating how the farmers are rushing into Canada from the United States, and I want to read it for the information of the House:

UNITED STATES LOSES MANY FARMERS; 200,000 WILL TAKE LANDS IN WESTERN CANADA THIS YEAR.

WINNIPEG, *April 29.*

Canadian Northern officials estimate that 45,000 United States farmers will settle along the lines of its railway this year. The total immigration of American farmers to western Canada, they say, will be 200,000. Four hundred thousand acres will be thrown open for settlement along the company's lines this year. Beyond Edmonton 10,800 free homesteads have been opened for settlement, and a great rush of land seekers is reported for the Peace River Valley.

I suppose some of our good friends here would say that we ought to favor this legislation in order to make it easier for those of our people who go to Canada to reside, but I think for the present we had better legislate for our own country, not but what we wish every citizen of the United States who may go elsewhere Godspeed and the best of success.

I want to say a word to those on this side of the House who have in mind voting for this pending bill, not to forget that it is a Democratic free-trade measure. You want to remember that you were not sent here to vote for any Democratic tariff bills or to support the theories of that party. Do not say that you propose to vote for this bill as a protest against those representing a minority of Republicans because they may have voted for a free-trade measure on agricultural products. Remember that that bill has not yet been enacted into law, but is now pending in another body, and with the showing that will be made by the farmers throughout the country, who are actively preparing to appear in large numbers before the Senate committee having the bill under consideration, it may never be passed, and I am sure it never will if the Republicans at the other end of the Capitol stand firmly by their convictions. In any event, let us hope the bill will fail, at least that it may be very materially amended, and then we will again have an opportunity to pass upon it here.

Remember, my Republican friends, you have got to go into a campaign in 1912. You have got to defend your acts here and the acts of your party, and I say to you that you can not consistently, in my judgment, vote for this bill merely because you are a little angry at some of those Republicans, who thought they were helping their manufacturing districts, who left their party long enough to vote for a free-trade measure.

I look upon those gentlemen I have referred to a good deal as we look upon the sinner who repents, and you know it has been said there is more joy in Heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance. [Laughter.]

Let us present the Christian spirit to our Republican sinning brethren who abandoned their principles and deserted us; let us forgive them, and inasmuch as they are now disposed to keep the faith, and by their speeches have indicated that they really are protectionists, let us stand with them, shoulder to shoulder, and to a man vote against this pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the provisions of this bill, but I find my time is expiring. It has been dissected by a number of gentlemen, particularly by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and by my own colleague [Mr. MARTIN], and there is not much more to be said about it. It is bad in form, crude in substance, and has been brought in here without any consideration by any committee, without any hearings having been had upon it, and without any definiteness as to how much it will affect the revenues. I am a protectionist, and this bill is a free-trade measure, and that condemns it with me. Some have denominated it as a sort of a soothing-sirup proposition, while the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] suggested entitling it "A bill to fool the farmers and catch Democratic votes in 1912." When he made that statement, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] proposed entitling it "A bill to repair damages," which might be a very good name for it.

There is no probability that the bill will ever become a law, and if there was, you gentlemen on that side of the House would never have brought it in here. It is a buncombe bill pure and simple, and one framed for the purpose of fooling the farmers of the country; but I want to say to you, my Democratic friends, that the American farmer of to-day is too well informed and is just as capable of knowing what is good for him as is any other citizen, and you can not fool him with any such claptrap or free-trade proposition as is embodied in the pending bill. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in opening this debate, stated how it was expected the revenue that would be lost by this bill would be made up, and, among other things, he said that the Democratic policy of lowering the duties would increase importations and thereby produce an increase of revenue. To increase importations would certainly have but one effect, that of displacing a corresponding amount of home production, thereby affecting the labor of this country; and lowering duties has not heretofore increased revenues, and I would call the gentleman's attention to the record from 1893 to 1897, which shows our receipts were $200,000,000 less than our expenditures. In other words, your theories, as I have before stated, do not work out in practice, and whenever you have had an opportunity you have been unable to make good, and you will have some trouble in getting a majority of the people to support you in the next campaign if you continue enacting bills of the character of the bill now before the House. Do not be deceived by believing that the result of the last election is an indication that the American people are going to turn to your party. My opinion is that what you offered had but little to do with the results in many of the congressional districts in the last election. I think it was due more to the fact that the people were deceived by a hostile press as to the merits of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and for that reason they remained away from the polls. Others remained away because they were satisfied with existing conditions, and you will find, if you consult the election returns, that many districts represented in the last Congress by Republicans that are now represented by Democrats, that the vote cast in the district for the successful Democratic candidate is no greater than was cast in the former election when a Republican was successful. In other words, you will find that you did not increase your vote materially, but the trouble was in the loss of the Republican vote, due, I say, to the stay-at-home voters who have often been responsible for turning an election, especially in an off year.

I have not the time to discuss your proposed remedy for dealing with the trust question, but I do not believe we have anything to fear, as the people know that protection in this country is a good thing, and they are not going to abandon it and destroy the industries of the country generally by adopting free trade, merely for the sake of hitting a few corporations that may be denominated as trusts. Furthermore, the people know that during the four years your party was in power—from 1893 to 1897—you did not enact a line of legislation dealing with the trust question, neither did you take any action to enforce existing law affecting trusts and monopolies, and they also know that the Republican Party has enacted much law upon this subject, and that during this administration and the administrations that have preceded it many prosecutions have been successfully conducted against violators of the law, and many others are now pending, and the evil is being dealt with without affecting any legitimate industry or enterprise in the country.

If I was going to give you any advice, my Democratic friends, as to what you ought to do in order to be in the strongest position in the next campaign, it would be to suggest that you adjourn this session of Congress at the earliest practicable date and that you confine your efforts in the next session to making the necessary appropriations and adjourn early, because the less legislation you enact that represents your theories of government the greater your chances will be for success in the next election.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that my time has about expired, as I would like to have gone on and discussed many of these questions more in detail, but as I have but a moment I will conclude in just a word.

For a half century, with a brief interruption, the destinies of this Republic have been shaped by the Republican Party. For 14 years last past the uninterrupted control of the government of the departments has been intrusted to this party, and under its wise policies during these years the country has experienced an industrial development, and all classes of our people have enjoyed a degree of general prosperity, that has been without parallel in all history.

I believe these conditions are due largely to the Republican policy of protection, but in any event it can not be denied that they came about contrary to Democratic prophecies and predictions. The Republican policy of protection includes the Republican policy of reciprocity, and until the present time it has never been thought to be the part of wisdom to divorce the

theories of the party in respect to these phases of its well-established policy. Hitherto these two policies have gone hand in hand and have been considered to be supplemental and not antagonistic to each other. Hitherto, when it has been proposed to apply the principle of reciprocity in a manner subversive of the principle of protection to American industry of whatever nature, the proposal has been promptly rejected.

The application of Republican principles of government, including its theories of reciprocity and protection, means opportunity for labor at good wages, markets for the products of the farms at prices which will enable the tillers of the soil to enjoy the comforts and luxuries of life enjoyed by citizens engaged in other pursuits, reasonable profits to the merchant and manufacturer, and safe and profitable investments for those who have to depend upon their savings to meet their daily living expenses.

Let us on this side of the Chamber have the courage to support the policies that are justified by experience and known to be conducive to the welfare and prosperity of our people. Let us also have the courage to resist all attacks of the opponents of the policy of protection in whatever form and from whatever source the opposition may come. In other words, let the Republicans of this body keep the faith that has been handed down to us from Lincoln to McKinley. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the charge is made repeatedly, and frequently believed, that the Democratic Party is weak in constructive ability; that it is a party of negation; that it lacks initiative and is wanting in that cohesiveness essential to prevent its falling into disorder and confusion in the face of responsibility. It is the "stock argument," the red flag, relied upon by the Republican spellbinder and press to frighten from the support of our policies the substantial business element of the country. Capital is cowardly and runs to cover at the first mention of danger. Our Republican friends, skilled in the arts of political warfare, are unfailing in their attempts to convince the public that Democratic success means business depression; that the Democratic Party is incapable of administering the affairs of this Government with that prudence and wisdom necessary to the successful conduct of an undertaking of such magnitude as involves the management of the varied and variable interests of more than 90,000,000 people. But if the potency of this time-worn charge is to be the chief reliance in the next campaign to cover up the sins of omission and commission of the Republican Party, the action of the majority of this House during the short time in which it has been in control must be a cause for unutterable chagrin and disappointment to those who expect to rely upon it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A Democratic majority, within the brief period of less than a month, has effected such reforms as to command for us as a party the respect and confidence of the American people. We have done business in a business way. We have demonstrated beyond any question our ability to measure up to the responsibility placed upon us by the electorate of the country. We have shown not only our power of initiative, but our capacity for constructive work of the highest order. We have evidenced a sincerity of purpose in the work undertaken which must be gratifying to every patriotic citizen who desires a correction of the abuses which have grown up during the 16 years of Republican control of all branches of the Government.

But most gratifying of all, we have presented to the country the example of a great political party inspired with the single thought of doing the will of the people and strong in the power which comes of harmony of purpose and unity of action. There are no factional differences on this side of the Chamber; we know the purposes for which we have been commissioned and are moving forward in unbroken phalanx to their accomplishment. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those who have sneered at the lack of cohesive strength of the Democratic Party have ceased to sneer, recognizing, as they have, that each individual of the party is willing to give up something of his own opinion for the success of the party which to him is synonymous with the good of the country. In this spirit of complete harmony, this singleness of desire, the party in this extraordinary session has been enabled to make a record for substantial constructive work unparalleled in the history of this or any other country. The most ardent partisan of the Republican faith will not dare the attempt to controvert this statement.

It is my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to review very briefly the legislation already enacted by the Democratic majority in this House, which is but an earnest of what will be done.

Ours is a representative Government—a Government of the people through their Representatives. This House is the popular branch of the Federal Congress. It is prescribed in the fundamental law that a Member of this House is the direct and immediate representative of a fixed number of people. It may be said that this House is, in fact, the entire American people assembled through their accredited agents to make such rules and regulations for their conduct as in their wisdom may be just and proper. It was designed by the fathers of the Constitution that this should be the forum in which the voice of the people might be heard and their will registered. In power, rights, and responsibility, each Representative is the peer of his associates, and any system of rules which denies to him such power, rights, and responsibility is, to that extent, a subversion of the intent of the Constitution and in like manner a denial to the people he represents of an equal voice in the conduct of the Government. That this House, under Republican control, had ceased to be a real representative body and had become a mere machine, dominated and controlled by a one-man power, alike unresponsive to the will of the people and unmindful of their demands, is a fact recognized by everyone acquainted with the situation. As a genuine representative body it had degenerated to such a degree as to become the object of ridicule and scorn. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Emboldened by successive renewals of confidence in it by the people, the Republican Party, so long in control, had constructed a system of rules for the House which robbed the individual Member of his representative capacity and lodged it in the personage of the Speaker of the House. The Speaker, through the authority thus conferred upon him to appoint all committees of the House, both of the majority and the minority parties, an authority carrying with it the power to reward his friends and punish his enemies, had become a figure all powerful, all dominating, all influential. It is a notorious fact that no proposition, however meritorious, could get before this House for consideration upon its merits except at his pleasure. The simplest resolution, involving the most minor proposition, had first to impress the Speaker favorably before that individual would permit a consideration of it by the representatives of the people.

The Speaker of the House, under its rules, had become the absolute dictator of the policy of the House. His will was law. Those who had received favors at his hands in the way of committee assignments, who had been placed in positions of prominence and influence, dared not pursue a course with reference to legislation contrary to the opinion and wish of the individual upon whose continued good will and favor their prominence in the future depended. Every act of this House during very recent years bears the unmistakable impress of the will of the Speaker. Through the influence which he exercised over the committees of his own naming, he had the power to pigeonhole legislation, to prevent consideration of it, and to thwart the will of the people. In a government of the people whose will must find expression through their representatives, if their will is to find expression at all, a system of rules which curtails the rights of the individual representatives and lodges them in any one individual is indefensible. It is a power too great to be placed in the hands of a weak man and too dangerous to be given over to a strong man. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The weak man can not use it in the interest of the people, while the strong man may use it to their hurt. I am more afraid of it in the hands of a strong man, for the tyrants of the world have been its strong men. This system, with its abuses and its dangers, has become known in the popular mind as "Cannonism," and upon the system, not the man, the Democratic Party in the last campaign and for years waged an unrelenting warfare, pointing out to the people the necessity for the restoration of the House to its real representative character. The people, quick to see and quick to resent any encroachment upon or curtailment of their rights in the administration of their own affairs, by the overwhelming defeat of the Republican Party, commissioned us, among other things, to bring about such reforms in the rules of the House as would permit their chosen Representatives to exercise their individual judgments upon all matters, without the hope of reward or the fear of punishment at the hands of any one man. To do this it was necessary to take from the Speaker the authority to appoint committees. This we have done by delegating to a committee elected by the membership of the House the authority to recommend for the final action of that body the membership of its various committees. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have made the committees responsive and responsible to the House and not to the Speaker. We have put every Representative of every congressional district in the United States, as is proper, upon a plane of absolute equality with every other Member; we have made it possible for the legislative will of every congressional district to find expression on the floor of

the House; we have made the Speaker the presiding officer and not the master of the House, and it is no longer necessary to court his favor or cringe at his knee to get consideration of propositions in which your people are interested. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have lifted the House from the low state into which it had fallen as a representative body to the high plane of a real representative body as was intended by the Constitution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

United States Senators are elected by the State legislatures. They are representatives, and it was so designed by the framers of the Constitution, of the States rather than of the people. The Senate was intended to be, as it is often designated, "the greatest deliberative body on earth," comprising in its membership the seasoned, experienced statesmanship and wisdom of the country. It was to be a check upon the sometimes too hasty actions of the less deliberative House; it was, as Washington said, "the saucer into which the hot coffee was to be poured to cool it," and, to guard it against the influences of the people, who sometimes act upon impulse rather than reason, was deliberately set apart from them and made responsible for its conduct to the States alone.

Those patriarchs of old, in giving us a Republic, launched an experiment—an experiment in the ability of the people for self-government. The experiment had never been tried before, the sea was uncharted, and wisely they, in this as in their every act, decided that complete self-government might become an instrument of danger in the hands of a people inexperienced in that art; hence, they constituted the Senate as an anchor of safety against the storms of popular passion and the designs of self-seeking and overambitious agitators. They were not confident of the fate of their experiment, nor was their faith in the capacity of the people for self-government complete.

But more than a century of experience in self-government has vanished all doubts as to the success of the experiment, and if this is in reality to be a Government of the people, for the people, by the people it follows that membership in both branches of the Federal Congress must be directly responsible to the people. The Democratic Party, believing that all authority originates in the people and that no authority is greater than the people, has for years favored the election of United States Senators by a direct vote. We believe that Senators, like Representatives, should owe their power to the people and be responsible to them for the reward for faithful or the punishment for unfaithful service. We have passed the bill and sent it to the Senate for its consideration providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people, as we promised to do in our campaign pledges and platform declarations, and we have done this by the unanimous vote of our party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We have passed the bill known as the corrupt practice act, which seeks to purify elections and prevent the use of money for the debauchery of our citizenship—a practice which has become a stigma upon the honor of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the last session of the Sixty-first Congress the Republican President of the United States sent to Congress a message conveying the information that a trade agreement had been entered into between this and the Canadian Government. The practical effect of this reciprocal pact was to lower the tariff barrier between the two countries, promoting at the same time a more friendly relationship between them. There is no more reason for a tax upon the products of the mine, field, and factory of Canada, entering into the United States than there is for a tax upon the products of North Carolina which enter the State of South Carolina. There should be no tariff wall dividing the North American Continent; certainly there should be no such dividing line between this country and Canada, whose people are similar in every respect.

The so-called reciprocity treaty is a long step in the right direction. The President requested of the Congress, both branches of which at that time was in complete control of his own party, to enact the necessary legislation to vitalize the agreement into law. A Republican House passed the bill, but only through the almost unanimous support of the then Democratic minority. A Republican Senate refused even to consider it. To this circumstance we are indebted for the present session of this Congress, and I am sure every Democrat must feel a sense of obligation to the circumstance which gives to a Democratic House its first opportunity to begin upon the enormous task of relieving the people of the heavy burdens which 16 years of Republican maladministration have laid upon them. As promptly as possible and with no effort to play politics we have passed the legislation in this House and sent it to its fate in a Republican Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] How it will fare there it is not for me to predict, but the country will understand that the Democratic majority of this House—and it is to this majority that the people look for Democratic inspiration and leadership—has fulfilled its obligation and discharged its responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, let it be borne in mind, let the country not forget, that these substantial reforms—this important work—have been accomplished without the necessity of the application of the "gag rules," so well known and relied upon under the old régime, when Cannonism was in control. No effort to prevent or limit debate has been made, the fullest freedom of discussion has been had, and the right to amend at all times has not been denied to any Member desiring to exercise it. This in itself is a reform, the significance and far-reaching importance of which time in its fullness only can show, but it means that the rights of the individual Member of this House have been restored to him.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we are about to take the next step in the Democratic program. The bill under consideration is the first movement in the direction of a real revision of the tariff in the interest of all the people of the country. It marks the beginning of a chain of events about to take place of momentous importance to the future of this Nation. It is the first shot directed against the citadel of protection, the first effort to unloose the grip of greed from the throat of the American consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It initiates an economic revolution. The Republican theory of protection is to be supplanted by the Democratic theory of a tariff for revenue. The warfare between these theories has been long and bitter. For 16 years the Republican idea has been triumphant. As the fruitage of this system trusts, combines, and monopolies have multiplied and grown strong almost beyond the power of the Government to control. The cost of living has increased enormously, while wages have failed to increase correspondingly. The few have fattened upon the toil of the many, and as a nation we have nearly substituted for the moral the material standard of living. We have learned to measure greatness and goodness by the yardstick of the dollar. We are rapidly beginning to follow the Morgan rather than the Jefferson ideal; to give ear to the voice of Mammon rather than to the oracle of justice and equality to all men, all classes, all sections. This tendency is inevitable; it is inherent in the system; it is a deep-seated cancer, insidiously, but surely, gnawing at the vitals of our Nation. The danger is too imminent to permit compromise with it; the people have directed its destruction root and branch. We are going to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The bill under consideration is a measure designed to give relief from the burdens of high protection to a large class of our people, and that, too, without regard to sectional lines. The Democratic Party has never stood for free trade. Historically and logically a large free list is un-Democratic. I quote from the Walker report, upon which was constructed the Democratic tariff act of 1846, ever afterwards recognized by Democrats as the ideal method of adjusting tariff rates for the true Democratic principles regarding the tariff:

First. That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government, economically administered.

Second. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Third. That below such rates discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties; or, for imperative reasons, the article may be placed in the list of those free from all duty.

Fourth. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

Fifth. That all minimums and all specific duties should be abolished and ad valorem duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluation, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

Sixth. That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

This bill is constructed in accordance with the principles just cited. It is not a step in the direction of free trade. There is a good Democratic reason for the inclusion in this free list of every article contained therein, either because of "imperative reasons" or "that the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section." This free list seeks not only for "imperative reasons" to relieve the tariff-tax payers of the country of some of their burdens, but at the same time carries into effect the righteous principle that these burdens shall discriminate "neither for nor against any class or section." It not only lightens the burdens of tariff taxation, but equalizes them. As the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, whose leadership of the majority in

this session has been signally brilliant and successful, said in answer to a question on April 21 of this year, speaking of this bill:

I will say to the gentleman that the bill puts on the free list agricultural implements, fencing wire, and salt and free lumber for your northern farmers. It puts on the free list free cotton bagging and free ties for the southern farmer. It puts on the free list free meat, free bread, and free salt for the people who live in the cities and who are crying for cheaper food products to reduce the cost of living.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Every section of the country is given fair treatment by this bill and the doctrine so tersely laid down by Chairman UNDERWOOD, as above quoted, is the old-fashioned Democracy to which every good Democrat may swear fealty. If I may be permitted, the same doctrine almost in identical language, was announced by me in a speech in the capital of my State on August the 20th of last year, in this language:

If the Democrats had controlled the House, and we had been called upon to frame a tariff bill, constructed along the idea of reduced expenditures and increased revenues from an income tax as a part of our plan of revenue taxation, it would have been possible to put lumber on the free list and yet work no discrimination against the taxpayers of the South. A Democratic bill would have so rearranged rates and schedules that they would have borne equitably and justly upon all sections, persons, and industries, as is repeatedly demanded in various Democratic platforms. The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, in its unjust discrimination against the South, gives the western farmer his binding twine free of duty, but puts a tax of a million dollars annually upon the bagging and ties of the people whom in part I represent. A Democratic bill would have given the western farmer free binding twine, the southern farmer free bagging and ties, and the lumber consumer along the Canadian border line free lumber; and here is a practical illustration of how these duties may be equalized under a Democratic system, with equal advantage to every and special hurt to no section.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Existing rates on many of the articles carried in this free list are revenue producing and therefore Democratic, but I support this bill notwithstanding that fact, because it in effect equalizes, without regard to class or section, the burdens of tariff taxation. It gives to the great producing class of this Nation upon whom depends its prosperity—the farmer—the implements of his profession free of taxation and opens up to competition his market for their purchase. The duties upon agricultural implements—and these duties measure the benefit to the Treasury of the United States—amount to a little more that $12,000 annually. The revenue is practically nothing, because the rate of duty evidently is sufficiently high to prevent importations. The fact is that our manufacturers of agricultural implements of all descriptions have become able, under high protective duties, not only to control the domestic market, but to sell their products in foreign markets at prices lower than they sell them to the domestic purchaser. Every section of the country—North, East, South, and West—is to the extent of its agricultural population an equal beneficiary under the terms of this bill.

The bill puts upon the free list cotton bagging and cotton ties. Already the binding twine of the western farmer is on the free list, and there can be no reason that the cotton producer, the fruits of whose labor make the balance in favor of the United States in her international trade relationship, whose toil gives to the world its chief clothing material, and who, though of the South, should not be entitled to fair and equal treatment with all other sections of the country, as is provided in this bill, which gives him the baling material for his crop free of taxation, saving him an annual burden of $1,000,000.

Leather, boots and shoes, harness, and saddlery are put upon the free list. There is imperative necessity for this. Hides are already on the free list, and, in addition to this fact, free boots and shoes will inure to the benefit of all classes of people in all sections of the country—the farmer, the hod carrier, the blacksmith, the clerk, all classes, are equally to share in the saving of nearly $100,000 annually which they now pay upon these articles.

The duties on barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, and so forth, amount to $514,000 a year as the tax which the consumers of these artices contribute to the support of the Government. All of these are placed upon the free list, which will mean a saving in taxation of more than half a million dollars to those who use fence wire and similar articles. Here, again, every section of the country, in proportion to its consumption of these articles, is the equal beneficiary of this proposed legislation. No one section is singled out; every section is included.

The ad valorem rate of duty upon fresh and preserved meats is 21.71 per cent, while the duty derived upon importations of fresh and preserved meats amounts to about $160,000 annually. The rate upon flour, cereals, and bread is 23.96 per cent, and the duties collected for 1910 are $273,746. Both classes of these food products, essential necessities of life in every family, rich or poor, North or South, East or West, are put upon the free list. Democratic justness again.

Sewing machines, the necessity for which exists in every home in the country, are put upon the free list. Our manufacturers of sewing machines have for years sold them in foreign markets cheaper than in the domestic markets, and there can be no just reason, either from a Republican or Democratic viewpoint, for the continuance of a tariff tax upon them.

Salt is a prime necessity of life. Every family uses it. It has never been regarded by the Democratic Party in its history as a proper subject for tariff taxation. The father of the Democratic Party, Mr. Jefferson, recommended the "suppression of the duties on salt," and Mr. Walker, in his report, says, "Salt is a necessary of life, and should be as free from tax as air or water." This bill puts salt on the free list in accordance with the Democratic theory and practice, although the Payne-Aldrich Act carried an ad valorem rate of 50.96 per cent upon it.

Lumber, laths, and shingles are put upon the free list, although the ad valorem rate on these articles is only 8.57 per cent, while the revenue to the Treasury from these duties is $1,918,803 annually. Certainly the rate of duty is not prohibitive, for the revenue produced is considerable. The nonsectional character of this bill is shown perhaps most unmistakably by the fact that the territory to be benefited by the removal of the duty on lumber, laths, and shingles is limited to a very narrow strip along the Canadian border line. It is easy to prove that the great body of consumers of lumber throughout the country can not and will not, under the laws of trade, benefit by the removal of this tax. Certainly the people of my section, those who buy lumber, will not feel the results of it, and yet in that spirit of fairness to all sections, according to the Democratic idea in the fixing of tariff rates, we propose in this bill to help the consumers of lumber along the Canadian border line to the extent of the remittal to them of the tax which they now contribute, through the duties on lumber, to the Federal Treasury.

Briefly summarized, the effect of this bill will make agricultural implements free of tariff taxation to the farmers of every section; cotton bagging and cotton ties free of tariff taxation to the southern farmers; sacks, burlaps, gunny cloth, and materials used in the making of bags and sacks for fertilizers and farm products free of tariff taxation to all the farmers; leather, boots and shoes, harness, saddles, and saddlery free of tariff taxation to every section of the country; barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, and so forth, free of tariff taxation to all consumers; fresh and preserved meats, flour, cereals, and bread free of taxation to every American home; sewing machines free of taxation to all; salt free of taxation to every household; and lumber, laths, and shingles free of taxation to those living along the Canadian border line.

The revision thus far attempted is in literal accordance with Secretary Walker's sixth principle for the levying of tariff taxes, "that the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section." There is not a fair-minded man in the House who can successfully controvert this fact, and it is surprising to hear the criticism that this bill is sectional in its character—a criticism unjust and without foundation. No section, class of people, nor industry is discriminated against, nor is there any discrimination in favor of any section, class of people, or industry. Equal and exact justice is meted out to all alike.

The bill comes to the House with the unanimous support of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, and will receive the unanimous support of every Democrat of the House. Whatever opposition develops will come from those who are wedded to the god of protection and who, consciously or unconsciously, have served the trusts so long they have forgotten how to serve the people. But over their protests, in the face of their opposition, this House, commissioned by the people to revise the tariff, is going to pass this bill, confident in its fairness and justice to all sections and that it will prove of substantial benefit to the people.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, as I have already stated, the passage of this bill marks the beginning of a chain of legislative events of vast importance. The tariff system is so interwoven into the warp and woof of the industrial life of the Nation that it is the part of wisdom to go about its revision sanely and conservatively and gradually, but in due time we shall revise other schedules in such manner as to cause the least business confusion, so adjusting them as to equalize taxation to all, and destroying as completely as possible the abuses, discriminations, and iniquities of the present law, whose revision the people demand. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, every American citizen who holds his country's welfare above that of mere party advantage must be gratified at the swift progress made by the Representatives of the Democratic Party in this House toward the redemption of the promises made to the people through the party platform. In the short time that has elapsed since the assembling of this extra session we have proven to the people, by the legislation passed, that party platforms are something more than mere platitudes framed to win support at the polls. We have shown that the restoration of the Democratic Party to complete power in all the departments of our Government, legislative and executive, will mean that preelection pledges made to the people will be faithfully and honestly kept. This is in strong contrast with the action of the Republican Party in the extra session of two years ago, when a Republican House and a Republican Senate were called into extraordinary session by a Republican President for the purpose of redeeming a solemn promise to revise the tariff downward, and after a session of six months' duration shamelessly repudiated the solemn pledge made to the people by passing the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act, which increased rather than decreased the burdens of tariff taxation. This prompt action on the part of a Democratic House at this session is but a manifestation of what a Democratic House will do two years hence in the interest of the people, when fortified and sustained, as it will be, by a Democratic Senate and a Democratic President.

A little house cleaning in governmental affairs now and then is a mighty good thing. This fact was never more clearly demonstrated than at the opening of the present Congress, when the Democrats came into control of the House for the first time in 16 years. It was found that during those years the Republican Party had created at least 98 useless jobs connected with the House organization alone, and that these jobs were filled by political favorites, who did but little, if anything more, than draw their salaries and get in each other's way in the transaction of the business of the House. We had promised the people retrenchment in governmental expenditures.

The pruning knife was promptly applied to all of these useless jobs and the result is that over $182,000 a year, or more than $580 for every working day in the year, has already been saved to the people in the organization of the House alone. And it may be safely predicted, Mr. Chairman, that the same care and scrutiny will be shown when the House comes to make up the appropriations for the various departments of the Government, and that all useless and unnecessary offices will be abolished and the expenses of the Government will be reduced in so far as it can be done without injury to its actual necessities and without denying to every employee the right to a fair and just wage for the services performed. It remains to be seen whether a Republican Senate will join a Democratic House in its effort to restrict and reform the enormous expenditures of our Government. If not, then the people will know whom to hold responsible.

The Democratic Party has always stood for a government which should be in the strictest sense responsive to the will of the people. And when it became apparent that the United States Senate was no longer regardful of the popular will; when it appeared that great legislative reforms were initiated and passed by the House only to be put to sleep in some committee of the Senate, the Democratic Party was first to declare for an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators should be elected by a direct vote of the people and thus brought in close contact with the people. And this Democratic House has kept that pledge in the letter, and in the spirit, by passing, as its first measure, a bill providing for the submission of such a constitutional amendment. And it is now up to a Republican Senate and a Republican President as to whether the people shall be denied the privilege of incorporating in their organic law the right to choose their Senators at the ballot box, and thus have a Senate as well as a House truly representative of the people and responsive to their will. And it may be interesting as a matter of history to say just here that the only President who ever recommended this reform in a message to Congress was a Democrat and a Tennesseean.

Andrew Johnson when a Member of this House introduced two resolutions providing for the submission of such an amendment. Later on, in 1860, while serving as a Senator from Tennessee, he introduced a similar amendment. And afterwards, when he became President, in 1868, he urged Congress to submit such an amendment to the people.

The principal question, Mr. Chairman, now agitating the public mind is that of tariff revision. Taxation of all the people for the benefit of a part of the people, or of a particular class, is wrong in theory and in principle. No taxes should be levied which are not for the common benefit of all. A system of tariff taxation which has for its sole object the protection of some industry from foreign competition must, in the nature of things, bear heavily upon that class of citizens who consume the products of such industry. Such a policy is not only un-Democratic, but it is violative of the spirit of fair play and equal opportunity which should obtain in a free and republican form of government. This was the issue upon which the Democratic Party rode into power in the last election. The people have grown tired of a policy of tariff legislation which has had an eye single and alone for the great manufacturing interests, and which has not taken into consideration the interest of the farmer, the wage earner in the mine and in the factory, and the other great consuming classes of our country. The people are opposed to a policy of exclusion which has placed restrictions upon trade and brought about artificial conditions which have destroyed competition in those articles of commerce which are necessary for the life, comfort, and happiness of all the people. The Republican Party, notwithstanding its solemn pledge to revise the tariff downward, and thus give relief from some of the burdens which are now resting upon the consuming classes of the country, failed to afford relief in the extra session of two years ago, and the people have turned to the Democratic Party as the only source from which this relief can be expected.

The pending bill, which undertakes to put agricultural implements, cotton bagging and ties, wire fencing, boots and shoes, fresh and preserved meats, flour, cereals, bread, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles which enter into the use and consumption of the farmer and of the consumer on the free list is the first of the measures proposed by the Democrats as a part of their plan to lower the tariff to a revenue basis. It is in harmony with the Democratic principle that the tariff should be made as low as possible on the prime necessities of life, and as high on the luxuries of life as is consistent with the object of raising the greatest amount of revenue. It comes as a companion bill to the reciprocity bill, which was recommended by the President, and which passed the House a few days ago, and is now pending in the Senate. There are those on the other side of this Chamber, who opposed the reciprocity bill because they said it did an injury to the farmer, in that it took the tariff off of his products and permitted Canada to import such products into this country free of duty. It struck me as passing strange, Mr. Chairman, that those who opposed most strongly that bill, because they claimed it would hurt the farmer, were those who have always stood for high protective duties upon the things which the farmer has to buy, particularly lumber and steel products. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No one, I dare say, ever heard them before lift up their voices in behalf of the farmer. And I have a suspicion that amounts to a certainty, that their solicitude for the farmer, and their opposition to that bill did not arise because it placed farm products from Canada upon the free list, but because it admitted lumber from Canada into this country free and reduced the duty on wire fencing and agricultural implements from Canada, thus furnishing competition with the Lumber Trust, the Steel Trust, and the Farm Implement Trust, thereby insuring cheaper materials to the home builders and the farmers of this country. And I wish to say to these gentlemen that if they really desire to legislate in behalf of the great American farmer, without regard to section or locality, the farmer of the North, the South, the East, and the West, then they should support the pending bill, which admits free of duty from all the world articles used by the farmer, thus bringing about a competition which will reduce the price which the farmer is now compelled to pay for these various articles, so necessary in the cultivation of his farm.

But, Mr. Chairman, I dare say that you will hear nothing from these gentlemen in behalf of the farmer while this bill is pending. They will not support it, for their solicitude for the farmer is not one-half so great as their desire to save harmless the great interests, which the passage of this bill will affect. In recommending the passage of the reciprocity bill, the President has admitted what Democrats have always contended, that is, that the tariff placed upon farm products, such as wheat, corn, barley, oats, etc., was of no advantage or profit to the farmer, and did not serve to increase the value of his products one farthing. Otherwise, the President, who is a protectionist, and believes in the policy of protection as applied to all American industries, is in the position of insisting that a high tariff should be maintained upon the manufactured products for the benefit of the manufacturer, and that the farming classes, numbering 30,000,000 of our population, should be denied equal benefits under our laws. But, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we live in a country of such great agricultural resources, both in fertility of soil and climatic advantages, that

we produce more than we need for home consumption and export every year great quantities of wheat, corn, and other products of the farm, proves beyond controversy that the tariff has absolutely nothing to do with the fixing of the price of our farm products. The price is fixed in the market, which takes our great surplus, where it comes into competition with like products from other countries. In the last 10 years we exported and sold abroad $1,975,278,025 worth of breadstuffs made from farm products. We exported and sold abroad during the last 10 years 812,239,651 bushels of wheat, and, in addition thereto, 144,945,543 barrels of flour. During the same years we exported and sold abroad 750,074,873 bushels of corn, and, in addition thereto, 5,402,383 barrels of corn meal. These facts show beyond any controversy that the prices obtained for these products abroad fixes the prices which the farmer obtains at home for their farm products, and that the tariff placed on farm products, and which has been removed in so far as Canada is concerned by the passage of the Canadian reciprocity treaty, has had absolutely nothing to do with the fixing of the prices of farm products.

The tariff on farm products was levied by the Republican Party simply for the purpose of justifying in the minds of the farmers the excessively high duties which are maintained on the articles of manufacture which the farmer has to buy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is simply a sham and a fraud on the part of the Republican Party to deceive the farmer and make him believe that he is sharing some of the benefits from the protection accorded to the protected industries of this country; that while, on account of the high tariff on those things which he has to buy, he is forced to pay more to the Implement Trust for his agricultural implements and more to the Woolen Trust for his clothing, and more to the Lumber Trust for his lumber, and more to the Leather Trust for his leather and his harness and saddles, and more for his boots and shoes, and all other necessities of life, he nevertheless reaps some of the benefits of protection through an increased price for his wheat and other products by virtue of the tariff duty which is levied on the imports of such products. But the utter fallacy of such an idea is apparent from the fact that we scarcely import any farm products, and that our exports, which are enormous, come into competition with similar products from other countries in the markets of the world, which fixes the price of our home market. The American farmer sells the product of his energy and toil in an open market, where he comes in competition with every farmer in the world. But when he comes to buy what he needs he is compelled to do so in a restricted and protected market. When he buys his hoe and his ax, which he uses daily; when he buys his plow, his harrow, his cultivator, his drill, and the other implements and tools with which he prepares his land and cultivates his corn, his wheat, his tobacco, and the other products of his farm; when he buys his harness and bridles, which he uses on his stock; when he and the laboring and consuming classes of this country buy boots and shoes for themselves and their families; when he and they buy the clothing which is necessary for their comfort and protection and that of their children, it is necessary for them to contribute 10, 20, 30, and even 40 per cent and more of the value of the articles to the manufacturer, who is protected from outside competition by a tariff tax of that amount. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The amount of such tariff tax is not paid into the Public Treasury, as is shown by the great amount of exports of these commodities. It goes into the pockets of the manufacturer, who has taken advantage of the fact that he is protected from outside competition and has formed combinations at home to annihilate home competition. The laborer and the wage earner in the mine and in the factory, in whom the Republican Party professes to be so much interested and with whom and whose interest it always seeks to conjure in the effort to cover up the real object and purpose of the protection policy to shut out foreign competition and swell the profits of the manufacturer, is also compelled to buy the necessaries of life in a high-protected market. There are no compensatory benefits for him. His wages have not kept pace with the increased cost of living and have not equaled the increase of profits which the manufacturer has enjoyed. The Republican Party believes in protecting his employer from competition with the foreign manufacturer, but it has made no effort during the long years of its complete control of the Government to protect the home laborer and wage earner from the great influx of cheap foreign labor which is coming into this country annually, practically unrestricted. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, consistency, thou are indeed a jewel! For whose benefit, Mr. Chairman, has this policy of shutting out foreign competition in the necessaries of life been engrafted on our statute books? The question answers itself. It is for the benefit of those great corporations which, under the shadow of the high-tariff wall, have been enabled to combine and monopolize the manufacture and sale of the farmer's tools of trade and those things which constitute the actual necessaries of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Take, for instance, the Farming Implement Trust. This great combine supplies the home market, and in 1910 shipped abroad products of its factories amounting to $28,124,033. Nearly one-fourth of its entire output is sold abroad. It is able to compete in the markets of the world with the foreign manufacturer, but is unwilling for the tariff on its products to be removed and to come into competition with them at home. As a result for a number of years it sold its products cheaper abroad than at home.

The result is that the foreign farmer uses American-made implements, purchased at a cheaper price than they are sold to the American farmer, to cultivate his crops, and then sells his products in the same market in competition with the American farmer. Mr. Chairman, there could be no more striking illustration of the unwise, unjust, unequal, and unpatriotic effect of the present high tariff on agricultural implements. If this great International Harvester Trust had been selling to the American as cheap as to our foreign competitors, millions of dollars would have been saved to the American farmer. Harvesting machinery has steadily increased in price to the American farmer, while it has decreased in every other country of the world. In support of this proposition I quote from the minority report of the Select Committee of the United States Senate on Wages and Commodities, filed June 23, 1910:

While everywhere else in the world the price of harvesting machinery has been appreciably reduced since 1900, in the United States it has been materially increased. In fact, the increase really started nearly contemporaneously with the Dingley tariff. In spite of the high protective tariff on this class of machinery and of the fact that machinery of American origin had to pay, until recently, a much higher duty in France than did machinery of German, Belgian, Austrian, or English origin, this combine sold its machines in open competition and at a lower cost than any other like machinery was sold in France. The fact is, they were satisfied with a comparatively small profit on their European sales as long as they had a free hand and could charge the American farmer any exorbitant price they deemed expedient. Not only this, but they made the terms and conditions of sale very burdensome to the American purchasers. It was shown before the committee that harvesters were bought before the trust was formed at $86 and that they advanced the price to $125, an advance of over 45 per cent. So binders have advanced from $100, the already high price of 1900, to $130 in 1910. Of course they were safe behind a tariff wall of 20 per cent ad valorem and high freight rates from abroad, together with the almost insurmountable difficulty of getting repairs when needed.

I also read from the majority report of that committee, which was prepared by Senator LODGE, whom everyone will admit is good Republican authority, and presented to the United States Senate on June 23, 1910. I dare say no gentleman on the other side of the Chamber will assert that he is not a good Republican authority. He says, speaking of the International Harvester Trust:

While industrial combinations may result in economies of production and distribution, the fact that competition is either wholly or partly removed leads to abuses. Thus, according to witnesses who testified before the committee, the International Harvester Co. has not only unreasonably advanced the price of self-binders, but have changed the method of sale in such a way as to result in many cases in a loss to farmers. Before the organization of the International Harvester Co. the local dealer selling the binder sent a mechanic to "set up" the machine and to remain a few hours until the machine was running smoothly, and in case repairs were needed they were supplied immediately from the stock of the local dealer. Since the organization of the International Harvester Co. the machine when purchased by the farmer is sent "knocked down" to his nearest railroad station, and the farmer must set up his machine, and in case repairs are needed the machine is idle until the repairs are forwarded by express from the branch house, usually located in some large city and not necessarily convenient to the grain section.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert some tables set forth in the majority report referred to, which show how rapidly the price of farming implements has been advanced to the American farmer in the last 10 years in every section of the country.

Prices paid by farmers for farming implements and supplies.
[Statement submitted by C. W. Robertson, Abingdon, Ill.]

Years.	Binders.	Mowers.	Two-horse wagons.	Wheat drills.	Plows, disk.	Plows, gang.	Harrows.	Farm harness, per set.
1910	$120.00	$45.00	$65.00	$85.00	$56.00	$56.00	$20.00	$40.00
1909	120.00	45.00	65.00	85.00	56.00	56.00	20.00	38.00
1908	120.00	45.00	60.00	82.50	55.00	55.00	20.00	35.00
1907	120.00	45.00	60.00	82.50	55.00	55.00	18.00	32.50
1906	115.00	43.00	57.50	80.00	55.00	55.00	18.00	32.50
1905	115.00	43.00	55.00	80.00	55.00	55.00	18.00	32.50
1904	110.00	40.00	55.00	80.00	52.00	52.50	18.00	30.00
1903	110.00	40.00	53.00	80.00	52.50	52.50	18.00	30.00
1902	110.00	40.00	53.00	77.50	50.00	50.00	18.00	30.00
1901	110.00	40.00	52.00	77.50	50.00	50.00	18.00	30.00
1900	110.00	40.00	50.00	75.00	50.00	50.00	18.00	30.00

Prices paid by farmers for farming implements and supplies—Continued.

[Statement submitted by John H. Sheppard, Fargo, N. Dak.]

Years.	Binders.	Mowers.	Two-horse wagons.	Wheat drills.	Harrows, disk.	Plows, gang.	Harrows.	Binder twine, per pound.	Farm harness, per set.
1910	$130	$50.00	$75	$118	$35	$70.00	$34	$0.11	$35.00
1909	130	50.00	75	117	35	69.50	34	.11	34.50
1908	130	50.00	74	116	34	69.00	32	.11½	33.00
1907	120	47.50	74	114	34	68.00	30	.12	32.50
1906	120	47.50	73	112	33	68.00	30	.12	32.00
1905	120	47.50	70	112	33	67.00	28	.12½	31.50
1904	120	47.50	68	110	32	67.00	28	.12½	31.00
1903	120	47.50	65	110	32	66.00	28	.13	30.50
1902	100	45.00	64	110	32	66.00	28	.13	30.00
1901	100	45.00	63	110	30	65.00	28	.13½	29.50
1900	100	45.00	60	110	30	65.00	28	.13½	29.00

[Statement submitted by R. P. Stackhouse, Dillion, S. C.]

Years.	One-horse plows.	Two-horse plows.	Harrows.	Mowers.
1910	$1.50	$6.67	$18.50	$42.50
1909	1.50	6.67	18.50	42.50
1908	1.35	6.67	17.50	42.50
1907	1.25	6.35	17.50	42.50
1906	1.20	6.35	16.50	37.50
1905	1.10	4.65	16.50	37.50
1904	1.10	4.65	15.00	35.00
1903	1.00	4.50	15.00	35.00
1902	1.00	4.50	15.00	35.00
1901	1.00	4.50	15.00	35.00
1900	1.00	4.50	15.00	35.00

[Statement submitted by J. C. Hickey, Henderson, Tex.]

Years.	Farm wagons.	Wagon harness.	Fertilizer.
		Per set.	*Per ton.*
1910	$70.00	$40.00	$25.00
1909	67.50	40.00	25.00
1908	65.00	40.00	25.00
1907	63.00	35.00	20.00
1906	60.00	35.00	20.00
1905	60.00	35.00	20.00
1904	57.50	35.00	20.00
1903	57.50	30.00	20.00
1902	55.00	30.00	20.00
1901	55.00	25.00	20.00
1900	55.00	25.00	20.00

[Statement submitted by J. C. Hickey, Henderson, Tex.]

Years.	One-horse plows.	Two-horse plows.	Harrows, disk.	Mowers.
1910	$2.50	[1] $7.50–$10.00	$27.50	$55.00
1909	2.50	([2])	27.50	55.00
1908	2.50	([2])	27.50	50.00
1907	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00
1906	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00
1905	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00
1904	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00
1903	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00
1902	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00
1901	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00
1900	2.00	([2])	25.00	50.00

[1] According to size. [2] No change in retail price on this line of plows.

[Statement submitted by J. C. Hickey, Henderson, Tex.]

Years.	Binders.	Mowers.	Two-horse wagons.	Wheat drill.	Plows, disk.	Plows, gang.	Harrows.	Binder twine, per pound.
1910	$130.00	$45.00	$65.00	$75.00	$16.00	$65.00	$12.00	$0.10
1906								.15
1900	110.00	40.00	55.00	65.00	14.00	55.00	10.00	

These tables speak for themselves. They show how persistently the manufacturer has advanced each year the price on all the implements and machinery used by the American farmer. We read much, Mr. Chairman, of the increased price and value of farm products, but we hear little of the manner in which the farmer is robbed of the fruits of his toil and the benefits of the increase by the action of this great combination in increasing the price of what he has to buy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There are two remedies for this situation, and both should be applied. These unholy combinations in restraint of trade and for the stifling of competition should be prosecuted in the courts and broken up, and, if necessary, to make the job complete and effective, those responsible for them should be put in jail. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The other remedy is to let the tariff bars down so that we may have full and free competition by the foreign manufacturer with the home manufacturer, just as is done in Europe, where the farmer reaps the benefits of the competition. This is exactly what the pending bill proposes to do, and in the interest of our farming population, numbering over 30,000,000 people, nearly one-third of our entire population, it ought to be enacted into law.

As long as our country shall remain so fertile and fruitful as it is to-day the American farmer can receive no benefits from a protective tariff on his products. He wants none. He asks none. All he wants is a square deal and a fair and equal opportunity. He only asks, and he has the right to demand, that this Congress shall pass this bill, which will at least put him on an even footing with his foreign competitors and will deprive the manufacturers of the tools which he uses the privilege of placing an arbitrary and exorbitant price upon them for the purpose of enriching themselves at his expense.

Mr. Chairman, I was surprised the other day to hear my distinguished friend Mr. MOORE, who so ably represents the city of Philadelphia upon this floor, in the course of a very able and interesting argument in opposition to this bill, and while engaged in a short colloquy with my colleague from Tennessee, say that he regretted that the boys who live in my colleague's district could not enter the factory where they might earn $3 per day. That was an amazing statement, coming as it did from a representative of a great city. One of the greatest problems of to-day is the congestion of the population of our large cities. Young men are leaving the farms of their fathers and are crowding into the cities, where they earn less and enjoy the pleasures of life less. This presents a serious question, to which statesmen and economists are directing their attention. One solution of the problem is to pass legislation which will give to the farmer an equal opportunity in the battle of life. The trouble lies, to a large extent, in the fact that the party to which the gentleman holds allegiance has enacted legislation solely with reference to the interest of those from whom the farmer has to buy and with no regard to the interest of the farming and consuming classes of this country. By such legislation great fortunes have been built up for the few at the expense of the many. The farmer grows his wheat, his corn, his tobacco, and his other products only to see the real fruits of his labor enjoyed by the speculators. If the value of his product increases, he finds that the value of those things which he has to buy in order to produce his crops and to clothe and sustain his family have increased in greater proportion. This condition is a most severe indictment against the policy and conduct of the Republican Party, for it is in large part due to the legislation enacted in a government to which the farmer is the hope of the future, as he has been its chief reliance in the past. The gentleman, with just pride, commented on the growth of the population of his city and its great corporate wealth. He spoke of the smokestacks of its factories and of the wage earners who are given employment therein.

But he must not forget that these things would not have been possible had it not been for the farmer who feeds the inhabitants of his great city. He should not forget that if it was not for the farmer in Tennessee and the other great agricultural States of this Union his city and the other great cities of this country would be depopulated. Let the farmer's boy take his advice and leave the farm for the factory and it will be necessary to shut the doors of the shops and close down the factories of which he boasted. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I wish to urge the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber, who have had a majority in this House for so long and have passed no legislation for the relief of the farmer, to give their support to this bill, which seeks to give to the farmer his tools untaxed and unmonopolized.

But, Mr. Chairman, while this bill has been called the farmers' free-list bill, its passage will be of benefit to the wage earner and the consumer in the city. It places fresh and preserved meats, flour, cereals, and bread upon the free list. It places leather and its products, made from cattle hides and cattle skins, also harness and saddles and boots and shoes, on the free list. The tariff now levied on these articles is a tax which the consumer must pay. As in the case of agricultural implements, the importations of this class of products are insignificant, and this tariff tax goes into the pockets of the manufacturer instead of into the United States Treasury. Two years ago hides were placed on the free list by the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act in order that the New England manufacturers might obtain raw material from Argentina and other South American countries at the lowest possible cost. I recall that

the hearings before the Republican Ways and Means Committee disclosed that some of the leading manufacturers argued that if they were permitted to bring their hides into this country free of duty no duty would be required on boots and shoes, because with cheap raw material the manufacturer would be able to compete with the world.

There can be no doubt about his ability to do so, for last year boots and shoes to the value of $13,216,000 were shipped abroad to foreign countries, where they came into competition with those of foreign make. Why, then, should a tariff be maintained on boots and shoes, or upon leather goods, when $51,123,000 worth of the latter was exported last year? If the American manufacturer can pay cost of transportation abroad and compete with the foreign manufacturer in foreign markets, why can he not compete with the foreign manufacturer in our home markets? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why maintain a tariff duty upon boots and shoes and leather goods which simply enables the home manufacturer to exact an exorbitant price from the home consumer? Two years ago the Democrats proposed to place boots and shoes on the free list, but the proposition was defeated by the Republicans who framed and passed the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act. Cheaper hides did not mean, therefore, cheaper leather goods and boots and shoes, but it meant greater profits for the manufacturer. He derives a double profit by this legislation, for he gets his raw material cheaper and a tariff on his products enables him to keep up the price of boots and shoes to those who wear them. He is enabled to manufacture his boots and shoes cheaper, but the consumer, for whom we ought to legislate, derives no benefit therefrom. Let us pass the pending bill and remove the duty on harness and saddles and boots and shoes, so that the masses of the country may reap the benefit of the cheaper cost of production rather than the manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The pending bill permits lumber to come into this country from Canada and other countries free of duty. This is in accord with the Democratic platform of 1908, which declared for free lumber in the interest of the home-building citizens of our country. There is no greater necessity. The timber of this country has been gradually cornered until it is now largely in the hands of great corporations, which largely control its price, protected as they are from possible competition from abroad on account of excessive tariff rates.

This product of our forests ought to be as cheap as it is possible to make it, for it affects every home-building citizen alike. We should, in so far as we can do so by legislation, give the fullest opportunity to every citizen who has the laudable desire to build and live in his own home. There should be no tax upon the material out of which the homes of this Nation are builded, for it is the home which guarantees the permanency of our free institutions. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those who believe in an extensive free list. As a general proposition, I believe that every commodity which is imported should bear its just proportion of the burdens of government. But, sir, there are exceptions which should be made, and I believe that this bill should pass. I understand it to be sound Democratic doctrine to place upon the free list articles which enter into competition with trust-controlled products and those necessaries of life which the American manufacturer sells abroad more cheaply than he does at home. The Democratic Party in its national platform of 1908 declared:

> Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list; material reduction should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home.

I favor this bill because it embodies these principles. I favor it because I believe that its enactment will redound to the best interest and to the material welfare of the farmer and the consuming classes of this country. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I am not a free trader, but a protectionist of the school and faith of Abraham Lincoln, who said:

"I don't know much about the tariff, but I know this much: When we buy manufactured goods abroad, we get the goods and the foreigners get the money. When we buy the manufactured goods at home, we get both the goods and the money."

There are two kinds of tariff in the United States:

1. A free-trade tariff.
2. A protective tariff.

A free-trade tariff, or tariff for revenue only, has been and is the policy of the Democratic Party.

A protective tariff has been, is now, and I hope ever will be the cardinal principle and policy of the Republican Party.

We are a busy people, and I want to remind you, lest we forget, that beginning with 1783, under the Confederacy, we have had five free-trade periods in this country, and every one of them has been disastrous.

At the close of one of these periods Mr. Benton—Democratic Senator from Missouri for 30 years—narrated conditions as follows:

"No price for property, no sales except those of the sheriff and the marshal, no purchasers at execution sales except the creditor or some hoarder of money, no employment for industry, no demand for labor, no sale for the products of the farm, no sound of the hammer except that of the auctioneer knocking down property. Distress was the universal cry of the people; relief, the universal demand, was thundered at the doors of all legislatures, State and Federal."

What do you think of a party that so conducts the affairs of the Nation that they must appeal for Federal and State aid to keep the laboring and other classes of people from starving?

During this same time we have had five protection periods, each of which brought prosperity, happiness, and contentment to all our people. At the close of one of these periods and in his last message to Congress, December, 1892, after the country had enjoyed a period of its greatest prosperity, and in an unguarded moment had turned both branches of Congress and the Executive over to Democracy, President Harrison said: "Another indication of the general prosperity of the country is found in the fact that the number of depositors in savings banks increased from 693,870 in 1860 to 4,258,893 in 1890, an increase of 513 per cent, and the amount of deposits from $149,277,504 in 1860 to $1,524,844,506 in 1890, an increase of 921 per cent. In 1891 the amount of deposits in savings banks was $1,623,079,749. It is estimated that 90 per cent of these deposits represent the savings of wage earners. The bank clearances for nine months ending September 30, 1891, amounted to $41,049,390,808. For the same months in 1892, they amounted to $45,189,601,947, an excess for the nine months of $4,140,211,139.

"There never has been a time in our history when work was so abundant or when wages were so high, whether measured by the currency in which they are paid or by their own power to supply the necessaries and comforts of life. It is true that the market prices of cotton and wheat have been low. It is one of the unfavorable incidents of agriculture that the farmer can not produce upon orders. He must sow and reap in ignorance of the aggregate production of the year, and is peculiarly subject to the depreciation which follows overproduction. But, while the fact I have stated is true as to the crops mentioned, the general average of prices has been so much as to give to agriculture a fair participation in the general prosperity."

What Senator Benton said about conditions at the close of one free-trade period could be multiplied many times by leading Democrats and others as to every free-trade period so far in this country, and what President Harrison said respecting conditions at the close of one protective period could be duplicated many times as to each of the five protective periods from the eloquent and forceful statements, not alone of prominent Republicans, but as well of Democrats who have held a foremost place in the councils of their party.

Some one has said: "Protection means prosperity; free trade means adversity." And no people know the truthfulness of this statement better, from practical experience, than do the people of this country.

"For whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth." So it is that the country is again inflicted with a Democratic House of Representatives. We like you personally. Our criticism is against the things for which you stand.

Here you are again at the first opportunity with another free-trade bill, pure and simple (H. R. 4413), popularly known as the "farmers' free-list bill." You say the country is sick and needs relief after several years of Republican rule; but you offer the same remedy that your fathers and forefathers gave the country which, without a single exception, brought sorrow, sadness, and ruin. And now you want the people to believe that the result this time will be different than it has ever been before. As time goes on, it will be more and more apparent that this bill received but little consideration at the hands of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, and less at the hands of the Republican members, for they had no opportunity.

I state, without fear of contradiction, that in the first instance the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee claimed the loss of revenue by this bill would be about $1,500,000, and now they frankly admit that the loss of revenue will be more than $10,000,000. This statement, standing alone,

ought to convince everyone that the bill was poorly considered before it was presented to the House.

Again I inquire, Was the Tariff Board consulted in the preparation of this bill? If not, why not? And, if so, where can the data be found that was furnished by the Tariff Board to the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee in the preparation of this bill?

It is well understood that this bill is offered as a "sop" to the farmers, but do not deceive yourselves. They read and think, and have not and will not forget that you refused to amend the reciprocity bill wherein relief might have been given to them. You seemed to think and acted in the passage of the reciprocity bill as though you were legislating for Canadians instead of Americans. You were not willing to give the American farmer just one lone chance to see what the Canadian Parliament would do with the amendments which were offered in the interest not alone of the farmers, but of all our people.

Your plea now is that this bill will grant the relief asked for in the reciprocity bill, well knowing that you do not hope or expect that it will pass the Senate.

The question is being asked on every hand, Why are not rice, peanuts, and other products of the South included in this free-list bill?

At the close of the third free-trade period in this Government, extending from 1833 to 1842, "a farmer in Illinois wrote a letter to his friend in the East, in 1842, complaining that he could get only $0.31 per bushel for his wheat, $0.25 for beans, $0.10 for corn, $0.01½ per pound for beef and pork, and $0.02½ per pound for tobacco, and so forth."

And in Colton's Life of Henry Clay you can find some further interesting facts as to the effect of free trade on the prices of farm products, viz:

"During the free-trade period of 1833–1842 the country witnessed one of the most appalling and disastrous financial revulsions ever known. Manufacturers suspended operations and all kinds of business was at a standstill. Property of every description was parted with at prices that were astounding, and as for currency, there was scarcely any at all. In some parts of Pennsylvania the people were obliged to divide bank notes into halves, quarters, eighths, and so on, and agree to use these fractions as money.

"In Ohio, with all her abundance, it was hard to get money to pay taxes. The sheriff of Muskingum County, as stated by the Guernsey Times in the summer of 1842, sold at auction:

"One 4-horse wagon, at $5.50.
"Ten hogs, at $0.06¼ each.
"Two horses (said to be worth $50 to $75 each), at $2 each.
"Two cows, at $1 each.
"One barrel of sugar, for $1.50.
"And a store full of goods at the same rate.

"In Pike County, Mo., as stated in the Hannibal Journal, the sheriff sold:

"Three horses, at $1.50 each.
"One large ox, for $0.12½.
"Five cows, 2 steers, and 1 calf, the entire lot for $3.25.
"Twenty sheep, for $0.13¾ each.
"Twenty-four hogs, for $0.25 for the lot.
"One eight-day clock, for $2.50.
"One lot of tobacco (7 or 8 hogsheads), for $5.
"Three stacks of hay, at $0.25 each.
"One stack of fodder, at $0.25."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question——

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I thought I would not improve this speech by permitting anybody to get into it except myself.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I simply want to ask the gentleman what is the date of that?

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I have not the date here, but I can supply the gentleman with it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I wish the gentleman would. Probably the same source from which the gentleman got that information can supply most any data for a campaign speech.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. It is Colton's life of Henry Clay; one of the most reliable and best sources of information. If the gentleman wishes to dispute that, it is his privilege, of course.

Does not this remind you of another period worse than free trade, if possible, in this country? I refer to the years from 1893 to 1897, under the Wilson-Gorman bill, when the only Democratic President that the country had had since the days of Buchanan—Mr. Cleveland—in a letter addressed to Chairman Wilson, July 2, 1894, when the bill was suspended in the Senate and its state uncertain, declared it a piece of party "perfidy" and party "dishonor."

This period was so recent in our country's history that I will not longer dwell upon it at this time, except to say that I think the Democratic Party are to be congratulated that in the 60 years from 1836 until 1896 they so improved their free-trade legislation that sheep advanced from 13½ cents each to be a drug on the market at 50 cents each in 1896.

I can not conclude these brief remarks without calling attention to the fact that in 1861, after 15 years of free trade or tariff for revenue only, the Government had to borrow money for current expenses, and paid for the same 10 and 12 per cent interest. Compare this, if you please, with conditions in 1891 after 30 years of protection, when the Government could borrow all the money it wanted at 2 per cent.

Now that our Democratic friends are bent upon free-trade legislation, as indicated by the bill under consideration, I want to call to your attention what James Buchanan, a Democratic President, said in his annual message at the close of that fourth distressful free-trade period: "With unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and all the elements of natural wealth our manufacturers have suspended, our public works are retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds are abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers are thrown out of employment and reduced to want. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet notwithstanding all these advantages our country, in its monetary interests, is in a deplorable condition."

We, who are protectionists and believe that this policy is for the best interests of all our people, like to remind those who do not agree with us of the opinion expressed by an impartial witness, Prince Bismarck: "The success (under protection) of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern times. The American Nation has not only successfully borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterwards disbanded its Army, found work for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, given labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within its territory, and has done all this by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less felt.

"Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective law, I urge that Germany has now reached the point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States."

My Democratic friends, either in or out of Congress, what would you not give if you were able to quote a distinguished citizen, either of this or any other country, who was able to speak in terms of commendation of any one of the free-trade periods when you have controlled the destinies of this Nation?

WOOL.

I have so many requests for information that I can not refrain from asking our Democratic friends, "What do you propose to do about wool?" I am well aware that many of you would like to put wool on the free list where it was under the Wilson-Gorman bill, but if you do this at this time you fear for the result of the election next year, not only in the legislative but in the executive branch of the Government. I think you owe it to the farmers, wool growers, wool buyers, and manufacturers to state frankly what your position is going to be now and what it will be if you get control of both branches of Congress and the Presidency in 1912.

During the years 1895, 1896, and 1897 more than three-quarters of a billion pounds of wool were imported into this country. Let me quote you a few prices showing the awful destruction of property in the wool and sheep industry after it was known in 1892 that the Democratic Party was to shape the legislation of the country for at least two and, possibly, four years. In 1893, the prices of fine, medium, and coarse wool in the eastern markets were 23, 24, and 21 cents; in 1894, they were 19, 21, and 19 cents; in 1895, they were 18, 21, and 19 cents; in 1896, they were 18, 19, and 18 cents. And to show you what effect the restoration of the Republican Party to power with the assurance of a protective tariff had, I will quote you prices in 1897 at 27, 29, and 25 cents, and in 1898 at 28½, 30, and 24½ cents; and in 1910, they were 33, 36, and 35 cents. I have a letter from a farmer in my district quoting the price of wool now as 18 cents per pound.

If a Democratic House of Representatives is responsible for this reduction as compared with former years since 1896, what would be the effect upon the wool and sheep market if they had full sway in the Government?

And the change was just as marked as to the number and value of sheep under the Wilson-Gorman bill as it was as to the prices for wool. For illustration, in 1893 there were

47,272,553 sheep, valued at $125,909,264; in 1894 there were 45,048,017 sheep, valued at $89,186,110; in 1895 there were 42,294,064 sheep, valued at $66,685,767; in 1896 there were 38,298,783 sheep, valued at $65,167,735—showing a steady decrease in the number of flocks and their value. And to show you what effect the restoration of the Republican Party to power, with the promise of a protective tariff, had, I give you 1897, 36,818,643 sheep, valued at $67,020,942; 1898, 37,656,690 sheep, valued at $92,721,133—clearly showing how soon there began to be an increase in the number as well as in the value—and in 1910 there were 57,216,000, valued at $233,664,000.

You will observe that during the 16 years from 1894 to 1910 there was an annual increase of more than three-quarters of a million in the number of sheep and that during the same time their value almost trebled.

Farmers, which do you prefer—free trade or a protective tariff on wool?

Is it not possible for a Democratic House to so legislate regarding this industry as not to ruin it as they did when last in power?

My countrymen, it is none too soon to begin to think and reflect on what the consequences may be. I ask you to pause upon the threshold of another great presidential campaign and ask yourselves which of the two great parties you want to continue to administer the affairs of this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, if I could persuade myself that this much-advertised and loudly proclaimed farmers' free-list bill would really benefit the farmer I should be inclined to vote for it, for I am a friend of the farmer and have good reason for being so. In the first place, I was born on a farm and brought up there to do all the work that the farmer's boy usually does on the farm. I know what it means to wring an unwilling dollar from a begrudging soil. In addition to that, strange as it may sound to some of you, a considerable part of my constituency is made up of farmers. If you do not believe it, come with me to some of our town and county fairs next autumn and I will show you some of the best agricultural products ever produced in this country and some of the finest farmers. These farmers are a most industrious, intelligent, and capable lot of men, and in addition to being successful farmers are capable in many other lines. One of their best products is direct self-government by the people themselves. We hear much these days of direct government by the people, as if it were a new discovery of an ultra-progressive age. As a matter of fact, the people of Connecticut have had direct self-government ever since it was a colony, and to-day a New England town meeting is the purest form of direct self-government by the people anywhere in existence. Right out in the rural towns of Connecticut live the men who have maintained and cherished through the years this form of direct self-government.

I was somewhat surprised and pained the other day, upon taking up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to find under one of those "leave-to-print" captions so recently discovered by the combined efforts of our Speaker and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] some remarks credited to Connecticut's junior Representative in this House, my good friend Mr. REILLY, in which he referred somewhat disparagingly to the legislators of our good State as representing white birches instead of men, and to our general assembly as being a "poplar" rather than a "popular" body. I had the honor of serving for four years in the more populous, if not more popular, branch of our general assembly—two years as its speaker—and I wish to state here that a more intelligent, clear-thinking class of men, or men more loyal to their State when assailed, it has never been my privilege to associate or cooperate with. If these men represent white birches—well, all I can say is that even the white birches of Connecticut are well represented. These men and the men they represent know what they want; they know when they want it, and they know how to get it; and yet not one in all my State has written a single word on behalf of this farmers' free-list bill. No; they are not deceived by a name. They look through the pretense and mere empty form of words and see the real danger that lurks behind this widely heralded bill.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in opening this debate several days ago, referred to this as the beginning of a new era in the revenue policy of this country. If I understand correctly his meaning, it is that as a people we have now turned our backs upon protection and have embarked on a policy of "tariff for revenue only," with free trade as an ultimate goal toward which we are tending.

In view of the proposed adoption of such a program, I trust that the Members of this House will indulge me in a few elementary words on the subject of tariff duties.

As our Constitution is framed, it seems to be clear and generally admitted that a large part of the revenues necessary to run this Government must and was intended to be raised by means of import duties. That being the case, we must levy such duties either upon articles which are competitive or upon articles which are not competitive, or both. There are two theories of laying import duties. One is to lay them upon articles which are not produced in this country and which one may properly call a purely revenue duty. That would be strictly a "tariff for revenue only." The other theory is to lay the duty upon articles the like of which are produced in this country, and by so doing give the manufacturer in this country a certain advantage to offset the disadvantage of higher-priced labor and materials, so that he may compete with the maker of like articles in other countries. As I understand it, it is to be the policy of the Democratic Party hereafter to adopt the first of these policies, so far as they are able to do so, and so far as they adopt the other they are going to call it a "tariff for revenue only."

Now, I believe that the phrase "tariff for revenue only" as applied to competitive articles is misleading; that it is not a fact. We can not have a "tariff for revenue only" on competitive articles, because to the extent of the duty, if it be only 1 cent, the like article with which it comes in competition in this country has the 1-cent advantage, and is therefore protected to the extent of that 1 cent.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman object to a question?

Mr. TILSON. Not at all.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, while that is true, the purpose for which the levy is made is revenue and not protection. As I understand, the difference between our side and yours is that you would levy the tax for the purpose of protection and we would levy it for revenue.

Mr. TILSON. I would levy the tax primarily for the revenue—for revenue we must have in order to exist as a Government—and, incidentally, as a part of the same system I would levy the tax upon articles the like of which we can produce to advantage in this country and thereby encourage the production of that article in this country rather than somewhere else.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. You would levy it for protection, then? That is the only purpose?

Mr. TILSON. No; first, for the revenue——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I was going to invite you on this side——

Mr. TILSON. And then for protection, because I believe in the conclusion of Lincoln's famous tariff argument, which I have already heard quoted many times on this side of the House and shall not repeat, that it is for the best interests of all the people that just as large a part of the articles consumed in this country as possible should be produced in this country. Therefore, in the collection of the revenue I would so impose the duty as to protect those articles which we can produce to advantage in this country.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If the gentleman has no objection I would like to ask him a further question. I do not wish to interfere with his speech.

Mr. TILSON. I gladly yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Of course, the gentleman believes that a tariff for revenue is beneficial to the country, or else he would not favor it. Now, the question I would like to ask him is this: By what sort of process of reasoning do you account for the fact that in the most highly protected localities there is the largest per cent of poor people—fewer people owning their homes?

Mr. TILSON. I do not accept that as a fact; but if it were true, it would prove nothing here. They might be still poorer if their employment were taken away.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. To be frank, I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that in his own State, which is highly protected, about 65 per cent of the people to-day are living in rented homes?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, that does not necessarily indicate at all the financial condition of a person—whether or not he lives in a rented home. Some of the comfortably wealthy people in my town live in rented property as a matter of choice.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It may be that I have misconstrued it. It may be that they are all wealthy people and, therefore, 65 per cent of them are living in rented homes.

Mr. TILSON. It does not follow at all that a man is poor because he lives in a rented home. As is well known, thousands of people who would be able to own houses if they wished to

do so prefer to rent, so that they may the more readily change their residence to suit their fancy or business without inconvenience or financial loss.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think that is the exception and not the rule. I think every American citizen, with the possible exception of those in the miserly class, believes in owning his home.

Mr. TILSON. I believe a better criterion is the savings of the comparatively poor in the savings banks of the country; and as to that I am willing to submit a statement of the savings deposited in such institutions in Connecticut for comparison with any other State in the Union.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to call his attention at that point to the fact that in Great Britain, with but little over half the population that we have in the United States, they have over 900,000 paupers, and for a generation that has been a free-trade country?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Oh, I will not take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not a believer in a high protective tariff. I am not a standpatter, if by that opprobrious term you mean a man who refuses to consider the facts and circumstances in connection with each imported article and fix the duty accordingly. As a matter of fact, that is the principal reason why I favor a Tariff Board, in order that we may have the facts and in order that we may ascertain intelligently how to fix upon those articles the duties which will hurt least and help most.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. TILSON. Very gladly.

Mr. CULLOP. I understood the gentleman to say that he would levy a tariff on articles coming into competition with articles produced here, for instance, and that he would be glad to vote to assist the farmer in this bill if it did assist him. Now, take agricultural implements. For the year 1909 we produced $112,000,000 worth. We exported $25,000,000 worth. There were none imported, and we consumed $87,000,00 worth. Now, if there were no importations, the tariff on such articles as that enabled the producer to charge a higher price to the American consumer than he would otherwise have been able to charge. Now, would it not assist the farmer, putting these on the free list?

Mr. TILSON. I confess I am not able to follow the gentleman in so long and involved a question. At any rate, I prefer not to diverge from the line of my argument here to follow a side issue. I therefore ask the gentleman to pardon me if I do not attempt to go at length into an answer to his question, particularly, inasmuch as I have only 20 minutes' time and have quite a number of other matters to speak of.

Mr. CULLOP. The only point——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TILSON. I stand on the Republican platform, and believe that the correct measure of the duty to be imposed in each case should represent as nearly as it can be ascertained the difference in the cost of production of that article in foreign countries and here. I recognize the fact that there is great difficulty in ascertaining this difference of cost, but I do not believe it is impossible, and with the help of the intelligent and capable Tariff Board, headed by my friend Prof. Emery, which is already working on this question, I believe that we are in the way of getting at such information as will enable us to fix the duties intelligently on this basis.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman says he believes the tariff should be measured by the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, I believe?

Mr. TILSON. I do.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does he go as far as his party goes in its platform and say that in addition to that there shall be added a "plus" for the manufacturer's profit?

Mr. TILSON. I take a different view of that, Mr. Chairman, from that which my Democratic friends take. If they undertake to make the Republican platform say that we propose to guarantee a profit to the manufacturer, I say "bosh; nonsense!" No stretch of language can make it mean that. If they attempt to make that clause in the platform say that in addition to the cost of production there shall be added a reasonable profit, they make it say nothing, because a legitimate profit is a part of the cost, and is so figured on both sides, and therefore if it means only that it means nothing.

To my mind that phrase in the platform means this: There was a great hue and cry about that time, as there is yet, for that matter, to the effect that the protective tariff enables manufacturers to make an inordinate profit. You will readily recall much that was said. To my mind what that platform says is that the proper measure of a protective duty is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, including only a reasonable profit; no more. It means something when thus construed. It means nothing if you misinterpret it the other way.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman will observe, however, by reading that platform that it reads:

> The duties shall equal the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit.

Mr. TILSON. That is right; that is absolutely correct. And it should be so, because a reasonable profit is a part of the cost, and is figured as such, and the duties should not be any more than that, if that figure can be correctly ascertained.

Now, much has been said, especially on the Democratic side of this House during this debate, in regard to the elections in 1912, as if it were more important that victory should perch upon the Democratic banner in 1912 than that we should enact proper legislation. Even this bill seems to have been drawn with that purpose in view, of helping to gain that victory in 1912. Certainly it was not drawn with any idea of ever being administered at the customhouses of the country, because the difficulties apparent on the face of it are such as to render its proper administration well-nigh impossible. It could easily have been made more specific, but it is dangerous to specify, and it is so much easier and so much safer to indulge in glittering generalities. It is evident that there is a well-laid plan to fool the dear people in 1912; and, recalling the success of a similar plan in the election of 1910, it is not strange that such ardent hopes are being indulged that it will work again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut three minutes more.

Mr. TILSON. But have a care. I am one of those who believe you can not always fool the people and that they will sooner or later learn what is being done for them or to them. I recall the closing words of that old saying of Lincoln, that you can not fool all the people all the time. I am one of those who do not believe that the American people in 1910 commissioned your party to revise the tariff downward to such an extent as to make it, as you call it, a "tariff for revenue only," and if you do it and thereby further disturb business conditions you will, in my opinion, imperil your chances of victory in 1912. For my part I look beyond 1912, or even beyond 1916. I am yet a young man, and I hope to live long in this land which I have tried and am humbly trying now to serve. [Applause.] I have more interest in what is going to be the condition of this country five years from now than I have as to who is going to be President in 1912 or 1916, or who is going to control this House.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman means that he has more interest as a Republican in what will happen five years from now?

Mr. TILSON. Not at all. I should like to see my party succeed in 1916 and in every year, because I believe its success means better times and better living conditions for the people of the country at large. My interest is above and beyond all partisan interest. I represent a State that is not only an agricultural State, as I have mentioned, but it is a State filled with manufactures, great and small, filled with all kinds of business, filled with a happy, brave, free, intelligent, independent people, a people that at present are well employed and well paid. They are comparatively happy and prosperous, and I do not wish to see any legislation here that will interfere with that prosperity. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KENDALL. Did the gentleman say his State is an agricultural State?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; and it is true; but not quite to such an extent as the great agricultural State which my friend from Iowa [Mr. KENDALL] so ably represents on the floor of this House.

It has not been denied that the standard of wages in this country is higher than in most countries with which we compete; nor is it denied that, other things being equal, manu-

facturing will be done where labor is cheapest. If we put all luxuries on a highly protected list, as we often hear advocated from the other side of this Chamber, and all the necessities of life on the free list, which we are told is the goal of the Democracy, then the tendency will surely be that our necessities will be manufactured by foreigners and only luxuries produced by ourselves. I doubt if anyone would regard that as a fortunate condition. It seems to be assumed that while monopolies may combine to keep up prices within, no combination or monopoly from without will attempt to artificially control prices. But can we be sure of this? Is there any more remorseless combination, trust, or monopoly than the Ocean Carrying Trust? Is it not possible to imagine that the same combination would not only put up freight rates, but would combine with others to manipulate prices of the necessities of life? The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], in a very able speech the other day, gave us an example of how one of the necessities of life not produced in this country is manipulated so as to almost double the price. Have we any assurance that this would not be done if all our necessities had to be secured abroad?

You talk gleefully of large importations as if you gloated over the fact that hereafter our goods would be much more largely manufactured abroad. But what does that mean? It means that just so much less goods will be manufactured here. And what does that mean? Less profits for the manufacturer? Perhaps so; but certainly less wages for the workingman. If his envelope is empty on Saturday night, the market gardener, the farmer, the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker will suffer next week, and it will not be made good by the difference in the price of the hoe the farmer buys. You say, Give the farmer cheaper products to use and consume. I say, Have a care that you take not from his best customers their power to purchase his products at any price. You are making a stab in the dark. You will recall that scene in Hamlet where a noise is heard behind the arras. Hamlet stabs, and Polonius is killed. Who will you stab by this proposed legislation? Some Polonius—a rich manufacturer? Perhaps so; and next year he may have to omit his new limousine car, but he will probably have left his open touring car, his runabout, and perhaps an electric victoria for his wife and be able to get through the year with these. But what will the man who rides on the trolley car and wears overalls at the factory or store do? And after all he is the most deserving to be considered, because he makes up much the larger part of our population.

I am not in favor of any tariff duty higher than will represent the difference in cost of production here and abroad, but I will not vote for a bill which, on its face in a number of items, discriminates against the American manufacturer. Give him at least an even chance with his foreign competitor. This bill does not do that. Nor am I willing to vote for a bill that I sincerely believe is but the entering wedge which, when driven home, will shake our industrial structure, reduce or destroy the wages of American workingmen, and imperil the general prosperity which has so long prevailed. I do not believe that your party has been, or will be, commissioned to revise the tariff below a fairly protective basis. If you do it, mark my word, the general prosperity of this country will pay the penalty of your rash action. Already the penumbra of uncertainty and anxious waiting is visible across the face of our American business world, due principally to your tariff agitation. Have a care that you bring not again the total eclipse. Not what is, but what is feared may be, already disturbs business conditions. Capital seeking investment is proverbially timid. Your agitation without cause and your action without knowledge will embarrass it or frighten it into idleness; and the first man to suffer will not be the capitalist, but the workingman, who loses the wages the capital would otherwise pay. Connecticut has an army of such workingmen, representative of millions of men all over this country—brave, intelligent, independent in action. I stand here to speak for them. If your ill-digested legislation brings again to them the conditions of the early nineties, they will understand and act accordingly. Go on with your agitation. Go ahead with your oft-repeated threat that this is but the beginning of what you are going to do in the way of tariff smashing. Once convince the business men of this country that you intend to do what you say and that there is a probability of your having the power to do it, and the partial paralysis in business already felt will become general. The extremities and weaker nerves of the industrial body are already affected perceptibly through fear of what may possibly happen. Have a care that you do not complete the prostration.

The highest and best interests of your constituents and mine—business men, workingmen, farmers, professional men all over the country, from one end of the land to the other—demand that we stop here and now before we pass this bill; and as soon as the Senate has acted upon what we have already done, which is all we were called here to do, let us adjourn and go home. Give business a chance for a little while free from disturbing legislation. Our duty is plain. If we fail to do it, your party, and not mine, will be held responsible for the consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CATLIN] 15 minutes.

Mr. CATLIN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the bill under consideration seeks to destroy some features, at least, of that economic policy of protection under which this country has steadily made great gains industrially and commercially—has reached out in stupendous expansion and development—I can not refrain from voicing, if but in a few words, my sentiments of disapproval of the measure.

During this debate, to which I have given close attention, much valuable statistical information touching the comparative imports, productions, and duty schedules of the respective articles attacked in this bill has been presented, and so I feel that it would be idle, in the few minutes allotted to me, to indulge further in an extended comparison of figures. My desire and purpose, however, is to enter a plea for the continuance and preservation of the present quality of American citizenship, as exemplified by the splendid standard of living and wage scale, with the attendant blessings and comforts, of the American workingmen, in contrast to the poorer conditions of their class in other countries,—especially in the Orient, where labor is cheap and plentiful,—and therein lies the danger. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have always been impressed with the force of the moral duty that we owe to the growing youths of this country, sons of the American workingmen,—and with a free-trade bill now threatening the fact comes home to me more than ever—to see to it that they are afforded every opportunity to enjoy all the blessings of decent manhood, such as their fathers have had before them. [Applause on the Republican side.] Let us strive and endeavor to elevate them even to higher levels, rather than be a party to legislation which would put them on a poorer basis!

Past experience has shown that the high standard can only be maintained by an adherence, in substance, at least, to the principle of protection. If we abandon this principle, we will necessarily be confronted with an ever growing peril from the Orient. Whereas, a few years ago, but little heed had to be paid to the producing powers of these oriental countries, now already Japan has entered the industrial arena with telling effect; and, even China, awakened from long lethargy, has at last cast aside some of the ancient traditions, in particular that of race prejudice, so as to have enlightened development. We have but to examine the following trade reports, compiled by the Bureau of Statistics in the Department of Commerce and Labor, to learn that our imports from Japan are increasing, whereas our exports of merchandise to that country are decreasing:

Imports from Japan.

In 1909 we imported from Japan merchandise in the sum of	$70,392,722
In 1908 we imported from Japan merchandise in the sum of	68,107,545
Showing a gain in imports from Japan in the sum of	$2,285,177

Exports into Japan.

In 1908 we exported into Japan merchandise in the sum of	$41,432,327
In 1909 we exported into Japan merchandise in the sum of	26,691,613
Showing a deficit in exports into Japan from this country in the sum of	$14,740,714

This, I think, is significant as showing that Japan is fast becoming an industrial nation, and is reaching out for our markets.

Her government, in the hope of encouraging and upbuilding industries, not only lends financial aid for this purpose, but is also sending her brightest and most energetic men to the United States and other countries to study modern methods of production, and is subsidizing lines of steamships in order that they may carry the finished products to all parts of the world. There are no patent laws there, covering inventions of more than two years ago, to add to the original cost of equipping new factories with the latest types of modern machinery, such as our industrial captains must meet in this country. Take, for example, the boot and shoe industry, the American companies have to pay large royalties on the machinery they use. The Japanese and Chinese have a peculiar

aptitude for copying and imitating; after securing some patented machinery, they can readily tear it to pieces so as to learn its component parts for the purpose of having similar ones made to be used in their respective factories.

As is well known, many kinds of modern industries have already been established there and are being operated by labor willing to work for 10 or 12 hours a day, and at a wage scale averaging from 15 to 50 cents per day. It is now proposed to invite this kind of labor to compete with the high wage scale and short hours of the American workingman. Shall we do it? In my opinion, more is to be feared from the competition in the Orient than from that of the European countries. There are about 62,000,000 of people in Japan, including Formosa and Korea; of this number about 43,000,000 belong to the laboring class, as do also the greater part of China's 435,000,000 of people; and, in this discussion of the probable danger from Oriental competition, the large population of India should also be considered, especially with regard to the jute industry in which the average workingman receives but 80 cents per week.

The question then, which confronts us, is this: After these many millions in the Orient have learned in a scientific manner the manufacture of the varied industries, under the management and supervision of Americans, Englishmen, or even their own trained experts, are we going to get their markets or will they capture ours?

It is, therefore, important, Mr. Chairman, for us to continue the policy of protection so as not to come into harmful competition with this Oriental labor. [Applause on the Republican side.] I view with apprehension the time when, under a policy whereby our markets shall be free and open to the Oriental trade, the American wage earners, their products, such as the ones specified in this bill—their present high wage scale and standard of living shall be displaced by the ingenuity, a 30 to 50 cent wage, and by the fish-and-rice diet of the Japanese and Oriental labor.

A few years ago, the Department of Commerce and Labor sent a special representative, Mr. Raymond F. Crist, to Japan for the purpose of studying trade conditions there, and I desire to submit herewith the following extract from his written report made to Congress as bearing on the shoe industry in that country:

> The return of the army from Manchuria will bring back in the neighborhood of a million men who have become accustomed to the use of foreign shoes, many of whom never wore shoes before their enlistment. The desire to continue their use will result in increased production of shoes among the Japanese. Realizing the necessity of meeting this demand, some Japanese shoe and leather goods houses have installed shoe-sewing machines, and many more will be installed as the value of this method of shoemaking over the slow hand process becomes established. American shoe-sewing machine manufacturers would do well to establish representatives in this field at an early date in order to supply the demand for these machines which is now springing up. With a new and higher tariff imposed upon the imports of shoes, which will in all likelihood be inaugurated for the stimulation of the shoemaking industry, the field now controlled by American-made shoes will dwindle into insignificance.

The proposed increased tariff mentioned in the above report has already been levied, namely, a tariff of 40 per cent.

It is unfair to assail the boot and shoe industry by removing the present 10 per cent duty simply because, as has been emphasized and brought out in this debate, one member of the trade appeared before the Ways and Means Committee two years ago and stated:

> That if hides were placed on the free list there would be no further need for a duty.

An examination of the following table, taken from the consular reports, will show that the average cost of production per 100 pairs of medium grade men's welt shoes is nearly twice as much in the United States as it is in the leading European countries:

In England	$27.73
In France	22.20
In Germany	21.90
In Austria	21.70
In United States	49.11

For this reason, the shoe companies of St. Louis maintain that, if the present tariff is removed, they will either have to lower wages or go out of business. I recently asked one of the largest shoe manufacturers there how long he thought it would take the Japanese to compete with the Americans in this market in the event the present tariff should be removed, and he was of the opinion that it would be only a few years, especially as to the trade on the Pacific coast.

The Japanese will have an additional advantage in that they can ship their products, say, boots and shoes, to San Francisco at a cheaper rate than the St. Louis manufacturers, whose total business amounts to about fifty or sixty million dollars a year, or one-sixth of the entire business done in this country, can ship theirs to the same place.

The total imports of boots and shoes from all countries for the year 1909, when there was a 25 per cent duty, amounted to $100,000, yet for the first six months of 1910, when there was only a 10 per cent duty, as at present, the imports amounted to $677,000, or more than six times as much in six months; and, notwithstanding this increase of supply, the price of the article has not decreased.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a country of golden opportunities for all within its confines, because, in their wisdom, a majority of the American people saw fit, for almost fifty continuous years, to protect their industries and products, their wage scale and standard of living from the harmful competition of European countries. The danger is not yet over; still another confronts us in the Orient, where labor is very cheap and the hours of employment long, and which condition, therefore, calls for a continuance of the principle of protection. I, for one, want to guard the present high wage scale and short hours of the American wage earners, the quality of their citizenship and standard of living against any such competition; accordingly, I must oppose this bill, which bears semblance of free trade with the whole world. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of H. J. Res. 83, neutralization of Philippine Islands, and the same was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 8143, granting pensions to certain military organizations, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Moss of Indiana was granted permission to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers with the bill H. R. 21966, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination and survey of Keweenaw Waterway, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination and survey of Satilla River from its mouth to Burnt Fort, Ga. (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination of Columbia River from Vancouver, Wash., to the mouth of the Willamette River (H. Doc. No. 42); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation of legislation as to the sinking fund in the Treasury (H. Doc. No. 43); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation as to jurat fees of notaries public (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting draft of bills, with recommendation that they be enacted into laws, relative to the administration of the offices of Treasurer and assistant treasurers of the United States (H. Doc. No. 45); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAY: A bill (H. R. 8383) granting a service pension to certain veterans of the Civil War, and amending other pension acts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 8384) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Cadiz, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8385) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Barnesville, in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 8386) to reduce postal rates, improve the postal service, and to increase postal revenues; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 8387) directing the Secretary of War to cause the superintendence, surveying, and inspecting to be done on the main interior channel of Jamaica Bay, N. Y., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8388) to amend section 4894 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8389) to promote the reclamation of arid lands in the Territory of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 8390) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at the city of El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8391) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Arkadelphia, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 8392) to establish a fish hatchery in Steuben County, Ind.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 8393) for the protection of wild animals in the Coronado National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Resolution (H. Res. 143) providing for an investigation of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: Resolution (H. Res. 144) amending section 4 of Rule XXVII; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STANLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 145) to investigate violations of antitrust act of 1890; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARDWICK: Resolution (H. Res. 146) to provide a select committee to investigate certain violations of the antitrust law; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to authorize and provide for a joint assembly and meeting of the parliaments and national legislative bodies of the nations of the world in the United States, and to extend an invitation to said parliaments and legislative bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 8394) granting an increase of pension to William A. Pullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8395) granting an increase of pension to J. W. Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 8396) providing for an increase of salary for the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CATLIN: A bill (H. R. 8397) graning a pension to Charles Kline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8398) for the relief of John N. Neal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8399) for the relief of James Bartlett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8400) to correct the military record of John J. Barlow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8401) granting an increase of pension to Michael Catt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8402) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Kilpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8403) granting a pension to Solomon L. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8404) to correct the military record of John W. Parsons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 8405) granting a pension to Andrew J. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 8406) granting an increase of pension to John Staley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 8407) granting an increase of pension to Gabrielle Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8408) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 8409) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Florine A. Albright; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8410) granting an increase of pension to John Hammaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8411) granting an increase of pension to L. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8412) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McGregor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8413) granting an increase of pension to Thomas K. Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8414) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hingson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8415) granting an increase of pension to George A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8416) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Heffler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8417) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8418) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8419) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Ashcraft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8420) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8421) granting a pension to W. A. Dobbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8422) granting a pension to Walter M. Corn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8423) granting a pension to John B. Carmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8424) granting a pension to W. A. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8425) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Frederick Feninger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8426) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Arnold, alias Jackson Arnold; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8427) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George Forbus, alias George Davidson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8428) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Herman Kneofler; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 8429) granting an increase of pension to Antoinette S. Edgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8430) granting an increase of pension to John Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8431) granting an increase of pension to Blackman E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8432) granting an increase of pension to Elzey Bird; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 8433) for the relief of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 8434) granting an increase of pension to John Howell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEALD: A bill (H. R. 8435) granting an extension of patent to Watson F. Quinby; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 8436) for the relief of the heirs or estates of William McClure and Margaret McClure, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8437) for the relief of James L. Wharton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8438) for the relief of Gabriel C. Wharton; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 8439) for the relief of George Owens, John J. Bradley, William M. Godfrey, Rudolph G. Ebert, Herschel Tupes, William H. Sage, Charles L. Tostevin, Alta B. Spaulding, and Grace E. Lewis; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 8440) for the relief of Mary E. Stelling, sole heir at law of A. S. Freitas, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 8441) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Swasey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 8442) granting an increase of pension to John L. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8443) granting a pension to James Hatton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8444) granting a pension to Nicholas Duteau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8445) granting an increase of pension to James H. Cosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 8446) granting an increase of pension to William Hopton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8447) granting an increase of pension to Jacob S. Robey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 8448) granting an increase of pension to Bridget M. Fauls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8449) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Joshua C. Drown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8450) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester C. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8451) granting a pension to Sarah Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8452) granting a pension to John Edward Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8453) for the relief of Edward Swainor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8454) for the relief of Thomas F. Conlan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 8455) granting an increase of pension to Fletcher N. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8456) granting an increase of pension to John W. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8457) granting an increase of pension to Abner H. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8458) granting an increase of pension to John H. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8459) providing for the presentation of a medal of honor to William M. De Hart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8460) granting a pension to Edward Rhoades; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8461) granting a pension to Margaret Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8462) granting a pension to Jack Pettis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8463) granting an increase of pension to Gilman A. H. Simmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEER: A bill (H. R. 8464) granting a pension to Mary Ellen Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 8465) granting an increase of pension to Ransom L. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 8466) granting an increase of pension to George Moblo, alias George Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 8467) for the relief of the legal representatives of William E. Tarbutton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers and affidavits for the relief of William A. Pullen, of Breckenridge, Mo.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: Resolutions of the Cincinnati Antituberculosis League, favoring a committee on public health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Wilcox Hardware Co. and 10 other merchants of Uhrichsville, Ohio, in opposition to the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of M. T. O'Connor, of Bronx, N. Y., favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURNETT: Resolutions of Building Trades Council of Birmingham, Ala., against action of California detectives in kidnaping a labor leader from Indianapolis, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: Resolutions of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, asking that cotton bagging and ties be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARR: Petitions of Yostville (Pa.) Local, No. 202, Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring the illiteracy test to restrict immigration; and Washington Camp, No. 583, of Old Forge, Pa., and Washington Camp, No. 200, of Carbondale, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, urging the passage of H. R. 15413, relating to immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers in support of House bill 8104, for the relief of Michael Broadbeck, of Three Springs, Pa., and House bill 8103, for the relief of James H. Maclay, of Middlesprings, Pa.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of committee of wholesale grocers of New York City, favoring the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions of Parnell Club, of Roxbury, Mass., against arbitration with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA: Petitions of J. O. Sullivan, of Mandan, N. Dak., against parcels post, and of citizens of Douglass, N. Dak., favoring the passage of House bill 2651, known as the Hanna bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of various citizens of Ransom County, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of Local Union No. 45, of Jersey City, N. J., of the International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, protesting against the kidnaping of J. J. McNamara from the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of Camp No. 503, Fishing Creek, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring the illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Frank J. McCaw Co., automobilists, favoring the Federal automobile registration bill eliminating the necessity of registering in the various States when touring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Affidavits to accompany House bill for the relief of the legal representatives of William E. Tarbutton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7243, for the relief of Show Hinebaugh, and House bill 5946, granting an increase of pension to Alexander F. McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *May 3, 1911.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Oh, Lord, our God and our Father, whose heart opens with love in response to those who seek Thee diligently, lift us by Thy grace into that purer atmosphere where spirit with spirit can meet and purify and ennoble the soul, that we may work in Thee, through Thee, with Thee, for the uplift of humanity, and, as we pass on toward the home of the soul, leave the world a little better for those who shall come after us. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this is Calendar Wednesday, and the rules provide especially that nothing shall be done after the Speaker's table is cleared except to call the committees.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think there are a few bills on the Public Calendar that would be in order to-day, but they do not contain matters of importance. I would like to

get through with the debate on the free-list bill. I understand that under the rules we have the right to dispense with the calendar by a two-thirds vote.

The SPEAKER. It takes a two-thirds vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I therefore move that the call of the calendar under the order of to-day be dispensed with, so that we may proceed with the bill H. R. 4413—the free-list bill.

The question was taken, and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the motion was agreed to.

NAVY CONTRACTS FOR SHOES.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I beg to report back a privileged resolution, H. Res. 134, with amendments, and to move the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as proposed to be amended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order, and I call attention to the fact that the resolution has not been properly reported by the Clerk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let the report be read.

Mr. PADGETT. The Clerk has read the resolution as amended. He should have read first the resolution as originally introduced.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois reserve the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I would like to have the resolution reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the original resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 134.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the House of Representatives full information, as follows, with regard to certain statements made by Hon. ROBERT E. DIFENDERFER, of Pennsylvania, in the House on April 25, 1911:

First. What proportion of the contracts for Navy shoes during the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911 were awarded to the firm of Hermann & Co.?

Second. What are the names of the individuals or firms who have secured contracts for Navy shoes in the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911? What was the amount of each contract?

Third. Have any competitors been blacklisted or disqualified from bidding on any Navy shoe contract in the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911? If so, what were the names of those competitors and what was the cause of their disqualification?

Fourth. What proportion of the Navy shoe contracts in the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911 were awarded to the lowest bidders?

Fifth. How many bidders were there for the last Navy shoe contracts?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order on the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Rept. No. 16):

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred House resolution No. 134, regarding Navy contracts for shoes, having had the same under consideration, report the same back with the following amendments, and, as amended, recommend that the resolution do pass.

Page 1, line 2: Strike out the word "requested" and in lieu thereof insert the word "directed."

Page 1, lines 2 and 3: Strike out the words "if not incompatible with public interest."

Page 1, line 4: After the word "follows" strike out the comma and insert a colon.

Page 1, lines 4, 5, and 6: Strike out the words "with regard to certain statements made by Hon. ROBERT E. DIFENDERFER, of Pennsylvania, in the House on April 25, 1911."

Page 1, line 11: After the word "individuals" insert a comma, strike out the word "or," and after the word "firms" insert "or corporations."

Page 1, line 14: After the word "eleven" strike out the question mark; strike out the words "what was" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and"; after the word "amount" insert the words "and quantity."

Page 2, line 1: Strike out the word "have" and insert in lieu thereof the word "were"; strike out the word "been."

Page 2, line 11: Strike out the word "last."

Page 2, line 12: After the word "contracts" strike out the question mark and add the following: "for the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911. Furnish complete list of all bidders and of all original and amended bids."

Add the following clause as a new section:

"Sixth. If the bids were invited by advertisement, furnish copies of the advertisements."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves the adoption of the resolution as amended. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, they will be voted for engross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

SITTING OF COMMITTEE DURING RECESS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 149.

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs have authority to sit during the sessions of the House and during the recess of the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire whether there is any necessity for the passage of that resolution for this special session?

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, having called attention to the fact, I withdraw the point of order, but I suggest that if a lot of committees start to sit during the meetings of the House at this session of Congress there will be great difficulty in obtaining a quorum here unless there is important business to transact.

Mr. PADGETT. I would state to the gentleman that we had called a meeting of the committee yesterday for 11 o'clock, and the House met at that hour and is now meeting at that hour, and it interferes; and also we have two very important bills which we wish to consider—bills of a legislative character—not with a view to putting them on the calendar at this session, but with a view to considering them, maturing them, and having them ready so as to get them out of the way for the next session, when we shall have a congestion of business growing out of the consideration of the appropriation bills.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the resolution was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 4413, a bill to put agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the free-list bill (H. R. 4413), with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The bill was read by title.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my practice to engage in general debate on subjects which do not come from committees of which I am a member, the reason for this being that it is presumed that members of committees who have heard the testimony on any particular subject are more competent to discuss the question intelligently and to present the facts than are other Members of the House; and, secondly, because I have some reservations as to the value of general debate on any subject at any time.

But this is not like the ordinary case, because this bill comes to the House without any consideration. The Ways and Means Committee did not consider it; its majority did not consider it; its minority did not consider it; and the utter lack of definiteness of the bill would indicate that the person who drew it did not give it much consideration. But it is brought in here with the statement that the majority have had a caucus and decided to pass it as it is, and they ask the country, and especially the trades affected by it, to accept that action without any change or the taking of any evidence.

It is my purpose to try to add something to the testimony which has been submitted in the addresses already made, relating especially to the shoe and leather industry.

I am not unmindful, too, of the fact that it has already been well discussed on this floor; that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the minority leader, punched the paragraph relating to this subject full of holes, and that my colleagues from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER and Mr. HARRIS] have discussed it ably and well, and that others have referred to it. But I think I may add some information on this subject, which is my only excuse for taking time to-day.

I am going to try to demonstrate, first, that there is no demand for this legislation, at least from the shoe and leather trade; second, that there is no trust or monopoly or combination connected with these industries in any way or shape; and, third, I am going to try to show why American shoes sell in Europe, why English and European shoes sell to a limited ex-

tent in this country, and why there is a falling off in sales of American shoes in Europe, and why there is an increase in the sales of foreign-made shoes in this country, which latter increase, I believe, is going to continue.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] stated the other day, and the same statement was made by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that the shoe manufacturers of this country appeared before the Ways and Means Committee two years ago with the proposition that if hides were put on the free list they would be willing to stand for free shoes and free leather. A careful investigation of the testimony adduced before that committee indicates that one witness made such a statement, and a few days afterwards, when he had had a chance to revise his figures, he returned, asked for a hearing, and stated that such a statement could not be applied to the trade at large. On two other occasions two other shoe manufacturers have made similar statements. There are 1,322 shoe manufacturers in this country, and of those 1,322, 3 have at some time and in some form made the statement which has been repeated here by the gentlemen on the other side to whom I have referred, and these expressions are the only evidence before the House on which to base this proposed action. The three men referred to are large shoe manufacturers in Massachusetts. One of them is William L. Douglas, former governor of the State, a Democrat, and a very enterprising shoe manufacturer. Gov. Douglas is reported to have said some years ago, at about the time he was a candidate for governor, that if he had free hides he could reduce the price of his shoes, and that he believed that with free hides shoes could be put on the free list and that we could compete with the world. I think he has not been heard to repeat that statement for six years. I have no doubt he was honest in his statement that he believed he could reduce the price of his shoes if hides were put on the free list; but other conditions bearing on this trade have changed since those days, and instead of Gov. Douglas reducing the price of his shoes since hides were put on the free list, he has increased the price of his shoes 25 or 50 cents a pair, and it has been necessary to do so to maintain the same value in the shoe. I do not ascribe to him anything in the way of bad faith on that account, because I think I can show before I finish that there are good reasons for this increase.

One other manufacturer who made a similar statement was Mr. Charles H. Jones, who came here two years ago representing the shoe manufacturers of New England, and I think he represented the shoe manufacturers of the whole country. He is the president of the Commonwealth Shoe Co. and is an able man and a successful manufacturer. Mr. Jones stated before the Ways and Means Committee originally—and he was the man to whom I have referred—that he believed if hides were put on the free list shoes could also be put on the free list, but later he revised his information on that subject, and not only revised his statement made to the Ways and Means Committee, but wrote a letter, of which I submit a copy:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 20, 1909.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. TAFT,
President, The White House, Washington, D. C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The schedule in relation to hides, leather, and shoes in the Payne bill is as follows:

Hides.	Band and sole leather.	Dressed upper leather.	Shoes.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
Free	5	15	15
Reduction from Dingley rate	75	25	40

The above rates seemed to the trade to offer sufficient protection except on sole leather, which most tanners believe should have been 10 per cent, a reduction of 50 per cent from Dingley rates. It is the feeling of most of the trade that the percentage of reduction shown by the Payne bill should be all that it needed to entitle us to free hides. If, however, as suggested by you this afternoon, still further concessions will be necessary in order to overcome the opposition from certain Senators, I believe, as I stated to you that with—

Hides free we can stand:	Per cent.
Band and sole leather	5
Dressed upper leather	10
Shoes	10

Many tanners will claim that these rates are too low to afford sufficient protection, but after careful examination of all facts and circumstances I can not believe any branch of the industry would be seriously crippled at these rates—certainly if the shoemakers can get along with 10 per cent protection, the makers of leather can do the same. I hope, however, it will not be necessary to cut the rates as hard as this, as it could do the people no good. With free hides, domestic competition will do again what it has always done before in leather and shoes, namely, keep the price to the consumer at the lowest point consistent with the smallest living profit. The rates of the Payne bill with sole leather changed to 7½ per cent or 10 per cent would be satisfactory to practically the whole trade and would show important reductions for the benefit of the consumer.

If you decide, however, that only on the basis of the further reduction mentioned, can free hides be secured, all branches of our trade will cheerfully undertake to meet whatever competition may come to us, and our chances of success will be far better with free hides and low duties on leather and shoes than they could be under the hide tax and the present higher rates on manufactured material.

Very respectfully,

CHAS. H. JONES.

There was no political bearing in Mr. Jones's statement, for, although he is a near Democrat, he came here representing the shoe industry, and that was his final judgment after considering the question with all classes of shoe manufacturers.

The third man who did say at that time, and has repeated his statement recently, that he could compete with the world in shoes, and that they could safely be put on the free list, is Mr. A. E. Little, of Lynn, Mass., the manufacturer of the Sorosis shoe. Mr. Little stated two years ago in a telegram to the present Speaker of this House that he believed that could be done, and Mr. W. L. Little, his partner, I believe, has recently made a similar statement. Mr. W. L. Little says:

I would not care to speak for the other manufacturers, but as far as the A. E. Little Co. is concerned, our business would not be hurt with shoes on the free list. A. E. Little telegraphed CHAMP CLARK that the A. E. Little Co. sold many shoes abroad at higher prices than they brought in this country, and that as the Sorosis shoes were meeting the competition of the English manufacturers on their home ground, there evidently was nothing to fear from the English manufacturers, if they brought their shoes to this country.

A Lynn, Mass., paper, commenting on that statement, says:

The A. E. Little Co. are entitled to the courage of their ignorance. But are they sincere? Or is it only a grab at free daily newspaper advertising and a desire to pose as the one American manufacturer who has shoe producing down to a really economic basis?

Mr. Little knew perfectly well that such an utterance would be grabbed up by every free-trade newspaper as a justification of the attack on the shoe duty. He knew it when he made a similar utterance two years ago. He does not know that free shoes will not injure him. He will not find one manufacturer in a hundred to agree with him, among the well-informed, who know the great advances made in foreign shoemaking and styles within the past two years, not only in England, but in France, Germany, Austria, and even Japan. Is there not a pretty good chance that the other 99 are right and he is wrong? And with the scales as evenly balanced as they are now, and foreign shoe imports increasing tenfold in six months, as they did in the last half of 1910, is it not fool's philosophy to propose to give the foreigners the equivalent of 10 cents on the dollar advantage?

It can certainly do Mr. Little no good for the Government to thus offer a 10 per cent inducement to foreign shoemakers; the almost united opinion of other manufacturers is that it will do the whole American shoe trade much harm; in common courtesy and fairness to his fellowcraftsmen, could he not have restrained himself from this rush to the center of the stage?

I am informed that the A. E. Little shoe is marketed abroad in an unusual way. The manufacturers of that shoe are among the few American manufacturers who sell shoes abroad, and they are among the limited number who sell shoes through their own stores.

There is a shoe manufacturer in Great Britain named Clark who runs a line of shoe stores similar to those familiar to us in this country; he manufactures a man's shoe. The manufacturers of the Sorosis shoe have made an arrangement with Mr. Clark so that they sell their women's shoes, the Sorosis being a woman's shoe, in the same establishment in which the men's shoes manufactured in Great Britain are sold. They have adopted this method of disposing of their goods, and, presumably, it is a profitable one, because it is being followed in Great Britain and, I think, to some extent on the Continent.

One other point about the Sorosis shoe. I have a pair of them here which I purchased yesterday in Washington, paying $4 for them.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Do I understand the gentleman that Mr. Clark, the English manufacturer, and the Massachusetts manufacturing company are selling their goods in this country?

Mr. WEEKS. Not in this country, but in Great Britain and on the Continent.

Mr. CANNON. Are selling them in Great Britain from the same room, one American made and the other English made?

Mr. WEEKS. That is substantially correct. I believe there is a thin partition between the two departments.

Mr. CANNON. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts informed as to whether there is being an international trust formed between these makers of footwear?

Mr. WEEKS. My investigation has not developed that fact. Now, I have here a $4 shoe which three or four years ago would probably have sold at $3.50. It is the ordinary Sorosis shoe.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. I understand the shoe that the gentleman is now exhibiting sells now for $4, and the current price two years ago was $3.50?

Mr. WEEKS. I did not say two years ago, but I think it would have sold at one time at that price.

Mr. KENDALL. Is it possible that the price of shoes has advanced that much since the tariff was removed?

Mr. WEEKS. I think so.

Mr. KENDALL. In the speeches made by the gentleman and some of his colleagues two years ago, the country was assured that the removal of the duty on hides would have the effect to reduce the price of shoes to the consumer.

Mr. WEEKS. I wish the gentleman would apply that statement to the man who made the speech.

Mr. KENDALL. I was quite sure that I heard such words fall from the lips of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. The gentleman from Iowa is mistaken; I never made such a speech or such a statement.

Mr. KENDALL. I am glad to see that the interest of Massachusetts is reviving in the protective-tariff policy. Let me ask another question: In the gentleman's opinion, what is the cause of the increase in the price of shoes?

Mr. WEEKS. I will go into that in detail later. Now, Mr. Chairman, the tops of these Sorosis shoes, and every part except the heel and the sole, is of vici kid, which is dutiable at 15 per cent. The shoe itself is dutiable at 15 per cent under the Payne-Aldrich bill, and will be dutiable at 15 per cent if the bill we have under consideration becomes a law. It is therefore easy for Mr. Little to assure the people that he is willing to have shoes made of cattle hides come in free when his own production is protected at the rate of 15 per cent, and will be if this bill becomes a law as now written. It is possible, of course, that he had not noticed this fact.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I trust that the gentleman from Massachusetts does not mean to insinuate that there can be any selfishness on the part of any manufacturer as to the rates put on shoes.

Mr. WEEKS. Well, I will leave the gentleman to make up his own mind on that score, having given him the facts.

Mr. CANNON. And yet, if I understand the gentleman right, and I want to get the facts into my head correctly, this manufacturer, who seems to be willing that shoes made from hides of cattle should be upon the free list, and this bill, if it becomes a law, leaves 15 per cent duty on the class of shoes he speaks of made by Mr. Little——

Mr. WEEKS. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. Then he is entirely disinterested, of course. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEEKS. This completes my list of the 3 shoe manufacturers out of 1,322 who have made the public statement that they are willing to have shoes come in without a duty on them.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is Mr. Little the only man who makes the kind of shoe exhibited by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and on which there is a tariff of 15 per cent?

Mr. WEEKS. No; I do not think he is—oh, no; he is not.

Mr. MADDEN. Are there any of the large American shoe manufacturers who make this kind of a shoe?

Mr. WEEKS. That particular shoe is made alone by Mr. Little, or the A. E. Little Shoe Co.

Mr. MADDEN. Are there any other shoes of this class made?

Mr. WEEKS. There are other types of women's shoes that are made of such material that they would not be put on the free list under this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the percentage of this class of shoe made in this country?

Mr. WEEKS. It is the percentage that would obtain from having some other material than the hides of cattle, the predominant component in making up the shoes.

Mr. MADDEN. What I want to know is, What proportion of all of the shoes made consist of the class of shoes about which the gentleman is speaking?

Mr. WEEKS. I have not that information.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. Where does this disinterested manufacturer live, who is willing to have everybody's product but his own go on the free list?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Little manufactures in Lynn.

Mr. KENDALL. Massachusetts?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; Lynn, Mass.

Mr. KENDALL. I thought so.

Mr. WEEKS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to pass to the proposition which was advanced the other day by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL], that most of the items in this proposed bill covered products which were controlled by trusts or combinations or monopolies. The shoe industry is one of the best distributed industries in the manufacturing line in the United States. Shoes are manufactured in 32 different States. The industry is increasing very rapidly in sections of the South and West, more so than it is in the East, where the industry originated. I recall only three manufacturers which are capitalized in such a way that the stock has a public market; these are the Regal Shoe Co., the W. L. Douglas Shoe Co., and the McElwain Co. Some preferred stock of each of these companies has a public market. There are many shoe companies in name, but those companies are close corporations in which stock has been issued to the partners and in some cases to the employees, but in no case are they public corporations. I do not know a single case, and I can not find one after considerable investigation, where the owners of any particular company have any interest in any other company. Therefore it is not possible that there can be any combination in the shoe industry in this country.

I want to call to the attention of the House at this time, fearing I may forget it, the fact that most grades of shoes sell at a difference in price based on 25 cents. It may be claimed that there is some combination or this would not be possible, but that is not the case. Shoes sell at $3 or $3.25 or $3.50, and every manufacturer who is making shoes of that general style and price puts into his shoes such value that his shoes will continue to sell. Suppose a man who sells shoes at $3.50 tries to scrimp their value, there are so many other well-known $3.50 shoes on the market that the minute he commences to lessen the value of his product his sales commence to decrease, so he must keep up the quality in order to maintain his output. Competition is keen enough in the shoe industry to bring about that result.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I have been paying a dollar a pair more for my shoes since two years ago, when hides were put upon the free list, and I inquired why. I was told there was an arrangement between the different manufacturers making that class of shoe by which they agreed to raise the price. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I was told that by the people who sold me the shoes.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, there is no truth in that statement. There is no arrangement at all. There is not a scintilla of evidence anywhere that there is any such arrangement. I doubt if the gentleman from New York is paying a dollar more for a shoe than he was three or four years ago—that is, for a shoe of the same value. I think, probably, he is paying 50 cents more.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Made on the same last, by the same parties, claimed to be made of the same kind of leather, and on the same kind of machine.

Mr. WEEKS. It may be that that is true, but the probabilities are that the increase has been 50 cents a pair instead of $1, if the same quality is in the shoe. Now, as to the leather industry. There is no combination in the leather industry. It is true that there are two large leather companies in this country—the Central Leather Co. and the American Hide & Leather Co.—but I am informed they do not manufacture more than 35 per cent of all the leather that is tanned in the United States, probably not more than 30 per cent, without including the tanning which is done for the packers—that is, by Armour & Co., Swift & Co., and Morris & Co., who now tan or stock tanneries, using in this way about one-half of the hides which they produce. The other two large packers do not tan any hides at all, but in any case, including the packers, these companies do not include one-third of all the tanning establishments, in number, in this country, and they do not include more than about 35 per cent of the total output of leather. No one can say—not even "the peerless one" would contend—that 35 per cent of a business in several different hands constitutes a trust or monopoly or combination.

Now, as to the question of machinery. It has been frequently stated, both on this floor and in the public press, that the shoe industry was in the hands of a machinery monopoly—that is, in the hands of the United Shoe Machinery Co., which does a large part of the shoe-machinery business of this country. This company represents a combination made 12 years ago of three companies—the Goodyear Sewing Machine Co., the MacKay Shoe Machinery Co., and the Consolidated & MacKay Lasting Machine Co. Each of these companies furnished fundamental machines to perform a particular class of operations, each independent of the other, but together making up the links of one industrial chain. But, in addition to these main machines, this company owns or controls more than 100 different kinds of machines which are used in the manufacture

of shoes. It does not require in its contract that any number of its machines shall be used. In fact, there are 60 different shoe machinery manufacturers in the United States furnishing shoe machines which are working side by side with these fundamental machines of the United Shoe Machinery Co.

Any manufacturer can lease the company's essential machines without being obliged to use any other machine which the company makes. Substantially every factory in the United States uses machines which it has not obtained from the United Shoe Machinery Co. In many cases they come in direct competition with the machines which this company produces. None of the machines which stitch together the pieces of the upper part of the shoe are produced by this company, and necessarily these machines must constitute a large part of any factory's equipment. The direct advantage which the United Shoe Machinery Co. has is that it can furnish all the machines which are used in attaching the soles and heels to the uppers, known as the bottoming room, and I believe it is the only company which can do this.

SUMMARY REGARDING MACHINES USED IN SHOE FACTORY FITTED TO MAKE GOODYEAR-WELT SHOES.

Total operations in factory, hand and machine	185
Hand operations	28
Total machine operations	157
Total operations done on machines not furnished by the United Shoe Machinery Co. or which may be done on competing machines	146

Any manufacturer is at liberty to lease the Goodyear welting machine and the Goodyear stitching machine without being obliged to lease or buy anything else from the company. Any manufacturer can lease the company's essential machines without being obliged to use any other of the many machines which the company makes. He can take the others or leave them, as he pleases, without regard to any lease he already holds.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WEEKS. I will.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Are these machines protected by patents.

Mr. WEEKS. They are protected by patents.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Are those patents near termination or have they a long time to run?

Mr. WEEKS. They have different times to run, but different patents are being taken out constantly, not only by the United Shoe Machinery Co., but by all other companies.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Have not a large number of the original patents run out?

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, undoubtedly; because this combination was made 12 years ago and they had been manufacturing machines for many years before 1899.

Mr. MANN. These machines are also protected, as I understand, by 45 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WEEKS. They are.

Mr. MANN. Which it is not proposed to remove in connection with putting shoes on the free list.

Mr. WEEKS. That is a fact. I do not want to forget it, but I noticed the gentleman from Illinois put in the RECORD the other day a statement made by Mr. Florsheim, a Chicago manufacturer, criticizing this machinery combination, as he termed it, and said if shoes and leather were put on the free list that machinery should be also.

I want to point out what would be the result of putting this machinery on the free list. The United Shoe Machinery Co. not only manufactures in this country, but manufactures in England, France, Germany, and Canada. It was necessary for it to do this in order to maintain its patents in those countries. It manufactures the same machines in those four countries that it does in the United States and it supplies its entire market for machines outside of the United States from those factories. Now, if machinery were put on the free list, they would undoubtedly, if they were going to try to make the best possible return on their capital, manufacture all machines abroad and send them in here, because I have testimony, which I will submit later, showing that the average wage which they pay for labor in their manufactories in Europe is 9 cents an hour, while the average wage paid in this country is 27 cents an hour. They employ in the cities of Beverly, Lynn, and Lawrence, Mass., 5,000 men, who are paid an average of $15.75 a week, the total wage being something like $75,000 a week, or nearly $4,000,000 a year. Now, if their machinery were manufactured on the other side at one-third the labor cost, we can easily see that it would mean the payment of wages not of $4,000,000, to our workmen, but either one-third of that amount to our own workmen or to the workmen of a foreign country. That is what it would mean to put shoe machinery on the free list.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. What is the fact about some of the manufacturers of this shoe machinery refusing to sell their machinery, but only leasing it?

Mr. WEEKS. The United Shoe Machinery Co. only leases its machinery. It does not sell it at all.

Mr. BARNHART. Why not?

Mr. WEEKS. Because its policy is to lease its machinery. I want to point out to the gentleman some advantages that come to the shoemaker as a result of this policy. Any man of good character can start in the shoe business in this country if he has money enough to furnish working capital for his business. He can go into almost any good town and get a suitable plant built for a shoe manufactory, without a large cost to himself, and have his property exempted from taxation for a term of years. He can obtain from the United Shoe Machinery Co. machinery without any cost to himself, on a lease basis, so that his machinery cost, as far as this company is concerned, is nothing. Therefore this leasing system has tended to stimulate independent shoemakers in the United States and has prevented the combinations which possibly would have been made otherwise.

Mr. BARNHART. Another question. Is it not possible that the price you speak of there might be maintained through the action of the shoe-machinery companies in keeping their lease rates so high that a man, in order to manufacture shoes, would necessarily have to sell his shoes at a higher rate from time to time as this shoe-machinery company might dictate?

Mr. WEEKS. Let me point out to the gentleman from Indiana why it is not possible. In the first place, the average wage paid to labor in the manufacturing industries in this country is about 17½ per cent of the entire cost. The average wage paid to shoemakers in this country is about 22 per cent of the cost of the finished product—4½ per cent more than the average in other industries. The labor cost of a $2.50 shoe—a shoe that costs the manufacturer $2.50—is 22 per cent of that amount, or about 55 cents a pair. The machinery cost of that shoe is not over 4½ cents a pair. The highest machinery cost on any pair of shoes manufactured in this country is 5.09 cents a pair. The lowest machinery cost is one-half cent a pair, and the average machinery cost of all shoes made in this country—there are 260,000,000 pairs made—is but 2⅜ cents a pair. The gentleman from Indiana can easily understand that if the wage cost is 22 per cent of the total cost, which in the $2.50 shoe would be 55 cents a pair, and if the average machinery cost is 2⅜ cents a pair, the machinery cost bears so small a proportion to the cost of the shoe that it is negligible.

Mr. ESCH. Can a manufacturer of shoes lease a portion of his machinery from the United Shoe Machinery Co. and purchase or lease his other portion of machinery from other manufacturers?

Mr. WEEKS. He can; and that is done by a large part of the shoe manufacturers of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want the clerk to read a letter which I send to the desk from a manufacturer of women's shoes in Fort Dodge, Iowa. I use this because it is an admirable statement of what I have been outlining, and which I would like to have time to discuss further, and would do so if the facts were not so clearly stated in this letter. However, before the reading of the letter I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Before the letter is read?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I understood the gentleman to say that the policy on the part of shoe manufacturers of renting machinery with which they made the goods they sell, instead of purchasing the machinery outright, enabled the manufacturers to engage in the business with less capital than would otherwise be necessary?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And that would tend to increase the number of manufactures?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If the figures submitted by Mr. HARRIS, of the gentleman's State, are correct, they would show that in 1910 there were 1,316 different concerns in the United States making shoes, when statistics show that 10 years ago there were more than 2,000 concerns making shoes, so that it seems to indicate that the number of concerns is getting less rather than more.

Mr. WEEKS. That is true; but if it had not been for this practice of renting machines I believe that instead of there being 1,316 different concerns now in the United States there

would be considerably less. This policy has not prevented people from engaging in the shoe manufacturing business, but it has, in my judgment, decreased the tendency to abandon it.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman stated the cost of the product in England and in this country, and also stated the cost per pair on shoes costing about $2.50 per pair.

Mr. WEEKS. The labor cost I stated, to which the gentleman refers, is the labor cost of manufacturing the shoe machinery, not the labor cost of manufacturing the shoes.

Mr. JACKSON. Can the gentleman give us the labor cost of manufacturing shoes in this country and in England?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; I will do that later.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. COX of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman, before he passes from the feature of foreign patent rights, whether it is not true that American manufacturers are no longer compelled to maintain their plants in Germany in order to retain their patent rights?

Mr. WEEKS. I understand that is correct; but the United Shoe Machinery Co. built a plant in Germany when it was necessary for them to maintain the plant there in order to retain their patent rights.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Now, will the gentleman permit this observation? At the time the American Government had up with the German Government, through the Commissioner of Patents and the Secretary of State, the matter of eliminating this practice, many of the manufacturers in my part of the country—and I think I represent the largest export district in America—were anxious to have that practice or regulation done away with. Our manufacturers held that by means of high-class machinery and help they were able to effect economies by manufacturing in this country and shipping the products abroad. It is true with reference to the cash register and the sewing machine that it is cheaper to make them in Ohio and ship them abroad than to make them in Russia or in Germany, a situation that conflicts with the gentleman's statement with reference to cheaper labor abroad.

Mr. WEEKS. That is true of certain industries, notably with the bridge-building industry. Some industries may be so well developed in this country that they can compete with any foreign manufacturer or with the facilities which any foreign manufacturer has. But I will call attention a little later on to the fact that these facilities are constantly increasing over there, and they are becoming more active rivals all the time. Furthermore, the question of manufacturing in this country or abroad would be largely determined by the proportional cost of labor to the whole cost.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. MANN. I will state to the gentleman in that connection that the bill proposes to put biscuits and crackers, and so forth, on the free list, and keeps the duty on nearly all the machinery used in making them. The tariff is paid on that machinery, because it is imported from England. It is not made here.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish once more to call attention to the fact that the letter now about to be read was written by a shoe manufacturer located at Fort Dodge, Iowa, and it is a statement of his iden of the advantages of using the machinery of the United Shoe Machinery Co.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1910.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to an article appearing in September number of Hampton's Magazine on the shoe-machinery question. The author of this article, while in the main correct, has presented his article in such a way that the reading public are likely to be entirely misled as to any real danger or hardship or oppression. Almost any large business, when dealt with in the aggregate, that is, as to the volume of business and profits, and not by the unit of profit or profit by article, is apt to appear in a false light and create an entirely wrong impression with the public. Specially is this true if the charge is made, as this article states, that the American people are being robbed and that the royalty paid to the United Shoe Machinery Co. constitutes a large share of the cost of shoes and attributes in large degree the high cost of living to this fact. Nothing could be further from the truth. While it is true that the machinery company in large measure controls the shoe machinery industry, it is so by virtue of having the best machinery on the market for the different processes of shoemaking.

Being a manufacturer of shoes (we make women's shoes), I am in a position to speak authoritatively on the subject.

Dealing with the subject as it applies to each pair of shoes, what do we find? We find that the largest amount of royalty that is paid on the highest-priced women's welt shoes is about 4½ cents per pair. Now, this would not appear to be such a large amount to go into hysterics about when compared with the total value of the shoe. This cost is, of course, added in the cost of the shoes, the same as leather, labor, and any items of expense in manufacturing, and, as you see, constitutes a very small amount of the cost or value of a shoe.

A shoe selling to the consumer at $4, $4.50, or $5 would have 4½ cents royalty cost. But what do we get for it? We get, first, as stated, the best made, most efficient machinery ever placed on the market for the different operations of manufacturing shoes. Next, we have the use of a corps of expert machinists, who come without cost to us (sent by the United States Machinery Co. from their different agencies) to set up the machines, teach operators, and keep the machines in repair at all times. We just to-day telegraphed for machinists to come to repair and put in operation two of their machines which became disabled. We are entitled to and get the benefit of improvements on machines by paying freight only on new machines. They send machinists to put up machines, teach operators in every instance, and also at any time if machines are disabled or new operators to be taught.

Royalties are very small, on some machines in the system from $5 to $50 a year. For a few machines operating material is bought from the company, such as nails and wire, but the cost per pair is so very small that it is hard to figure in some instances the cost per pair. I think I can safely and conservatively say that 85 per cent of the shoe manufacturers of the country are perfectly satisfied with the present conditions, with the cost, with the treatment, and with the advantages of having the best-organized concern, employing the best and most competent machinists, who are at all times at the service of the shoe manufacturer.

Now, as to any presumed extortion from the consuming public. What would be the result if we were operating under old conditions? Several different machines for doing the same operations would be on the market, some good, some bad, and some quite indifferent, but none of them with the efficiency of the machines in operation now, because the United Shoe Machinery Co. do not put out machines until they have been thoroughly tested and found absolutely perfect in their operation. This is necessary from every point of economy, because their revenue depends upon the perfect and constant working of the machines, as most of the royalty is paid so much per pair. The shoe manufacturer is not a machinist. When, under old conditions, he bought a machine he had to buy it outright and take his chances on its doing the work as represented by the company selling, and also take his chances on an improvement being made at any time which would make his machinery worthless. He would have to employ an expert machinist, competent to take care of all his machines, which could hardly be done, for the United Shoe Machinery Co. people find they have to and do employ separate machinists for each system of machines. If such a machinist could be employed, he would be a very high-priced man, and the ordinary manufacturer could not afford to pay the price, and if they did they would have to add the extra cost to the cost of the shoe. So, taking the expense incurred by depreciating machinery, which would be constantly occurring in large degree, other than ordinary wear and tear on account of continual supposed improvement, together with the large expense of employing at high salaries expert machinists to take care of and keep in repair the machines, the cost per pair over what it now costs would conservatively amount to four or five times as much as the present royalty system involves. What would be the result? Every small concern and, in fact, every concern except the very largest would be forced out of business, because they would not have capital enough to keep up their machinery account and employ the high-priced experts to take care of it, and we would have a shoe manufacturers' trust far more formidable and costly to the consumers than under present conditions. The fact is that under the admirable organization of the United Shoe Machinery Co. the industry of shoe manufacturing is stimulated, so that any energetic, capable person with a little money can go into the shoe manufacturing business. The development of the shoe industry in the United States in the past few years has demonstrated this. The people to-day are buying better shoes for the same or less money than it would be possible under, strictly speaking, competitive shoe-machinery competition. It might be asked where and how does the United Shoe Machinery Co. make such large earnings? Per pair the profit is small, but in the aggregate, due to their magnificent organization and equipment and the consolidation of the business, the operating cost is reduced and the aggregate profit, of course, large. In other words, they save what would be wasted or dissipated by the old method, and the public is getting their share of this saving.

No one can complain from an economic point of view to a 4½ cent a pair cost in a pair of shoes when that cost would be doubled or trebled under other and less favorable conditions.

I am induced to write this letter in order that a false issue may not be started and the consumer of shoes be led astray by a wrong conception of the matter.

Very truly,

R. O. GREEN.

Mr. HARDY. In connection with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that the machinery to make crackers, and so forth, was imported and a duty paid on it because not made in this country, I noted that the gentleman now occupying the floor [Mr. WEEKS], when the question was raised by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] as to whether the machinery cost might not interfere with the independents making shoes, stated that the machinery cost of most manufactured articles was between 2 and 4 per cent.

Mr. WEEKS. The gentleman from Texas misunderstood me. I said the machine cost for manufacturing shoes averaged 2½ cents a pair. I was not speaking of other articles.

Mr. HARDY. Now, I want to suggest, with reference to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, that the machine cost for crackers made a very small per cent of the total cost of crackers, and that therefore the duty paid would be so infinitesimally small in connection with the total cost that it seems to me that ought not to affect the cost of crackers.

Mr. FORDNEY. What is the machinery cost for making crackers?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I stated when I began speaking to-day that I was going to talk about the shoe and leather industry. I think I know something about that, and I do not want to have injected into it some other matter which I have not investigated and concerning which I may not have the information.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman is right; but I only spoke of that in reply to what the gentleman from Illinois had said.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me, as long as the gentleman's remarks about the machinery cost of manufacturing crackers are in the RECORD, I would like to have in the RECORD a statement of what the machinery cost for making crackers is.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to have this cracker argument left out of my remarks.

Mr. MANN. The other side of the aisle are very much interested in crackers.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, just for the purpose of getting the thing clearly in the RECORD, I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts whether or not the United Machinery Co., referred to in the letter that has just been read, is the United Shoe Machinery Co., of Massachusetts?

Mr. WEEKS. It is the same company.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one critic of the United Shoe Machinery Co., at least in some respects, is Mr. Charles H. Jones, president of the Commonwealth Shoe Co., to whom I have referred. Notwithstanding his not being entirely in sympathy with this company, I want to read something that Mr. Jones stated in a public interview four years ago as to the advantages of this company's machinery and its methods.

Q. Is it not a fact, as claimed by the advocates of this bill, that the Shoe Machinery Co. is very arbitrary in its dealings with the shoe manufacturers and that its large earnings are a heavy tax on the industry?—A. There are, undoubtedly, some clauses in the different leases which manufacturers are required to sign with the machinery company that give the impression that the company desires to bind the manufacturers and limit them in their business action to an unreasonable extent. At the time of the organization of the machinery company I resented very deeply what seemed to me the extreme and unfair advantage that they were taking of the power which they undoubtedly held over shoe manufacturers, but in the six or seven years during which they have been in operation I must say that I have waited in vain for any unfair or arbitrary use of this power on the part of the company; in fact, their dealings with us have been marked by more consideration than was formerly shown us by many of the constituent companies. It is a fact that must not be overlooked, that if the company is a despotism it has been up to this time of the most benevolent type. It has actually reduced the prices on many of its machines; it has placed others in our hands on a rental system that has saved us a very large investment of capital; it has certainly given more faithful care and attention to the running of the machines and keeping them in order; and in our country factories, where we employ a large proportion of inexperienced help, they have given us more constant and faithful attention in instructing new operators and in the supervision of the machinery under trying conditions than we ever obtained from any of the constituent companies.

Q. Has the charge for such service as you describe been increased over what you formerly paid?—A. I can not say that it has. As far as I recall them, the royalties demanded by the company are the same, exactly in amount, that we have always paid. It is only fair to add that they have supplied us with many additional machines to do the minor parts of the work, without any charge at all. These machines have been of considerable value to us, both in the saving of labor and increasing the uniformity of the goods, and are such machines as would undoubtedly have cost us a round sum if the United Shoe Machinery Co. had not been in position to furnish them to us gratis.

Q. The newspaper reports of the hearings at the legislature made quite prominent the statement that exorbitant prices have been charged by the company for supplies. The prices of tacks and nails in the open market and the price charged by the Shoe Machinery Co. were compared. Do these statements show the facts as they actually exist?—A. I did not see the statements, and so can not answer that question; but if you wish to know whether the company is charging us an unfair price for tacks and nails, will say that this is entirely untrue. The royalty on some of their machines is derived from the price of the tacks and nails used on them; consequently the price which they charge for the tacks and nails is certainly greater than the same thing could be bought in the market for use by hand; but, as a matter of fact the Shoe Machinery Co. charges us no more for tacks to-day than they did many years ago when tacks in the open market were much cheaper than to-day; in fact, my impression is that they have actually reduced the price of tacks between 25 and 30 per cent, while everyone knows that the cost of tacks and nails in the open market has advanced.

Also, in regard to eyelets, which they now manufacture extensively, we are paying them from 10 to 20 per cent less than we formerly paid, although it is perfectly well known that the copper and spelter from which they are manufactured have advanced in price nearly 50 per cent since 1899.

Q. You do not seem to be one of the manufacturers who regard this trust as one of the burdens on the industry?—A. I must say that that is not my view to-day. I am by no means convinced that all their methods are the best, or that their policies might not be changed to make them more liberal in some respects, but I am very glad to say that the expectations I had of what was to be the result of this combination when it was formed have not been borne out by our experience. Up to this time I do not believe any manufacturer who has been honest and straightforward in his dealings with the company can show any clear grievance against the company, or can make out the slightest case of crowding or coercion. On the contrary, I can say for ourselves that the question of royalties and machinery, which was formerly one of the most vexatious and exacting departments of our business, has ceased to give us any concern at all. We were formerly obliged to examine new inventions, and were forced to make experiments with machines for months at a time, with the result that we obtained more or less bad work, and were put to much useless expense, and the thought and attention of our best men was given to deciding between the merits of the old and the new. We were obliged to dicker and trade with every different manufacturer of machinery all the time with the moral certainty that somebody who had more time and attention to give to it would get a better bargain than we were able to obtain, and with it all there was an enormous and perpetual shrinkage on account of the changes made necessary by the introduction and adoption of machinery that was not thoroughly and satisfactorily developed before being placed on the market. To-day this is all changed. If we want a machine, we simply notify the company. Their agent confers with our foreman. The best machine known for doing the work is installed with little or no expense to us. We are obliged to pay a rental in some cases, which would amount to about the same as the yearly shrinkage in value of the machine if we had had to buy it, but the capital which we would formerly have been called upon to invest is still in our possession for use in our regular business. We are confident that we are getting the machine on as favorable terms as any competitor, and we are enabled to employ our own time and ability in the legitimate branches of our business, and we have not, up to this time, been obliged to pay as much for this privilege as we formerly paid, for the very much less satisfactory condition. It may be true that the Shoe Machinery Co. suppresses inventions, but my own experience with outside manufacturers during the past five or six years has gone quite a way toward convincing me that the outside inventor gets all the consideration from the company to which he is entitled. We have encouraged a few of them that we thought had good things, only to be sold out by them as soon as they could make a satisfactory trade with the company.

I wish to summarize some of the facts relating to this company and its business. The highest royalty charged in the manufacture of any shoe—the Goodyear welt men's shoes—is 5.09 cents per pair; for women's Goodyear welt shoes the royalty charged is 4.24 cents per pair; for McKay shoes, 1.75 cents per pair; for Goodyear turned shoes (both of the latter women's shoes), 1.1 cents per pair. This rental includes installation of machines, maintenance of machines, depreciation, all care of machines, and repairs, except the cost of new parts. The royalties charged abroad—and exactly the same methods are followed in other countries which prevail here—are the same as in the United States. It is claimed that the company has furnished its lessees with the very best equipment obtainable at all times; that it always substitutes improved machines for those which have become out of date; that since the combination was formed it has eliminated payments which were previously required for the installation of machines; that it has reduced its rentals and royalties, both directly and indirectly—the latter by furnishing auxiliary machines without additional royalty charge. It has constantly increased the efficiency and extent of its service; it has spent from $300,000 to $750,000 a year since the organization of the company in maintaining a corps of inventors and developers in its experimental department. During this time nearly 100 new machines have been developed by the company, and by the use of these new machines it is believed that manufacturers save annually in cost of production an amount greater than the royalties paid at the time the company was organized, 12 years ago.

I now take up the third proposition which I stated at the outset, and that is, why English shoes are sold in this country, why American shoes are sold in Europe, and why the shoe sales in many European countries are not increasing, and other matters relating to that subject.

We were the earliest and best developers of shoe machinery, which is the basis of the great prosperity in the shoe manufacturing industry to-day. As I have said, it only costs 2½ cents to make shoes with this machinery, while if labor had to be used the cost would probably be many times as much. The machinery is so well developed that it makes a better shoe, on the whole, than we would be likely to get if it were handmade.

Most of our shoes sold in Europe are made by a few manufacturers. George E. Keith is the largest seller, probably selling one-third of all the American shoes now sold in Europe. He has 23 shoe stores in Great Britain, 5 in London, 1 in Paris, and 1 in Brussels. Quite likely Mr. Keith makes more per pair by selling in this way than he would in any other. In any case, it is carrying out the same methods which prevail in this country, developed during the last 20 years by our large shoe manufacturers. Among the other large sellers abroad are the makers of the Sorosis, the W. L. Douglas, the Regal, and the Hanan. American shoes sold abroad are largely sold through these shoe stores established by the manufacturers themselves. They are not sold through jobbers to the same extent that shoes are in this country.

Now, why do people buy them if they can buy as good a shoe at the same price made in their own country, as they undoubtedly can? I do not believe that an American shoe ever sold on the other side on account of its being cheap in price, but

because it had more style and fitted the foot better. In fact, we do not sell any low-priced shoes in Europe.

The shoes that we sell there are all shoes varying from $3.50 to $7 a pair. They sell, first, because there is a large colony of Americans, especially in Paris, London, and other centers, who naturally buy the American product. Then there are people in Europe who like to buy things made abroad. In addition, there are thousands and tens of thousands of Americans traveling in Europe who naturally buy the shoe that they would buy at home if they were here. These classes furnish a large per cent of the market we are finding for our shoes abroad, and this business is being extended. My attention was called the other day to one of these American shoemakers who started a store in Sofia. This was no sooner done than a capitalist living there, attracted by the character of the shoe, thought it would be a good business, went to Germany, and made arrangements with the United Shoe Machinery Co. to start a manufacturing plant in Sofia. Then he went to Paris and raised additional capital, so that he is going to establish a manufacturing plant in Constantinople, one in Bucharest, and one at some other point in the Balkans; I do not recollect just where.

But we are not selling more shoes in Great Britain than a year ago; we are selling less, because the English have got on to our methods and our form and our style. We are selling more shoes in Canada, Cuba, and Mexico—very many more—in fact, nearly the entire increase in our sales abroad is in these countries. We are selling these shoes because the countries mentioned are near at hand, can buy more readily, and get quicker delivery than if they buy elsewhere. But our European trade is not increasing. That with Great Britain and France is actually falling off. Another reason, which I have neglected mentioning, why our shoes sell in Great Britain is that we have always made a shoe of better style. We have always made half sizes in shoes. The English for many years made their shoes varying from one size to another—a three or a four or a five, but no three and a half or four and a half or five and a half. They made only one width, or at most two, in each style. A friend of mine has told me recently that he went into many shoe stores in a city of 300,000 people in Great Britain, some seven years ago, and tried to buy an English shoe of more than one width, but he could not find such an article in any shoe store in that particular city. We make seven and eight widths for each size of shoe. That is one of the elements in increasing the cost in our shoe manufacturing business. We manufacture so many varieties of shoes, so many sizes, and so many forms.

That condition, however, is what originally gave us this foreign trade. We fit the foot of the purchaser; and, therefore, when a man has worn an American shoe once his disposition is to wear the same American shoe again. These methods have been adopted by foreign manufacturers, who have sent their men over here, putting them into our factories, buying our lasts, and getting our ideas, so that they are in time going to manufacture as good shoes in Great Britain and in France and in Germany as we do in this country. I do not mean shoes having as much value of material in them—because they have always put the value of material into the shoes—but shoes that will fit the foot—that have the style—and, therefore, are likely to sell as well as ours. The same condition is true in the manufacture of leather.

A few days ago I was informed by a tanner of leather in Massachusetts, one who has been shipping a large quantity of leather to Great Britain, that he had been informed by his customers there that the German and French leather was now quite as good as ours, and could be had at lower prices than they were paying in this country. Incidentally, the vici kid that I have spoken of, which composes the upper of the Sorosis shoe, was a German patent, which our people took up and developed in this country. Two former Members of this House, Mr. Foerderer and Mr. Burke, of Pennsylvania, were the developers of vici kid; they built up a very large trade in this country by using this German patent and making a product suitable for the market and also sellable abroad. Now, those people on the other side are making use of their own patents, and have developed a leather which fairly well meets the requirements of the trade which our leather has heretofore supplied.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, with the gentleman's permission, that I spent over a year in Scotland, and you can not possibly detect the difference now in some of the best quality of English-made shoes from the American shoes. I have been fooled a number of times myself in the purchase of shoes, supposing I was buying an American shoe, when, in fact, it was an English-made shoe.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have passed around this shoe which I hold in my hand having the toe cut off, because it is a sample of the best class of American-manufactured shoe. It is the Goodyear welt shoe, made for women. The section shows the connection between the inner sole, the upper, the welt, and the outer sole. I think it may be of some interest, because it represents the best product of our machine-made shoe and indicates the ingenuity required to develop machinery which will do all of this work.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman, while the shoe is going around, permit one question?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to wait for the shoe to get around; but I will say to the gentleman that I will yield to him for a question.

Mr. HARDY. If one of your companies can maintain and establish 23 houses in Great Britain in competition with the shoemakers of that country there, why can they not do it here?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I have explained to the committee why those houses have been established over there—because we were making a shoe of an excellent style, a shoe which fitted the foot, and our competitors were doing neither.

Our shoemakers made a shoe which was sold to American travelers and American residents over there and other people who liked it better than the shoe which was made there. Now, the English manufacturer is using the same last, frequently purchased in this country, and he is using the same machinery——

Mr. HARDY. Is it the gentleman's conclusion that these 23 houses established by an American factory would have to be closed in Great Britain?

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, people are very largely influenced by custom and habit. I do not think they will be immediately closed, but I am told that some of them are not profitable to-day, while some have worked up a profitable trade. It depends upon the local conditions. I do not think they will be closed this year or next year. I do not think they will be even if shoes are put on the free list, but eventually I feel positive they will go out of business in the countries referred to. Such ventures are seldom profitable at once; it takes time, capital, and experience to build up a profitable foreign trade.

Mr. HARDY. Now, I am asking for information, because I understood gentlemen the other day to say they bought the same kind of shoes in London much cheaper than they were sold here, and I did not understand the gentleman to deny that, and I would like to ask now, Is it a fact that those shoes are sold cheaper abroad than here?

Mr. WEEKS. It is not a fact. I do not believe you can buy an American-made shoe in London a cent cheaper than in this country. On the contrary, in some stores in some places it will sell at a higher price. The United Shoe Machinery Co., manufacturing its machinery abroad, as I have shown, at one-third of the labor cost in this country, leases it abroad exactly as it is leased in this country and at the same rate. There is no foreign manufacturer getting a single machine of the hundred and some odd made by the United Shoe Machinery Co. one penny cheaper than that machinery is being leased for in this country.

Mr. HARDY. What I wanted was the statement from the gentleman that it is not a fact that shoes made here are sold cheaper abroad than at home.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know of any such case and do not believe it exists.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such time as may be necessary to permit him to conclude his remarks.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I will try not to intrude upon the time of the committee any longer than necessary, but I have been delayed somewhat by questions.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If it be a fact, as the gentleman stated, that American manufacturers are not selling their shoes in the English market cheaper than they are selling them here, has the American manufacturer anything to fear from the competition of English shoes in this country?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, that is a pretty difficult question to answer definitely, but I will try to answer it before I finish my statement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman just at that point to see if I understand it. I understand the United Shoe Machinery Co. of America charges the same license for their machinery and that they manufacture at a less labor cost in Europe than here.

Mr. WEEKS. Absolutely.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, I understand that they are selling that machinery, manufactured abroad at a less labor cost, to the foreign manufacturer and that he engages in the manufacture of shoes abroad at one-half or less the labor cost with the same kind of machinery that comes in competition under this bill with American-made shoes——

Mr. WEEKS. That is true, except they do not sell the machinery; they lease the machinery there, as they do here.

Mr. CANNON. Now, the machinery which they lease is similar in Europe to that used in the United States, and it is leased upon the same terms; but in the United States, as I understand the gentleman, and that is what I want to ask him, the cost of operating the machinery in the shoe factory is at least double what it is in Europe. Is that correct?

Mr. WEEKS. That is substantially correct; I am just coming to the question of labor cost.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, are not two statements inaccurate? Last and style have nothing to do with the machinery leased by this company, both to the English and American manufacturer.

Mr. WEEKS. The last is an entirely different matter from the machinery, of course. But they are buying their lasts over here in order to get our styles.

I want to add one word to my answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], to the effect that the machinery cost of shoes is less in this country than it was five years ago. It is less than it was 10 years ago, when the combination was formed. It is the only item which goes into the making up of a shoe which has not increased in cost in the last 10 years, and the machinery cost is the only item going into the making of shoes abroad which is not cheaper abroad than it is in this country. Every article that goes to make up the shoe, in small ways, as well as the leather, is cheaper abroad than it is here.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Do the English shoes of the same grade sell in the English market for a less price than an American shoe of that grade?

Mr. WEEKS. It is pretty difficult to tell. If they are not of as good style——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the answer to the same would indicate that the Englishman may make his shoes of the same grade cheaper than the American. You have stated that the American gets as large a price in England as he does here. I think it would be quite as important to be informed as to whether the Englishman is getting a larger profit upon the same grade or whether he is selling cheaper.

Mr. WEEKS. It is difficult to say when a shoe is of the same grade, although they are made by the same machinery and on the same last. It is a question of finish. The English use some different methods from ours in making their shoes. They use hand labor instead of machine labor, in some instances, which adds something to the cost of the shoe.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The question of grade would be the controlling question with the purchaser, would it not?

Mr. WEEKS. The question of style, and whether the shoe fitted his foot or not—such things are taken into consideration and are frequently the controlling factors in deciding what shoe one will buy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the custom that is said to prevail in certain European countries of marketing as American made goods that are made at a cheaper wage rate in Europe than in the United States?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The consular reports frequently tell us that is the practice, namely, that shoes made abroad are labeled "American-made shoes," and in this way obtain popularity in foreign markets.

Mr. WEEKS. It is possible that is so, but I have not investigated that subject.

Mr. MURRAY. May I ask the gentleman whether or not he has any figures which he can give us on the relative efficiency of American shoe laborers and foreign shoe laborers?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I have not any definite figures on that subject, but this machine labor is largely controlled and limited by the agreements which are made with the unions in both countries, to a greater extent abroad perhaps than it is in this country. For instance, a welter of shoes in Brockton, Mass., welts 22 dozen pairs a day. If he is a skilled man he may finish his day's work at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. In this respect, I should say, it is something similar to piecework. But I see no reason why the shoemaker of England should not be as competent a man as the shoemaker in this country. He is not, however, able to complete as much in the way of finished product, because the methods over there have not been as up-to-date as our methods; that is, they have in the past used more hand labor, and, in consequence, less machine work has been done. But all of these conditions are being gradually changed to conform to those which obtain in this country.

Mr. CONNELL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNELL. The gentleman has stated that a great deal of the trade in American shoes abroad comes from Americans who travel abroad?

Mr. WEEKS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CONNELL. I wonder if there are any statistics on that subject?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think it would be possible to get statistics on it.

Mr. CONNELL. Is it not a fact that the average American traveling in Europe is more apt to buy the thing that is made abroad for the novelty of the thing?

Mr. WEEKS. That might be true of other articles of wear, but I do not think it would be true with respect to shoes. My little experience and the inquiries that I have made upon that subject would lead me to a directly contrary view. Americans abroad are sight-seeing and they can not take chances on wearing ill-fitting shoes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that our Consular Service, our consuls abroad, have reported that since the introduction of the American machinery in the manufacture of shoes our trade in Great Britain and on the Continent has fallen off?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; our trade is falling off in Great Britain and on some parts of the Continent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to continue the third proposition which I advanced when I commenced to speak, regarding the sales of shoes abroad and here, the cost of labor, and other items which bear upon that proposition. We make in the United States 260,000,000 pairs of shoes in a year at this time. The average labor cost is $460 a year to those engaged in the manufacture. There is considerable difference in the wages paid to labor in the different sections of this country which I want to point out, not because the highest wage is paid in the State which I in part represent, but because it shows the benefit which accrues to the laboring man from increasing the output to the full capacity of a factory and locality—the advantage which comes from developing the industry to the highest possible degree of efficiency.

For instance, Brockton, in Massachusetts, is the largest shoe manufacturing point in the United States, and the highest average wage paid to shoe workers in the United States is paid in Brockton. The next largest manufacturing point in the United States, excluding one or two points in California, where a limited business is done, is Lynn, Mass., and the second highest rate of wages paid in the United States is paid in Lynn. The wages paid there are materially higher than the wages paid in most other Massachusetts cities and towns and very much higher than the average paid elsewhere in New England, and so much higher than the average paid in other parts of the country that you will see the probable advantage in developing these industries at certain points to the highest degree of efficiency.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. The statement of the gentleman as to the rates of wages is very interesting. Does it not also show that the laborers' compensation is not entirely dependent upon the tariff, if they are getting different rates in this country?

Mr. WEEKS. I think that is true. I do not think anyone will contend, and I do not believe it has ever been contended on this floor by anybody who has ever given serious consideration to the subject, that the difference of wage paid to labor in this country and other countries depended entirely upon the tariff.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman's statement as to "those who have given serious consideration to the matter" lets him out. [Laughter.] It has been stated repeatedly on this floor that the rate of wages depended on the tariff.

Mr. WEEKS. I give these figures, not to reflect in any way upon other parts of the country, but because they are interesting and should go in the RECORD.

In the Southern States the shoe industry from 1900 to 1905 increased 110 per cent. It is increasing in some of the sections of the West much more rapidly than in New England. For instance, Ohio has become the third largest shoe-manufacturing State in the Union, and Missouri has become the fourth, the industries in those States being largely centered in Columbus and Cincinnati in the one State and in St. Louis in the other. There are 3,363 people employed in this industry in the Southern States, and their wages are $897,000 a year, or about $266 each.

The average wages paid in the Atlantic States, which includes New York and Pennsylvania and Delaware and Maryland, is $423, or a little less than the average wage for the whole country. There are 30,277 people employed, and their wages are $12,802,835 a year.

The average wage for the Central States, which include the Mississippi Valley States and Ohio, where there are 35,753 people employed and their wages are $14,377,281 a year, is $402 per year. The average wage in Ohio itself, where there are 13,890 people employed and their wages are $5,222,723 a year, is $379; and in Missouri, where there are 10,428 people employed and their wages are $4,335,005 a year, it is $414. The average wage for New England, where there were 79,537 people employed and their wages were $40,462,957 for 1905, which is the year to which these figures apply, was $508. The average wage in Massachusetts for that year was $562.29.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to ask the gentleman if the shoe workers themselves generally are unionized?

Mr. WEEKS. I think so; almost entirely so.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then the statement of the President about the Shoe Workers' Union was correct—that they did voice the sentiment generally of the shoe workers?

Mr. WEEKS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MURRAY. May I ask the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that there are two very highly organized unions in this trade, between which there is a very keen rivalry on most public questions of this sort?

Mr. WEEKS. I know there are two organizations.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the gentleman know that there is some rivalry between them?

Mr. WEEKS. On some questions there is keen rivalry, but I do not think there is any rivalry between them as to their desire to get a suitable recompense for their services. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has just stated the average wages in various sections of the country in the shoemaking business.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will ask the gentleman whether that is an increase or a decrease as compared with the wages paid a few years ago?

Mr. WEEKS. That is an increase, a decided increase.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Since 1890?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; and since 1895 and 1900, too.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have some figures here which show that in the year 1900 the average wage paid throughout the country was $437.

Mr. WEEKS. I am talking about the shoe industry. I am not touching other industries now.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I am talking about the shoe industry; but probably I have included some other industries in these figures. But I think these figures are prepared to cover shoes.

Mr. WEEKS. I could not answer the question if it includes other industries than shoemaking. I am not talking about other industries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make some comparisons between the wages paid to machine shoe workers in various cities of this country and abroad. For instance, the welter in six St. Louis shoe manufactories gets 41 cents an hour. In two Newark, N. J., factories he gets 67½ cents an hour, and in several Brockton factories he gets from 55 to 70 cents an hour. The Goodyear welters working on women's shoes in four Lynn, Mass., factories get 50 to 60 cents an hour; in two Brooklyn factories from 55 to 65 cents. These are sample wages which I have had looked up.

Lasters in Great Britain receive $7.75 a week. Lasters in the United States, on an average, receive $18 a week. The welter in Great Britain receives $9.35 a week. The welter in the United States receives $25 a week. The stitcher in Great Britain receives $9.37 a week. The stitcher in the United States $25 a week. The heeler in Great Britain receives $8.25 a week, and in the United States he receives $18, and in some cases a great deal more.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Can the gentleman give any idea of the relative efficiency of the two kinds of labor?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think there is any great difference in the efficiency.

Mr. SHERLEY. But can the gentleman give any actual figures of efficiency? That is a necessary factor in the case.

Mr. WEEKS. I have said that the welter in Brockton is limited to 22 dozen pairs a day. In the English factory he works a greater number of hours, but probably he does not do any more than the workman in this country, although he may work more hours. I have not the statistics to demonstrate the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is the difference as to the price in this country due to the difference in efficiency of the workman? The gentleman has shown that there is a marked difference in the wages between different parts of this country, in some cases as much as 33 per cent.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; but wages are different in all industries in different parts of this country.

Mr. SHERLEY. But does the gentleman say that that difference is on account of the difference in efficiency?

Mr. WEEKS. No; not entirely; but in places where business is carried on on a large scale better labor is developed, and generally better labor conditions prevail.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say, in all fairness to the gentleman, that I am trying to get the data to show whether or not that may not also explain the difference in the price between the average American and the average English wage. If these figures are to be of value they must carry with them all the factors in the equation.

Mr. WEEKS. It is difficult to do that. If the gentleman from Kentucky were a manufacturer and he had a hundred lasters in his employ, it would be difficult for him, even in his single factory, although he might be familiar with them and their work, to determine what was their relative efficiency, and put that efficiency in figures. There would be a difference in the men and in the work they could do, and I do not see how such figures could be prepared for a section or the whole country without including the hours employed and the product finished, both of which conditions are frequently governed by agreements with the labor employed. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to go on. The cutters in Great Britain get $8.50 a week and in this country $21.

Let me compare these with the wages on the Continent. Machine workers in France get $7.50 a week, somewhat less than the wage in Great Britain. In Germany they get $6.39 a week. The average wage in this country for similar work is three times that. The best comparison I have been able to make between the average wage in the shoe industry in European countries and this is that they get on an average 40 per cent of as much wage as our people do.

Mr. THAYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. THAYER. Is there any great immigration of skilled shoemakers from France to this country?

Mr. WEEKS. I think so.

Mr. THAYER. Has the gentleman any statistics on that subject?

Mr. WEEKS. I have not.

Mr. THAYER. Now, one other question on a subject the gentleman has already covered, but I had to get a statute to verify my belief. When the gentleman spoke of the beneficent operation of the United Shoe Machinery Co.——

Mr. WEEKS. I did not refer to it as "beneficent."

Mr. THAYER. That was the tenor of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. WEEKS. I referred to it to show that it was not a monopoly.

Mr. THAYER. Did the gentleman have in mind the statute—the act of 1907, in Massachusetts, chapter 469—which was passed against this very corporation?

Mr. WEEKS. I did not have it in mind, but I am perfectly familiar with it.

Mr. THAYER. I would like to have that read.

Mr. WEEKS. I object to having it read in my time. The gentleman can put it in the RECORD in his own time, if he sees fit.

Mr. FINLEY. In referring to the wages paid those engaged in the shoe industry in England and the United States, is it not a fact that the wages paid are based upon piecework rather than by the day or week?

Mr. WEEKS. No; I do not think there is very much work done based on piecework. There is some in all industries, but I do not think that the workingman is generally inclined to adopt that basis for his agreement with his employer.

Mr. FINLEY. Has the gentleman the figures to show the amount of work turned out by the American workman in a day or a week as compared with the amount turned out by the English workman in a day or a week?

Mr. WEEKS. No; I have not.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman not think that, in order to make the comparison accurate, that should be included?

Mr. WEEKS. It would be a very difficult thing to get, because it would vary in every factory; and I do not think there are any statistics, either in this country or abroad, that would furnish the data.

Mr. FINLEY. I beg to differ with the gentleman. I have seen such statistics. I do not have them in mind at present.

Mr. WEEKS. I should be glad to have my attention called to them, because I do not know of any.

Now, I want at this point to call attention to the fact that the English Board of Trade has very recently been making some investigations in this country as to the conditions of labor and wages and the cost of living. I will print these newspaper clippings relating to the subject. Briefly, this report shows that, assuming that a man in Great Britain gets a dollar a day, the same man doing the same work in this country would get $2.30 a day, and that the cost of living in this country is 52 per cent higher than it is abroad. The report is most voluminous and is along similar lines to the instance just quoted. The following article with reference to the British Board of Trade's inquiry is from the Boston Transcript:

WAGES, OURS AND BRITAIN'S—A REVIEW OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT'S INQUIRY—THE EXHAUSTIVE MANNER IN WHICH THEIR INVESTIGATORS WENT INTO OUR EXCELLENT CONDITIONS—LIVING FOUND MORE COSTLY HERE, BUT WAGES MUCH HIGHER STILL—WHAT THE EXAMINERS SAW IN BOSTON—SOME STRIKING LESSONS TO US AS WELL AS TO ENGLAND IN THE FIGURES THEY PRESENT.

[By F. W. Coburn.]

The British Board of Trade's inquiry into the cost of living in American towns, the document which, with its frank admission of the better estate of American workmen, at least one Tory organ has declared to have dealt a deathblow to free trade, has just reached these shores. Press dispatches this past fortnight have told of excitement caused in the tight little island by its findings. John Bull has long hugged the delusion that while 'Arry and Hobbs were paid smaller wages than those received by working people in Brother Jonathan's realm, the situations, at least, were essentially evened up by the much higher cost of living in "the States."

Now comes the relentless statistician of the labor department of the board of trade to prove, after an exhaustive study of 28 cities of the United States, that the English workman who emigrates and successfully reestablishes himself in an American community gets wages that are about 130 per cent better than he had received, while his expenditures for food and rent are advanced only by about 52 per cent. He makes by removing his Lares and Penates.

Technically the inquiries included "the collection of statistical data as regards wages and hours of labor, rents, prices, and family expenditures on food."

It is the generalizing summaries, of course, which have disturbed British complacency. The results of the international comparison show that the ratio of the weekly wages for certain occupations in the United States and England and Wales, respectively, at the dates of the two inquiries was 243 to 100 in the building trades, 213 to 100 in the engineering trades, 246 to 100 in the printing trades, and 232 to 100 in all the trades together. Allowing for a slight advance in wages in England and Wales between the dates of the two inquiries the combined ratio would be 230 to 100.

MORE MONEY AND LESS WORK HERE.

Not only do American workmen receive much higher wages, the British investigators are obliged to admit; they work shorter hours. The weekly hours of labor on this side were found to be 11 per cent shorter in the building trades, 7 per cent shorter in the printing trades, and 6 per cent longer in the engineering trade, the combined ratio showing up as 96 to 100 in this country's favor.

As regards rent, it was found that the American workman pays a little more than twice as much as the English workman for the same sort of housing. The actual ratio is 207 to 100. The difference between the two countries is much less marked in the retail prices of food, exhibiting a ratio of 138 to 100.

Almost interminable family-budget studies lead to the conclusion, which might have been expected a priori, that "the consumption of meat is much larger in the United States, and the consumption of vegetables is also larger. The budgets indicate in general that the dietary of American working-class families is more liberal and more varied than that of corresponding families in the United Kingdom.

This monumental inquiry, one learns, was begun in February, 1909. It investigated 28 cities, all but two of them lying east of the Mississippi. These American towns were as follows:

New York.

New England towns: Boston, Brockton, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, and Providence.

Other eastern towns: Baltimore, Newark, Paterson, and Philadelphia.

Central towns: Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Louisville, Muncie, and Pittsburg.

Middle West towns: Chicago, Duluth, Milwaukee, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and St. Louis.

Southern towns: Atlanta, Augusta, Birmingham, Memphis, New Orleans, and Savannah.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the man who gets 130 per cent more and pays 52 per cent higher for his living cost would be 78 per cent better off?

Mr. WEEKS. Of course he would.

In the year ending June 30, 1910, the value of the imports of shoes into this country—I want you to listen to these figures, because they are rather illuminating—was $171,807. The duty on those shoes was from 10 to 15 per cent; on some of them 10 per cent, under the Payne-Aldrich bill, and on some of them 15 per cent. It averaged almost exactly 13 per cent on the total. The total duty on the goods was $22,695. The labor cost on these shoes in this country would be 22 per cent of the value of the shoes—that being the average cost for the whole of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean the labor cost of the shoe itself, or the labor cost of everything going into the shoe, including the making of the shoe?

Mr. WEEKS. I mean the labor cost in making the shoe. The labor cost of the 1910 importations would be $37,685 in this country on that basis.

The labor cost abroad, figuring it at 40 per cent of our labor cost, which would be almost exactly the English board of trade figures, would be $15,074, a difference in labor cost of $22,611. Twenty-two thousand six hundred and eleven dollars is within $84 of the actual duty collected on these goods. In other words, the difference in labor cost and the duty of 13 per cent were substantially the same amount. That seems to be a scientific tariff, based on the difference between the cost of labor at home and abroad. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY. May I suggest an inaccuracy that occurred to me as the gentleman went along—that the amount of duty collected was $37,000.

Mr. WEEKS. The amount of duty collected was $22,695. I read the wrong figures.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has stated these figures demonstrated that this is a scientific tariff. It is not in accordance with the Republican platform, is it, because it eliminates a reasonable profit to the manufacturer?

Mr. WEEKS. I added a scientific tariff, based on the difference in the cost of labor abroad and at home.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the gentleman does not take any credit for a tariff of that character.

Mr. WEEKS. We take all the credit we can get. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to a comparison of wages at home and abroad, I should like to ask my colleague whether it is not true that under the German regulation, which compelled the American manufacturer to maintain his plant on German soil in order to keep his patent rights, he operated there and sold in the German market, and was not compelled, in consequence, to pay the German tariff.

Mr. WEEKS. That is my impression, though I am not sure.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Now, further than that, about a year ago the Commissioner of Patents and the Secretary of State, at the behest of business interests in this country, induced Germany to give up that regulation. Is that not true?

Mr. WEEKS. I think that was given up about two years ago.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it not true that it was given up at the behest of American manufacturers?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know at whose behest or for what reason, but the Germans do now impose a tariff upon our manufactured goods which would offset the difference.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it not a matter of historic truth that the change was brought about by the intercession of our Commissioner of Patents and the Secretary of State?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know about that.

Mr. COX of Ohio. And, further, because the American manufacturer so desired.

Mr. WEEKS. I am willing that should go as a statement of the gentleman from Ohio, which I have not investigated.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Well, it is correct, absolutely. And the point is this—if the alleged cheap help made possible cheaper products abroad, then why do American manufacturers ask Germany to remove the patent regulation in order that the American plants can be brought home?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, the only case in point which bears on the subject which I am discussing is the United Shoe Machinery Co., which was manufacturing in Germany before this change was made. Now, I want to call to the attention of the committee the fact that we are actually receiving in

this country English shoes. I would like to have the members of the committee look at these shoes which I have here on my desk, from which they can determine whether they think the Englishman can make good-looking shoes. These are all English shoes, made either in Nottingham or Leicester. They are offered for sale in Boston and quite likely in other parts of the country.

I am informed that these or similar shoes are being contracted for by the Kendall Co., of Kansas City, and by other shoe jobbers. It was stated in the Boot and Shoe Recorder of April 26 that five English drummers have been offering English shoes in Boston, and a Leicester man told me only yesterday that a Leicester manufacturer had received an order from the United States for 5,000 pairs of English shoes a week based on samples he submitted, but that his factory was not large enough to warrant his filling it, though he could ship a part of his supply to this country and make money at the price offered. The increase in the shipment of English shoes to this country, while not large in the years 1908, 1909, and 1910, will be a considerable factor this year.

If the second half of the year shows the same rate of increase as did the first half, the importations will amount to $600,000 or $670,000 for the year. It is reported that Sears, Roebuck & Co., a large distributing house in Chicago, have recently placed abroad an order for 300,000 pairs of women's cheap shoes, shoes which take the place of those manufactured in this country. Before making the proposed reduction in the duty on shoes, Congress should give careful consideration to the views expressed by our competitors when the duty was reduced in 1908. The Boot and Shoe Trades Journal, of London, of August 27, 1909, in an editorial stated, among other things:

When we come to the higher grades our advantages are even more pronounced and our prospects more pleasing. Our 12s. 6d. and 13s. lines compare to a distinct advantage with the $4 shoe of America, whilst, in addition, we can give an English oak sole by the side of a red or union-tanned sole of American manufacture. There is no comparison in the wear or in the shape-retaining qualities of the two articles. In the cheaper-class goods, and particularly in boys' and girls' school boots, we can beat our rivals hand over fist. They have made a big mistake in reducing their duties on footwear. As we have said, not a solitary American shoe was ever sold here in consequence of its cheapness, but because of its novelty and its better fitting qualities. But our friends across the "pond" have no longer these monopolies. We have carefully copied all these good points and married them to the undoubted advantages we have always possessed, namely, better work, more durable work, and better sole leather. We have the best of their machinery, and we have some which they have not got, and, what is more, we know how to make use of our advantages. It is for these reasons that our shoes are superior and cheaper.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the amount of shoes imported from England for 1910 approximated $178,000?

Mr. WEEKS. One hundred and seventy-one thousand dollars.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Can the gentleman inform the committee, approximately, what exportations of American shoes to Great Britain took place in the same year, 1910?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; I can do that. Mr. Chairman (after searching), I have mixed my figures so I can not find those which would furnish a reply to this inquiry, but I will say that the shipment of shoes to Great Britain from the United States decreased from 1909 to 1910.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will permit, I think I can give the figures. The exportations to England from this country for 1909 were $998,762 worth and in 1910, $799,453 worth, a loss of about $200,000.

Mr. WEEKS. I stated early in my remarks that the increase of shipments of shoes from this country was to Cuba, Mexico, and Canada, and the continental part of Europe, and the trade to Great Britain has fallen off.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman permit another interruption, and that is to say, that a very few years ago we had a large business with Australia.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And that is absolutely cut off by the duty of 30 per cent?

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to refer to that right here, to say the duty is 40 per cent, not 30. Here is something that happened in Australia within two weeks. They have a wage board in Australia, which has recently increased the rate of wages to be paid to shoe workers with this result.

I take my information from a report made by Vice Consul General Baker in Consular and Trade Reports, April 1, 1911:

AUSTRALIAN BOOT AND SHOE INDUSTRY.

With reference to the Australian boot and shoe trade, the increasing difficulty, as appears, of Australian boot and shoe manufacturers in competing with imported goods, owing to increased cost of wages, has resulted since the first of this year in one Melbourne factory, with a capacity of 5,000 pairs of boots, being closed down, while all the factories engaged in the trade are suffering and have decreased their output.

The benefit to employees from increased wages as ordered by the wages boards seems to be offset by decreased work for them to do, many men having been recently laid off. On February 1 a mass meeting of those engaged in the industry was held at Melbourne, at which it was suggested that the Government should be requested to increase the duty on imported boots and shoes to about 70 per cent. One of the leading manufacturers said at this meeting that, owing to the rise in the wages, the manufacturers had to make a slight advance in the price of footwear and that opened the door to the foreigner. They had imports in 1909 of $1,372,000 worth of shoes and in 1910 $1,747,900 worth, an increase of $375,000 in one year. They had to compete against the wages paid in England and other parts, and to meet labor conditions, which led to 26s. ($6.35) being paid for 53 hours' work. When the wages were fixed at £2 2s. ($10.22) the manufacturers paid 10d. (20 cents) per pound for their "crop." To-day they find that the commodity has gone up to 1s. 3d. (30 cents) per pound. Wages had increased from £2 ($9.73) to £2 14s. ($13.14). Several of their factories were closed and others were only working half time, and manufacturers were obliged to lose some of their best men.

Now, I want to call attention to the duties which are imposed by other countries on our footwear. In Canada the duty has recently been raised to 30 per cent; in Mexico it is from 30 cents to $1.50 a pair; in France, under the new tariff, it has been recently raised from 50 to 95 cents a pair; in Germany it is 20 per cent and averages about 25 cents a pair; in Belgium it is 27 cents a pound; in Russia it is $1 a pound; in Spain it is $1.10 a pound; in Japan it is 40 per cent; in Argentina it is 40 per cent; and so on through the list. Every country with which we are doing any considerable business imposes a tariff on our footwear, while we are proposing to give up the policy which we have been consistently following since the organization of this Government in putting our footwear and our shoemakers on a free-trade basis.

I have been asked some questions as to the reason why we have an increase in the cost of shoes in this country. Mr. Charles H. Jones, to whom I have referred several times, stated recently before a committee on the cost of living:

I have no suggestions to offer the committee as to how the American shoe can be brought to the consumer on a lower basis of price. The $3.50 shoe costs the factory approximately $2.30. Selling, office expense, and the ordinary advertising necessary in any modern business bring the cost up to at least $2.50, and frequently $2.55, leaving but a narrow margin of profit for the manufacturer, who is obliged to sell the shoe for $2.60 or less. The retailer, who pays $2.60 for a $3.50 shoe, has practically no profit at all for himself. His cost of doing business is approximately 30 per cent, so that a man's $3.50 shoe, which is naturally a leader in the hands of the average retailer, contributes nothing at all to his profit.

If this statement is correct, a man's $3.50 shoe, which is naturally a leader in the hands of the retailer, contributes nothing at all to the retailer's profits.

Mr. Jones goes on to say that the increase in the cost of these shoes is based on the increase in cost of almost everything which goes into the shoe, including the cost of the lasts, the boxes in which the shoes are shipped, the cost of selling, maintaining more drummers on the road and paying them higher wages, the cost of labor and the cost of material, an increase which necessitates the selling of what was formerly a $3.50 shoe at $4 or $4.50 a pair.

The opposition to this legislation does not come entirely from the manufacturer; it comes from labor, and especially that labor directly interested in the industry. As an indication of labor's position I quote from a letter written by John F. Tobin, general president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, April 26, 1911:

The greater efficiency of labor in the shoe industry in the United States, as against any foreign country, is not sufficient to offset the lower standard of living in all foreign countries as compared with the United States, notwithstanding the cheaper labor prices which prevail in foreign countries. To put shoes and finished leather on the free list, or to in any way reduce the present tariff, would compel American shoe manufacturers to meet foreign competition through the only avenue open to them, namely, to attack the wages of the shoe workers and thereby bring about a standard of wages lower than at present exists, which would result in industrial warfare and no doubt eventually establish the lower standard of wages, consequently the lower standard of living.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Would not the same argument apply to the bill pased a few days ago, known as the Canadian reciprocity bill?

Mr. WEEKS. I want to say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I have stated, I think, three times that I am trying to discuss the shoe industry, and I am stating to him and the other members of this committee what I think that industry is entitled to. I do not say that all other industries or all other classes are getting what they are entitled to, more or less. We might agree and we might disagree as to that, but now I am trying to prove to him that the shoe industry and the shoe worker are entitled to all the protection now being given them.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Can the gentleman give the committee some information as to the condition of the shoe industry, as to how it is prospering, and whether or not it is making large profits or merely reasonable profits?

Mr. WEEKS. I can give the gentleman from South Dakota briefly some information on that subject. It is a good industry; and, like all others, perhaps to a greater extent than in most other cases, it depends on the skill of the management and the volume of the business. The probable average profit made by the best shoemakers, by Mr. Keith and others, is about 8 cents a pair. Mr. Jones and Mr. Keith have both testified recently that the average profit which they made was about 8 cents a pair. But the profit on coarse or low-priced goods is very much less than that. It is not more than about 3 or 4 cents a pair. I very much doubt if you will find any shoes on which the manufacturing profit is more than 10 cents a pair.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Can the gentleman give any information as to the probable cost on the capital invested in that line of industry?

Mr. WEEKS. I can not do it, because I have not the figures segregating the selling cost from the profit, after taking out the cost of material, the cost of labor, the cost of machinery, and the cost of salaries.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course, the vital thing the committee would like information upon, if we are to be informed about the industry, is what percentage he makes upon his capital.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the industry is making about 8 cents a pair on shoes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course, that throws no light on whether it is profitable or not profitable.

Mr. WEEKS. It throws some light on it, because the capital invested is about $125,000,000; 8 cents a pair would be about $20,000,000. So that would indicate that the gross profit, after taking out the cost of selling, is 16 or 18 per cent; but this does not allow for the capital invested in machinery, which is leased, and it probably does not adequately cover the cost or the value of real estate, which in such an industry is usually carried at a very low figure. These charges would greatly reduce the net income.

Mr. BOWMAN. Has the gentleman considered the competition that would come from the surplus, in view of the fact that it has been stated on the floor of this House that manufactories are being established at Helsingfors, in Finland, and in other European countries, fully equipped with American machinery and supplied with American lasts, so that in case of depression in trade, when they would carry large stocks of goods, those stocks might be thrown in here, and thus demoralize the business of this country?

Mr. WEEKS. I have not referred to that because I have not had time to, but I will say that that is an element which ought to be considered. If you are going to remove the duty from shoes, we will become the dumping ground of the surplus of all the manufacturing establishments of the world. Whenever they have a surplus on hand, they will dump that surplus into this country at whatever price they can get.

That is a question frequently discussed here, whether American manufacturers are justified in selling abroad lower than the normal price at home. That is frequently done by the manufacturers of all countries. It is done because by so doing the manufacturer can maintain his establishment at the highest state of efficiency, can keep his labor employed all the time, and it enables him to sell closer than would be the case if he were obliged to run, making a reduced output. Many industries are not profitably run at 75 per cent of their full capacity, when they would be very profitably run at full capacity, even if the output were sold in both cases at the same price.

Mr. SIMS. As an illustration, I can suggest to the gentleman a case that all will appreciate. When the Payne-Aldrich bill was enacted, taking the duty off hides, putting hides on the free list, and reducing the duties on shoes and leather, it was predicted that the price of shoes would go down. Now, I use the Stacey-Adams shoe, and have worn that make of shoes for a number of years, and a few months after the Payne-Aldrich tariff went into effect I went down town to the shoe store that I patronize to get a pair of those shoes and the firm charged me more for a pair of the same shoes than before. The price was higher than when the Payne bill was passed, and this gentleman told me they had not increased their profit at all, but that the shoes cost them more.

Mr. WEEKS. I have spoken of that, and I have gone into some detail to show why shoes are now costing more than they cost five years ago. But I want to ask the gentleman if he is sure he got a Stacey-Adams shoe?

Mr. SIMS. Yes. I have got them on now, and they are subject to the gentleman's inspection. [Laughter.] They said they would either have to increase the price of the shoes or reduce the quality of the material that entered into their manufacture, and they had chosen the former.

Mr. WEEKS. The gentleman should always be sure that he sees the stamp of the manufacturer on the shoe, then he will be likely to get a better article.

Mr. SIMS. I have worn that kind of shoe for 14 years.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I will suggest to the gentleman that he might have bought the shoes from different retailers, and that point should be taken into consideration when commenting on a difference in price.

Mr. WEEKS. Gentlemen on the other side have repeatedly said during this debate that it was up to this side of the House to show why these duties ought not to be removed—why shoes should not be put on the free list, for instance. This is a great industry, employing a large capital and nearly 175,000 persons; some substantial reason should be advanced why a change should be made rather than propose the change and ask those interested in the industry or believers in the protective policy to prove that it is unwise. It would be just as logical for the Government to arrest a man and say to him, "Unless you can prove that throughout your entire life you have been innocent, you are guilty." The obvious method of procedure would have been for the Ways and Means Committee to have given shoe manufacturers and shoe workers a chance to answer this question and to show why the change should not be made. Instead of that, the majority has proceeded without any consideration, has agreed in a caucus to support the bill, without amendment, and it is impossible to believe that this attempt at legislation is not mere buncombe, intended to delude those in whose benefit it is supposed to be passed, if, indeed, it is passed at all. It is not information the other side wants; it is material to use in a coming political campaign; so if the evidence which I have tried to submit, bearing on this question, assists in showing the folly of proceeding in such a manner as has the majority in this case, I shall not consider the time wasted, although I have taken much more of the time of the committee than I intended. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, when the Canadian reciprocity bill was before the House I voted for it, not because I thought it entirely satisfactory, but because I thought it was the beginning of a good work—a first step in the right direction—and I felt that when the Representatives of the people had once put their hands to the plow they would not turn back, and that they would surely take additional steps in the same direction.

Many of the ablest advocates of a tariff for protection were wise enough to see the true meaning of it and frank enough to admit that their opposition to it was largely on the ground that it was an assault on the system of protection, and, so believing, they fought it with every weapon available.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] well expressed their views when he said that the reciprocity bill "was an abandonment of the protective policy."

The same thought is expressed in the report of the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee. They say:

> If this bill becomes a law it will mark the downfall of the protective system.

Other eminent gentlemen on the floor of the House, distinguished for their devotion to protection, have given expression to similar sentiments. These gentlemen did not, however, make their fight against the bill on that line.

Their arguments were not a direct defense of the policy of protection, which they admit this bill puts in jeopardy. They attempted, rather, to base their defense on the theory that the bill is an attack on the farmers of America, and they appealed to the agricultural interests and sought to enlist them on their side. Scarcely a word was said during the debate in defense of the American lumber interests, although the bill would undoubtedly reduce the price of lumber. Not a word was heard in defense of the Paper Trust, although, beyond question, its monopoly would be injured, if not destroyed, should the bill become a law. Other big interests which were involved had no open defenders on the floor, and the whole plan of defense seemed to be based on the supposed injury which would result to the American farmer. Why this silence as to the other interests? Why were there no voices raised bewailing the loss to the Paper Trust or the lumber barons? And why such sudden

solicitude for the farmers? Is it unreasonable to conclude that their volunteer defenders were trying to make a rampart of the farmers from behind which they might defend other interests that have been plundering the people far too long? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Some light is shed on the matter by Circular No. 271, sent out in opposition to the reciprocity bill by Mr. Wakeman, secretary and treasurer of the American Protective Tariff League. I quote the latter part of it. Speaking of the reciprocity bill, he says:

> It aims at a reduction of prices of such "necessaries" of life as the farmer has to sell, but provides for no reduction of prices for the "necessaries" the farmer has to buy.
>
> Protection can not endure upon a basis so entirely unjust and unfair. It must be for all, or it will be for none.
>
> Once the American farmer finds that protection is not for him, the end of protection will quickly come.
>
> Ten million votes are cast by American farmers. Kindly write or wire your Senator or Representative in Congress in opposition to the treaty.
>
> We inclose copy of Words of Good Cheer, giving the names of all Senators and Representatives who should be addressed in this connection.
>
> Very truly, yours, W. F. WAKEMAN,
> *Treasurer and General Secretary.*
>
> NEW YORK, *February 6, 1911.*

One of his objections, you will notice, is that the bill provides no reduction of prices—that is, no reduction of tariff—on what the farmer has to buy. Well, he can rest easy, for we are now ready to correct that defect and reduce the price of what he has to buy, and I hope Mr. Wakeman will be satisfied. He lets the cat out of the bag, however, when he tells us that "10,000,000 votes are cast by the American farmers," and that "once the American farmer finds that protection is not for him, the end of protection will quickly come."

Evidently the secretary of the Protective Tariff League looks on the farmer as a convenience, and the inference that some other advocates of protection take a similar view is not a violent one.

One would think, from the arguments of those opposed to the reciprocity bill, that the protective system had been originally devised, and is still maintained, for the sole and especial benefit of the farmers. I want to enter my emphatic dissent from such a view, and to assert that, on the contrary, this unfair and unreasonable system of levying and collecting taxes from the people for the benefit of favored classes has steadily robbed the farmer, and it would be a great blessing for him should Congress wipe out the whole protective system. Of course it would not be the part of practical wisdom to wipe it out at one stroke. We have had it with us so long that we have grown accustomed to it; our business transactions are based upon it; we have had to buy and sell with reference to it. During the 50 years it has been in existence it has become ingrained and interwoven in our business affairs to such an extent that it is now a fact, a condition, which, as sensible men, we must recognize. And we must deal with it in such a way as to create the least practical amount of business disturbance. There is a law of inertia in business as well as in physics, and we are bound to recognize that law and not move with undue haste, even in a good cause.

I remember reading somewhere that the girls employed in the arsenic mills in Austria-Hungary eat small quantities of that drug, because it gives to their complexions a delicate and much-desired tint. Little by little they increase the amount taken until, after long use, they are able to take with impunity a quantity that would kill an ordinary individual not accustomed to it. Of course the habit, if persisted in, finally causes death. But the strange thing about it is that if the victim suddenly ceases to use it she becomes violently ill and exhibits all the symptoms of arsenic poisoning. Hence to effect a cure of the habit the quantity taken must be gradually reduced until it can be finally dropped altogether. As it is with the arsenic eaters, so it is with our protected industries.

After the protection habit was formed it was necessary to keep increasing the dose, the recipients of the plunder always finding a pretext for the increase. First, they said that our infant industries needed wet nursing. Then they said we had to protect American labor from competition with the pauper labor of Europe. Then they insisted on protection for the American farmer. He must be protected, forsooth, by preventing the importation of articles which he is constantly exporting and selling in the open markets of the world and in competition with all the world. And, finally, they said we must have protection to guarantee the manufacturer a reasonable profit on his business. Having been practically driven from all these positions, they are now resorting to the familiar device of an armistice in order to gain time for the invention of some new pretext. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Their proposition is to create a tariff commission, which is to perform the impracticable, if not impossible, feat of ascertaining the difference in the actual cost of producing manufactured articles at home and abroad. In this they doubtless console themselves with the hope that the commission will not make a report until they can discover some new sophism with which to deceive the people into the belief that they can increase their prosperity by taxing themselves; and I am inclined to think they would not regret it much if the commission did not report till Gabriel was about ready to sound a blast on that historic trumpet. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

The advocates of protection are both shrewd and able. Persistent opposition has driven them together, has welded them into a solid and homogeneous mass, where they have been unitedly working, each for all, and all for each. They realized the force of Franklin's remark, and they have learned to hang together to keep from hanging separately.

In its earlier days its advocates justified protection on the ground that capital paid better in agricultural pursuits than in manufacturing, and they insisted that it was the duty of the Government to so frame the laws as to enable the manufacturers to make the price of their goods artificially high, so as to induce capital to leave the farms and go into manufacturing enterprises.

The raising of revenue from duties on imports is and has been practiced by all Governments, and is legitimate, because the money so collected is used for public purposes, and these duties are frequently levied on such articles, and in such a way, as to partially shield the home manufacturer of them from competition, thus giving him a limited and incidental advantage. But the theory of protection goes much further than this. It calls for the erection of practically impassible barriers against the wares of foreign manufacturers, leaving the American consumer entirely at the mercy of the American manufacturer. This stage of protection was reached only by slow degrees. Before the Civil War our tariffs were comparatively low, but the necessity for revenue during that struggle demanded an increase in customhouse taxes, and these taxes added to the foreign cost resulted in prices so high as to greatly stimulate investments in manufacturing enterprises.

Having tasted of the sweets of high prices and big profits those who enjoyed them were not satisfied to give them up when the war was over. But as the Government's need of money grew less, and it was proposed to reduce the customhouse taxes, those who enjoyed the benefit of war prices had to devise some new reason for the continuance of a high-tariff policy. Then it was they raised a cry for the necessity of protecting our infant industries, and they succeeded in getting the people to credit them. But the infant grew to adult size, became a great big, overgrown, selfish mollycoddle, who seemed to think consumers were created for his especial benefit. He bawled as if he were being crucified if a boy half his size made a face at him, and he had an attack of hysteria if asked to enter into any kind of competition. He wanted pap, and then more pap, all the time, and he wanted it brought to him at that, and because he never had to exert his strength he did not really know what he was capable of and lived in constant fear. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] told us the other day that the fear of the Wilson bill brought on a business panic nearly two years before the bill passed.

If the gentleman was right, it proves how timid and hysterical and brash those industries are which rest on protection. Of course I do not agree with the gentleman as to the fact. I think protection has borne two legitimate children. It is, as Mr. Havemeyer said, the legitimate mother of trusts, and it is also the legitimate mother of panics. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I might concede that there was a time when protection stimulated manufacturing enterprises, but stimulation, when excessive, is always followed, first by exhilaration and then by depression and prostration, and these panics are but "the cold, gray dawn of the morning after." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The "infant-industries" theory finally grew to be a national joke and had to be abandoned. A new watchword had to be found, and the infant was pushed behind the curtain, where he was kept temporarily out of sight but by no means out of mind. Its beneficiaries then insisted that protection was not for the benefit of the infant prodigy at all; that the real purpose of it had always been to protect the American laboring man against competition with the pauper labor of Europe. "We can not bear it," said the beneficiaries of protection at election time; "it makes our hearts bleed to see the American laboring men competing with the pauper labor of Europe." And the laboring men heard them and believed; and on this cry, aided by unpatriotic

appeals to passions engendered during the Civil War, protection again triumphed at the polls. But when the workingman, after the victory, insisted on getting his share of the protection pap in the form of higher wages, he was coldly ignored. Protection emissaries went to Europe and brought what they had been calling "pauper labor" right to the door of the American workingman to compete with him at close range and thus keep wages down, regardless of campaign promises. The workingman soon saw that if his wages were to be increased he must attend to the matter himself. He then went to work organizing labor unions, and in that work he had to overcome bitter opposition from those protected interests which pretended such solicitude for his welfare. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Another and a favorite argument of the protection advocates has been that by making the price of the manufactured articles high capital would be induced to invest in manufacturing industries; that then men with money to spare would invest it in manufacturing; that this would make competition keen, and thus bring about lower prices. Thus we were told that the protection policy might at first mean high prices, but that it would eventually make low prices by means of this competition. You may believe, if you can, that the party of protection really favored a policy because it would result in low prices for their wares. I must be shown. I am from near Missouri. [Laughter.]

That they were not sincere in it is fairly well indicated by their last platform declaration, which proposes to make the American people guarantee reasonable profits to the manufacturers, and that, too, regardless of the conditions ordinarily required to secure success in business; and leaving it entirely to the interested party to judge his own case and determine what is a reasonable profit. Do you imagine the beneficiaries of such a platform declaration when enacted into law would permit their modesty to interfere with their profits?

I would not assert that when they were urging the theory that lower prices would be reached through the protection policy they foresaw what did actually happen, but I will say that I think they did not really want low prices for their wares, and that they may have seen, and probably did see, that some way would be found to prevent the advent of low prices and only reasonable profits.

We now know that the promise, whether sincerely made or not, proved vain and empty. When the time came for the low prices through competition, those who made the promises organized trusts and other combinations to prevent the performance of their own promises. Protection prevented competition from without, and there could be little or none from within, new manufacturing enterprises being practically impossible, as no one would have the temerity to start a new business concern in the face of trust opposition, which would surely destroy his business by underselling well knowing that when it was destroyed they would get their money back from the customers by overcharging.

It is scarcely necessary now to call attention to another catch phrase long urged by the protectionists, namely, that the foreigner pays the tariff tax. I mention it, not to refute it—that would be waste of time—but rather to show their ingenuity, to show how prolific they have been in the invention of deceptive phrases. Driven from one position to another, I indulge the hope that they reached their last ditch when they proclaimed that the law should guarantee a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. No conditions are imposed, no qualifications provided. The investment may have been a foolish one; the machinery may be out of date, the business may be mismanaged, the capital stock may be inflated; 50, or 100, or even 200 per cent of water may have been pumped into the stock, as appears to have been done in the case of the Steel Trust, but still, according to the platform promise, the concern is entitled to a reasonable profit, and the interested parties are to decide what constitutes such a profit. Such a platform promise was at least well calculated to make the beneficiaries of protection open up their hearts and purses to those who made the promise, nor could they forget that past legislative performances justified them in accepting the offer at its face value. Surely those who made the promise must have been in great need of something with which those to whom they made it could supply them.

In the not very remote past it is generally believed that they contributed to the campaign funds of the protection party sums which could not have been expended legitimately, and they doubtless did it in the belief that the party would later on confer further legislative favors which would enable them to reimburse themselves from the general public, with liberal interest.

But the people disapproved of their policies and practices last November, and declared in favor of a real revision of the tariff downward, and they gave the Democrats a commission to make the necessary reductions.

I realize that the execution of that commission is a serious task. It is like a difficult but necessary surgical operation; it has to be done, but no matter how skillfully it is done it will hurt. In attacking intrenched privilege and wrong those making the attack must begin not where they would, but where they can. The necessity for beginning somewhere has been recognized by President Taft, who is a protectionist, and by many other prominent Republicans who are also protectionists. They prepared and proposed the Canadian reciprocity measure, and we carried it through the House. Again I say I think it is lame and insufficient if we stop with it. But why should we stop with it?

This first short step was proposed by a Republican President and supported by many Republican Representatives, and, little as it is, we Democrats would, in the face of our former declarations, be guilty of insincerity and political cowardice had we refused to take it. Having already taken it, we are now about to make further progress, to take the next step, and pass the Farmers' Free-List Bill.

I am not one of those who think that other and additional steps toward tariff reform will be prevented by another branch of the Congress or by the President. I assume that they will do their duty in the premises and join with us in giving the people the relief which they demand and need so much. But if they do prevent progress in that direction, they will surely have to answer to the people for it.

I feel reasonably sure that the President and those Republicans who voted for reciprocity are too wise and too clear-sighted not to see that a corresponding reduction of the more oppressive schedules is absolutely necessary for the relief of the public in general and of the farmers in particular.

Such revision could be made without particular disturbance or shock to business if certain professional protectionist calamity howlers would cease trying to save the protection graft by predicting all sorts of disasters in case any of it is taken from them. So good a protectionist as the editor of the Iron Age admits this to be true. He said, editorially, on December 22, 1910:

> The country generally has not felt seriously alarmed over the possibility that some of the schedules might be taken up separately and lower duties named on articles therein classified. This is a matter which was not thought to be specially disturbing, although it would, of course, retard trade for a time in the commodities on which new duties were under consideration.

And, again, he says:

> No general tariff revision is desired by the great majority of the people. The revision of a very few schedules of the present tariff is all that should be attempted.

You see, he admits that some schedules should be revised. And then he adds:

> The country imperatively needs a rest from governmental interference with business.

He wants "a rest from governmental interference"! Now, what do you think of that? The Government for 40 years has been legislating in the interest of a class. It has compelled and is still compelling millions of its citizens, through protection legislation, to pay tribute to that small class which the Iron Age represents. And look at the results.

We boast of our great national wealth, now rated at $125,000,000,000. Where is this wealth? Who has it? The great bulk of it has been gathered into comparatively few hands, and largely through tariff laws which, in my judgment, have prostituted the taxing power of the Government, by using it to make millions of our citizens pay tribute to a favored few.

This is well illustrated by a condition in the line of business which the Iron Age represents.

It is said when the 24 directors of the Steel Trust sit down to their table the owners of one-twelfth of the wealth of the United States occupy the chairs. This is further illustrated by the fact that 1 per cent of the American people own more property than the other 99 per cent, while five and one-half million American families, or 44 per cent of our people, own an average of only $150 per family.

The protection laws which are largely responsible for these conditions are still in force. The people still suffer from them.

But the Iron Age thinks we tamper with these laws too much, and that the country needs a rest; which, I suppose, means that the victims of protection should not grumble while the favored class is collecting its tribute from them. How kind and how good of the Iron Age. Speaking for that favored class he says, in effect, "All we want is to be let alone"; but in the meantime, like the daughter of the horseleech, they keep on crying "give, give." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But how about the victims? Do you not think they would be willing to put up with a little temporary inconvenience in order to be permanently relieved of a burden which has become well-nigh intolerable?

Of all those who have suffered from tariff exactions none have suffered more than the farmers. None have given more or gotten less through protection than they have. It is said by gentlemen that putting agricultural implements on the free list will not give them any relief; that they can now buy agricultural implements cheaper than they can be bought in any other country. That argument, as the poet said of vaulting ambition—

O'erleaps itself and falls on the other side.

If they can buy such implements cheaper here than anywhere else, what objection can there be to putting agricultural implements on the free list? But can they buy them cheaper here? I think the evidence is the other way. The manufacturers admitted a few years ago that they were selling their goods cheaper abroad than at home, and explained by saying they did so in order to keep their employees at work. I am glad that I can admit the fact without being compelled to accept their explanation of it. I prefer to take the view expressed by the late Mr. John Hay, Secretary of State. In an address made not long before his death, he said:

We are building locomotives for railways in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Our bridges can be built in America, ferried across the Atlantic, transported up the Nile, and flung across a river in the Sudan in less time than any European nation, with a start of 4,000 miles, can do the work. We sell ironware in Birmingham, carpets in Kiderminster; we pipe sewers of Scotch cities; our bicycles distance all competitors on the Continent; Ohio sends watch cases to Geneva. All this is of advantage to all parties; there is no sentiment in it. They buy our wares because we make them better and at lower cost than other people.

According to him, they did sell abroad cheaper than at home. They could not compel foreigners to pay such exorbitant prices as our protection laws enabled them to exact from the home folk.

Mr. Bridgman, in his book, The Passing of the Tariff, published in 1909, says:

The policy of underselling to foreigners has become a recognized practice on the part of the protected manufacturers of the United States, secret if possible, but followed constantly, whether secret or open.

Dr. Charles W. Elliott, late of Harvard, in an address made in September, 1908, said:

That the tariff is not necessary to the maintenance of American wages or American standards of living appears clearly from the common practice of selling American goods in foreign countries at much lower prices than they are sold in the United States, and yet at a profit.

And he significantly adds:

If the American people mean to maintain their individual liberty in industries, trades, commerce, and politics, they must steadily defend themselves against monopolies.

At its meeting in Hartford, Conn., in November, 1907, the National Grange passed a series of resolutions condemning American manufacturers for selling their goods cheaper in foreign countries than at home, at the expense of American agriculture, and recommending that every article so sold be put upon the free list.

There is scarcely a limit to the evidence which could be collected to show that gentlemen were in error in asserting that the American farmers got their implements cheaper than those of any other country, but I will content myself with adding a list of the home and foreign prices of American-made articles in common use, in all of which the farmer is interested:

Article.	Home price.	Price sold at abroad.
Cultivators	$11.00	$8.40
Plows	14.00	12.60
Axes, dozen	8.25	7.20
Kettles	1.40	.85
Table knives, gross	15.00	12.00
Horseshoe nails	3.00	[1] 2.00
Barbed wire	3.00	[1] 2.00
Cut rivets	10.00	[1] 5.55
Typewriters	100.00	60.00
Sewing machines:		
Fine	27.50	20.75
Medium	22.00	17.50
Cheap	18.00	12.00
Steel rails	28.00	[2] 23.00

[1] Per hundredweight. [2] Per long ton.

Our protection friends are great admirers of that form of sophism known as "the false cause."

When two things which might be related are found together, this method of reasoning assumes that they bear the relation of cause and effect. We have a high protective tariff, this alleged argument runs, and our farmers are prosperous, hence the high tariff caused their prosperity. Or this: We have protection and we have high wages, hence protection makes wages high. By a parity of reasoning I might say they have cyclones in Kansas; the farmers of Kansas are prosperous, hence cyclones cause prosperity. Or thus: We have a great many schools and churches in this country; we also have a great many divorces, hence the schools and churches are the cause of the divorces. And all of these arguments are equally sound, which means they are all unsound.

Mr. CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do.

Mr. CONNELL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if this is not a good place in his speech to elucidate a fact that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have evidently forgotten, a very important argument in bringing their case forward, which is that there is six weeks' delay in the coming of spring here in the District of Columbia, which may be figured as being due to this Democratic Congress?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is the tariff agitation here, of course, which did it. There can be no other adequate reason for it. [Laughter.] According to the logic of the protectionists, the two things being found together must bear the relation of cause and effect. [Laughter.]

Our prosperity is due to other causes than high tariff. The prosperity of the farmer, when he is prosperous, is largely due to the quantity of fertile land in this country adapted to the use of the best farming methods. The farms of the West average 386 acres. In France they average less than 20 acres. Our land in the West at least is comparatively new, and very fertile, and if the farmer has accumulated a little wealth it is largely due to the fact that increasing population has added to the value of his land. Cheap, fertile land and plenty of it has been the principal cause of our great growth, aided by the profuse abundance of mineral wealth of every kind which the God of the universe, and not the protective tariff, placed in the bowels of the continent. Every condition which makes for prosperity in agriculture is here. Climate, soil, variety of production, and facility for transportation; in short, nature seems to have exhausted herself in giving us every material advantage.

People from Europe came here in myriads because of these natural advantages. They came when we had low tariff, and they would have come just the same if we had no tariff, and their coming helped to develop our great agricultural resources. Many of them lived in tariff-ridden countries, and if protection is such a wizard in making prosperity, why did they have to leave the homes of their childhood to come to a strange land? It was not the fact of protection here that brought many of them, for many of them left that behind them, and many came when we did not have high protective tariffs.

The fact is that no decade in our history shows such material progress as the 10 years from 1850 to 1860 under the Walker tariff—a purely revenue measure.

Our national wealth during that decade increased 126 per cent, an increase far beyond that of any similar length of time.

The following figures contrast that decade with the one from 1890 to 1900, much to the disadvantage of the latter:

	1850 to 1860.	1890 to 1900.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Our national wealth increased	126.0	36.0
Products of manufactories increased	85.1	38.9
Capital invested in manufacturing increased	89.4	50.7
Railroad mileage increased	300.0	19.0

This remarkable progress, made during a decade when we had what protectionists, with ridiculous inconsistency, call a free-trade tariff, is a forceful and eloquent answer to the claim that protection is the cause of prosperity, except, of course, in the sense that protection has made favored individuals prosperous by affecting the distribution of wealth in such a way as to multiply millionaires at one end of the industrial scale and paupers at the other end of it.

The claim that protection is the cause of the high wages paid here is equally unfounded.

Primarily, wages should be an equitable share of what labor produces. What the labor of anyone will produce depends, first, on the efficiency of the individual and, second, on the conditions under which the labor is performed. Any comparison of wages in different countries, or in different communities in the same

country, which ignores these two fundamental conditions is necessarily, and I might almost add willfully, misleading. And yet while our protectionist friends never cease calling attention to the fact that we pay higher wages than are paid in other countries, they never once allude to either of these fundamental facts. They never tell that labor is more efficient here and that the conditions here are more favorable to labor, the environment better than elsewhere, and yet it is largely because of these facts that wages are higher here than abroad, and because of these facts wages have always been higher here. Whether we had high tariff or low tariff, wages were higher here; and if we had no tariff at all, wages would still be higher here because of the greater efficiency of the American laborer and the better conditions under which that labor is performed.

The position of the protectionists on this question of wages is singularly absurd and leads them into the most illogical positions. This is well illustrated in a speech made by one of my Republican colleagues from Illinois during the consideration of the Payne tariff bill and reiterated in his argument yesterday. Here is a table of wages he gave showing the day wage paid in certain industries in this country and also in Great Britain, Germany, France, and Belgium. He made the usual protection argument in connection with that table. He said:

I do not want to live to see the day when the American workingman will be forced by legislation to accept the low wage scale of foreign free-trade nations. If there be those here who think that there is no substantial difference between the wages received by our laborers and the wages received by foreign laborers, I would respectfully invite their careful inspection of the following comparison of wages in this country and the wages paid in free-trade Europe:

	United States.		Great Britain.		Germany.		France.		Belgium.	
	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.	Hour.	Day.
Bricklayers	$0.55	$4.40	$0.21	$1.68	$0.13	$1.04	$0.13	$1.04	$0.08	$0.64
Stonecutters	.42	3.30	.20	1.60	.12	.96	.14	1.12	.07	.56
Stonemasons	.46	3.68	.21	1.68	.13	1.04	.14	1.12	.08	.64
Hod carriers	.29	2.32	.13	1.04	.08	.64	.10	.80	No data.	
Carpenters	.36	2.88	.20	1.60	.13	1.04	.15	1.20	.07	.56
Painters	.35	2.80	.18	1.44	.12	.96	.13	1.04	.07	.56
Plumbers	.44	3.52	.20	1.60	.11	.88	.15	1.20	.08	.64
Machinists	.27	2.16	.17	1.36	.13	1.04	.13	1.04	No data.	
General laborers	.17	1.36	.10	.80	.08	.64	.10	.80	.05	.40

Not a word said about what the laborer accomplished in a day; not a word about the conditions or environment; not a word about the fact that in the United States we have less than 30 persons to the square mile, while Belgium, one of the countries compared, has 622 persons to the square mile, that Germany has 305 to the square mile, and that Great Britain has 347. How ridiculously absurd, to compare wages and conditions in two countries, when the population is 20 times as dense in one as in the other and competition proportionally keen.

But let us examine this table which is supposed to prove the case for protection and see what it shows. In the first two columns it appears that the American laborer gets about twice as much daily wages as the British laborer does. With the usual ostrich logic of protection it is assumed that that proves the case. Evidently there are none so blind as those who will not see. How very strange that my colleague and his protectionist associates could not see the real meaning of the figures he quotes.

His statistics show that protected Germany and protected France pay bricklayers 13 cents an hour. Protected Belgium pays 8 cents an hour, and free-trade England pays hers 21 cents an hour. And this proportion holds good throughout his table. The figures show, then, that free-trade England pays almost twice as large a daily wage as protected France or Germany and about two and a half times as much as protected Belgium. And this comparison is between countries where the conditions are nearly similar. According to my colleague's logic, the conclusion is inevitable that free trade means high wages and that protection makes low wages. Add to this the fact that German workmen migrate to free-trade England, but no Englishmen go to protected Germany, and according to protection logic, the case is proved.

Of course, the truth is, as I have already said, that wages are regulated, primarily, by what the labor produces, modified, of course, by the law of competition, and that the law of competition is in turn modified by labor organizations, which largely control it.

In Belgium, with 622 persons to the square mile, the struggle for existence is a hard one, and competition is keen. In the United States, with only 30 persons to the square mile, the struggle is less hard, competition is less keen, and labor has more to work on and draw from.

The question of efficiency is an important element in the amount of wages paid, and the misleading nature of reference to the daily wage as a basis of comparison without reference to efficiency is well shown by the statement of Mr. J. H. Bailey, of the Broderick & Bascom Wire Rope Co., of St. Louis, to the Ways and Means Committee on November 28, 1908. After giving the daily wages of British workers, he says:

The wages paid for similar services in the United States is doubtless considerably more than stated above, but to compensate for this difference in wages it must be borne in mind that in England one man attends to but 1 thick-wire block; in the United States 1 man attends to at least 4, and often 6, thick-wire blocks, while for the finer sizes, say Nos. 24 to 36, there is still a greater difference. For these sizes in England 1 man attends to 10 to 15 blocks; in the United States 1 man, with the help of a boy, attends to 30 to 50 blocks.

From the foregoing it will appear that while the individual earnings of the American workman is greater than that of the English workman, still the cost per hundredweight in wages is greater to the English manufacturer because of the greater amount of work turned out by the American workman, due to the greater number of machines attended to by the American.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie stated before the same committee that the general rule is that the highest-paid labor produces the cheaper products.

Senator GALLINGER, of New Hampshire, in a speech on the floor of the Senate June 25, 1902, said:

As regards the power of production, Mulhall has shown that a farm hand in the United States does as much as 2 in the United Kingdom, 3 in Germany, 5 in Austria, and 7 in Russia. It takes 4½ Europeans to equal one American.

And, again, he says:

This comparison is emphasized by our coal consumption and steam power and finally by our products of manufacture.

If the tariff regulated the amount of wages, then England, having no tariff, would pay the lowest wage of any country, but the table cited by my colleague shows—what, indeed, we all know—that the contrary is the fact, and that England, which on their theory should pay the lowest, in fact pays the highest, and much the highest, daily wage paid in any European country.

If their theory was correct the daily wage would be the same wherever the same tariff rate prevailed.

But we know that this is not true, and that the daily wage differs as much in different parts of our own country as it does in entirely different countries.

Carroll D. Wright, who was one of the foremost statisticians of his day, estimated the cost of living in this country and the various countries of Europe, and he measured it, not by money, but by days' earnings.

He concluded that the number of working days required to cover the cost of food, clothing, lighting, heating, and taxes for an average family are, in—

	Days.
England	205
United States	225
France	231
Germany	240
Russia	286
Italy	290

Speaking generally, according to this table, so far as Europe is concerned, the higher the tariff the lower the wages. But in spite of all this, in spite of the fact that wages were higher here, regardless of tariffs; in spite of the fact that wages have doubled in England since they abolished tariffs; in spite of reason and experience; in spite of everything, the protectionist will raise his voice and say, "Our high protective tariff is the cause of our high wages." A friend of mine insists that a man can make the most absurd statement, and if he will repeat it loud enough and often enough, after a while he will really think it is so. The protectionists make me think my friend is right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is a most significant fact that in spite of the great increase and vast amount of our national wealth, of the twelve million and a half of families in the United States, according to the census of 1900, five million and a half of these families were practically propertyless, according to the late Charles B. Spahr, then associate editor of the Outlook. He estimated that those five million and a half of families had an average of only $150 a family, consisting of clothing and household goods. He further stated that 125,000 families owned more wealth than the other 12,375,000 families, in other words 1 per cent owned more wealth than the other 99 per cent.

This is an unhealthy condition and will result in mischief if continued.

It was fashionable a few years ago to denounce those who called attention to this condition and brand them as disturbers, but that stage has been passed, thanks to the great independent press and magazines.

How foolish to ignore this condition, and how foolish to denounce those who point it out and emphasize it.

How foolish of the patient to abuse the physician who demonstrates that a cancer is forming in a vital part of his body. How much wiser it would be to thank him and set about getting cured while there was yet time.

But what has protection to do with this condition of congested or concentrated wealth?

Let me illustrate, and in doing so make clear the difference between a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection.

Mr. Schwab, in 1899, while he was president of the Steel Trust, made a statement in writing and afterwards testified that the statement was true. In it he said:

I know positively that England can not produce pig iron at actual cost for less than $11.50 per ton, even allowing no profit on raw materials; and can not put pig iron into rails, with their most efficient works, for less than $7.50 per ton. This would make rails a net cost to them of $19. We can sell at this price and ship abroad, so as to net us $16 at works for foreign business, nearly as good as home business has been. What is true of rails is equally true of other steel products. As a result of this we are going to control the steel business of the world.

You know we can make rails for less than $12 per ton, leaving a nice margin on foreign business. Besides this foreign costs are going to increase year by year, because they have not the raw materials, while ours is going to decrease. The result of all this is that we will be able to sell our surplus abroad, run our works full all the time, and get the best practice and cost in this way.

Mr. Schwab here tells us they could make steel rails in Pittsburg at less than $12 a ton and that the same kind of rails could not be made in England for less than $19 per ton. But while they could make steel rails at $12 per ton, and by selling them at $15 make 25 per cent profit, yet they actually sold them at $28 a ton f. o. b. at Pittsburg. Had there been no tariff at all on them, you see, few or none could come from England. Allow $3 per ton for getting the English rails to the seaboard, loading them on the ship, paying the freight and insurance charges to New York, and, without any profit whatever, they would have cost $22 when they reached the customhouse there. The duty on steel rails under the Dingley law was $7.84 per ton, which, added to the other items, makes a total cost of $29.40 a ton this side the customhouse in New York.

If an American purchaser bought rails in England, of course he paid the customhouse duty or tariff of $7.84 to the collector of customs, and the money thus paid went into the Government Treasury as revenue, to be used in defraying the public expenses. But the Steel Trust was perfectly aware of what the foreign rails would cost an American purchaser, and to prevent importation they fixed the price of rails at Pittsburg at $28 a ton, or $1.40 below the foreigner's price, even if he sold at actual cost. This gave the American manufacturer a profit of $16 per ton, or 133⅓ per cent.

You will notice that he did not add the whole of the tariff. If he did the price would have been $29.40, and then there might be some importation. But by remitting $1.40 and adding only $6 of the tariff to his price, he had a monopoly of the business.

Now, where did the $6 per ton, which the tariff law enabled him to add to the price, go? Did any of it go to the Government as revenue? No indeed, not a cent. It all went into the treasury of the Steel Trust as bounty or protection.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. My time is nearly up, but if the gentleman will get it extended, I will be glad to answer his question, if I can.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman know what this country paid for steel rails at the time we did not make any in this country?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman does, and I am glad you asked that question. The gentleman knows well, but he knows that at that time the processes that have since been invented for making steel rails were practically unknown, and the gentleman knows that most of those processes were developed by Americans. [Applause.] The gentleman knows that in the last 10 years there were 650,123 patents granted in the United States, whereas in England, in all time, there were only 278,000, and in Spain 22,000. This shows the comparative ingenuity of the peoples.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The gentleman has not answered my question. Does the gentleman know what the United States paid England for steel rails before we made them in America?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman said he did, and he does.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. But has the gentleman answered the question?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman is glad to answer it. I concede, as I said awhile ago, when the gentleman from Oklahoma probably was not here, that protection stimulates, but stimulation is usually followed by prostration; and, in order to prevent that, when stimulation had reached the point where the American manufacturer had the market to himself, he then went to work and organized what we now call trusts to keep the price up, instead of putting it down, as it was said he would do.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman tell us what we paid England for steel rails prior to the time they were manufactured in America?

Mr. GRAHAM. Just about what Englishmen had to pay for steel rails. They were as high as $150 a ton, and the processes that cheapened them have been largely the result of American brains; and if there is any reason why the protection barons of this country should have the benefit of all inventions made by American brains, I do not know what the reason is. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I think when there are great inventions like Whitney's or Watt's, or any others, the people should have some of the benefits of them and not give it all to a few who are piling up millions, so that to-day they own a large part of the wealth of the country and have been practically running the Government, and not running it in the interest of the people, but in their own interest.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman permit another question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I do not know whether I quite understood the gentleman or not; but if I did, did I understand him to say that prior to the time when we made any steel rails in America we paid England as high as $150 a ton for steel rails?

Mr. GRAHAM. Please talk faster; the clock keeps moving.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Did I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. GRAHAM. I really do not understand why the gentleman repeats his question. I thought I made it as plain as I could make it.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Simply to see if I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not responsible for the gentleman's understanding. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I do not know that I misunderstood the gentleman. I just want to get him to tell me.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said very clearly that at one time rails cost $150 a ton; that at that time the present processes of making steel were unknown. It was done by hand, by hammering and heating and cooling, and there was a great deal of expense to it which is now obviated by a very simple process.

The Bessemer process had scarcely been in vogue till 1870. The price in England was then $50 a ton. In 1873 the prices there went down to $36. By 1877 the price was $30 and the duty $28. The price here at that time ranged from $61 to $67.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will if I can.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. At the time we were buying steel rails for $165 a ton, were not those rails made by the Bessemer process?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were not.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I would like to ask the gentleman further, if all the rails made in this country up to about 12 years ago were not made under that same Bessemer process?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were made under such processes as enabled the Steel Trust to make them for less than $12 a ton, when England could not make them for less than $19 a ton. But the Steel Trust sold them for $28 a ton, thus making a profit of 133 per cent. That is merely an illustration. Every protected article is like steel rails, differing only in degree and not in principle, and in that way protection has been gathering wealth from the producers of this country until now 1 per cent of the American people owns more than the other 99 per cent.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. The gentleman from Illinois has referred to the testimony of Charles M. Schwab. Did the gentleman read that portion of Mr. Schwab's letter in which he said that the statement as to the price for which rails could be made in Pittsburg was written for the purpose of selling the property of the Carnegie Co., and if people kept that in mind they could place a better value on it?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman from Illinois did read that in his testimony, but not in the letter, and the gentleman read further; he read where Mr. Burke Cockran asked him the specific question, if the facts stated in the letter were not true, and Mr. Schwab said that they were true.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. In a way.

Mr. GRAHAM. He said it absolutely. He said it is entirely true. I would be delighted to read the whole pages upon which that matter appears, had I the time. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SIMS). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. GRAHAM. For the year 1909 there were 1,633,775 tons of steel rails used in the United States. Six dollars per ton on that amount made $10,132,750, a nice little gift, which the protective tariff laws compelled the American people to give to the manufacturers on steel rails alone. In 1908 twice as many rails were used, and the gift was over $20,000,000 that year. And as the protective tariff works on steel rails so it works on every other line, the difference being only in degree. When it is an ideal protective measure, and shuts out imports altogether, it diverts all the tariff graft into the manufacturers' pockets. When not ideally protective some things are imported and some revenue is obtained for the Government. A perfect protection measure would yield no revenue.

It becomes an interesting question how our tariff thus divides the money taken from the people—that is, how much of the tariff goes to the Government as revenue and how much to the protected interests as tribute or graft? I have seen many estimates, and the weight of the evidence is, I think, that for every dollar the Dingley tariff put in the Treasury as revenue it put from $5 to $8 in the treasuries of the protected manufacturers as tribute.

I have never been able to persuade myself that such a law is a proper exercise of the Government's taxing power. I deny its right to take from the pockets of some citizens their hard-earned dollars to put them into the pockets of other citizens. As the Government has been collecting over $300,000,000 a year revenue from customhouse taxation, and as at least five times as much is collected from the people each year for tribute to the manufacturers, and as this has been going on for 40 years it becomes apparent why there is such concentration of wealth as I have already adverted to.

With annual tribute paid by the American people of from 10 to 20 millions on steel rails alone, it is little wonder that the 24 directors of the Steel Trust represent one-twelfth of the country's entire wealth.

How long, O Lord, how long!

Not the least of the objections to this system of public robbery under the forms of law is the fact that it is dishonest and immoral, in that the law authorizes the manufacturer to collect money from the people for his individual benefit and under the protection of the taxing power. It is like authorizing the grocer, by law, to put sand in the sugar or authorizing the butcher to weigh his hand with the meat; and the protection idea, the idea that he is getting the advantage, that the law enables him through protection to get something for nothing is sapping the foundation of public morals and of public honesty.

But, as I see it, the greatest evil is the danger to republican form of government. We can not safely ignore the lessons of history, and one of them surely is that wealth is power, and those who control the wealth of a country will control its government and its destinies.

When we consider that one out of each hundred of our people own over half the country's wealth, and that the ownership of that half, through banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and otherwise makes them the custodians of much of the remainder, which is almost as useful to them as the ownership of it, the danger becomes more apparent. And we should consider, too, that many of the very rich seem to be getting tired of a republican form of government and are willing, if not anxious, to use their vast wealth for the purpose of purchasing titled sons-in-law and arranging matters so that our children and grandchildren will have to produce dividends or rent to be sent abroad to maintain the titled descendants of these modern Tories in affluent dissipation.

While protection is not the sole cause of these evils, it is the most far-reaching and the most prolific one, and little progress can be made in other directions so long as the law permits a favored few to thus exploit the people. This bill is therefore in the right direction, is well worthy of support, and ought to pass. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for the courtesy he has extended to me. A new Member on this floor, it would ill become me to consume much of the time allotted to this side of the Hall in the discussion of this important question. I want to promise the House here now that whatever of merit or demerit my speech may contain, it will at least possess one quality which will commend itself to you, and that will be its brevity.

When I came here and looked around me, it occurred to me that this House might be likened unto a great school. It seemed to me, as I noticed the difference in the experience and the knowledge of the Members of this body, that there might be found here those who are freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors in this great school. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it occurred to me that there are those who by reason of their great experience and their many years of distinguished service in this body may well be denoted post graduates in this institution.

I thought when I came that I would enter as a freshman. But a few days ago as I listened to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois, the ex-Speaker of the House, and when he brought forth his map and talked to us about the geography of Canada and delivered to us what he was pleased to term a kindergarten lecture, I became convinced that I had overlooked one department in this body, and I was forced to conclude that the eighty-odd new Members would be considered as belonging to the kindergarten. [Laughter and applause.]

Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that experience in this body does and should play an important part. All the new Members have received at the hands of the old Members many courtesies which we appreciate. I have listened attentively to the debates on this and other measures. Indeed, it might be said that the new Members of this body have been noted for their careful, candid, and interested attention to these debates. And let me express the hope that we may continue so to do, even should the fortunes of future elections allow us to become old Members of this great body.

Mr. Chairman, I come from an agricultural district. Within the limits of my district the largest town contains less than 2,500 inhabitants. My people are an agricultural people. I voted for the reciprocity bill. I voted for it, first, upon the broad ground that its passage would be beneficial to the entire country, from one end of it to the other, and that between two countries such as the United States and Canada there ought to be no artificial tariff wall.

I voted for it, in the second place, because I believe it is to the interest of the agricultural people of this country to have no tariff between Canada and the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When the statistics are carefully examined, and when it is seen that the balance of trade between this country and Canada is in our favor, I can see no disadvantage; on the contrary, I see great advantage to our agricultural people in getting rid of that tariff wall. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I have here some figures in reference to this matter, which I shall not take the time now to read, but will incorporate in my printed remarks. They are figures that have been used before on this floor by other speakers, but they show conclusively that the balance of trade between the two countries is in favor of the United States.

The Government statistics show that in five years ending June 30—

We sold in Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

These Government statistics further show that in the same five years—

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Meat and dairy products:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	25,916,672

Of the foregoing items we sold to Canada $53,030,755 more than Canada sold to us.

I voted for the reciprocity bill for another reason, and that was that I knew full well that just as soon as it was passed there would come right along after it this measure which we are now considering, the companion bill—if you please, the farmers' bill—which, far more than the reciprocity measure, relieves the burdens upon the people of our country [applause

on the Democratic side], and especially upon that great army of producers, the American farmers, whom, more than anyone else, I have the honor to represent upon this floor.

I am strongly in favor of the passage of the pending bill. It will benefit my people. I am one of those that believes a Member of this body should legislate for all the people he represents without regard to their political affiliations, and this is one bill that will benefit every man, woman, and child within my district. This bill puts upon the free list practically every article used by the farmer in the production of his crop and in the equipment of his farm. It benefits every farmer in every nook and corner of this Republic. It places upon the free list the plow and the harrow used upon the hillside and in the valley, the cultivator and the planter used upon our broad, extended prairie land, the harvester and the header used in the West and in the great Northwest, the cotton gin and everything used in cultivating and caring for the cotton in the Southland, the wagons and the harness used everywhere, the wire fencing used to inclose the farm land, and the lumber with which to build the homes and the barns and the granaries. It even goes further than that. It is broader than that. It places upon the free list the bread and the meat and the boots and the shoes that are so absolutely necessary to the workingmen of this country, whether they work upon the farm, whether they work in the mines, in the factory, upon our great railroads, or I care not where. The very reading of this measure, the enumeration of the articles contained therein is, to my mind, sufficient to convince any reasonable man that it will be a great benefit to all the people and ought to become a law. I shall not read it, but will incorporate in my printed remarks the items which it places upon the free list.

This bill places upon the free list the following articles:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

I can not, Mr. Chairman, in the limited time at my disposal enter into a detailed discussion of this measure. I have listened carefully to the arguments presented against it by those upon the other side of the Hall who oppose it, but I have listened in vain for a single substantial reason why it should not pass.

The opposition has been one of criticism and technicality. Some oppose this measure because it is too broad and opens too wide the door of trade. Some oppose it because, perchance, it is too narrow and does not place upon the free list some things which in their opinion should be there. Still others oppose it for purely technical reasons, because its phraseology or grammatical construction or something of that kind is not just right. The argument most frequently resorted to by those upon the other side has been that the passage of this measure would close factories and reduce wages. I want to say here, Mr. Chairman, that is an old, old cry. It has come down to us through many years. It has been used not only to frighten the Congress of the United States, but it has been used upon election day to intimidate the voter [applause on the Democratic side] and to carry the elections in this country. I do not believe that it will close a factory. I do believe that it will possibly reduce the income of some of the millionaire owners of factories, but it will not close a single factory, and it ought not reduce the wage of a single laborer therein. I have listened with some surprise, Mr. Chairman, to the speeches made on the other side. I have heard Republican speeches as made out in my part of the country, but I did not know you had the same kind of speeches here that we had out there. I looked for the speeches here to be upon a higher and a different plane from what we found them out in the campaigns. More speeches were made in my district by the opposition than ever before in the history of our district, and every one of them talked about the hard times of the Cleveland administration.

I am surprised when I hear gentlemen on the other side make these same old speeches. Why, Mr. Chairman, if, perchance, we should be discussing the tariff 20 years from now, and somebody should introduce a bill to reduce the tariff upon some manufactured article, those upon the other side, the high protectionists, would make great speeches about the hard times of Grover Cleveland's administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Even further than that, Mr. Chairman, I expect that on the last great day, the judgment day, when Old Gabriel gets ready to sound the trumpet to bring the dead to life, some protectionist, if he happens to be near enough, will rise up and say, "Mr. Gabriel, just hold on a minute before you toot that horn; I want to say just a few words about Grover Cleveland's administration." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, they talk to us about closing the factories. It has been demonstrated on this floor that the manufacturer of farm machinery takes his products abroad and sells them there cheaper than he sells them to the people here at home. Talk about the boot and shoe factories; they are exporters, they sell their products in foreign lands. And right here, while I am discussing boot and shoe factories, let me say this: Two years ago, when this same question was being considered, representatives of boot and shoe factories came before the Senate committee and the House committee and said they wanted free hides. "Why," they said, "if you give us free hides, we can do without a tariff, but we would like to keep that on for the name of the thing; but we can do without it. And if you will give us free hides, we will reduce the price of shoes from 25 to 50 cents a pair." The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was passed and it gave them free hides; it gave them a 10 per cent tariff; but instead of shoes being decreased in price from 25 to 50 cents a pair they have been increased in price from 25 to 50 cents a pair.

But they say it will reduce wages. Out in my part of the country a great railroad system has for two or three months been trying to get hold of a president. They have offered the job to two or three high-grade men, but the job has been refused, presumably because they were already getting a large salary. Salaries have been offered to those men greater than the salary paid to the President of the United States, and yet that same railroad and many others, when we had the Republican panic of 1907 and it became necessary to economize, began economizing by discharging the men who worked upon the section for $1.25 a day. My friends, the trouble in this country with our corporations is this, that whenever, perchance, it becomes necessary to economize they begin at the wrong end of the line. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Instead of discharging or reducing the salaries of the overpaid officials at the top they begin at the other end of the line by discharging the laboring men down at the bottom. We witnessed in this House the other day a rather remarkable occurrence. A bill passed this House by a unanimous vote, not a single, solitary vote against it. A few days later we were discussing the reciprocity measure. Those upon the other side were divided; a majority of them voted against the bill and talked against it. A minority of them voted and talked in favor of the reciprocity, but whether they were for it or whether they were against it, they were united in that they were talking and speaking of their devotion and their love for the great American farmer. So I thought to myself as I listened to the discussion, this House is going to repeat itself; this House is going again to be unanimous; the minority of the minority is going to unite with the majority of the minority, and together they are going to present a solid front and stand by the great Democratic majority, they are going to vote unanimously when the bill comes up to give the farmers a free-list bill. But, my friends, I was mistaken, I was deceived. They talk for the farmer, but they are not willing to vote for the farmer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The very ones, some of them who opposed the reciprocity bill, and gave as their reasons for it that it would be detrimental to the farmer, have in the consideration of this bill been most bitter in their opposition to it.

I know a farmer, away out yonder in the central part of this great country; he dwells in a little valley in the Ozark Mountains of south Missouri, among as good a people as God ever let live upon this earth. [Applause.] He came there when a boy. At the breaking out of the Civil War he entered the Army and gave four of the best years of his life to the service of his country. After the war was over he came back home, married, entered a piece of land, and settled down upon the little farm where he lives to-day. Years came and went. Many children came to bless that little home, trials and hardships came upon him, but he shirked not. By dint of hard and honest toil from early morn until late at night, day in and day out, he was enabled to provide for that growing family.

One by one as those boys and girls grew to manhood and womanhood they left that old home. Two or three of them located on farms in the near-by neighborhood, but a larger number of them, lured by the dazzling splendor of the great city, are now eking out a small subsistence in factories, in machine shops, and behind the counters in the great department stores. 'Way back yonder in old Missouri, on that homestead, the father and mother live to-day. Now, here is what I want to emphasize: Every year of his life that farmer has gone to the county seat, he has hunted up the county collector, and paid to him his taxes, State, county, and school, out of his hard-earned savings. Every year of his life he has disposed of the products of his farm and has therewith purchased the necessaries of life. During all those years every time he purchased an imported article upon which a tariff duty was levied, and those articles were few in number, he paid a tax for the support of his Government. And during all those years every time he purchased a home-manufactured article, upon which a protective tariff duty was levied, and those articles were many, he paid a tax to the manufacturing interests of this land. The tax which he paid to his State and to his county and to his school and to his Nation was just and right, but the tax which he has been compelled every year to pay to the manufacturing industries of this country is wrong, is unjust, and ought not to be. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You gentlemen upon the other side promised to reduce these burdens. You promised it when you wrote your platform in 1908 at Chicago. You have not done it. Are you going to do it now? The farmer, Mr. Chairman, that I have mentioned here, is but a type. The life story of that farmer is but the life story of millions of farmers throughout this land. Honest, upright, and patriotic, they are the bone, the sinew, the highest type of American manhood. [Applause.]

My predecessor occupied a seat upon the other side of this Hall in the last Congress. I have the honor in the present Congress to occupy a seat upon this side of the Hall. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He was a member of the majority in the last Congress. I am a member of the majority in this Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But, oh, Mr. Chairman, what a difference between that majority and this majority, as evidenced by what we have already done and by the measures that we have already passed, and a difference which will become more and more manifest as the days and weeks go by.

I listened to the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], and I agreed with him in one thing, although I could not agree with him in the main part of his argument. He stated that if his party had been true to its pledges that we upon this side of the House would be in the minority instead of in the majority. My opponent, as I said a moment ago, was on the other side. He was a stand-pat Republican. He violated his party's pledge; he voted for the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. If he had acted with the gentleman from Wisconsin and a few others on his side of the House two years ago, and stood by his party platform, possibly things might be reversed between my late opponent and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been said, and truly said, that this Government is a government by parties. When the assembled representatives of a party meet and formulate its platform, that platform becomes a solemn and sacred agreement between the party and the people that support that party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And he who receives the nomination upon that platform does so knowing full well the contents of it, and if elected he should do everything in his power to carry into effect the policies and the pledges of his party.

We are to-day making history. This is a history-making Congress.

Already we have done some things which, though almost revolutionary in their nature, have been done with such a spirit of peace and unanimity on the part of the party that did them as to be almost phenomenal. When our caucus met—the Democratic caucus—and nominated its Speaker, I believe for the first time in the history of this country we witnessed the nomination of a man to that position, to serve his first term, by the unanimous vote of his party. That fact in itself shows that he stands high in the esteem and admiration of his party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We admire him, we honor him, we believe that he is capable of fulfilling the duties of that high office, no matter what its duties may be now, may have been in the past, or may be in the future. He is just as able to carry them out as any man who has ever occupied that position. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Yet, notwithstanding our love for and our confidence in him, believing that the selection of committees should rest with the body itself and not with the Speaker, the first thing we did was to place their selection with the House itself, and that has been hailed by the people of this country as one of the greatest steps we have ever taken for the advancement of representative government here. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Then, Mr. Chairman, when this House convened in special session it went to work, it got right down to business, and has been busy ever since. The first thing we did was to eliminate about a hundred useless jobs and thereby save to the people something like $182,000 annually. Then we took up and passed the resolution providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. We then passed the reciprocity bill. We passed the measure reapportioning Representatives to the several States. Then we took up the present bill. For 50 years Congress after Congress has convened and in the writing of tariff legislation they have passed laws in the interest of the manufacturers of this country.

Mr. CLINE. And we passed the campaign expenses bill.

Mr. RUBEY. Yes; as the gentleman says, we passed the bill requiring the publication of campaign contributions before as well as after elections, and on that occasion we witnessed the remarkable occurrence of every man present voting in its favor.

As I said before, the Congresses have heretofore legislated in favor of the manufacturer and the special interests. We are now considering a bill that is not for the benefit of the special interests in this country, but for the benefit of the great masses of the people. We are going to pass this bill, and when we have done so we will take up another bill of benefit to the people and pass it, and so, one by one, we are going to pass those measures which the people are demanding and which are of interest to the people all over the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when the gavel falls at the close of the Sixty-second Congress this side of the House, the Democratic side, will have redeemed every pledge that it has made to the American people. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I learned my tariff creed from those patron saints of Kentucky Democracy, Beck, Carlisle, and Breckinridge, whose memory is still revered and cherished and in whose footsteps the younger generation delight to follow, as well as from those old Democratic masters of the tariff school of Watterson, Blackburn, and McCreary, men who have shed luster and renown upon our State and are now leaders in the councils of our Nation.

The star-eyed goddess of tariff reform, once more in the ascendency, has her abode and abiding place in Kentucky. [Applause.] As the result of the teachings of these old masters to whom I referred, the people of my State understand the workings and the operations of the tariff. They know that as the result of legislation placed upon the books by a more powerful political party unhallowed tribute has been wrung from them. They know that by unjust and unequal laws you of the North have gathered tainted wealth from them. They know that the tariff has not added a single dollar in value to any one of their staple products that support them. They know that their products are part of the basis of the surplus that goes into the markets of the world, and that the price has always been fixed there. They know that with the rarest exceptions the tariff does not increase the cost of any article when the exports of that article largely exceed the imports of the same. They know that whenever the price is increased by the tariff, the consumer and not the foreign importer pays the tax. They know that the tariff incubates monopoly and shelter trusts; that the freight rate often overbalances the apparent effect of the tariff; and that a prohibitive tariff brings no revenue to the Government,

but does augment the bank accounts of the beneficiaries of the tariff; that a feast is preferable to a famine; that the truth is more powerful and enduring than falsehood; that intelligence is far better and more desirable than ignorance.

These fundamental, basic propositions have been understood by the people of my State since a time when the memory of man runs not to the contrary.

THE SURPLUS FIXES THE PRICE.

The statement has been made on this floor that the place where the greatest quantity of a product is sold fixes the price of that product. I deny the proposition; and no one can say, and say it truthfully, that the surplus of all the wheat produced by all the wheat-raising countries—I have selected that, because around that item this fight has been waged—that the surplus of all the wheat-producing countries in the world does not exceed the surplus sold by any one wheat-producing country in the world. The official statistics show that the world's product of wheat last year amounted to 3,667,494,000 bushels; that the wheat-raising countries of the world exported in 1908—the figures for that year being the latest that I could obtain—468,561,011 bushels, and the same year 24,469,940 barrels of flour. Estimating 5 bushels of wheat to the barrel of flour, we have a total surplus of wheat amounting to 590,900,711 bushels. If the price of wheat is not fixed by the surplus, how is it that in those countries, even in those localities where consumption exceeds production, the price of wheat does not exceed the price of wheat in those places where production does exceed consumption?

All of the counties in the district that I represent are wheat-growing counties. In some of them the consumption exceeds the production. In some of them the production exceeds the consumption. Yet the price in each of them or in all of them is the market price paid in the business centers, less the freight from the shipping point to the business centers.

Much has been said here on the floor about the vast area of Canada that is capable of producing wheat, and that the tide of immigration is rushing into that portion of Canada. Admitting all that has been said to be true, what are you going to do about it? How can you stop the development? The people are going to these lands, and the increasing surplus that Canada produces will simply be augmented by the increased area and the increased production. You have to meet the surplus of Canada in the markets of the world now, whether this reciprocity bill passes or not, and you will simply have to meet that increasing surplus in the markets of the world.

That this increased surplus may tend to lower the price of wheat I admit, unless consumption keeps pace with it.

The reports that are being received bespeak a most bountiful crop for this year. No farmer should be alarmed if the price of wheat should fall, for with the prospects of a greater yield, as a matter of course, the price would have a tendency to lower.

Year by year the Republican Party is filching Democratic doctrines. Behold at this belated day the Republican President of the United States, either converted to the true doctrine and faith or else unwilling longer to deceive the American people as to the working of the tariff. In his speech before the general assembly at Springfield, Ill., on February 11, he, in part, said:

> There is a difference of 10 or more cents a bushel on wheat and other cereals between the markets in Winnipeg and Minneapolis, and this difference is fully explained by the lack of transportation and elevator facilities and by the greater difficulty that the Canadian farmer now has in point of economic carriage from the Northwest to Liverpool, where the sale of this surplus and the price of wheat is fixed for the world. To let the wheat of the Northwest go down to Minneapolis and Chicago will steady the price of wheat, will prevent its fluctuation, will make speculations more difficult, and will furnish us greater insurance against the short crop and higher prices. But that it will in the end or substantially reduce the price of wheat, which is fixed for the world at Liverpool, no one familiar with conditions can assert.

In the practice of law I was always better pleased to make out my case with the other fellow's witnesses, and I have devoted some portion of this address to such high authorities in the Republican Party as the President and to Republicans of such high renown as our Secretary of Agriculture, who spiked the guns of the Republican teachers of the false doctrine that the tariff is of any benefit to the farmer when he stated in his open letter to the legislative committee of the National Grange February 9, 1911, that the price of wheat raised in the United States was fixed in Liverpool, and said:

> The United States produces surplus wheat above domestic requirements, and this surplus production is sold in foreign countries. The price of our export surplus is governed by the world's requirement, being regulated by the law of supply and demand. The price of wheat in the United States while we are exporting is governed by the price at which the surplus is sold, as a general proposition. Occasionally wheat corners may interfere with the law of supply and demand and temporarily affect the price.

The Republican Select Committee on Wages and Commodities, authorized and directed to ascertain and report on the cause of extreme high cost of living, exonerated the tariff by saying:

It—

The tariff—

does not increase the price of food production, because the cost is fixed in the markets of the world.

More than half the Republican membership in this House have been converted to this position, and have proclaimed this old Democratic law of trade. How long will you, O protectionists, continue to abuse the patience and confidence of the farmer? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The people have driven the Republican majority in this House from the floor, and the defenders of the high protective tariff have been driven from the floor in this debate. Slowly but surely the Republican Party is being driven from power and its untenable position. Formerly your party slogan was protection for "infant industries." This plea is now obsolete, it has faded away from your platforms. They dare not defend it in the face of the gigantic trust that it has engendered; it is worth any Republican's life politically to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Your Republican President did not dare to proclaim this in the speech referred to before the General Assembly of Illinois at Springfield. On the contrary he said:

> There was a time when Republican leaders thought there was no danger in having the tariff higher than necessary to protect any industry. It was thought that if the country was made to depend upon manufactures behind the tariff wall, the competition between the manufacturers would stimulate the reduction in the cost of production, and thus reduce the price, but the temptation to combine by which the price could be controlled, and thus the excessive tariff taken advantage of, led to a modification of the protection theory, and to a declaration that the protection of any industry ought not to exceed in the tariff imposed more than the difference in the cost of production abroad, the cost of production here, and enough to give a fair profit to the domestic producer or manufacturer.

WASTE AND INEFFICIENCY INCREASE TARIFF.

Let us look at this proposition for a moment. The latest attempt to deceive the people is a tariff not to exceed the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, plus a fair profit to the manufacturer. So, again, the Republican Party perverts the object of government by guaranteeing a profit on legislative credit. It is a sly method of reaching the same result by a different route, and through this catch phrase to secure precisely the same result: and instead of being a radical modification, it is the same proposition with a sugar coating. The cost of production at home and elsewhere is an ever-varying proposition, even under like conditions, ranging all the way from efficient and inefficient management to the cost of construction, accessibility of raw material, quality of labor, character and kind of machinery, freight rates, fuel, location, and so forth; and now applying their theories, they are drawn to the maximum of protection as the basis of their protection, else there is no protection.

Why will the producer feel concerned about the cost of production when he has the guaranty of the Federal Government that, at all hazards, he can not lose, and that he is to have a fair profit? Aptly stated, the proposition is a premium on unbusinesslike methods. The duty rises as waste and inefficiency increase, and the limit of protection is the worst managed business sanctioned by Federal legislation, while the burden of the unnecessary and inflated cost is to be borne by the consumer solely by reason of such legislation.

During this debate much has been said about the difference in cost of labor in Canada and in the United States. A few days ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS], in the course of his address, stated that in his city of Detroit, only 2,600 feet away from his Canadian neighbors, with a population of 465,000 people, daily there was an army of people crossing the Detroit River from Canada into the United States and from the United States into Canada, earning their daily livelihood. The question of wages was not involved as to which side of the river wage received the highest compensation; it was solely a question on which side the job or the employment could be had.

Our friends from Iowa and Wisconsin are very much perturbed about the prices of eggs and poultry and milk, as the result of the enactment of the reciprocity bill. I have been at a loss to understand the whys and the wherefores of this alarm. Can it be possible that a Canadian hen lays more than one egg a day? Or, if the Canadian hen does not lay more than one egg a day, is it a question of the labor equation that is involved in the proposition? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Does the average Canadian cow give any more milk than the average American cow, or will Canadian milk stand more watered stock than American milk? [Laughter

and applause on the Democratic side.] I take it that when it comes to extracting the fluid from the cow, milking is milking on both sides of the line.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is broken-hearted over the fact that a Canadian fishing in the same hole with a Yankee fisherman can catch fish cheaper than the Yankee can. I presume that it is a question of the cost of bait. With us this enterprise of fishing has always been largely a matter of luck, and if the Canadian can outluck the Yankee fisherman I believe that the proposition is even beyond the aid or control of the Federal Congress of the United States. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I would suggest, however, if permitted to do so, to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the best bait for a fisherman is to be found in Kentucky, but it is never used on the hook.

The above instances are fair illustrations of the ridiculous extremes to which protectionists go. It is a great blessing that the rains, the air, and the sunlight are under the sole and exclusive control of the good Lord above else some Republican would place a prohibitive tariff on them, and no one be allowed the benefits of either who does not vote the Republican ticket or put up campaign funds for that party. There are gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who do not believe that an Italian can run a pushcart fruit stand or a street organ, or that a Greek can run a shoe-shine stand without a protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

These instances that I have cited simply serve to show to what ridiculous extremes protectionists will go.

DANGER SIGNALS TO THE FARMER.

When I see such defenders of the tariff system arraigned against the reciprocity bill as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], all of them high priests of protection, I am thoroughly convinced that there is virtue in this measure for the farmers and for the people generally, for the red light on the track is no more evidence of danger to the engineer than the position of those three men on this bill is to me. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] stated, as he did on the 15th day of February last, that the Republican protectionist, when this vote is taken, marches to his doom I am fortified in my opinion. When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] stated, as he did in his address to this House, that he was for any amendment that would defeat it or kill it, and to amend it was to kill it, I am further satisfied of the course that I should pursue. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the rider of the Republican winds and the stirrer of the Republican storms, stated, as he did in his speech on the 15th day of April, and appealed to all men who are of Republican faith, that if the Republican Party is to live it can live only by being true to and supporting the policies of protection, which policy this bill attacks, my belief becomes a conviction.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] prophesies penalties will follow the enactment of the bill, and the United States Steel Co. proceeds forthwith to start the discipline to which he no doubt referred. Was the wish father to the thought? Would the protectionist welcome a made-to-order panic in order to forestall the bill? Let the interests bear in mind that the American people have been patient and forbearing, that if the issue to which he refers does come that it will be fought to a finish, and it will be in vain for them to cry "socialism," or if the disasters the gentleman from Illinois predicts do come be it ever remembered that the reciprocity bill is the offspring of a Republican President and that he brought on the difficulty. Let no farmer be deceived by the wail or tears of these men to whom I have referred. Their interest is not for him. They plead but to preserve the protective system and policy, for no one knows better than they that when the hoodwink is removed from the eyes of the farmer and he realizes that he derives no benefit from the protective tariff, then the protective policy is indeed doomed and the Republican Party destroyed. None of them believe in revision downward. The first question for the farmer to solve for himself is whether he is a protectionist. The farmer, like every other business man, is interested in the widest possible expansion of the trade on the best possible terms. I have taken pains to secure first-handed the freight rates on wheat and lumber from cities on the Canadian border and Chicago to points in central Kentucky, the portion of the State in which the district I represent is located. I now send it to the Clerk's desk and would like to have it read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter designated in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

WHEAT AND LUMBER—VARIOUS POINTS TO STANFORD, PARIS, RICHMOND, AND VERSAILLES.

LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE RAILROAD CO.,
Louisville, Ky., April 27, 1911.

Mr. HARVEY HELM,
House of Representatives, United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of April 23. The following are the present rates in cents per 100 pounds:

To—	Wheat, carload, from Duluth and Minneapolis, Minn.	Lumber, rough or dressed, carload, from—			
		Chicago, Ill.	Williamsburg, Ky.	Pineville, Ky.	Jackson, Ky.
Stanford, Ky	[1] 32	[2] 22	[3] 9	[3] 10	[3] 15
Paris, Ky	[1] 25	[2] 20	[3] 8	[3] 8	[3] 11
Richmond, Ky	[1] 27	[2] 22	[3] 8	[3] 8	[3] 12
Versailles, Ky	[1] 25	[2] 19	[3] 13	[3] 12	[3] 11

[1] Carload minimum in cars of 28,000 pounds capacity, 26,000 pounds; carload minimum in cars of 30,000 pounds capacity, 28,000 pounds; carload minimum in cars of 40,000 pounds capacity, 34,000 pounds; carload minimum in cars of 50,000 pounds capacity, 44,000 pounds.
[2] Carload minimum, 34,000 pounds.
[3] Carload minimum, 30,000 pounds.

Yours, truly,

D. M. GOODWYN,
General Freight Agent.

FREIGHT RATES INSURMOUNTABLE PROTECTION.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, the point I wanted to make was that freight rates from Canadian points on wheat and on lumber from Canadian points and Chicago to central Kentucky towns are an insurmountable protection in themselves. From the letter, it appears that the freight rates on wheat from Minneapolis to central Kentucky towns is 32 cents per 100 pounds, or about 20 cents per bushel.

No one has ever claimed that there is a difference of 20 cents per bushel between Canadian wheat and wheat in the United States. The tariff, in my opinion, has never kept a grain of wheat out of the local market in central Kentucky. It has never kept a stick of timber or a plank from Canada out of central Kentucky points. But the freight rate has, and it always will do so. There is always a line in matters of transportation where all profit is consumed by freight rates or transportation, and it is impossible for Canadian wheat to reach central Kentucky towns and pay the freight, tariff or no tariff.

I do not say that there are not spots along the Canadian line, or even a twilight zone along the Canadian line, where wheat by reason of transportation or elevator facilities may not be higher in the United States than in Canada. But it is the exception, and it is not the rule. It should also be borne in mind that the millers of the United States require the hard Canadian wheat to mix with their soft wheat in order to make an export flour. An examination of the prices of wheat at Winnipeg, which corresponds to the Chicago market, will disclose the fact that wheat is selling at Winnipeg, which the gentleman from Indiana, my friend [Mr. CULLOP], well knows, higher than it is in Chicago. The closing prices at each place for the dates mentioned is as follows.

However, I will not read them, but will insert them.

Closing prices of wheat on Chicago and Winnipeg markets for the days given.

[May delivery.]

	Chicago.	Winnipeg.
Apr. 10, 1911	$0.88½	$0.91
Apr. 12, 1911	.88⅝	.90⅜
Apr. 14, 1911	.89½	.90⅜
Apr. 15, 1911	.91⅛	.93⅛
Apr. 17, 1911	.90	.92½
Apr. 18, 1911	.88¼	.91⅛
Apr. 19, 1911	.88⅜	.92½
Apr. 20, 1911	.90	.93½
Apr. 21, 1911	.93½	.94

Two weeks ago May wheat was quoted on the Chicago Board of Trade at 85 cents per bushel. To-day it is quoted at 95 cents per bushel.

The total value of domestic breadstuff produced in the United States in the last five years that the home market could not absorb was $849,802,878. This went into our export trade. We imported only $20,808,905 worth. In the same five years we exported 280,808,905 bushels of wheat, valued at $290,314,156, and imported 3,908,864 bushels of wheat, valued at $3,418,127.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. HELM. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. On all wheat shipped into this country for export of the kind you have described, to mix with the United States soft wheat, is not the tariff only 1 per cent of 25 cents a bushel?

Mr. HELM. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. So that there is practically no tariff on that wheat at all?

Mr. HELM. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to give some front-door propositions, some blackboard demonstrations, as it were, of the situation with reference to wheat and our exports of agricultural and farm products.

I make the broad statement that the freight rate from Canadian points to central Kentucky points will always offset all differences in prices, if any, on all competing products of Kentucky and Canada.

EXCESS OF EXPORTS OVER IMPORTS IN FARM PRODUCTS.

But a few years ago Germany either excluded or threatened to exclude our meat products from her market. This caused a decline in prices and alarmed the farmers. I refer to this as an object lesson, showing that the farmers need the widest market for their surplus products. The merchant who has the most customers is always the most prosperous business man. The United States is, as it were, a gigantic department store; it has everything to sell, and to prosper it must have the greatest possible number of customers. If this vast volume of agricultural products that we are producing here annually, and which our people can not absorb, could not find its way into foreign markets the price of our home products would necessarily fall.

Canada can never be a corn-raising territory; the seasons are too short. Without corn they can put few, if any, hogs on the market. During the five years last past we exported 391,901,418 bushels of corn, valued at $209,856,762, and imported 268,551, valued at $200,128. The reciprocity bill will give us a better market for corn and a better market for hogs.

Carload after carload of cattle leave central Kentucky annually, via Newport News, for Liverpool. All the time there has been a tariff here on cattle and meats of all kinds. The Liverpool market has been free and open to the world. Why has not our tariff made our prices higher here than there? The contrary is true; if it were not, the shipper of the cattle would need not protection but an asylum. The winter season in Canada is longer, necessitating a longer feeding season, with hay and corn to be imported for feeding purposes. The farmers in my section are frequently compelled to go to Kansas City, Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati for cattle to graze and feed their grain to. They rush their calves and pigs to market, thereby losing the weight of the grown and developed animal, which serves to limit the quantity of food, minimizing reproduction also. The difference in freight rates will prevent the butcher stuff from Canada from competing with our butcher stuff in our near-by markets. The beef packers oppose the act because it makes for them a wider territory to control, and their agents who go among the farmers are walking delegates in opposition to this measure.

The exportation of meat products from the United States for the years 1904–1908, inclusive, has varied from $170,000,000 to $235,000,000 in value. If Canadian cattle are cheaper than our cattle, it occurs to me that, the freight rates permitting, it would be to the interest of the Kentucky farmer to buy the cheap feeders there, to which to feed his corn and graze on his grass.

The number and value of cattle raised in the United States in the last five years that the home market could not absorb and that were exported were 1,703,472, valued at $136,244,826. In the same time we imported 310,816, valued at $5,080,856.

The Kentucky farmer often goes to St. Louis, and even as far as Kansas City, for the low-grade cheap horse. The Canadian horse sells for more than the average-grade horse of the United States, and Canada is a splendid market for horses. And for these reasons, together with the protection resulting from freight rates, they are insured against a lower price for their horses. The high-grade Kentucky horse is in a class by itself, and defies all competition. [Applause.]

The total number of horses exported by the United States, as shown by the latest available figures for the years 1904 to 1908, inclusive, was 149,704, valued at $17,900,101, while at the same time we imported 29,852, valued at $8,900,521. In the same year we exported 29,815 mules, valued at $3,948,687.

Having shown the magnitude of our agricultural exports over imports of the same kind, to demonstrate that the tariff can not increase their market value any more than a tariff on raw cotton, on which there has never been a tariff, and of which we raise 13,000,000 bales and export 8,000,000, and which has increased in price from 6 cents to 16 cents per pound, I now desire to present a comparison of our trade balances along the same line with Canada, which is presented in concise form in the letter prepared by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], which I will not take time now to read, but I will insert it.

The letter referred to is as follows:

The Lumber Trust and the Paper Trust are waging a fierce fight against reciprocity. They are making desperate efforts to get the farmer to join them. Wherever possible they have enlisted the papers which circulate among the farmers. They try to make the farmer believe that by reason of the tariff he gets more than the fair market price for his products.

Canada has a tariff which operates against our products sold in Canada. We have a tariff which operates against Canadian products sold here. Reciprocity is an agreement between the two countries to modify both tariffs with a view to more extended trade.

In spite of these obstructive tariffs a large trade has grown up between us and Canada. In five years ending June 30, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

These figures show that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys from us more than it sells to us is a good country to trade with. No tariff wall should stand between us and such a country.

Let me show you Government statistics for five years ending June 30—

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14,172,475
Canada sold to us	2,549,211
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Meat and dairy products:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672
Total difference in our favor on above items	53,030,755

I have voted without hesitation for the reciprocity bill both times that it has passed the House because I apprehend no injury to the agricultural interest—a benefit rather than a disadvantage to the farmer—because it will give us a wider market and more customers for our products, and because its passage will ultimately lead to the overthrow of the protective policy, to which policy I am unalterably opposed, by which the farmer has been burdened, oppressed, and taxed to enrich those who do profit by its operations, and because, among its vices, it makes legislative pensions and hand-outs for business cripples and makes crutches for the special interests, furnished them by taxing the people, which interests use the Government as a silent partner as a guarantor against losses. I trust I have, in a measure, demonstrated that the farmer reaps no benefit whatever from protection.

OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE.

I turn now to the other side of the picture and will attempt to show who does get the benefit of the tariff, how it is done, and how the passage of the bill known as the farmer's free-list bill will benefit the farmer. At the outset it should be borne in mind that the United States leads all the countries in the world by far in the production of the articles embraced in the proposed free list. And just in this connection let me say that no one would claim that farm labor derived any benefit from the tariff on farm products. Neither does labor get anything out of the tariff on manufactured products. Organized labor gets only what the organization is strong enough to compel the employers to pay, though, generally speaking, when there are two men looking for one job labor goes down, and when there are two jobs looking for one man labor goes up. But be that as it may, we have ceased to hear those familiar speeches on that side of the aisle, "All kinds of work for all kinds of men." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The farmer's stock in trade is a given amount of earth, ever varying in quality and productive capacity, that can be only utilized for certain purposes, depending, among other things, upon the season. Each farmer pitches a crop that will, in the first instance, support his family. His success depends upon a variety of conditions. It may be a feast or it may be a famine. In the very nature of things he can not organize. Organiza-

tion counts for everything with the manufacturer, whose stock in trade consists of a certain amount of capital invested in a given enterprise. The capacity of his output at fixed charges can be figured to a mathematical certainty as to quality, quantity, and cost. The different manufacturers can act in concert and can be put in action with military discipline. A given type of machinery, manipulated by an expert, produces a fixed result daily, while the farmer, operating along the best lines, can not control the yield, and he never knows what the harvest will be. What chance has a farmer with a surplus of 50 bushels of wheat to sell against a combined world's surplus of 544,000,000 bushels of wheat?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed further for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection on this side of the House to the extension of the gentleman's time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is temporarily absent. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. HELM. How can the farmer at seeding time anticipate the world's production of the crop he pitches, as compared with the manufacturer, who can figure within a small fraction of what the trade will absorb? How different is his condition from that of the manufacturer or of the operators of the Brockton (Mass.) shoe factory, which has an annual output of $144,291,436 worth of shoes out of a total annual domestic production of $320,107,458 worth? How can the farmer ever know the exact cost of the other farmers' product on the market? The manufacturer does know the output that the trade will absorb, the cost of his own finished article, and the cost of his competitor's article, and can apply the protective tariff in the way of profit with mathematical accuracy, all the way from the fraction of a cent to a prohibitive tariff.

The prohibitive tariff is a legislative license to the manufacturer to charge the consumer what he pleases. It amounts to a concession, and can be utilized to multiply his profits. If the object of the tariff is not to make him a profit, what does the manufacturer want with it? It follows that the higher the tariff that can be brought into play the greater the profit. But the farmer is helpless to bring it to bear upon his output, his crop, or product, because he is unable to organize and control the cost, the quantity, and the selling price of the same. He is completely at the mercy of the manipulation by the boards of trade of the world's surplus, over which boards he has no control and in which he has no interest, and which he should avoid as religiously as he would avoid a gambling den.

WHAT FREE LIST SAVES THE FARMER.

Turning to the free list and taking the year 1905—the data for which is the latest available, because the departments are a set of masked batteries from which information can only be extracted, as it were, by a corkscrew—and apply the Payne-Aldrich tariff rates, we find that our domestic consumption that year of agricultural implements like those made free in this bill was $90,623,231 worth. These implements have a duty of 15 per cent protection, which amounted to $13,593,484, which sum represents the tariff profit to the manufacturer, and without which the same implements could have been purchased by the consumer for $77,059,747. In the same year our manufacturers sold at a profit in the open markets of the world, after paying freights and tariffs in foreign countries, the same class of implements to the value of $20,731,741.

They tell us that these implements come in free from countries that impose no tax or duty on like articles imported from the United States. They fail to state, however, what countries, if any, that produce these implements do not impose a duty on the articles that go to them from the United States. They say that foreign agricultural implements cost more than those made here. Since when did this happen? It is about as sudden as Cook's discovery of the North Pole and about as reliable. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What has become of the foreign pauper labor that gentlemen on that side of the aisle have harped on for the last 50 years?

In the same year our domestic consumption of sewing machines and parts amounted to $20,039,721. Applying the 30 per cent protection in the Payne bill, we find that the duty tax amounts to $6,011,916, which sum represents the tariff profit to the manufacturer, and without which the same machines would have been purchased by the home consumers for $14,027,805.

During the same period these same manufacturers sold at a profit in the open markets of the world these machines to the value of $6,104,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] it seems proper that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] be granted additional time. I take the responsibility, on behalf of the gentleman from Alabama, of yielding to him 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman will be recognized for 10 minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. Of a total domestic consumption for the same year amounting to $243,555,127 worth of sole, tanned, and curried leathers, on which the lowest rate is 5 per cent tax duty, the tariff profits to the manufacturer was $12,177,756, which, deducted from the actual cost, leaves $231,377,371, the amount it should have cost the consumers. Selling at the same time $9,444,873 worth of sole leather alone at a profit in the open markets.

In the same year the domestic consumption of boots and shoes produced in this country amounted to $311,942,303; allowing the lowest rate of 10 per cent, it amounts to $31,194,230, which, deducted from the actual cost, leaves $280,749,073, the amount the consumer should have paid for the total consumed. In the same year the same manufacturers sold at a profit in the open markets of the world $8,057,697 worth of said boots and shoes.

For the same year our domestic consumption of harness and saddlery amounted to $42,497,340, on which there was a tariff benefit in the interest of the manufacturer amounting to 20 per cent, yielding them a profit of $8,499,468, and which deducted from the actual cost leaves $33,997,872 that the consumer, except for the tariff, should have paid for same.

In the same period the 50 per cent per thousand tariff on shingles, of which the home consumption amounted to $23,940,089 worth, cost the consumer $7,241,566 more than he should have paid, except for the tariff. At the same time the consumer, by reason of the tariff on laths, paid the manufacturer $500,000 more than he would have done but for the tariff concession to the dealer.

Thus it appears from the few items in the free-list bill that I have been able to get accurate data upon, showing a total annual domestic consumption of $708,657,722, yielding no revenue whatever to the Government, there will be an annual saving in the passage of the bill of $79,218,410 to the home consumer of these items, which sum represents manufacturers' tariff profits, exclusive of trade profit. I have been unable to obtain from the masked batteries of the departments sufficiently accurate data to show the increased cost to the consumer on the many other items in this proposed free list, such as barbed wire, salt, wire rods, ropes, and so forth, by reason of the tariff rates, but I have sufficient information to warrant the statement that the passage of the free-list bill means an annual saving far in excess of a hundred million dollars to the consumer, solely by reason of the removal of the tariff rates, while the total annual loss of revenue on all imported items of like character in the bill now amounts to only about ten millions, which can be easily recouped by economies already inaugurated.

Lest we forget, I want to remind the Members that the above profits do not represent all that Congress, under Republican control, has done for the manufacturer in the way of grace. There is couched in the Payne-Aldrich bill what is known as "the drawback clause," which is another method by which the manufacturer gets his gain, if, perchance, he does pay any customs duty on imported material which he uses and which he in turn charges up to his victim—the home consumer—and which the Treasury refunds to him as its favored child if the goods are sold to a foreigner.

OLD GUARD RETREATING IN DISORDER.

In the face of these manifest blessings that will come to the farmer through the passage of this free-list bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] undertakes to laugh the bill out of court, so to speak, to pooh-pooh and make light of a measure drafted in the interest of the toiling masses of the people, and with an air of derision, in his discussion of the bill on the floor of this House, asks, "What are agricultural implements?" Does he need a photograph or a sliding picture to identify an agricultural implement? I observe that when he wanted evidence the gentleman read a letter from a trust magnate, generally not a disinterested witness when it comes to the free list, beginning with the International Harvester Co., the United States Steel Corporation, shoe and leather associations—professional jurymen, as it were, who are always in easy reach and touch.

It is written, "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." I have heard it said that there are none so blind as those who will not see.

It is generally true with the debater that when he is compelled to resort to ridicule exclusively the facts are against him. The question is, Are you in favor of extending the free list? If so, do not pull back. You have attempted to show by your tables that foreign-made agricultural implements sell higher in foreign countries than the same kind of implements made here sell for. Then, why do you object to the repeal of the tariff? Of what benefit is it if their implements cost more and sell higher than ours? I again ask you, What has become of that "foreign pauper labor" over which so many fits have been thrown on that side of the House? How was it that you had such a nightmare over the meaning of the term "agricultural implements" when on the 14th day of last February the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] moved to recommit the reciprocity bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back with the addition of the following articles on the reciprocal free trade list:

Fresh meat and all meat products.

What were meat products then? Rats?

Flour, cereal foods, bran, agricultural implements, cotton ties and bagging, binding twine, and lumber.

What were agricultural implements then? You voted for it. Were the market-garden supplies of Peter Henderson & Co., of New York City, agricultural implements or fine tooth combs then? Were farm wagons agricultural implements or aeroplanes? The gentleman said that burlap has recently become useful as a decoration for walls. Has the latest fad come in since the gentleman from Pennsylvania moved to recommit? Was macaroni a cereal food or angel food then? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman might increase his salary a dollar's worth if he will tell this House what cereal foods were then. How is it that the International Harvester Co. have left the United States to establish plants in foreign countries in which the cost of their output is greater than in the United States? That does not ring true.

In the first place, no doubt, they had the plant, but what on earth has become of that "foreign pauper labor" of the old countries where material is scarce? Again, he tells us that the packers have plants in Argentina, a new country that is developing rapidly. Of course there is pauper labor there, and everything is cheap in new countries, especially in Alaska, where one of our 10-cent dairy lunches costs a dollar. [Laughter.] But, of course, the Argentine packers can flood the markets of the United States, while the harvester company can not sell one of its foreign-made machines here, even though the machines are put on the free list.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] drew a beautiful picture of the prosperity of our country and attributed it all to the policy of protection. We have prospered, but the price that was paid was a dear one, after all. We have a country of marvelous resources. When I think of it as compared with the other countries of the world, the parable of the sower rushes to my mind.

Christ, speaking to the multitude, said:

Behold a sower went forth to sow, and when he sowed some seed fell by the wayside, and the fowls came and devoured them up; some fell in stony places where they had not much earth, and forthwith they sprang up because they had not much depth of earth: when the sun was up they were scorched, and because they had no root they withered away; and some fell among thorns, and the thorns sprung up and choked them; but others fell into good ground and brought forth fruit, some a hundred, some sixty, and some thirty fold. Who hath ears to hear let him hear.

Ours is the good ground that has brought forth a hundredfold in spite of the baleful influence of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Illinois says that we have but scratched the resources of this great country. I hope that what he says is true, but I trust that, whatever the future has in store, this unfolding wealth will escape the grasp of the small group of men who now control two-thirds of the wealth of the Nation. To-day the Republic of Mexico is in a state of revolution because the President of that Republic has peddled out everything of value by way of concession. But a few years ago, under the reign of Mark Hanna, more trust and holding companies were formed than in all the past history of this Government. The reins of this Government were turned over to him, while he, in turn, handed out to predatory wealth powers and rights that we are trying to regain and control, not by revolution, but by processes of the laws' delay.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SWEET].

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Chairman, this bill is for the benefit of the great body of consumers both in the country districts and in the cities of our country. A large proportion of those who are now opposing this bill belong to that faction of the Republican Party which in the last Congress favored the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, which so flagrantly discriminated against consumers. These same Members are opposed to the reciprocity agreement with Canada. Their tariff position was plainly stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] a few days ago when he said:

I voted for the Payne-Aldrich bill. I agree with the President in what he said at Winona—that it is the best protective tariff bill ever passed. I still believe that. If I had supreme power, I would wipe out some things in it.

The Payne-Aldrich bill and the supreme power of the gentleman from Illinois while he was Speaker were the chief issues last November. The people condemned the former as an unjust measure, and their condemnation of the latter was scarcely less pronounced.

The standpat Republicans are now charging the Democratic majority with "playing politics" because we have not combined the reciprocity measure and the free list in a single bill. This is an easy charge to make, and it is often made by the rankest politicians, on the "stop-thief" principle, in order to turn attention from themselves.

There are two ways of "playing politics." One is the old way which our friends on the other side of the aisle have played until it is threadbare. Their method is based on insincerity. Its foundation is a sham and its superstructure is deception and fraud. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The stand-pat Republicans have had long experience and can give us pointers in this manner of playing the political game.

But there is another way of playing politics. It consists of right doing because it is right and of gaining popular support by deserving it. Let me illustrate.

The people demanded a downward revision of the tariff with a just regard for the interest of the consumer. Republicans knew this and admitted that they did when they put into their national platform of 1908 a promise to honor this demand. If they had fulfilled this promise, it would have been playing politics according to the new rules, which they had not then and have not yet learned. For obvious reasons they can not give us pointers on this modern game. This recalls the experience of a representative of the Fort Wayne Electric Co., who sold a dynamo to an old German miller in a little town in Ohio. The agent inserted in his bid an item of $75 for the time and expenses of an expert to connect up the dynamo. When the old German saw this item he said:

Cut that out. Me and my boy Herman vill set her up ourselves.

A week after the dynamo was delivered the agent received a letter from the old man, in which he said:

Your dynamo is no good; she von't vork. I vish you vould come und take her avay.

The agent wrote a letter in reply, in which he said:

The Fort Wayne Electric Co. furnished the brains to make that dynamo, and it is as good as any on the market. The railroad company furnished the brains to bring it to you. You said you and Herman could set it up, and just because you don't know enough to do so you want me to take it back or to furnish the brains to make it work.

A few days later he received a postal card from the old German, in which he said:

The dynamo, now she vork all right; me and Herman fix her. But if she don't, I vouldn't ask you to furnish someding vot you don't carry in stock.

[Laughter.]

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON], with impressive emphasis, also accused the majority of playing politics because they refused to present these two measures in a single bill. He voted for the reciprocity measure, and I have no doubt will vote for this bill. No one questions his sincerity. He believed that the two measures should be joined, because in that form he thought their chance of favorable consideration in the Senate would be increased. In this his judgment is at fault, and from this error of judgment he has been led to make a charge which has no foundation and which he will regret.

Before leaving my home to attend this extra session I considered with great care the best manner of bringing forward these bills. There were three possible courses. First, to pass the free-list bill at the outset, in the hope that it would pass both Houses, holding back the reciprocity measure as a menace, which might be supposed to have considerable effect upon the President. This plan I discarded, because it was putting the cart before the horse. It was not the logical order. It involved the postponement of the very measure we were called in extra session to consider, and smacked of disrespect to the President.

The second plan that occurred to me was to tack the two measures together just as these gentlemen say we should have done. The reasons for discarding this plan were to my mind still more apparent. I had no doubt that the combined measures could be carried in the House by a safe majority, but I was equally confident that they would not in that form pass the Senate. From what transpired, or rather failed to transpire, in the Senate at the last session of Congress, it was safe to assume that the reciprocity measure had many enemies in that body, although it is quite probable that its enemies are not now as numerous as they were then.

But it is safe to say that even at the present session if these measures pass the Senate, it will be by the vote of some Senators who are not enthusiastic in their favor, and possibly by the votes of some who might welcome a plausible excuse for opposing them. The question, as I viewed it, was this: Would not the addition of the free list to the reciprocity measure furnish just such an excuse? Would not the combination of the two bills incur the hostility of every Senator opposed to either of them? Moreover, would it not enable a Senator to vote in the negative without incurring the full responsibility of his vote? It is of the highest importance that the vote of every Member of either House should place him clearly and distinctly on record, so that his constituents can tell exactly where he stands. When two distinct measures are joined together this is impossible. The present case affords an admirable illustration. A Member who might desire to shirk responsibility could vote against the combination measure and when afterwards called upon to give an account of his stewardship he could claim that he was compelled to vote as he did because of his opposition to either one of the two measures, though making a pretense of favoring the other; and if he were inclined to "play politics" he might have one excuse for the manufacturer and another for the farmer.

We on this side believe both measures are right. We want both of them to pass. They are both opposed by standpatters, and we "love them for the enemies they have made." If the reciprocity measure becomes a law, as we believe it will, we are confident that an inherent sense of justice operating upon the minds of Members of both Houses and of the President—justice to the wage earner, who needs cheaper shelter and food; justice to the farmer, who has never received any material benefit from protection and who thinks that the reciprocity measure unfairly discriminates against him—will cause the present remedial free-list bill to also become a law. An all-pervading sense of justice is one of our distinctive national traits inherited from our Anglo-Saxon ancestors. It permeates the great mass of our people, and it is well for their Representatives to keep that fact in mind.

Personal views have been expressed by Members on both sides of this House as to the probable fate of the present bill in the Senate. Such expressions are mere guesses without the slightest binding force upon anyone. So far as I am concerned, I refuse to be bound in the slightest degree by the opinions of others upon this point. The people of the United States have said that they want the cost of living reduced. Reciprocity with Canada gives some help in that direction. This bill gives still more. Before the election last November I promised to do what I could to that end. I shall keep that promise by voting for this bill. If Senators do not listen to this demand of the people that is their affair, not ours.

My sincere belief, however, is that the Senate will pass both these measures. Senators know what the common people of America are thinking and saying, and I believe that they will perform their duty in this matter both from motives of policy and from motives of humanity. If they see fit to combine these two measures and to send them back to the House in that form without amendments which seriously impair their value I, for one, shall be glad to give them my support.

The third method which I considered, and which I made up my mind was the most logical, the most likely to succeed, the least open to the charge of "playing politics," and in all respects the best, is precisely the one which was reported by the Ways and Means Committee and which we are now pursuing. It is the natural method; it is straightforward; it is businesslike. It affords the most conclusive evidence of our sincere desire that both these measures should be adopted, and all of our countrymen who are not blinded by partisanship will recognize the purity of our motives and will give their hearty approval to our conduct.

I come from a district which is largely agricultural, and, I might add, largely Republican. It lies in the so-called "fruit belt" of Michigan. We raise enormous quantities of peaches and apples. From Grand Rapids, my home city, we ship peaches, not by the carload, but by the trainload. Our farmers are applying the most scientific methods to the care of their orchards. They keep the ground well tilled and spray the trees. I know a farmer in my district—and he is a good Democrat—who has 1,400 acres of land. His farm buildings are numerous and well painted. From a distance they look like a small village. He has an apple orchard of 40 acres. He planted the trees himself 24 years ago. He recently refused $60,000 for the 40 acres—$1,500 per acre. He has an automobile, as have many of our other farmers.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT] said that farmers were leaving his State and going farther north. They are not leaving the fifth district of Michigan. They are prosperous, and neither need nor desire to tax the less fortunate wage earners of the cities in order to put more dollars into their own pockets. Their generosity is proverbial. It has been claimed that the Good Samaritan was a commercial traveler, because he said: "When I come again I will repay thee." But this claim is not sustained by the facts. The farmer in olden times brought his produce to the city, as he does to-day, but often from very long distances. He frequently traveled the same road back and forth. The fact is the Good Samaritan was a farmer, and the farmers of my district are his lineal descendants. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They are not only prosperous and generous, but they are also intelligent. When you Republicans put a tariff on wheat you did not fool the farmer in my part of the country. He voted your ticket, and was good naturedly satisfied to pay a tariff tax on everything he bought in order to give the manufacturing interests a lift.

But he knew all the time that wheat was an article of export and not of import, and he was not fooled by the pretended protection you gave him. What he did he did with his eyes open, and until you carried the thing too far and continually increased the tariff rates instead of lowering them, as you said you would, he made no complaint. When in the campaign of 1908 you and your candidate for President promised a reduction of tariff rates, the people accepted your terms, elected your candidate, gave you the control of both Houses of Congress—in a word, they completed the contract with you. The reason why they have lost confidence in you is because you broke that contract.

I do not wish to be understood as claiming that a majority of the farmers in my district are in favor of the reciprocity measure, but in almost every case which has been brought to my knowledge, where there is objection, it is not so much to the measure itself as it is to the injustice, after all these years of self-imposed sacrifice for the benefit of the manufacturer, of removing even the nominal and visionary benefits supposed to be conferred upon farm products without a corresponding removal from the output of the manufacturer.

Their position is stated with remarkable clearness in a letter I recently received from the master of the Michigan State Grange, Mr. N. P. Hull, of Dimondale, Mich. He says:

> As master of the Michigan State Grange, the largest farmers' organization in Michigan, an organization composed of 60,000 of the best farmers and their families in the State, I want in their name to make one last appeal to you in the interest of plain justice and fairness. If protection is an advantage and the capital and labor of the manufacturer are to be given that advantage, then by what principle of justice are we to be refused it? Have we not been loyal citizens? Have we not done our part to build this Nation and to make it wealthy? Have we not given as freely of our blood and of our treasure to maintain it in both war and peace as has our brother in the city? If legislation to lower the price of farm products is desirable, why is it not equally desirable to lower the price of other men's labors? What arguments can the cities bring for reciprocity with Canada in farm products that would not be as forceful and logical for us to use in favor of reciprocity with England in manufactured products?

He concludes with these significant words:

> All we ask is a square deal, the same protection for our labor and investments as other classes enjoy, an equal opportunity with others to provide for ourselves and our families. In God's name, are we not entitled to this?"

What the farmer wants is simple justice. He is willing to take his chance of a slight reduction in what he has to sell, provided he is given the benefit of a fair reduction in what he has to buy. That is precisely what this bill aims to do. It puts on the free list, not only from Canada and from England but from all the world, agricultural implements, wire fencing, lumber, fence posts, harness, shoes, meats of all kinds, bags for grain, bagging for cotton, sewing machines, and so forth.

The farmer and the laborer in the city are the consumers of these things. They know that most of them, even when produced in this country, are sold in foreign markets at lower prices than they have to pay for them. They know that their own earnings for the year are the difference between the amount they receive and the amount they pay out. They know that if the International Harvester Co. gets from the farmer $20 more than it should for a grain drill and $40 more than it should for a self-binder these sums are deducted from his net earnings.

Years ago, when the farmer was beguiled into the belief that the protection of infant manufacturing industries would create a greater home market for his products, he willingly submitted to the tax imposed upon all his purchases in the hope that it would prove a good investment, and that he would some time or other get his money back with interest.

He never dreamed that the principle of protection was to be a permanent policy. He never dreamed that it was to be carried to the extent of building up great monopolies in our own country. He never dreamed that tariff-fattened manufacturers would attempt to debauch legislation in their own interest and against the interest of those whose enforced contributions had made them multimillionaires. Even now most of the farmers in my district cling to the belief that there is inherent merit in the principle of protection properly applied, but they see no justice in tariff measures which absolutely ignore the interests of the great consuming public and make the rich in our country richer and the poor poorer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Although the reciprocity measure was not an issue in the campaign last fall, I have made an honest effort to ascertain where the people of my district stand on that question. I have sent out several hundred letters asking for a frank expression concerning it. A majority of the replies are favorable to reciprocity, and, so far as I can learn, the opinion that it should be followed by the free-list bill now under discussion is almost unanimous. The only opposition to the free-list bill comes from a few special interests among manufacturers who fear it will reduce their profits.

The opponents of these measures have frequently said during the progress of this debate that a reduction in the price of cattle would not cheapen the price of the poor man's meat because of the manipulations of the Beef and Packing Trusts. If that is true, God help the poor, for Congress confesses its inability. If it is true, no reason can be given except that under the shelter of the tariff foreign competition has been removed and home monopolies have grown so strong as to be absolutely beyond our control. If there is no relation between the price these monopolies pay for what others produce and the price they charge when they come to sell substantially the same articles, the happiness and even the lives of our people have been placed in their hands.

If those on the other side who have used this argument realize the full force of what they are saying they ought to be the first ones to advocate the opening of world-wide competition, in order, so far as possible, to break down these merciless monopolies. If natural competition at home, which would induce cheaper selling where there is cheaper buying, is so far a thing of the past that all natural laws are eliminated, the most beneficent purpose which can possibly be served by the adoption of this bill is to be found in the admission of competition from abroad and the consequent destruction of these monopolies.

The bill under consideration is not too drastic. It will not cause the sacrifice of a large amount of revenue. By cutting off unnecessary employees and by businesslike economies in the House of Representatives alone a saving of about $182,000 per year has been effected. If that proportion, or anything like it, should be carried out through the other departments the $10,000,000 loss of revenue which this bill will cause will be made up many times over in a manner which will meet the approval of every business man and every thrifty farmer in the country.

These two measures, in my judgment, constitute the best legislation which has been enacted in this Chamber for many years, and yet they are merely the repeal of former legislation. They merely restore to the people natural rights which have been taken away by law. Buckle, the great English author, asserts that the best legislation of modern times is that which abrogates former legislation. He is speaking of England. In proof of this statement he cites the corn laws, which were passed for the purpose of enabling the English landlord to get higher rents. They were passed without serious objection, but it required for their repeal years of the hardest kind of fighting in Parliament and a war of classes which cost many lives. He cites the laws restricting the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech, and calls attention to the years of effort on the part of the greatest English statesmen to repeal those laws.

It is only within a few years that our own people have come to realize how the principle of protection can be misused. The climax was reached by the adoption of the Payne-Aldrich bill, when our people saw that special interests were in the saddle and that the very wealth which had been diverted from the many to the few was being used not only to perpetuate the system, but to render it still more oppressive. To place the people back in control of their own Government, to set right the wrongs they have suffered, to effect so far as may be a more just distribution of wealth, to remove the burden from shoulders that are unable to bear it, to bring the comfort of warm clothing and proper nourishment to those who can not now afford them, to call a halt in the mad march of money getting, to make a start at least toward a broader and better humanity; these are purposes which are inspiring the people in their widespread insurgency, and they are purposes which may well control the actions of this body. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, during a colloquy this morning on the floor of the House between the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] and myself I asked him the question if it was possible that the contracts of the United Shoe Machinery Co. with shoe manufacturers might not be responsible, in a measure, for the increased prices or the constantly increasing prices of shoes. He very emphatically denied that that could be possible. About the time that my friend was delivering this speech a Senate committee was holding a hearing on that very question. The statement made in that hearing this afternoon was such that I believe it is important that, in conjunction with my colloquy with the gentleman this morning, I be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD to cover the evidence given in this hearing before the Senate committee this morning. I therefore ask unanimous consent to print this report in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The order has already been given authorizing Members to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Sensational and startling testimony as to the extent to which the United Shoe Machinery Co., of Boston, known as the Shoe Machinery Trust, has the shoe manufacturers of the United States under its domination was given to-day by shoe manufacturers before the Finance Committee.

The story told by the shoe manufacturers seemed to make out so complete a case of violation of the antitrust laws that one of the ablest lawyers in the Senate expressed himself freely in commenting on it.

"I think that if these hearings are transmitted to the office of the Attorney General the United Shoe Machinery Co. will have trouble on its hands," he remarked.

He did not hesitate to declare that the contracts which the Shoe Machinery Trust virtually forces manufacturers to sign are invalid. He declared that the signature of such contracts in some of the States would be a crime.

The whole Finance Committee pricked up its ears and took notice as witnesses recited the details of the story of how the United Shoe Machinery Co. held the shoe manufacturers of this country in thralldom, and how, under the system pursued by the company in question, the foreign manufacturers of shoes, especially the English, got much more favorable treatment than American shoe manufacturers.

The hearing set out to be one in which the shoe manufacturers were to tell the Finance Committee why they ought not to be subjected to free shoes. But it had not got far before the United Shoe Machinery Co. was run into. The committee found itself much more interested in the story of how what is alleged to be trust was keeping the shoe manufacturers in subjection than it was in the simple matter of duties on boots and shoes.

If the temper displayed at the hearing to-day by Senators who were told about the shoe machinery company is any indication, there will be strenuous demand in the Senate for prosecution of the United Shoe Machinery Co. and for the testing in the courts of the validity of its contracts.

The witnesses before the committee to-day were members of the Western Shoe Manufacturers' Association. They came from St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, and other shoe manufacturing centers of the West. The first one to speak was William D'Oench, of St. Louis, of a leading shoe company there. Mr. D'Oench started out to tell the committee how the shoe business had suffered because the duty had been lowered on shoes from 25 per cent to 10 and 15 per cent.

The witness recited to the committee the list of articles going into the manufacture of shoes and the duty on each.

In this connection Mr. D'Oench pointed out that the English manufacturer of shoes had a great advantage in that all the articles used in shoemaking could be imported free in that country, while here there were duties imposed on these articles. He cited the case of a certain kind of wire, which costs 14 cents in England and 36 cents here.

It was at this point that the committee began to learn something about the operations of the United Shoe Machinery Co. Mr. D'Oench was asked why the American manufacturer did not import the wire, since the English cost plus the duty was far less than the American cost.

Mr. D'Oench explained that the United Shoe Machinery Co., which he said was a trust, controlled in this matter. The American shoe manufacturers signed leases on the machinery of the company and at the same time had to use the material furnished by the company. The company controlled the wire about which he had been talking.

"The Shoe Machinery Trust owns practically all the shoe machinery in this country," said Mr. D'Oench.

In answer to questions, he said it was a Boston concern and was an American organization.

Senator HEYBURN, Senator SMOOT, and others asked if it did not control the patents to the machinery in question, and if this control was not the basis of the alleged monopoly.

"The basic patents have expired," said the witness.

He then explained that the only way the American manufacturer could get shoe machinery was to lease it from the Shoe Machinery Trust, which at the same time furnished the wire and other parts. Mr. D'Oench said as good machines could be got in Europe, but there was a 45 per cent duty on them.

Senator SIMMONS asked why not abolish the duty.

"That would relieve us very much," said the witness.

Senator SMOOT then asked why the American shoe manufacturers did not buy English machines and pay the duty.

"Because the United Shoe Machinery Co. would come into our plants and take every machine out."

In the course of the hearing it developed that the shoe manufacturers were tied up to the Shoe Machinery Trust by 17-year contracts, that the trust had some machines which the manufacturers could not get in Europe, and that unless the Government smashed the United Shoe Machinery Co.'s alleged monopoly the manufacturers felt they were helpless.

Mr. D'Oench told of the efforts of Thomas G. Plant, of Boston, to compete in making shoe machinery with the trust, and how some months ago the trust bought him out.

Milton S. Florsheim, of Chicago, gave other details of the grip the Shoe Machinery Trust has on the manufacturer here. He said there was no market here for a competing shoe machinery company, because the manufacturers of shoes here were tied up by 17-year contracts, and no capital would go into the business of competing with the shoe machinery company.

Mr. BARNHART. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it seems that the United Shoe Machinery Co. is protected by a 45 per cent tariff wall, and it avails itself of this protection to arbitrarily fix its own terms as to lease price and conditions to shoe manufacturers, who are thereby forced to pay any prices the Shoe Machinery Trust imposes. Of course the ultimate consumer—the wearer of the shoes—pays the extravagant profits which the United Shoe Machinery Trust admits it is making, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has been led into error.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, in opening the debate in opposition to the pending bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the brilliant leader of the minority, after criticizing the language of the free-list bill, undertook to say that up to the present time the legislative program of the Democratic Party in this body consisted solely of warmed-over Republican legislation.

The gentleman had reference, of course, to the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people and to the bill providing that there should be publicity of campaign contributions and expenditures before as well as after the election. When the gentleman took the position that the Democratic Party, in presenting these measures, was merely tracking Republican footsteps, he disregarded the record and the facts.

The Democratic national platform of 1904 and 1908 contained a clear-cut demand for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for the election by the people of United States Senators, and I have yet to read in any Republican platform of either of the years I have specified, or in any other year, where that party has taken such a position.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it not a fact, however, that the Republicans did through the Congress pass such resolutions or bills prior to the coming in of the Democratic Party at this time?

Mr. HARDWICK. It is not a fact. On three separate occasions in recent years joint resolutions to so amend the Constitution of the United States have passed a Republican House——

Mr. MADDEN. I mean the House.

Mr. HARDWICK. And every time they met an untimely death at the hands of a Republican Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman will not deny they were introduced in the House by Republicans and passed by Republicans.

Mr. HARDWICK. And by Democrats as well; but the Republicans, it must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, not only controlled the House, but the Senate, and what they gave the people with one hand they took from them with the other. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, in his opening speech the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] contended that in presenting the Rucker bill to amend the law relative to publicity of election contributions and expenditures so as to require publicity before as well as after the election we were simply tracking Republican legislation. The fact is precisely otherwise. In the Democratic platform of 1908 there was a plain, clean-cut demand for this publicity legislation. The demand was specific that the legislation should include publicity before as well as after the election. I have yet to read in the Republican platform of 1908 or in that of any other year where that party indorsed this legislation in any form.

Mr. MADDEN. What difference does it make about the demand if the fact obtained?

Mr. HARDWICK. None, if the fact did obtain. Let me tell the House what the facts were in reference to this legislation, and then our good friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will understand how unmerited is the criticism that his brilliant colleague, the leader of the minority, has ventured to make on this floor in reference to the subject. In the last Congress we did pass through a Republican House what was generally known as the McCall campaign publicity bill, and I happen to know that that bill was literally forced out of an unwilling Republican committee and through a reluctant Republican House on account of the political exigencies of the hour and because of the attitude of a Republican President. I know something of these facts, because I served for years on the committee that perfected and reported this measure. The bill, as the House committee reported it, provided for publicity in respect to these campaign contributions and expenditures before election as well as after, and it passed the House in that form, and when it went to a Republican Senate, that body, in the exercise of that infallible wisdom for which it is noted, saw fit to provide that the publicity should be had after the election was all over——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota rose.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman will pardon me for a moment—and saw fit to provide that the stable should be locked after the horse was stolen, to use a homely but forceful phrase, and in conference this House was forced to accept the Senate's position, and did accept it on the theory that half a loaf is better than none; and that the bill, as amended by a Republican Senate, was at least a step, although a very short one, in the right direction. Yet the brilliant gentleman from Illinois, the able leader of the minority, has ventured to state that in presenting this measure in the exact form in which it is demanded by the Democratic national platform, and in a very different form from what a Republican Senate forced us to accept in the last Congress, that we are simply presenting warmed-over Republican legislation. God save the mark! I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is not the criticism of the gentleman upon another body rather than upon this House, and in that connection I would like to remind the gentleman that when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] opened the debate on the Canadian reciprocity bill, I think in the first paragraph of his speech—and it can be verified if the speech is ever revised and published; I think it has not been published yet—he stated, and got glory out of the fact, as he said, that a Democratic House had done more in the few short weeks of the session than the Republicans had done in 10 years, while I find, upon looking up the record——

Mr. HARDWICK. I would prefer that the gentleman make a speech in his own time, as I do not wish him to take up too much of my time——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I wish to say that three times a Republican House has done the same thing——

Mr. HARDWICK. I have just stated the facts to the House, both in regard to the election of Senators and to the campaign publicity law, and if the Republican Party can get any glory out of its record in both the House and the Senate on these questions, it is entirely welcome to do it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It never passed a Democratic House at any time when you had it.

Mr. ADAMSON. We had better Democratic Representatives in the House than in the Senate——

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen who desire to ask questions must first address the Chair.

Mr. HARDWICK. No; these propositions were not presented in Congress during Cleveland's administrations because the abuses which have formed public sentiment on these questions had not then occurred. So much for that.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will permit, I just want to suggest to the gentleman that he has omitted the important fact that after this Congress adjourned and the campaign was in progress the Democratic executive committee did put that into operation and published the contributions before election, while the leaders of the Republican Party absolutely refused to comply with that suggestion.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman may, of course, be right about that. I do not recall. The question I am discussing is the political record of the two parties in both Houses of Congress in reference to this legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after an unwarranted criticism of the Democratic performance in this House, which criticism I have already alluded to, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] then launched into an extremely technical and hypercritical analysis of the language of the pending bill. I venture the statement that any one of the revenue laws passed by either party during any Congress can be taken as a basis, and criticisms equally as superrefined, equally as technical, and equally

as worthless as those made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] can be made of its language. The gentleman complains that the language of this bill is too broad. Mr. Chairman, this bill gives to American consumers, and to the toiling masses whose backs have been burdened for many weary years, some relief—relief to which they are most justly entitled, according to my opinion. If it should happen that decisions in the Treasury Department, or in the courts, should broaden the language even beyond our construction, then the first and most important result will be that the benefits of this measure will be increased and the burdens of those who toil still further lightened.

Mr. Chairman, in the early days of the Republic no statesman ever dared to assert, and no political party to contend, that taxation, either direct or indirect, was a blessing in disguise, and that the more you taxed a people the happier they were and the more prosperous they became. It has remained for latter-day, for Republican, statesmanship to advance that very remarkable contention. In the early days protection was justified and defended on two grounds: First, it was contended that it was necessary to build up and diversify our infant industries; and, second, it was contended that when foreign competition was shut out, either in whole or in part, by a tariff wall, domestic production would be stimulated and that increased competition between more numerous producers would keep down prices to the consumer.

In order that we may keep our history straight, and in order that the House and the country may understand how accurate is the statement I have made of the case for protection, I wish to now cite a few authorities on these two points. Before I do so let me digress for just a moment while I commend to my Republican brethren Alexander Hamilton's contention about whether the consumer or the importer paid the duty, made at the time when Mr. Hamilton was strongly contending that in most cases the consumer paid the tariff, and therefore the tariff duties ought to go into the Common Treasury, and not into the treasury of the importing States. In No. 35 of the Federalist, Mr. Hamilton said:

Suppose, as has been contended for, the Federal power of taxation were to be confined to duties on imports, it is evident that the Government, for want of being able to command other resources, would frequently be tempted to extend these duties to an injurious extent.

There are persons who imagine they can never be carried to too great a length, since the higher they are the more, it is alleged, they will tend to discourage an extravagant consumption, to produce a favorable balance of trade, and to promote domestic manufactures. But all extremes are pernicious in various ways. Exorbitant duties on imports would beget a general spirit of smuggling, which is always prejudicial to the fair trade and eventually to the revenue tariff itself; they tend to render other classes of the community tributary in an improper degree to the manufacturing, to whom they give a premature monopoly of the markets; they sometimes force industry out of its more natural channels into others, in which it flows with less advantage; and, in the last place, they oppress the merchant, who is often obliged to pay them himself, without any contribution from the consumer.

When a demand is equal to the quantity of goods at market, the consumer generally pays the duty, but when the markets happen to be overstocked a great proportion falls upon the merchant, and sometimes not only exhausts his profits, but breaks in upon his capital. I am apt to think that a division of the duty between the seller and the buyer more often happens than is commonly imagined. It is not always possible to raise the price of a commodity in exact proportion to every additional imposition laid upon it. The merchant, especially in a country of small commercial capital, is often under a necessity of keeping prices down in order to secure a more expeditious sale.

The maxim that the consumer is the payer is so much oftener true than the reverse of the proposition that it is far more equitable that the duties on imports should go into a common stock than that they should redound to the exclusive benefit of the importing States.

This is almost precisely the Democratic contention of to-day, and yet it was Alexander Hamilton's admission when he was giving his reasons why this revenue from tariff should be given to the Federal Government and not to the States.

To illustrate the statement I have made of the case for protection, I now call your attention to certain statements made by Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay, James G. Blaine, John Sherman, and Andrew Carnegie. I first read from Mr. Hamilton's famous report on manufactures, made to the Congress of the United States December 5, 1791:

This is another and an efficacious means of encouraging national manufactures; but, in general, it is only fit to be employed when a manufacture has made such progress and is in so many hands as to insure a due competition and an adequate supply on reasonable terms. Of duties equivalent to prohibitions there are examples in the laws of the United States, and there are other cases to which the principle may be advantageously extended, but they are not numerous.

Again, he says on the subject of domestic competition in this same report:

But, though it were true that the immediate and certain effect of regulations controlling the competition of foreign with domestic fabrics was an increase of price, it is universally true that the contrary is the ultimate effect with every successful manufacture. When a domestic manufacture has attained to perfection and has engaged in the prosecution of it a competent number of persons, it invariably becomes cheaper. Being free from the heavy charges which attend the importation of foreign commodities, it can be afforded, and accordingly seldom never fails, to be sold cheaper in process of time than was the foreign articles for which it is a substitute. The internal competition which takes place soon does away with everything like monopoly and by degrees reduces the price of the article to the minimum of a reasonable profit on the capital employed. This accords with the reason of the thing and with experience.

Let me next invite your attention to the arguments advanced in support of the protection system by one of its most distinguished and most brilliant advocates. In an elaborate and able exposition of what he was pleased to term the "American system," Henry Clay, of Kentucky, in the Senate of the United States, in February, 1832, said:

This brings me to consider what I apprehend to have been the most efficient of all the causes in the reduction of the prices of manufactured articles, and that is competition. By competition the total amount of the supply is increased and by increase of the supply a competition in the sale ensues, and this enables the consumer to buy at lower rates. Of all human powers operating on the affairs of mankind, none is greater than that of competition. It is action and reaction. It operates between individuals in the same nation and between different nations. It resembles the meeting of the mountain torrent, grooving, by its precipitous motion, its own channel, and ocean's tide. Unopposed it sweeps everything before it, but, counterpoised, the waters become calm, safe, and regular. It is like the segments of a circle or an arch; taken separately each is nothing, but in their combination they produce efficacy, symmetry, and perfection. By the American system this vast power has been excited in America and brought into being to act in cooperation or collision with European industry. Europe acts within itself and with America, and America acts within itself and with Europe. The consequence is the reduction of prices in both hemispheres.

Hear Mr. Clay again, in the Senate, speaking on the same subject:

Competition, therefore, wherever existing, whether at home or abroad, is the present cause of cheapness. If a high duty excites production at home and the quantity of the domestic article exceeds the amount which had been previously imported, the price will fall.

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years of Congress, says:

Protection in the perfection of its design does not invite competition from abroad, but is based on the contrary principle that competition at home will always prevent monopoly on the part of the capitalist, assure good wages to the laboring man, and defend the consumers against evil extortion.

In 1889 John Sherman said:

The primary object of a protective tariff is to secure the fullest competition by individuals and corporations in domestic production. If such individuals or corporations combine to advance the price of the domestic product and to prevent the free result of open and fair competition, I would, without a moment's hesitation, reduce the duties of foreign goods competing with them in order to break down the combination.

Mr. Andrew Carnegie is quoted in the American Manufacturer, of Pittsburg, under date of July 25, 1884, as saying:

We are the creatures of the tariff, and if ever the steel manufacturers here attempt to control or have any general understanding among them, the tariff would not exist one session of Congress. The theory of protection is that home competition will soon reduce the price of the product so it will yield only the usual profit; any understanding among us would simply attempt to defeat this. There never has been nor ever will be such an understanding.

Lower prices, which Mr. Hamilton claimed would result from a protective-tariff system, may have accorded in the "reason of things" as things appeared to him; it may have accorded with experience up to 1791, though I doubt it, but no living man, be he Democrat or Republican, can truthfully and candidly say that it accords with either the reason of things or with experience up to and including 1911. Is the reduction of prices which Hamilton and Clay, Blaine and Sherman predicted the shibboleth on which the American people commenced the work in 1910 of driving the Republican Party from power by giving to us control of this House? Has Mr. Carnegie's confident prediction that "there never has been nor ever will be such an understanding" among the manufacturers been borne out by subsequent results, even in the steel industry? How many, or how few, years elapsed before we find this same king of the steel industry selling out to a trust for cash and bonds and retiring from active industrial life in America to become the "Laird of Skibo" in a foreign land?

Let me next invite your careful consideration of the all-important question as to whether or not the experience of this country has demonstrated the truth or falsity of the contention of the protectionists that a high tariff, by stimulating domestic production, increases domestic competition and thereby ultimately reduces the price of the protected article to the consumer. Before I do so, however, permit me to call your attention to a brief summary of the tariff history of this country.

It is true that even from the beginning of our Government tariff duties that were more or less protective were levied and collected, and yet it is also true that the amount of protection afforded thereby was usually relatively insignificant up to the time of our Civil War. The actual rate of duty collected under our first tariff law averaged only about 7½ per cent. This was under the law of 1790, and even up to the year 1808 the average of duties collected upon imports did not exceed 13 per cent. The embargo act of 1808 and the War of 1812 resulted in the

rapid growth of American manufactures, and the necessity of protecting them to some extent, when they were real infants, from a foreign competition was strongly urged, and at the close of the War of 1812 seems to have appealed to statesmen of all parties and all sections, but even the tariff of 1812, which was considered a remarkably high tariff, levied only an average duty of about 20 per cent. Under the tariff of 1824 the duties averaged from 25 per cent to 33 per cent. The one exception of the general rule in the early days of the Republic was the tariff of 1828, generally known throughout the country as the tariff of abominations, which imposed duties averaging 48.88 per cent, and which was finally superseded by the tariff of 1832, which practically restored the rate of duty carried in the tariff laws of 1824. The compromise tariff of 1833 provided that all duties in which the tariff exceeded 20 per cent were to have one-tenth of such excess taken off on June 1, 1834, one-tenth more on January 1, 1838, and another tenth on January 1, 1840. It further provided that on January 1, 1842, one half of the remainder of such excess was to be removed and on July 1, 1842, the other half of the remainder of such excess was to be removed, so that on July 1, 1842, the average ad valorem tariff rate would be 20 per cent.

The Whig tariff law of 1832 carried an average ad valorem duty of 32 per cent, and the Democratic tariff law of 1846, commonly known as the Walker tariff law, carried an average tariff duty of 25 per cent, which was still further reduced by the act of 1857 to an average of about 18 per cent. The Morrill tariff law of 1862 increased the duties to an average of 37.2 per cent, and the war tariff of 1864 raised this average to 47.6 per cent. Between this period and the enactment of the McKinley law in 1890 there were many changes in regard to various schedules and subjects, and usually these were in the direction of more protection to the manufacturer. The McKinley law of 1890 still further raised the duties until the average was more than 50 per cent, where they remained until the Wilson bill of July 1, 1897, reduced them to about 42 per cent. Under the Dingley law of 1897 the duties were again increased to an average of 44.6 per cent, and under the Payne law of 1909 they were still further increased to an average of 45.72 per cent, if we may accept the figures at that time made by Mr. Evans, the accurate and painstaking clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the Sixty-first Congress.

So that it appears from the foregoing statement that our manufacturers and producers have had most liberal "protection," almost without a break and certainly without a serious check, in the upward march in the rate of duties since the period of our Civil War. It now becomes pertinent to revert to the inquiry I have just suggested, to wit: What has been the effect upon prices? Has competition kept them down, or has combination among our protected manufacturers and producers throttled competition and elevated prices?

In the year 1903 one of the most distinguished gentlemen who ever served in this House, a staunch Republican and a loyal protectionist, Mr. Littlefield, of Maine, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of 793 trusts, with a total capitalization of over $14,000,000,000. Of the trusts "discovered" by Congressman Littlefield, 435, representing over nine billions of capital, were classed as industrial combinations.

Census Bulletin No. 22, issued by the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce and Labor, in 1900, gave a list of 183 "industrial combinations," with a total authorized capital of $3,607,539,200. Of these 183 trusts, 7 were formed in the year 1897, 20 in 1898, 79 in 1899, and 13 in 1900 prior to June 30 of that year. Nearly two-thirds of these trusts were therefore formed in the three years immediately following the passage of the Dingley tariff law.

In his interesting book called The Truth About the Trusts, published in March, 1904, Mr. John Moody gives a list of 318 important, active, industrial trusts, with a capitalization of $7,246,342,533. Of these 318 trusts, 236 were capitalized at about $6,000,000,000, and were incorporated subsequent to January 1, 1898. So that it would appear that trust combination received its first splendid impetus through the Dingley tariff law.

Let me give you another list of just a few of the larger trusts, taken from the splendid work of Mr. Franklin Pierce, of the New York bar, The Tariff and the Trusts, published in 1907:

The Meat Trust, a combination of the National Packing Co., Armour & Co., Swift & Co., John P. Squire & Co., Schwarzschild & Sulzberger Co., St. Louis Dressed Beef & Provision Co., Northern Packing & Provision Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby, protected by 2 cents a pound on beef and pork and 5 cents a pound on bacon and ham, practically controlling the whole market and fixing the price on the domestic product at a price equal to that of 1860, when butchers slaughtered animals by hand and availed themselves in no way of the by-products. This trust is also protected on most of its by-products.

The Standard Oil Co., controlling 20 different companies, with an authorized capitalization of $102,000,000, protected on many of its by-products by heavy duties and by rebates on its imported tin cans of 99 per cent of the duty.

The American Linseed Co., combining 47 different companies, with an authorized capital stock of $50,000,000, representing 85 per cent of the linseed-oil production of the United States, and under the domination of the Standard Oil Co.

The National Lead Co., with an authorized capital stock of $50,000,000, comprising 26 plants, and under the domination of the Standard Oil Co.

The United Lead Co., combining 19 different companies, and also under the domination of the Standard Oil Co.

The American Sugar Refining Co., controlling 55 different companies, representing 70 to 90 per cent of the product, with a total capital issued of the parent and affiliated companies of $145,000,000.

The International Harvester Co., controlling 6 plants, with an authorized capitalization of $120,000,000, controlling 70 per cent of the industry.

The American Brass Co., with an authorized capitalization of $20,000,000, and controlling 9 plants.

The American Thread Co., with an authorized capitalization of $12,000,000, owning or controlling 13 different plants, controlling 50 per cent of the industry.

The Casein Co. of America, known as the Milk Sugar Trust, with a total capital issued of $6,492,000, owning 5 different plants and controlling 70 per cent of the industry.

The Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co., with a capitalization of about $8,000,000, owning 7 plants and controlling 80 per cent of the industry.

The Central Foundry Co., known as the Soil-Pipe Trust, with a capitalization of $14,000,000, owning 13 plants and controlling 80 per cent of the industry.

The Diamond Match Co., with an authorized capital stock of $15,000,000, owning 18 plants and controlling 85 per cent of the industry.

The International Steam Pump Co., known as the Steam Pump Trust, with an authorized capital of $25,000,000, owning 8 plants and controlling 80 per cent of the product.

The General Chemical Co., with an authorized capital of $25,000,000, controlling 70 per cent of the trade and 24 chemical plants.

The American Woolen Co., with a capital of $25,000,000 preferred stock and $40,000,000 common stock, having about 30 plants and controlling upward of 60 per cent of the sales.

The California Fruit Canners' Association, with a capital stock of about $3,500,000, including 18 different fruit companies and controlling 65 per cent of the trade.

The Glucose Trust, controlling 5 companies, with 20 plants, including the National Starch Co. and the Illinois Sugar Refining Co., having an authorized capital stock of $30,000,000 preferred and $50,000,000 common stock and controlling a large part of the sales in the United States.

The Candy Trust, with a capital stock of $9,000,000, including 16 different plants and controlling over 55 per cent of the sales of candy.

The National Enameling & Stamping Co., having a capital stock of $30,000,000 and controlling 13 plants and 55 per cent of the industry.

The Glassware Trust, with an authorized capital stock of about $5,500,000, having 19 plants and controlling about 70 per cent of the sales of glassware.

The Rubber Goods Manufacturing Co., having a capital stock of $50,000,000 and 17 plants, and controlling about 60 per cent of the sales.

The United Button Co., having a capital stock of $3,000,000 and controlling 3 plants.

The Æolian Weber Piano & Pianola Co., having a capital stock of $10,000,000 and owning 12 plants.

The Allis-Chalmers Co., known as the Machinery Trust, having a capital stock of about $36,250,000, controlling 4 large plants and 50 per cent of the trade.

The American Agricultural Chemical Co., known as the Fertilizer Trust, being closely allied with the American Tin Plate Co., and having a capital of $88,000,000 and 123 plants, and controlling about 75 per cent of the trade.

The American Cement Co., known as the Cement Trust, having a capital of about $2,000,000 and controlling 6 plants.

The American Cotton Oil Co., known as the Cotton Oil Trust, having a capital stock of about $433,000,000 and 30 plants, and controlling about 65 per cent of the industry.

The American Felt Co., known as the Felt Trust, having a capital of about $4,000,000 and 5 plants, and controlling about 60 per cent of the industry.

The American Glue Co., having a capital stock of about $3,000,000 and 9 plants, and controlling 55 per cent of the industry.

The American Hide & Leather Co., having a capital stock of about $32,000,000 and 22 plants, and controlling about 60 per cent of the industry.

The American Radiator Co., having an authorized capital stock of about $10,000,000 and 12 plants,, and controlling 80 per cent of the industry.

The American Seeding Machine Co., known as the Seeding Machine Trust, having an authorized capital of $15,000,000 and 6 plants, and controlling 90 per cent of the trade.

The American Sewer Pipe Co., having an authorized capital of $8,000,000 and controlling from 40 to 50 per cent of the industry.

In the elaborate report presented by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, to the Senate on June 23, 1910, in behalf of the Select Committee of the Senate on Wages and Prices of Commodities, under the subhead "Combinations and associations," it is admitted by the majority members of the Senate committee that the country is teeming with trusts and industrial combinations, and that every line of business and industry is honeycombed with them.

Without multiplying words or extending the investigation further on this particular point, I think we can safely conclude what everyone with any common sense or with any experience or observation knows, and everyone with any candor or sincerity concedes, that the domestic competition that was promised us years ago by advocates of the protective system has utterly broken down and failed, and that in its stead we have enthroned industrial and trust combinations of spectacular size, without precedent or parallel in the history of our own or any

other country. Competition has died an untimely death at the hands of combination and monopoly extorts from the consuming public the utmost farthing that can be wrung from necessity.

Let me observe here that, in the face of well-established facts, apologists for the protective system often assert that free-trade England is as badly infested with trusts as protected America. On this subject, I desire to quote briefly from the very interesting address of Mr. Byron W. Holt, of New York, made in the year 1907 at Chicago, Ill., at the conference on trusts and combinations:

The Industrial Commission, a Republican partisan protectionist body of the most pronounced type, sent Prof. J. W. Jenks to Europe to find as many trusts there as possible. He found 35 so-called trusts in England, with a total capital of $460,000,000, or less than one-third that of our pet Steel Trust. He quoted tables from Liefman's book, showing that there had been 345 trusts in Germany, and that from 230 to 250 were in existence there in 1897. He stated that "in England the movement toward combination has not gone so far as in either Austria or Germany"—both highly protected countries. He stated that the English trusts have but little water in the capitalization as compared with American trusts; that the English trusts have had little or no effect in advancing prices; and that the (then) recent slight advance in prices was "due in good part to the increase in the prices of the raw materials." In Germany he found that many of the trusts, taking advantage of the high-tariff duties, had advanced prices very much. This was particularly true of the Iron and Steel Trusts and of the Sugar Trust, or cartel, both of which pattern after our much larger trusts and sell goods for export much below the home prices.

Other writers find even fewer trusts in England than did Prof. Jenks. Mr. Wilhelm Berdrow, a German economist, says in the May, 1899, Forum:

"As far as England is concerned, it must be admitted that the trust system has as yet found but tardy acceptance in that country. This is doubtless due in some degree to the thorough appreciation of the principle of free trade, for it is well known that the largest trusts are powerless unless their interests are secured by a protective tariff excluding from the whole market the product of foreign countries."

Mr. Thomas Scanlon, of Liverpool, writing of trusts in England, said: "It can not be said that we suffer in any appreciable degree from combinations of producers to keep up prices."

These and other authorities virtually agree that, instead of the price-raising, Congress-controlling, law-defying, bulldozing, and all-powerful tariff monsters with which we are familiar in this country, the so-called trusts of England are really only harmless syndicates, with little or no control over prices. They exist not because they have any monopoly, but because production can be carried on more economically on a large than a small scale. If they attempt to control prices, as did the recently formed Soap Trust, they commit what, in England, is regarded as the unpardonable sin. The Soap Trust endured but a few short weeks. A really free people would not stand, for one month, the robbery of any one of our scores of plundering tariff trusts.

The testimony is overwhelming that trusts do not flourish in free-trade England as they do in protected America, Germany, and the United States. Nowhere, outside of the Republican Campaign Book and of the organs of protection, published by organizations supported by the protected interests, is it even pretended that England has trusts comparable to those in this country. These organs brazenly disregard and defy all known facts. Thus the Republican Text Book of 1900 said:

"England has no tariff, and trusts exist and flourish in free-trade England—trusts more monstrous than any that we know anything about."

The monstrous trusts, it was said, "are solely, thoroughly, and absolutely the product of the Cobdenite free trade."

The American Economist, organ of the Protective Tariff League, on October 18, 1907, says:

"Former Gov. Douglas says the only way to save this country from the trusts is to cut down the tariff. Douglas would have a terrible time telling the British people how they were to get out of the clutches of the trusts. They are in the clutches more than the people of the United States, and they have no tariff to cut down."

I hesitate to say that the writers of these statements knew them to be false and that they deliberately distort and falsify facts and figures in order to deceive the voters and to prolong our accursed tariff system. I prefer to credit such misrepresentations to the overzealous efforts of protection fanatics who honestly believe that foreign trade and commerce is a curse and who would like to see each country surrounded by walls of fire.

That we have the trusts with us, and with us at every turn, can neither be denied nor doubted. It seems to me equally undeniable and undoubted that the effect of these combinations is and has been necessarily and naturally to raise the prices of the products they control. In the report of the select committee of the Senate on Wages and Prices of Commodities, already referred to, there is this statement, quoted from page 11 of the majority report:

Wholesale prices in the United States in 1909, as measured by the prices of the 257 commodities included in the price index number of the United States Bureau of Labor, advanced 3 per cent over 1908 and 14.5 per cent over 1900. The price in 1909, however, was 2.3 per cent below the high point reached in 1907. Beginning with September, 1908, wholesale prices increased month by month without a break until March, 1910. In March, 1910, prices were 21.1 per cent higher than the average for the year 1900 and 18.5 per cent above the price in March, 1900.

Quoting again from the excellent speech of Mr. Holt in 1907:

Since 1897, and especially since 1899, the prices of trust products have been maintained at extremely high points. Because of excellent crops, sold at good prices, this country has been prosperous since 1897. But the protected trusts have skimmed the cream of our prosperity and have left only the skimmed milk for workingmen and farmers. Money wages have risen, but tardily and slowly, and only about half as much as has the cost of living. The prices of farm products, until this year, had risen less than had the prices of most manufactured goods.

The average rise of prices is best shown by Dun's index numbers. These include the prices of 350 commodities and give a weight in accordance with its importance in consumption. On July 1, 1897, Dun's index number was 72,455; on March 1, 1907, it was 109,913, showing an advance in average prices since 1897 of 51.7 per cent. By April 1, 1907, there had been a decline of about 2 per cent. For some reason Dun's figures, which until then had been published regularly for 30 years, have not been published since April. It will be recalled that, because of the cold spring the prices of cotton, wheat, corn, oats, etc., rose rapidly during April. Possibly there was some connection between these two facts. Possibly the publication of these cost-of-living figures was "accelerating public sentiment" in the wrong direction—for the trusts. It is worth noting that one year previously the Department of Commerce and Labor at Washington suddenly ceased to publish Dun's telltale figures in its monthly reports. There was considerable of a "spread" between Dun's and the Government's figures of prices, and the spread was growing rapidly. These coincidences may have had nothing to do with the stoppage of the most scientifically constructed cost-of-living figures ever published. Regardless of economic or political consequences, we earnestly hope that Dun's Review will soon continue to give to the world the benefit of its price tables.

Bradstreet's less scientifically constructed figures show an increase in wholesale prices of 56 per cent from July 1, 1898, to March 1, 1907. The figures of the Labor Bureau at Washington show that wholesale prices averaged 40.6 per cent higher in 1906 than in 1897. They show that retail prices of food averaged 15.7 per cent higher in 1906 than for the 10 years from 1890 to 1899. These Government figures are very unsatisfactory and are evidently made to order. Almost any kind, and almost all kinds, of retail prices can be obtained, even on different streets of the same city. They afford excellent opportunity for trick juggling. It is fair to assume that these opportunities have been utilized. We know that the statistics of the census, so far as they relate to wages and manufactures—especially in the protected industries—are juggled so that they are almost worthless.

It is reasonably certain that the price level in this country is now between 50 per cent and 60 per cent higher than it was 10 years ago. It is not pretended that all of this advance should be credited to the Dingley tariff and its brood of trusts. The Labor Bureau report of last spring suggested that "internal revenue and tariff acts have in a marked degree affected prices by helping them to move upward." This is undoubtedly true. About how much of the advance should be credited to the tariff and trusts can be learned from a comparison of our price figures with those of England, where there are no protective duties and no tariff trusts.

Sauerbeck's index numbers advanced 35.1 per cent from July, 1896, to March, 1907—from 50.2 per cent to 80 per cent. The index number of the London Economist advanced 37.6 per cent from the end of 1897 to March, 1907. Since March last it has declined rapidly and is now only 30 per cent higher than in 1897. Its figures in 1897 were 1,890, and on October 1, 1907, 2,457.

It is evident from these figures that during the last 10 years prices have risen about 55 per cent in this country and 35 per cent in England. The 35 per cent advance is undoubtedly due to the depreciation of gold. A similar advance has occurred in all countries. The greater advance in this country, Canada, and Japan can fairly be credited to the higher tariffs of these countries and to the protected trusts.

That we now have the highest prices that this country has known in many years, and the highest prices in the world, is so well known that it does not seem to me to require much elaboration. The people of the United States understand it tolerably well and punished the Republican Party in November, 1910, for its failure to keep faith with them by reducing the tariff and thereby lessening the cost of living.

That the trusts are here and that high prices are with us also is not merely a coincidence. These facts bear the relation to each other of cause and effect. On this subject let me quote briefly from the report of the Senate committee already referred to:

The fact that prices of some of the commodities manufactured by the industrial combinations have not advanced as much as have commodities not manufactured by trusts does not prove that industrial combinations have not held prices at a higher level than was justified.

Industrial combinations in their very nature make for economies in production by placing the control of the business in the hands of a few individuals and thus reducing general expenses; they also reduce materially the cost of distribution by enabling products to be distributed from the nearest producing point. Industrial combinations are also able to maintain or steady prices. The possibility of industrial combinations contributing to the advance or maintaining of prices, even though prices of their products may have risen less than have other articles, is plainly shown by witnesses engaged in slaughtering cattle, who have testified before the committee that all the profit they would ask would be the value of the by-products, which they are not able to utilize but which the large packers are able to dispose of. The economies of production are, of course, a result of the development of the factory system, and the well-organized industrial combinations represent the highest development of the factory system.

While industrial combinations may result in economies of production and distribution, the fact that competition is either wholly or partly removed leads to abuses. Thus, according to witnesses who testified before the committee, the International Harvester Co. has not only unreasonably advanced the price of self-binders, but have changed the method of sale in such a way as to result in many cases in a loss to farmers. Before the organization of the International Harvester Co. the local dealer selling the binder sent a mechanic to "set up" the machine and to remain a few hours until the machine was running smoothly, and in case repairs were needed they were supplied immediately from the stock of the local dealer. Since the organization of the International Harvester Co. the machine, when purchased by the farmer, is sent "knocked down" to his nearest railroad station, and the farmer must set up his machine, and in case repairs are needed the machine is idle until the repairs are forwarded by express from the branch house, usually located in some large city and not necessarily convenient to the grain section.

It is true that the majority report of the Senate Committee on Wages and Prices of Commodities advances the remarkable contention that in some cases the trusts have lowered prices of the products they control, but it is equally true that in those cases the majority report fails to mention the fact that the foreign price has been lowered even below the American price, and that in America the trusts have prevented our consumers from obtaining the reduced prices that ought to have come from improvements of manufacture and natural causes, such as greater natural supplies. Wherever prices on trust-made articles have been lowered here, they have not been lowered one moiety of what they would have been lowered if the people of this country had received the advantages of improvements in manufacture and of the natural causes that seem to operate everywhere else on earth except in trust-ridden America. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Everyone knows that in this country there is hardly a branch of human activity, hardly a line of business or industry that is not either directly or indirectly controlled by these trusts and combinations. Our children are rocked in trust-made cradles, our dead are buried in trust-made coffins, and if there is an article of necessity that the American citizen must use, or a luxury that he wishes to use, that is not in some way or the other, directly or indirectly, controlled by these interests, I have yet to discover it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What are we to do about it? Is the Congress of the United States impotent? Have vested wrongs grown so hoary with age that they have become vested rights? Are the people to continue to have profits guaranteed by law because they happen to be engaged in one branch of industry rather than another? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Twenty-one years ago Senator John Sherman, of Ohio, suggested one remedy. However much we may disagree with either the economic theories or political principles of the great Ohio Senator, yet we all must agree that he was an able statesman and a great man, and that his remedy is entitled to receive not only careful consideration but fair trial. The remedy he proposed was to revamp, with only slight modifications, the common law against forestalling, regrading, and engrossing. The principle is as old as the Anglo-Saxon law, indeed, as human civilization itself. It is based on an inherent opposition to monopoly. I refer, of course, to the celebrated Sherman antitrust law of July 2, 1890, by which combinations in the restraint of trade or commerce in the several States by way of trust or otherwise are declared to be illegal. Are we to rely on that law as a complete panacea for all our evils? I think not. I think if we were to adopt that policy and rely wholly upon it, we would be guilty of equal stupidity as a man would be if his blood was impure and therefore his body was afflicted with sores, and he should go to a doctor and have the sores cut out, instead of going to a doctor for treatment of the impurity in his blood that caused the sores. I believe that to put the trust magnates in jail, that to enforce the law against the criminals who violate the antitrust law will do a great deal of good, but that can never be a complete remedy, no matter how vigilant, how industrious and impartial is the prosecution; as long as the system that creates these criminals continues in existence, trusts and combinations will be bred by it more rapidly than they can be broken up by criminal prosecutions.

What, then, is the real remedy? I fear that I can not in the course of this speech undertake to amplify it as fully as I would like, but I venture to express the hope that I can at least suggest it. The remedy must come from the complete readjustment of our entire economic system. I mean particularly that system so far as same is related to or is based upon the tariff laws of the country. I understand, and I make this statement with that reluctance that a man naturally feels in admitting conditions that require him to submit even temporarily to wrong and injustice, we can not do this at once or suddenly. If our whole tariff system was changed in the twinkling of an eye it might and would probably throw this country into a terrible business panic from which we would only recover with great difficulty and after great suffering. But it is my deliberate and mature judgment that we ought to come as rapidly as possible to another and to a fundamentally different view of tariff taxation. Our industries are no longer infants. They are conquering the markets of the world and are competing with the industries of other nations all over the earth without tariff aid. Bitter experience has demonstrated to the American people that existence of a high tariff law that severely restricts foreign importations affords an irresistible temptation for the formation of combinations and monopolies that increase the prices of the products they control and raise the cost of living. The true American system of the twentieth century must and will eventually be, so far as this question is concerned, an imposition of import duties on articles of strict luxury and on noncompetitive articles alone. A great English statesman, addressing a great English constituency, said 80 years ago that he would never vote for any law that, under the guise of taxation, enabled one Englishman to charge another Englishman a penny more for any article made in England than he could have charged, but for the existence of a tax law. Are we less patriotic than this foreign statesman was, or do we love our own people less than he did his? Are we less prepared to do them justice? Yet no man can dispute the proposition that so long as we continue to lay duties on competitive products, we not only burden our people with the payment of three hundred millions of revenue that is actually received and actually goes into the Public Treasury, but also we put upon them a far greater burden that comes from the enhancement of prices on articles of domestic manufacture or production that are so protected from foreign competition. The most careful economists who have considered this question estimate that this indirect burden is fully five times as great as the revenue the Government collects from the duties imposed. In other words, besides the $300,000,000 that finds its way each year into the Treasury in the shape of these duties, fully fifteen hundred millions per year is extracted from the pockets of the American consumer in the enhanced price that he must pay for articles of domestic manufacture or production over and above what he would have to pay but for the protective duties.

To my mind, this is the greatest injustice that can be done the people under the guise and form of law, and to such a system I am unalterably and irrevocably opposed. It may be contended, however, that we could not raise sufficient revenue from the tariff to run the Government under this system. In answer to that objection I wish to say that 30 States of the American Union have already ratified the income-tax amendment to our Constitution, and the affirmative voice of but five others is needed to make it a part of our organic law, and I firmly believe and confidently predict that before many months longer that amendment will be ratified. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

From a properly adjusted income tax we can readily secure one hundred million a year, and even more if necessary, and in levying such a tax we will not only carry out Democratic principles, but will subserve the wisest policy of statesmanship by placing at least a portion of the burdens of Government upon the backs of those who are best able to bear them, and who receive a large portion of its benefits.

From a duty on luxuries or on articles that are either entirely noncompetitive, or practically so, we could easily raise the remainder of the revenue necessary to administer economically and effectually the Federal Government.

Let me call your attention to the following table of articles entirely or largely noncompetitive, the figures therein being from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for the year 1909:

	Value.
Art works, not produced by Americans	$3,200,000
Indigo	1,400,000
Gum arabic	200,000
Crude camphor	600,000
Copal	2,300,000
Gambier	1,200,000
Shellac	3,900,000
Other gums	1,400,000
Crude iodine	23,000
Licorice root	1,700,000
Potash	7,500,000
Quinia	200,000
Nitrate soda	12,600,000
Sulphur, crude	300,000
Vanilla beans	1,500,000
Vegetable wax	1,000,000
Other waxes	7,000,000
Cocoa, crude	15,000,000
Coffee	80,000,000
Cork, wood	1,000,000
Diamonds, uncut	5,000,000
Emery ore	200,000
Fertilizers	6,600,000
Istle fiber	700,000
Jute	7,000,000
Manila	7,000,000
Sisal grass	10,000,000
All other fiber	1,000,000
Lobsters and shrimps	1,500,000
Bananas	11,000,000
Coconuts	1,200,000
Cream nuts	400,000
Furs	12,000,000
Balata	500,000
India rubber	61,000,000
India rubber, scrap	1,500,000
Ivory	2,600,000
Mattings and mats	3,200,000
Meerschaum	200,000
Nickel ore	2,300,000
Creosote oil	2,200,000
Coconut oil	4,000,000

	Value.
Nut oil	$1,100,000
Palm oil	3,000,000
Pearl shells	1,500,000
Raw silk	79,000,000
Nutmegs	200,000
Pepper	2,000,000
Other spices	2,000,000
Raw sugar	90,000,000
Barks	1,000,000
Tea	18,000,000
Tin	26,000,000
Mahogany	2,400,000
All other cabinet woods	1,400,000
Total	581,426,000

The total imports, free and dutiable, in 1909 amounted to $1,312,000,000; the articles dutiable amounted to $712,000,000; the articles free amounted to $599,500,000. The tariff law of 1909 enlarged the free list. The noncompetitive articles amounted to $581,426,000; the revenue produced by the dutiable list in 1909 amounted to $300,977,438, or an equivalent ad valorem rate of 42 per cent.

Applying this rate to the noncompetitive list the probable revenue would be approximately $245,000,000; the revenue in 1910 was approximately $328,000,000.

Applying the principle of taxing noncompetitive imports a deficit of $80,000,000 would probably follow, which could easily be met by several other forms of taxation.

I next wish to invite your attention to the statement of the revenue of Great Britain for 1908:

1. Customs:		
Tobacco	$68,600,000	
Tea	29,000,000	
Rum	12,000,000	
Brandy	5,900,000	
Other spirits	2,700,000	
Wine	5,800,000	
Currants	630,000	
Coffee	910,000	
Raisins	1,100,000	
Cocoa	1,400,000	
Sugar	33,800,000	
Other articles	970,000	
		$162,900,000
2. Excise:		
Spirits	88,500,000	
Beer	65,600,000	
Licenses	22,000,000	
Railways	1,700,000	
Other sources	700,000	
		178,600,000
3. Estate duties:		
Estate duty	71,700,000	
Temporary duty	35,000	
Probate duty	240,000	
Legacy duty	19,500,000	
Successive duty	3,600,000	
Corporation duty	250,000	
		95,500,000
4. Stamps, etc.:		
Deeds	15,700,000	
Receipts	8,600,000	
Bills of exchange	4,300,000	
Patent medicines	1,600,000	
Licenses	880,000	
Companies	2,500,000	
Bonds	2,000,000	
Insurances	3,300,000	
Other	2,100,000	
		39,500,000
5. Land tax		3,500,000
6. House duty		9,600,000
7. Property and income tax		159,300,000
Total taxes		647,200,000
8. Post office		89,200,000
9. Telegraph		2,200,000
10. Crown lands		2,500,000
11. Interest on Suez Canal shares		5,900,000
12. Miscellaneous		11,000,000
Total nontax revenue		130,800,000
Total revenue		780,100,000

On tea alone Great Britain receives twenty-nine millions of revenue; on tobacco, sixty-nine millions; on sugar, nearly thirty-four millions; on various spirits, nearly thirty millions; on coffee, about one million.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes.

Mr. KENDALL. Is the gentleman from Georgia in favor of establishing a tariff on tea and coffee for revenue purposes?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, of course, asks me a question that is entitled to a candid answer, and I will endeavor to give it to him. Yes, I favor it and will vote for it with pleasure, either now or later, provided you take the duties entirely off competitive products and adopt the system of duties on luxuries and noncompetitive products. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KENDALL. Then, if the gentleman had the power in the House he would abolish all——

Mr. HARDWICK. Speaking for myself alone, I would say yes.

Mr. KENDALL. Is that to be the policy of the Democratic Party?

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman will have to form his own conclusion about the policy of the Democratic Party. If the Democratic Party does right, then, in my judgment, that will be its ultimate policy on this question. It is the only intelligent policy of this tariff question, unless you are going to embrace protection.

Mr. KENDALL. I inquired of the gentleman, because I believe him to be in the confidence of that party.

Mr. HARDWICK. And I hope I am, and yet on this question I would not undertake to speak for anybody on earth except for myself and the constituency I represent upon this floor. Of course I would not support, and I think I was the first man in this House two years ago to protest against the imposition of a tax on coffee, so long as we were pursuing the system of raising our revenues principally from competitive products. We can not and ought not to adopt both policies on this question, because they are antagonistic to each other and are diametrically opposite in principle. My own idea is that we ought to raise as much as we can from the income tax, from internal-revenue duties, and then ought to supplement it, so far as may be necessary, by moderate tariff duties on noncompetitive products exclusively, and a still higher revenue tax on articles of strict luxury.

Why levy our duties on noncompetitive products except in case of luxuries alone? It is undoubtedly true that whenever we levy duties on competitive products that for every dollar which reaches our customhouses at least $5 in indirect protection goes into the pockets of domestic manufacturers and producers, never reaches the customhouse at all, and yet most grievously burdens and oppresses our people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On this subject, let me call your attention to a striking statement made during the progress of the debate when the Payne tariff bill was under consideration. It was made by that distinguished gentleman who is now Speaker of this House, Hon. CHAMP CLARK of Missouri. Mr. CLARK said:

> I will tell you the truth about revenue tariff and protective tariff very briefly. Up to a certain point on any article that is made in the United States, as well as abroad, a tariff rate is both a revenue rate and a protective rate, and no human being ever had or can have the ingenuity to separate them. It is an impossibility in nature. For instance, I might say that I am in favor of putting a 25-cent rate on a certain article for the purpose of revenue, and my friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] might say that he is in favor of putting a 25-cent rate on the same thing as protection. The upshot of it would be that I would get my revenue and the gentleman from Michigan would get his protection, whether I wanted him to have it or not.

Mr. CLARK states the case well and he states it truly. If the gentleman from Michigan stands on the Republican side and votes for a duty of $2 per thousand on lumber and calls it "protection," and if a gentleman stands on this side of the Chamber and votes for $2 per thousand on lumber and calls it "revenue," what difference does it make to the man who pays the bill? Does the rose by another name smell more or less sweet?

As long as we pursue this system of levying tariff duties on competitive articles we are forced, in order to raise the necessary revenues, to grant a vast amount of "protection," and to impose a still vaster amount of burden upon the American consumer, and therefore, I say, if we want to really lighten that burden, if we are really in earnest in our professed desire to lower the cost of living, if we really wish to present to the American people an issue that goes to the very heart of the matter and involves a great principle upon which legislation can be fashioned and an economic system built, then let us abandon this system of imposing duties on competitive articles and obtain our revenue entirely from noncompetitive articles, the sole exception being in the case of luxuries.

My construction of the time-worn battle cry of our party, "A tariff for revenue only," may not be the conventional one, but it is, I believe, the one that sound statesmanship suggests. As I interpret that phrase, "only" is not an adverb of purpose, but is an adverb of effect, and duties should be laid not only for the sole purpose of obtaining revenue, but so as to have no other effect except to raise revenue.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the views I have expressed may not meet with the approval of every gentleman, even on my own side of the Chamber. I do not expect it. In expressing them I speak, as I have stated before, for no one on earth except myself and my own constituency, but to that extent I assume for them entire responsibility. I do not think any party will ever raise an issue with "protection" that is worth two seconds of the time of the American people until it comes to the position that it will levy no tariff duties except on luxuries and noncompetitive articles, and will supplement those duties with the internal-revenue duties and an income tax. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY].

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pledge my unqualified support in behalf of this measure as an advanced economic policy of vital interest to the American consumer and as a direct step taken to break down the control of the trusts which, thriving under a protective-tariff policy, are plundering the people of the land.

Broadly and truthfully stated, what does this free-list bill promise the wage earner? It means a loss of some $10,000,000 a year in the revenues of the United States Government, but it means a saving of some $300,000,000 a year to the consumers who buy the articles included in this bill and from which an unjust tax will be removed. And the price, in my judgment, is indeed small to pay, considering the burden lifted from the backs of men engaged in most laborious occupations.

I stand as a bitter and unrelenting foe of the Republican Party, because under its economic policy it does not make all men of this Nation equal before the law.

And our Republican friends, in the face of the November elections, return here to again repeat their assumption and rest their case upon the miserable economic theory that wages are increased by tariff taxation, their favorite and only ground for argument addressed in support of restricted trade.

The wages of this country depend upon supply and demand. There is absolutely no trade in labor that can be protected and busy artisans move about the country unscheduled in tariffs. And to the wretched sophistry that taxation under a protective tariff increases wages, the best reply is found in the fact that there is a free trade in labor, a closed and monopolized market in the products of labor, and which labor must buy to live upon. Labor sells its service in a free-trade market and is paid in the necessaries of life, advanced beyond all reason in price by a protective tariff and the trusts sheltered by the tariff. These trusts control competition from abroad, kill competition among themselves by price agreements, and up to the very highest limit that the consumer can stand.

The people of this country believe that free raw materials will help them and their industries; they so declared last November, and they have the power in this House to make their will into law and to defeat any petty spirit of revenge.

Within these hallowed walls the hour of a new dispensation is at hand.

It is the producer of the land who will benefit by the passage of this measure. Agricultural implements will cost our farmers approximately about $14,000,000 less. The southern planters will save $9,000,000 a year on their bagging, ties, and sacks, and the Lumber Trust will be compelled to suffer a reduction of revenue of about $60,000,000 a year in the passage of this bill. Upon leather, boots and shoes, saddles and harnesses the saving to the American people will be $37,000,000 a year.

The trusts of the country producing the articles named in this bill will cease riding upon the back of the Government at will to stupendous profits by the strangling of competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican Party, year after year, has made its bargains with the trusts' interests of the country, frying out the fat of bloated corporations and then distributing their money and securing votes in return for measures that have laid the heavy hand of taxation upon the people, not primarily for revenue nor for government but to add to the gigantic wealth of special interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Under this benign protective policy the Republican Party loves the American workman when the votes are coming in and the protected manufacturer when the bills are coming in. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The object of this free-list bill is to help destroy the principle of government that the many must suffer in order to enrich the few.

I say to you, my friends, let us rise and remove the heavy burden of taxation and give our farmers and artisans an equal chance in life, and the money wrung from them to fill the coffers of great trusts and combinations of capital will go for a better and a happier living, the enjoyment of a greater comfort to the people of our land, and the wages earned in varied employments will go for the better support of the families, the enjoyment in a small measure of some of those pleasures that are incident to the possession of means, and for the better education of their children.

The northern and southern farmer as well are praying for relief from an inequitable burden of taxation and are eagerly expecting some means of relief from the Sixty-second Congress as the result of their voice expressed at the polls in November last. The Democratic principle is: That imports coming in competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list and articles of absolute necessity should be imported free of duty. The Republican Party has reached its extreme outpost under its last tariff measure.

For the Government gets $1 of revenue while the trusts take $7 out of the pocket of the consumer.

The trust system of this country, of which the Republican Party is the master, belongs to monarchy and feudalism, and it has no valid part or lot in a government built upon the affirmation of all men as free and equal.

The saving that will come to the consumers of the country by the passage of this measure will be stupendous. We find the farmers producing the very things upon which the people of this land subsist, and at every hand their means of production is burdened by the exactions of an oppressive Republican tariff policy largely dictated by the trust barons.

And every revolt against the Republican Party, as indicated by the honest and courageous men upon the floor of this House who bear the title of "insurgents," leaves the party more and more in the clutches of evil influence.

Trust magnates are made the patrons of an exorbitant tariff; they grow rich beyond the dreams of avarice, and the voice of an outraged Nation that the necessaries of life shall be made cheaper falls upon deaf and unresponsive ears.

This economic system places the burden upon the many for the benefit of the few, for without the present extravagant tariff there never could have been the vast accumulation of wealth by the trusts of the country.

Never in the world's history were the ringing words of the great apostle of freedom, William Ewart Gladstone, more true than they are to-day. Gladstone said:

> Conceal the hand of the tax gatherer and you can tax a people to the point of impoverishment, if not starvation, without resistance upon their part.

Remember, my friends, that when an abuse of the legislative power of the country is made to enrich any person it can only be so exercised by the taking of wealth from some one else.

Now, the argument of a protective tariff is that the manufacturer is first enriched and the laborer afterwards. Yet, with a vast number of trusts controlling the products of the land and rolling up millions upon millions, how often do you ever hear of the workmen being called together and given an increase of wages of even a fraction of 1 per cent?

And now what are the actual facts? As a distinguished economist has most well and truly declared:

> After 16 years of Republican rule we find the American laborer working harder and producing more to-day than he ever produced in his life. But he has actually less to eat and wear than he ever had before. And why? Because, my friends, real wages consist of what can be bought with the money received as wages. You can not eat or wear money. You must exchange your money wages for the necessaries of life before you can tell whether wages are high or low.
>
> The trusts have increased the price of living in this country 60 per cent in 16 years, during which time we find that wages have been either at a standstill or declining.
>
> The people of this country are becoming so used to the thought of want under the brutal injustice of the trust system that they do not feel that the evil grows greater to the sufferer the longer that it lasts, for it actually becomes less so to the observer by the very fact of its duration.

And in these days of trust domination how eloquent are the words of Daniel Webster at Plymouth Rock, in December, 1820. Webster said:

> A free government can not long endure where the tendency of law is to concentrate the wealth of the country in the hands of the few and render the masses poor and dependent.

That massive intellect, that clear, gray, gleaming eye foresaw 90 years ago the danger of the economic situation as it exists to-day.

Again, at Albany, N. Y., in 1844, Webster declares:

> The culture of the soil is the great leading interest of the country; trade and manufactures should be regarded as subordinate and auxiliary to it. I am willing to admit that if the theory and practice of protection can be shown distinctly to militate against the agricultural interest it ought to be given up.

It is the experience of the world's history that whenever any person is equipped with the power to oppress his fellow men for his own benefit that power will be exercised.

The economic story of the times is that under this form of protective tariff the right to tax—the greatest right and power that the world knows, and which Chief Justice John Marshall declared was the right to destroy—has passed from the Government to individuals and corporations, in defiance of the popular will.

This policy is diametrically opposed to every contention of justice for which the fathers fought and is the sinister shadow resting upon our land to-day.

Give to the American producer free raw materials and by his marvelous skill he can defy competition in every quarter of the earth.

This policy of protection has made the American flag upon the waterways of the world as great a curiosity almost as the behemoth upon land. But this subject is a more appropriate topic for another day to come.

The tariff taxes of this country should be as low as they can be made, for the very reason that, while effective in gathering revenue, the exaction does not fall upon property, but upon consumption. The tariff laid upon the farmer and artisan is a law upon which the poor stand upon an unhappy plane of equality with the rich.

And the law of taxation, as especially applied to the agriculturists of this land, places the small class within the division of the profits of the trusts of the country.

Why, my friends, the policy of a high protective tariff that has been argued upon this floor during the present debate is identically the same economic policy that drove from the ranks of the Republican Party Wendell Phillips, Horace Greeley, Charles Sumner, William Pitt Fessenden, Lyman Trumbull, Henry Ward Beecher, George William Curtis, Alexander K. McClure, Charles A. Dana, James C. Carter, George Hoadley, D. H. Chamberlin, William Lloyd Garrison, jr., James E. Campbell, Francis Parkman, Walter Q. Gresham, Wayne McVeagh, Thomas M. Cooley, John M. Palmer, James Russell Lowell, Benjamin F. Butler, James Freeman Clarke, Carl Schurz, Salmon P. Chase, Hugh McCulloch, Thomas W. Higginson, Francis A. Walker, David Davis, Moorfield Story, Henry L. Pierce, William Everett, and the present governor of Massachusetts, Eugene N. Foss. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will give you some extra time from this side.

Mr. CURLEY. I do not wish to yield at present.

In my candid opinion the heresy of the Republican economic situation has been well and truly defined by a distinguished Massachusetts economist, who has declared that because a township may levy taxes to support the poor there is no principle of justice or common sense that compels it to levy taxes and give them to those persons or things that make the poor.

When we see a Carnegie, an Armour, a Morgan, or a Rockefeller able to both control and enact legislation and exact tribute from the whole people the issue becomes far more vital than one of taxation. It is the right of the people to govern themselves and have the law used for their own purpose. A militant and powerful Democracy demands that this right shall be given back to the people and that laws shall be placed upon the statutes that shall free them from trust influence and corrupt legislation.

And remember that the American people have expressed by their suffrage a protest, country-wide in its extent, against this Republican policy of a tariff measure upon which the trusts wax fat, and that every dollar unnecessarily levied in support of a policy designed to enrich a special class is a dollar taken from the family contingent fund.

Its subtraction under this system of protection means less comfort in the home of the American artisan, less clothes and shoes for the children, and less bread upon the table.

We have witnessed in our manufacturing cities the cottage of the toiler disappear with its beautiful environment and breathing ever and again the sweet story of human affection.

We demand that this Nation and its people shall again enjoy that economic freedom that was made possible under Democratic rule and prosperity in the first 60 years of this Republic's life and that the love of country and its flag borne by our forbears in the spirit of the founders of this Nation shall return and that the right of taxation which governs our people shall not be sold upon the altar of Mammon.

We ask for the American workman only the just return for his wage, a means of relief from the unseen, ruthless hand of the taxgatherer which the trust system of this country fosters under a protective tariff.

For it is the men who have hewed the forests, who have built the homes, the schools, the churches, and the ships, and who have blazed the trail across the great confines of this country that have made civilization possible. Other men have been useful indeed, but it has been the man who labors with his brains and hands who has been largely responsible for the world's development.

This class of men must have justice before the law, their protest has been heard at the polls, and for them and in their behalf we ask naught but economic opportunity and freedom. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a splendidly written article from the pen of Mr. R. M. Gates, the very intelligent and wide-awake Washington correspondent of the Commercial Appeal, published at Memphis, Tenn., which appeared in the issue of that paper of April 30 last. I ask unanimous consent to print it with these remarks in the RECORD. This is the article to which I refer:

HOUSE DEMOCRATS MAKE PROMISES GOOD—PASS RECIPROCITY, CUT EXPENSES, ETC.—PROMISES MUCH FOR 1912—CHAMP CLARK READILY ACCEDED TO CURTAILMENT OF SPEAKER'S POWER—WILL UNDERTAKE INVESTIGATION OF ALL PARTS OF GOVERNMENT.

[By R. M. Gates.]

WASHINGTON, *April 29, 1911.*

The Democrats of the lower House of the Sixty-second Congress have made an auspicious beginning. They are keeping the faith; they are vindicating the splendid majority by which control of the House was transferred from the Republican to the Democratic Party. They are doing things in an orderly way and without that harshness and friction which the Republicans had hoped and prophesied would mark Democratic domination of the House. No Democratic House ever accomplished more in the way of practical legislation in an equal length of time, and, unless the unexpected supervenes to change the trend of things, the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives will make history of the highest character for the presidential campaign of 1912, in which year even a greater Democratic triumph than that of last November will probably be recorded. Unquestionably things are moving along smoothly in the House as far as the Democrats are concerned. While there was at the beginning of the session some soreness on the part of those Democrats whose patronage plans went awry because of the new rules under which political favors are being dispensed, no Democrat thus far disappointed has sought to create a disturbance. The patronage question is still unsettled in some minor particulars, but as the machinery of the working organization steadies there will be an adjusting of all the parts.

TOOK POWER FROM SPEAKER.

The last congressional campaign was waged along certain well-defined lines of reform, not only with reference to a reformation of the rules of the House, but with respect to matters of vital legislation, notably the tariff. Some time before the Sixty-second Congress was convened in extra session the Democrats of the House met in caucus and agreed that certain important reforms in House procedure should be put into practice. The most radical departure from the old order of things was to take the appointment of committees from the Speaker and lodge that power with the Committee on Ways and Means, which was also constituted the committee on committees. The people had been promised this reform as a far step in the direction of thwarting what had become known as personal legislation, or legislation directed by the Speaker. The Democrats promised to take the appointment of committees from the Speaker before the November election, and after that contest, by which a Republican majority was changed to a Democratic majority in the House, the Republicans declared that the proposed reform would not be vitalized, because CHAMP CLARK, whose promotion to the Speakership was practically settled in advance of the election, would demand that he be allowed to retain all the power that had made his predecessors invincible. But the Republicans were poor profits. Assured of his election as Speaker, Mr. CLARK readily subscribed to the reform by which he, as the presiding officer of the House, would not enjoy the privilege of assigning committee places. Under the new order of things Speaker CLARK is the presiding officer of the House, and nothing more. It has been facetiously observed that all the Speaker has left is the gavel.

CUT EXPENDITURES.

Another important reform which the Democrats promised the country and which they made haste to put into effect was a curtailment of expenditures in connection with the Capitol and the conduct of the business of the various departments. The first part of that promise is already a fact and the second part may be regarded as a near fact. The first official swing of the ax lopped off an annual expense of approximately $183,000, which, under Republican control of the House, had been paid to useless employees about the Capitol. For example, at the beginning of our trouble with Spain a wild rumor of a "dastardly conspiracy" to blow up the Capitol swept the Republican side of the House of Representatives. Instantly 35 additional guards were given service in the great building. These police recruits were brought from Republican districts as a reward for political favors, and remained on the Government pay roll until the Democrats organized the present House. Moreover, clerks had been appointed to committees which never held a meeting. The Democrats could not see why useless policemen and clerks should be retained on the pay roll simply because they found them there when they took control of affairs at the House end of the Capitol.

PASS RECIPROCITY.

Freer trade relations with Canada has been agitated by both Democrats and liberal Republicans for years, but under the Cannon régime there was no chance to break the shackles which American tariff barons had placed upon the arms of commerce. President Taft tried it the first year of his administration and failed. The Democrats made it one of the issues in the congressional campaign, promising closer trade relations with Canada if the people would place them in control of the House. What they have done toward the redemption of that pledge is the most interesting chapter yet written by the Democrats of the House of the Sixty-second Congress. The treaty which President Taft negotiated with Canada was put up to them, and they in turn have put it squarely up to the Senate, after giving it their enthusiastic indorsement. Another important pledge to the country was then fulfilled. What the Republican Senate is going to do is a matter for speculation. Surface indications are that the treaty will be accepted, but not without a long and hard struggle. If the Senate rejects the Canadian reciprocity proposition, it will mean the beginning of the end of President Taft's aspirations to succeed himself in the White House. * * *

WILL PASS FARMERS' FREE LIST.

Still another great reform promised by the Democrats was to revise the important schedules of the Payne-Aldrich protective tariff law. Not only will the Democrats of the House revise the vicious woolen and cotton schedules, but they will pass what they have labeled as their "farmers' free-list bill." This bill seeks to place upon the free list

agricultural implements, mechanics' tools, and many articles of food of common consumption. This bill will draw the full fire of the protectionist forces in both Houses, and it is by no means certain that President Taft would sign the bill if it should get to him. At any rate, the Democratic House is going to put the issue up to the Senate and the Executive.

WHOLESALE INVESTIGATION.

A searching investigation into the various departments of Government will be undertaken at the instance of the Democratic majority in the House. Committees charged with the conduct of these investigations have been appointed, and soon the light will be turned on in full force. That there is "something rotten in Denmark" is beyond dispute, and the Democrats are going to locate the malodorous odor. There has not been an investigation of some of the departments in nearly 20 years, so the timeliness of the proposed looking into things is apparent.

In view of what they have already done and what they propose to accomplish, the Democrats of the House feel that they will convince the country of their capacity for still greater achievement with the cooperation of a Democratic Senate and Democratic President.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413—the free-list bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. PALMER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Alton E. Cobb, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, May 4, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 8468) to provide for the erection of a public building at Canonsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KORBLY: A bill (H. R. 8469) to amend section 5278 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8470) to establish a national military park at the Brandywine battle ground, Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8471) to provide for the erection of a public building at Phoenixville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8472) to erect a monument on Brandywine battle field, Chester County, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8473) to erect a monument to the memory of John Morton; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Resolution (H. Res. 147) to appoint a committee of five Members of the House to investigate the American Woolen Co. and ascertain whether said company has or is violating the antitrust act of 1890 or any other law of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STANLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 148) to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890, and other acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: Resolution (H. Res. 150) authorizing the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to examine into the affairs of the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DIFENDERFER: Resolution (H. Res. 151) asking the Secretary of the Navy to furnish data; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 152) asking the Secretary of War to furnish data; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 86) to investigate the Diplomatic and Consular Services of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the Legislature of New York favoring elections of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 8474) granting an increase of pension to James A. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8475) granting a pension to Teresa Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8476) granting an increase of pension to John C. Ernst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8477) granting an increase of pension to Israel Walterhouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8478) granting an increase of pension to Alba Howey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8479) granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8480) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas H. Pond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8481) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8482) granting an increase of pension to Merritt Hauver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8483) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mahaffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8484) granting an increase of pension to Pollis Blon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8485) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn W. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8486) granting an increase of pension to John Schlosser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8487) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8488) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8489) granting an increase of pension to Amon Freese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8490) granting an increase of pension to James A. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8491) granting an increase of pension to A. S. Konkel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8492) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8493) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cupps; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 8494) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8495) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8496) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel F. Currey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8497) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8498) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Swope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8499) granting an increase of pension to James T. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8500) granting an honorable discharge to Alfred L. Dutton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8501) for the relief of Lieut. Jerome E. Morse, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8502) for the relief of William H. Diamond; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8503) granting a pension to Catherine E. Jacobs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8504) granting a pension to Horace W. Durnall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8505) granting a pension to Frank E. Laurence; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8506) granting a pension to Albert B. Kidder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8507) for the relief of Mag Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8508) for the relief of the legal representatives of Charles Durkee, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 8509) granting an increase of pension to Burch Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8510) granting an increase of pension to Valentine Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8511) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon C. Sween; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8512) granting an increase of pension to John W. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8513) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8514) granting an increase of pension to James Gaines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8515) granting an increase of pension to John L. Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8516) granting an increase of pension to James F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8517) granting an increase of pension to John C. Bingaman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8518) granting an increase of pension to L. S. Clemans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8519) granting an increase of pension to Virgil D. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHOE: A bill (H. R. 8520) granting a pension to Francis A. Grenner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 8521) granting an increase of pension to Alfred O. Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 8522) granting an increase of pension to William W. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 8523) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cummings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY: A bill (H. R. 8524) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8525) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8526) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8527) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8528) granting an increase of pension to Perry Bottles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8529) granting an increase of pension to William Catt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8530) granting an increase of pension to Louisa McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8531) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8532) granting an increase of pension to Joshua F. Spurlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8533) granting an increase of pension to Othaniel Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8534) granting an increase of pension to Henry Seal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8535) granting an increase of pension to William A. Wreunick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8536) granting an increase of pension to William A. Robson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8537) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Earl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8538) granting an increase of pension to Middleton Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8539) granting a pension to James F. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8540) granting a pension to John F. Joyce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8541) granting a pension to James H. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8542) granting a pension to Morton W. Sebring; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8543) to correct the military record of Thomas Weaver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8544) to correct the military record of Edward Payton, alias Edward Paddin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8545) to correct the military record of Wendlin Erust; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8546) to correct the military record of Leopold Baudendistel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8547) to correct the military record of Samuel Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 8548) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Batchelder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 8549) granting an increase of pension to Blazins Untereiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8550) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bay; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8551) granting a pension to Thomas J. Stroup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8552) granting a pension to Mary Reilly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 8553) granting an increase of pension to Charles Neilman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8554) granting a pension to Thomas F. Keating; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8555) granting a pension to Lillian J. Hartley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 8556) granting an increase of pension to Ferdinand Armentrout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 8557) granting a pension to William E. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8558) granting a pension to Philip C. Elbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8559) granting a pension to Fred W. Nisbett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8560) granting an increase of pension to Jen Rody Chauncey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8561) granting an increase of pension to Moses Soard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8562) granting an increase of pension to Wallace R. Kelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8563) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Berlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8564) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8565) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Claus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8566) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus W. Graff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8567) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 8568) granting an increase of pension to Ellen T. Dunne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8569) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8570) granting an increase of pension to O. B. Shine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 8571) granting an increase of pension to James Campbell Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8572) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Vale, alias Thomas Vaile; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8573) granting an increase of pension to John C. Moss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 8574) granting a pension to Wenzel Patzelt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8575) granting an increase of pension to James P. Hanlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8576) granting a pension to John M. Bunnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8577) granting an increase of pension to James V. Gault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8578) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Venatta; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 8579) granting a pension to David A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 8580) granting a pension to Lucy F. Geiger; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8581) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 8582) granting an increase of pension to John S. Cairoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8583) granting an increase of pension to Henry Root; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8584) granting an increase of pension to Frank Sayre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8585) granting an increase of pension to William Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8586) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UTTER: A bill (H. R. 8587) granting an increase of pension to George P. Kenyon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8588) granting an increase of pension to William H. Follett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8589) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Lawton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8590) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8591) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Underwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8592) granting an increase of pension to Georgianna M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8593) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Sheehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8594) granting an increase of pension to John P. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8595) granting an increase of pension to Michael McCormick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8596) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8597) granting an increase of pension to Albert Phetteplace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8598) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8599) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bucklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8600) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Sharpe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 8601) granting an increase of pension to James A. Brake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, No. 101, Coshocton, Ohio, favoring a repeal of 10 cents tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of T. B. Gilbert and 10 other merchants of Loudonville, Ohio, in opposition to the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of the International Molders' Union of North America, Local No. 270, and the Chamber of Commerce and the Oakland Board of Trade, all of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring a reduction of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 75 residents of the twentieth New York congressional district, favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolution of Washington Camp No. 84, Goshen, N. Y., favoring legislation to restrict undesirable immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 713, Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers of America, favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolutions of Local No. 275, of Chester Springs; Camp No. 314, of Darby; and Local No. 338, of Downington, all in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the illiteracy test; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Rayersford and Spring City Trades Council, Spring City, Pa., favoring withdrawal of the troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Board of Trade of Chester, Pa., favoring a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENVER: Sundry telegrams from W. E. Noftsinger, of Hillsboro, Ohio, against any change in tariff on wool; from J. R. Bickett, Xenia, Ohio, and J. M. McKinney, against the reduction of the tariff on wool; and telegram and letter from the Xenia Shoe Manufacturing Co., Xenia, Ohio, against the removal of duties on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolution of the State senate at Albany, N. Y., favoring the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the National Association of Tanners, protesting against placing leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the Legislature of New York, favoring elections of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bills for relief of William W. Hudson, of Rockford, Ill., and Alonzo F. Stalker, of Winnebago County, Ill.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the Essex County (Mass.) Shoe & Leather Association, protesting against any change in the existing tariff schedules on leather, boots, and shoes, and National Association of Tanners, against placing leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of John W. Cummings, of Litchfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of assessors of Cottonwood County, Minn., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Excelsior Chapter of American Woman's League, of Amboy, Minn., favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HELM: Papers to accompany H. R. 8436, for the relief of the heirs or estates of William McClure and Margaret McClure, deceased, of Eubank, Pulaski County, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Papers in support of bill introduced in behalf of James Campbell Stevenson, county of Lawrence, State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in re bill for an appropriation of $100,000 for a site and a public building at Canonsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Papers to accompany H. R. 7577, for the relief of the estate of L. C. Chisholm, of Tuscumbia, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Seward Commercial Club, Seward, Alaska, requesting that legislation be enacted to open the coal fields of Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Bookkeepers, Stenographers, and Accountants' Union, Local 12646, American Federation of Labor, of New York City, protesting against the kidnaping of John J. McNamara from the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of New York, favoring elections of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. UTTER: Resolutions of the Second Convention of the Churches of Rhode Island, representing all Protestant denominations, approving the Sunday closing of post offices, so far as possible, and advocating the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of F. D. Keller and 97 other citizens of West Mansfield, Ohio, asking for the passage of bill granting an increase of pension to James A. Brake, and affidavits to accompany bill for the relief of James A. Brake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May 4, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the National Business League of America, praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Mothers' Meeting of the Mount Pleasant Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the congregations of the Churches of the Brethren, of Speermoore and Waynoka, Okla., and of the Presbyterian Ministerial Association, of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of Local Union No. 4, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Watertown, N. Y.; and a memorial of the Hartje Paper Manufacturing Co.,

of Pittsburg, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of John Schuler Post, No. 67, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Wyoming, of Sheridan, Wyo., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DU PONT presented a petition of Washington Camp, No. 4, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Wilmington, Del., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Springfield and Belleville, in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WETMORE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Woonsocket, R. I., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 42.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the commercial organizations of the city and county of Denver are desirous of having the city and county of Denver establish in the mountains immediately west of Denver a mountain park, to be owned, maintained, and controlled by the city and county of Denver; and

Whereas the establishment of such a mountain park would be of vast benefit to the city and county of Denver and to the State of Colorado; and

Whereas there is a large amount of land belonging to the United States available for the use of such mountain park, which has little or no value for any other use:

Now therefore your memorialists respectfully recommend to your honorable bodies that 10,000 acres of land belonging to the United States within a radius of 30 miles westward from the limits of the city and county of Denver be granted to the city and county of Denver for a mountain park, the said 10,000 acres to be selected by the city and county of Denver within one year from the passage of the act granting the same, and that pending such selection all land belonging to the United States within such radius westward be withdrawn from entry.

STEPHEN R. FITZGARRALD,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE MCLACHLAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved April 25, 1911.

JOHN F. SHAFROTH,
Governor of the State of Colorado.

Mr. McLEAN presented memorials of the German-American Alliance of New Haven and New Britain; Monsignor Slocum Branch, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Waterbury; of J. H. Farnam, of Bridgeport; P. J. Kelly, of New Haven; and sundry citizens of Union City, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Williams County, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry business men and farmers of Grafton, Fertile Township, Walsh County, Adams, Hoople, Hastings, Bottineau County, Joliette, McVille, Tunbridge, Brocket, Ramsey County, Milnor, Sharon, Steele County, Elm River Township, Hatton, Minot, Buford, Orthell Township, Thompson, Orr, Pekin, Dickey, Underwood, McLean County, Plaza, Leeds, Pleasant Lake, Amanda, Grand Forks, and of Kindred, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BURNHAM presented the memorial of C. T. Rossiter, of Claremont, N. H., and the memorial of Lewis Page, of Goffstown, N. H., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Christ, of Westfield, N. J., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Daniel Sullivan, of Jersey City, and sundry citizens of Montclair, Elizabeth, and Newark, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burlington County, N. J., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of Washington Camps, Nos. 11, 43, 51, 103, 105, and 131, all of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, in the State of New Jersey, and of sundry citizens of Newfoundland, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of Phoenix Lodge, No. 315, International Association of Machinists, of Elizabeth, N. J., remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called Taylor system of shop management in Government arsenals and navy yards, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 45, International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, of Jersey City, N. J., remonstrating against the method of procedure and arrest in the case of John J. and James W. McNamara for alleged dynamiting of the Times Building, Los Angeles, Cal., which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented memorials of sundry citizens of Rumford, Livermore Falls, and Chisholm, all in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 271, Patrons of Husbandry, of South Montville, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a memorial of the memorial and executive committee, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to incorporate the Grand Army of the Republic, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Ithaca; of the Robert Fulton Social and Literary Society, of Buffalo; of the Robert Emmet Memorial Association, of Buffalo; of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Erie County; and of sundry citizens, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the United Master Butchers' Association of New York City; of the Chamber of Commerce of Oswego; of the Seward Republican Club, of the sixth assembly district of Brooklyn; and of the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, all in the State of New York, and of the National Business League of America, praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Chapter of the American Institute of Architects of New York, praying for the selection of a site at the intersection of the main axis of the Mall and the proposed Arlington bridge for the proposed Lincoln memorial, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented petitions of Local Camps No. 22, of Yonkers; No. 17, of Elmira; of No. 34, of Goshen, Patriotic Order Sons of America, and of Local Union No. 9, International Alliance Theatrical State Employees, of Syracuse, all in the State or New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Republican Club of Yonkers, N. Y., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Socialist Local Union of Bolivar, N. Y., praying for the withdrawal of the United States troops from the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of B. G. Shaver and sundry other citizens of Clay, N. Y.; of Palmer Local Union, No. 7,

International Brotherhood of Paper Makers; of the board of trustees of Port Edward; of the Port Edward Trades Assembly; of Pomona and Union Granges; of the legislative committee of the National Grange; of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers No. 145; of Kayaderosseras Grange; of Wilton Grange; of the Dairymen's League of Otisville; George M. McKee and other citizens; of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Ballston Spa; of Forest City Grange; of Corfu Grange; of Pomona Grange, of Onondago County; of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers; of the Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers and Stationary Firemen; of Lebanon Grange of Ticonderoga; of Pomona Grange of Oneida County; of Olean Grange; of Clifton Spring Grange; of Marble City Local Union, No. 67; of Felts Mill Local Union, No. 6; of Thompson Local Union, No. 158; of the Harmony Farmers' Club; of 25 grangers of Onondaga County; and of sundry granges of Cortland, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Cotton Exchange, of New Orleans, La., praying that cotton bagging be placed on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENYON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Cedar and Clinton Counties, and of Osage, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Kinsman Post, No. 7, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of the so-called old age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I present a concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 15.

Whereas the Government of the United States levied a tax on all raw cotton in 1862 and continued the same at varying amounts until 1867; and

Whereas the chief burden of this tax, amounting to $68,000,000, fell upon the cotton growers at a time when they were least able to bear it; and

Whereas the constitutionality of this tax has always been seriously questioned and was affirmed only by an equally divided court; and

Whereas the direct tax on land, the constitutionality of which has never been questioned, was long since returned to the States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Arkansas (the senate concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That we request the Government of the United States to return this tax to the States in which it was collected in order that it may be used by them for the benefit of rural schools.

SEC. 2. That the governor of the State of Arkansas be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to the executives of all the other States to be by them laid before the legislatures for such action as they may see fit; to the President of the United States for his consideration; and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress with the request that they formulate and introduce a bill designed to carry out the end suggested in this resolution.

Mr. BRIGGS presented the petition of James M. Ayres, of Freehold, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called National Tribune pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 45, International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, of Jersey City, N. J., and a memorial of the Local Hudson County Socialist Party, New Jersey, remonstrating against the procedure in the arrest of John J. McNamara and James W. McNamara for the alleged dynamiting of the Los Angeles Times Building, California, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of Somerset Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, of Middlebush, N. J., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented memorials of the Emerald Club, of Paterson, and of sundry citizens of Elizabeth, Jersey City, Paterson, and Newark, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Phoenix Lodge, No. 315, International Association of Machinists, of Elizabeth, N. J., remonstrating against the proposed installment of the so-called Taylor system of shop management in Government arsenals and navy yards, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented memorials of the County Board of Douglass, and of sundry citizens of Green Bay and Arbor Vitae, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Williamsburg, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial of Oak Grange, No. 665, Patrons of Husbandry, of Topeka, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called cold-storage bill, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented memorials of Hurricane Grange, No. 359, Patrons of Husbandry, of Overbrook; of Oak Grange, No. 665, Patrons of Husbandry, of Topeka; of Local Union No. 538, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Woodsdale; and of sundry citizens of Russell and Beloit, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWN presented resolutions adopted by the State Association of Commercial Clubs, of Nebraska, favoring the enactment of legislation creating an additional division of the Railway Mail Service, with headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of Local Union No. 52, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Kalamazoo; of the Trade and Labor Council of Kalamazoo; and of the Summit Farmers' Club, of Jackson County, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Wells-Higman Co., of Traverse City, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called uniform-package bill, which was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. ROOT presented memorials of Alden Grange, No. 1138; Aurora Grange, No. 1154; Argyle Grange, No. 1081; Ethan Allen Grange, No. 961; Aurelius Grange, No. 1196; Alleghany Grange, No. 843; Albion Grange, No. 270; Brockport Grange, No. 93; Beaver Falls Grange, No. 554; Byron Grange, No. 395; Bombay Grange, No. 924; Bath Grange, No. 294; Bristol Grange, No. 1080; Bernhards Bay Grange, No. 822; Barre Grange, No. 1026; Barrington Grange, No. 1101; Bullville Grange, No. 1002; Cooper Grange, No. 820; Coopers Plains Grange, No. 820; Chester Grange, No. 984; Cambridge Valley Grange, No. 1090; Caledonia Grange, No. 870; Chicago Grange, No. 446; Clarendon Grange, No. 1083; Canisteo Grange, No. 460; Corinth Grange, No. 823; Conquest Grange, No. 1027; Castile Grange, No. 1017; Claaverack Grange, No. 934; Camden Grange, No. 354; Chaumont Grange, No. 855; Dryden Grange, No. 1112; Denmark Grange, No. 535; Ella Grange, No. 783; East Clay Grange, No. 469; Elk Creek Grange, No. 506; Elma Grange, No. 1179; Easton Grange, No. 1123; Eureka Grange, No. 46; Ellery Grange, No. 353; Floyd Grange, No. 665; Friendship Grange, No. 72; Five Corners Grange, No. 1000; Fulton Grange, No. 719; Great Bend Grange, No. 642; Greece Grange, No. 311; Goshen Grange, No. 975; Gouverneur Grange, No. 303; Hartford Grange, No. 1190; Henderson Grange, No. 145; Hartford Grange, No. 1122; Hoosick Grange; Honeoye Falls Grange, No. 6; Hopewell Grange, No. 472; Interlaken Grange; Ischua Grange, No. 953; Jordanville Grange; Jasper Grange, No. —; Knowlesville Grange, No. 1124; Kirkland Grange, No. 684; Kingsbury Grange, No. 1085; Locke Grange, No. 868; Lenox Grange, No. 42; Lorraine Grange, No. 117; Lake Placid Grange; Lombard Grange, No. 714; La Fargeville Grange, No. 15; Minaville Grange, No. 668; Morrisville Grange, No. 1149; Mount Hope Grange, No. 902; Manilla Grange, No. 1133; Minisink Grange, No. 997; Movers Grange, No. 837; Mansfield Grange, No. 1089; Mapletown Grange, No. 812; Marlborough Grange, No. 904; Mentz Grange, No. 1156; Nicholdville Grange, No. 797; Owasco Lake Grange, No. 1074; Oak Hill Grange, No. 574; Olean Grange, No. 791; Parishville Grange, No. 928; Pomona Grange; Putnam Valley Grange, No. 841; Poughkeepsie Grange, No. 889; Pierstown Grange, No. —; Peru Grange, No. 933; Perry Grange, No. 1163; Pomona Grange, Erie County; Russell Grange, No. 1031; Romulus Grange, No. 1181; Ramapo

Grange, No. 11013; Rock Stream Grange, No. 1177; Smithville Grange, No. 60; Stillwater Grange, No. 681; Stephens Mills Grange, No. 308; Shawangunk Grange, No. 1018; Stockholm Depot Grange, No. 538; South Rutland Grange, No. 53; Schuyler Grange, No. 30; Seebers Lake Grange, No. 1193; Towlesville Grange, No. 430; Volney Grange, No. 165; West Groton Grange, No. 818; Wadhams Mills Grange, No. —; Waterport Grange, No. 1059; Villenova Grange, No. 604; Ingleside Grange, No. 426; Veteran Grange, No. 1108; Whalonsburg Grange, No. 954; Wharton Valley Grange, No. 991; Warsaw Grange, No. 1088; Waneta Grange, No. 1055; Williamson Grange, No. —; Webster Grange, No. 436; Westville Grange, No. 1047; Wawarsing Grange, No. 956; Wright Settlement Grange, No. 706; Marion Grange, No. 214; Upton Lake Grange, No. 812; of sundry members of the Dairymens' League, of Youngsville; and of sundry citizens, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of the Okanogan Water Users' Association, of Omak, Wash., praying for the enactment of certain legislation relative to issuance of patents to homesteaders, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DU PONT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1791) to correct the military record of Henry Duffey, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, which was agreed to.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 339) providing for the reappraisement and sale of certain lands in the town site of Port Angeles, Wash., and for other purposes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS INCIDENT TO THE SESSION.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, and I submit a report (No. 2) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the joint resolution.

Mr. WARREN. The House simply submitted the portion that belongs to that body and the amendment offered by the Senate committee refers to the corresponding offices of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the committee will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, after line 5, insert:

SENATE.

For compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate, namely: Sixteen pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of $2.50 per day each during the session, from April 4 to June 30, 1911, $3,520, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

For stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $1,000.

In lieu of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for "compiler of the Navy Yearbook and indexer for Senate public documents, Pitman Pulsifer," for the fiscal year 1911, and the amount appropriated for "compiler of Navy Yearbook and indexer for Senate public documents, Pitman Pulsifer," for the fiscal year 1912, there shall be made available so much of the sum of said unexpended balance and appropriation as may be necessary for the payment of salary to the person or persons designated by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to perform such work of compiling and indexing. And the unexpended balance of the sum of $6,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, appropriated for "compiling and indexing reports and hearings when necessary of Senate committees and joint committees of the Senate and House of Representatives under Pitman Pulsifer, indexer," in the urgent deficiency act approved December 23, 1910, shall also be expended for such work of compiling and indexing under the direction of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BACON. I do not ask that the joint resolution be reread, but I should like to know what is the nature of the expenses that are included.

Mr. WARREN. It provides on the House side for their pages and certain messengers the per diem until the 30th of June. It provides for the pages of this body until the 30th of June. As passed by the House it provides stationery for the House, to which we do not add anything for the Senate except $1,000 for general stationery, occasioned by the new adjustment of committees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

MILEAGE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 3) making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives, and I submit a report (No. 1) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.

Mr. WARREN. I also report back favorably from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) to correct the errors in the enrollment of certain appropriation acts approved March 4, 1911, and I submit a report (No. 3) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming ask for its present consideration?

Mr. WARREN. I ask for its present consideration. I may state in explanation that the amendments propose to strike out the preamble and to change the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. HEYBURN. I object to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the present consideration of the joint resolution, and it will go to the calendar.

TEMPORARY STRUCTURES IN POTOMAC PARK.

Mr. CULLOM. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C., for which I ask present consideration. This joint resolution has already passed the House.

The Secretary read the joint resolution; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. BRIGGS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate resolution 16, submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] on the 13th ultimo, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. BRIGGS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred Senate resolution 20, submitted by Mr. WARREN on the 17th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. BRIGGS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred Senate resolution 22, submitted by Mr. CLARK of Wyoming on the 20th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-second Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer to

report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject that may be pending before said committee, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. BRIGGS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back Senate resolution 28, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] on the 1st instant, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed, by subcommittee or otherwise, to make investigations of internal-revenue, customs, currency, and coinage matters, and to compile and prepare statistics and documents relating thereto as directed from time to time by the Senate and as may be necessary, and to report from time to time to the Senate the result thereof; and for this purpose they are authorized to sit, by subcommittee or otherwise, during the recess or sessions of the Senate, at such times and places as they may deem advisable, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such stenographic, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary, the expense of such investigation to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and the committee is authorized to order such printing and binding as may be necessary for its use.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to ask if the resolution does not duplicate the work of the Monetary Commission and the work of the Tariff Commission. If it does, I desire to object. It seems to me that it does duplicate much of the work that those commissions are now doing.

Mr. PENROSE. There is, of course, no intention of duplicating the work of the Monetary Commission or the Tariff Commission. This is the usual resolution offered at the beginning of every Congress in relation to the Finance Committee. For the last 15 years, I believe, a resolution similar to this one has been passed by the Senate, and it is absolutely necessary in view of the many directions made by the Senate to that committee. The Senate has already directed the committee to compile a number of documents involving great labor, and it is work requiring accuracy and expert knowledge. Without some such authority the committee will be absolutely at a standstill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon object to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not, unless it duplicates the work of those commissions.

Mr. PENROSE. There is absolutely no such intention.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. BRIGGS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back Senate resolution 6, submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on the 6th ultimo, and referred to the committee on the 1st instant, and I submit a report (No. 4) thereon; I ask that the resolution and the report be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Senate by resolution adopted on the 20th day of June, 1910, authorized and directed the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate certain charges against WILLIAM LORIMER, a Senator from the State of Illinois, and to report to the Senate whether in the election of said LORIMER as a Senator of the United States from said State of Illinois there were used and employed corrupt methods and practices; and

Whereas said committee, pursuant to said resolution, took the testimony of a large number of witnesses, reduced the testimony to printed form, and reported the same to the Senate, which was thereafter considered and acted upon by the Senate; and

Whereas the Illinois State senate thereafter appointed a committee to investigate like charges against WILLIAM LORIMER and to report to said State senate whether in the election of said LORIMER to the United States Senate corrupt methods and practices were employed and used; and

Whereas as it appears from the published reports of the proceedings of the said Illinois State senate committee that witnesses who were not called and sworn by the committee of this Senate appointed to investigate said charges have appeared before the said committee of the Illinois State senate, and upon being interrogated have given important material testimony tending to prove that $100,000 was corruptly expended to secure the election of WILLIAM LORIMER to the United States Senate:

Resolved, That Senators JOHN D. WORKS, CHARLES E. TOWNSEND, GEORGE P. MCLEAN, JOHN W. KERN, and ATLEE POMERENE be, and they are hereby, appointed a special committee, and as such committee be, and are hereby, authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate whether in the election of WILLIAM LORIMER, as a Senator of the United States from the State of Illinois, there were used and employed corrupt methods and practices; that said committee be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of Congress, to hold sessions at such place or places as it shall deem most convenient for the purposes of the investigation, to employ stenographers, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to report the results of its investigation, including all testimony taken by it; and that the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the report as follows:

Mr. BRIGGS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, submitted the following report to accompany the resolution (S. Res. 6):

This resolution is reported to the Senate by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with a favorable recommendation. In making this recommendation the committee disclaims any purpose to indicate whether the investigation should be made by the standing Committee on Privileges and Elections or by the special committee whose membership is named in the resolution, or whether the investigation should be made at all; those matters being left, as they must be left, to the future action of the Senate, but intends by its action to provide the money necessary for this investigation if an investigation be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. DILLINGHAM, and Mr. BRIGGS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I request that the resolution lie upon the table, to be called up by me for consideration by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin objects to the present consideration of the resolution and asks that it lie on the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My request, of course, makes objection in another form.

Mr. BRIGGS. If the Chair will pardon me, I wish to say that the request which I made was that the resolution be read, and after it had been read I did not intend to ask that it be now considered, but that it go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that the resolution lie on the table? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like at this time, Mr. President, to give notice that early in the next week I shall ask the Senate to consider the resolution, at which time I shall submit some information to the Senate and some observations upon the importance of passing the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will remain on the table, subject to call.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a large number of Senators on both sides of the Chamber have suggested that, in view of the work that is before the committees of the Senate, it would be well to adjourn over until Monday next. I notice that there are two measures on the calendar. I want to ask the Senators interested in those measures whether they will object to a motion for an adjournment until Monday?

Mr. BORAH. I will say, in answer to the Senator from New Hampshire, that if we could have the second number upon the calendar, House joint resolution 39, made the unfinished business, I would not object to adjournment until Monday, but I should like to have that disposed of and made the unfinished business before the matter of adjourning over is finally concluded.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I will inquire by what method the Senator proposes to make the joint resolution to which he refers the unfinished business? It can not be done at this hour under any rule of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be done by unanimous consent at this time, but in no other possible way.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not think that we can make it the unfinished business by unanimous consent. Unfinished business is an automatic proposition. A bill or resolution becomes unfinished business because of the position it has occupied on the calendar.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. As to the matter of the unfinished business, I wish to say that unfinished business is created by motion to take up a measure at a certain hour, and, of course, the Senate can make a measure the unfinished business by unanimous consent. We can suspend the rules; we can do anything, practically, by unanimous consent. I have seen here, I should say many times, agreements entered into to make a certain measure the unfinished business at 2 o'clock. That is simply making the motion out of order; that is all.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is not written in any rule of the Senate that we can make any measure the unfinished business——

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. I want merely to finish the expression. I am not going to discuss this matter, but I intend to interpose such opposition as I may properly interpose under the rules of

the Senate against making any measure the unfinished business by a resolution or by any unanimous-consent agreement that does not take up the measure. It can not become unfinished business until it has been taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator objects, that is the end of the proposition.

Mr. HEYBURN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho objects.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Without reference to whether or not the joint resolution can in this manner be made the unfinished business, Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that some of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary desire to file their views in writing with reference to the joint resolution. There has hardly yet been opportunity for them to get together, and therefore I hope that no attempt will be made to bring the joint resolution formally before the Senate as the unfinished business until that can be done, which will be in the very near future.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Idaho, then, in view of the suggestion made by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, if he will let this matter go over until Monday?

Mr. BORAH. If that is the desire of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, of course I will do so; but I did not understand that the chairman desired that. He only desired that no formal action be taken such as will necessitate a vote. If, however, the chairman desires that the request shall go over until Monday, I will not object.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then, Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. BAILEY. I move that until otherwise ordered the daily sessions of the Senate shall begin at 2 o'clock post meridian.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas moves that until otherwise ordered the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 2 o'clock p. m. The question is on that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. Some 10 days ago the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] submitted his resignation as President pro tempore of the Senate. I ask whether any action has been taken by the Senate on that resignation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No action has been taken thereon.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator that during the present week there will be a conference on the part of Republican Senators on that question.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 1991) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Anderson;

A bill (S. 1992) granting an increase of pension to John L. Reese (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 1993) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Perkins (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1994) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Bigley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 1995) to restore Capt. Alpha T. Easton to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

A bill (S. 1996) to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 1997) for the relief of Edwin S. Metcalf (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1998) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shabley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 1999) granting a pension to Carrie Kellogg (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2000) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Lewis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2001) to provide for the award of congressional medals of honor to officers of the naval service, and officers and enlisted men of the revenue marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 2002) to regulate and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the United States Navy and Marine Corps (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2003) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments for work already done under public contracts; and

A bill (S. 2004) to amend section 1505 of the Revised Statutes of the United States providing for the suspension from promotion of officers of the Navy if not professionally qualified; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2005) granting a pension to Mary Ann Leindecker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 2006) to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "the Civil War volunteer officers' retired list," to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 2007) granting an increase of pension to William B. Roberts; and

A bill (S. 2008) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Mowery (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 2009) granting an increase of pension to Francis L. Prouty; and

A bill (S. 2010) granting an increase of pension to Ransom W. Bailey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRIGGS:

A bill (S. 2011) authorizing the increase of the limit of cost for a site for the public building at Plainfield, N. J., to $150,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2012) granting an increase of pension to Helen Lydia Ruger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2013) to provide for the erection of a public building at Elkins, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2014) for the relief of George Owens, John J. Bradley, William M. Godfrey, Rudolph G. Ebert, Herschel Tupes, William H. Sage, Charles L. Tostevin, Alta B. Spaulding, and Grace E. Lewis; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 2015) granting an increase of pension to Michael H. Skinner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 2016) for the relief of Fred C. and C. Helen Fisher; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BACON:

A bill (S. 2017) granting an increase of pension to Dellevan L. Terrill (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2018) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Willis (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2019) for the relief of the heirs of Francis H. McLeod; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 2020) for the relief of John A. Heard (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAYNER:

A bill (S. 2021) for the relief of the estate of John Young, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2022) granting a pension to William Bieber; and

A bill (S. 2023) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Whitson (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 2024) for the relief of Lewis Lemert; and

A bill (S. 2025) to correct the military record of Oliver C. Rice and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2026) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wible; and

A bill (S. 2027) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Fry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2028) for the relief of Henry E. Rhoades, a retired officer of the Engineer Corps, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2029) granting an increase of pension to Thomas V. McConn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2030) granting a pension to Sarah Wilson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Cockrell (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2032) granting an increase of pension to George W. Buck (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2033) granting an increase of pension to Bradford L. Hollenbeck (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2034) granting a pension to Louise A. House (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2035) granting an increase of pension to Isaac T. Chambers (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2036) granting a pension to Grace J. Cowan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2037) to provide for the erection of a monument on the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate the services of the United States Signal Corps during the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2038) to amend section 3613 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and

A bill (S. 2039) to amend section 304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of March 31, 1886, authorizing the temporary appointment of an Acting Assistant Treasurer, and for other purposes (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 2040) granting a pension to James Mullin;

A bill (S. 2041) granting a pension to Catherine Allison; and

A bill (S. 2042) granting a pension to Elizabeth McNally; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 2043) granting a pension to Richard L. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 2044) for the relief of the estate of John A. Heard, deceased (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 2045) granting an increase of pension to John M. Guthrie; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRINTING OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ADDRESSES.

Mr. LODGE. I present three short speeches of the Attorney General of the United States, one being his remarks before the New York State Bar Association at Syracuse, N. Y., January 19, 1911; another an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, at the dedication of the new Federal building, March 20, 1911; and also his remarks at the annual banquet of the Daily Princetonian, at Princeton, N. J., May 1, 1911. I move that the articles be printed as one document. (S. Doc. No. 20.)

The motion was agreed to.

WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to make an investigation into the affairs of the Washington Gas Light Co., a corporation authorized under and by virtue of acts of Congress and doing business in the District of Columbia, and to report the facts to the Senate. In making such investigation said committee shall especially inquire into the capitalization of said company, including its stocks, bonds, and certificates of indebtedness, when and by what authority issued, their volume and value; also its holdings in other companies, their character, and value; also the extent, character, cost, and value of the physical property of said company, the cost of operation, dividends declared, how and when paid, the volume and quality of gas sold and price collected therefor, the character of service, and all other matters relating to the business of said corporation.

Said committee is authorized to employ experts, administer oaths, take testimony, send for persons and papers, employ a stenographer to report its hearings, to sit during the session of Congress or during recess, and to have the testimony taken printed.

All necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 30), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures be, and they are hereby, authorized, in the consideration of bills referred to it, to sit, by subcommittee or otherwise, during the recesses or sessions of the Senate, at such times and places as they may deem advisable, to subpœna witnesses, to administer oaths, to have the hearings stenographically reported, and to employ such expert and other assistance as may be necessary, and to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary, the expense of such investigations to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. CLAPP submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof be, and the same is hereby, authorized to sit during the session, send for papers and persons, and to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills or other matters pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

CONSTITUTIONS OF ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BROWN. I desire to call from the table Senate joint resolution 2 and to have it referred to the Committee on Territories. It is the joint resolution approving the constitutions of Arizona and New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska asks that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) approving the constitutions formed by the constitutional conventions of the Territory of New Mexico and the Territory of Arizona be referred to the Committee on Territories. In the absence of objection, that reference will be made.

REFORMS IN REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, a few days ago the Attorney General of the United States delivered an address at Princeton criticizing as a "spasmodic intervention" of a "popular uprising" some of the reforms that are now in vogue. I desire to submit an editorial from the Baltimore Sun in reference to that matter, and I ask to have the Secretary read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary proceeded to read the editorial.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I was temporarily absent from the Chamber when the reading of this document commenced. I am unable, from anything I have heard since returning, to ascertain that it is in any way proper to be read in the Senate, and I object to its further reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reading was permitted by unanimous consent, and the Chair supposes when unanimous consent has been given that the reading should be concluded. It is nearly concluded anyway.

Mr. HEYBURN. I was not here, and I am desirous of knowing how this extraneous matter came before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter came before the Senate at the request of the Senator from Oregon, who asked unanimous consent that it be read, and that consent was granted.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not know what is in it——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon stated, in making his request, that it was an editorial from the Baltimore Sun relating to a certain subject.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest, Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. I hope the Senate will adopt a new rule in regard to allowing things to be read by unanimous consent without having knowledge whether it is from the Pentateuch or the Arabian Nights.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Idaho did not hear it, he ought to read the editorial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will conclude the reading.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the editorial, which is as follows:

NOT TO DESTROY BUT TO RESTORE REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT.

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 3, 1911.]

Attorney General Wickersham apparently fails to appreciate either the force or the spirit of the progressive movement. His address at Princeton indicates that his views have in nowise changed since he went to Chicago a year ago to administer his rebuke to the Republican insurgents. He seems to regard genuine reform proposals as the "spasmodic intervention" of a "popular uprising." He resents proper criticism as "heckling and misrepresentation," and fears that it will make competent men hesitate before they undertake public service. He does not appreciate the fact that the tendency of the people to hold their servants to a stricter accountability is because their confidence has so often been misplaced. His objection to the multiplicity of laws is well founded, and most of us will agree with him that we are a "law-ridden people." Too many laws are passed and two few enforced. But legislation must keep pace with changing conditions, and the sudden growth of vast corporations, absorbing most of the business of the country in many lines, demands regulation, and the Attorney General, in his able arguments before the Supreme Court in the Tobacco and Oil Trust cases, has ably set forth this necessity.

But is he justified in denouncing as "demagogy" the proposed changes in the Constitution? There are only two such propositions now before the American people. One is to enable the Federal Government to levy a tax on incomes. The resolution proposing it was adopted by Congress upon the urgent recommendation of President Taft, and is to remove doubt from a power that it was believed the Government possessed until the Supreme Court surprised the country by declaring, by a mere majority vote, the income-tax clause of the Wilson tariff law unconstitutional. The Attorney General himself had a hand in drawing the provision of the Payne-Aldrich Act that levies a tax on corporations. The other proposition is for the election of United States Senators by direct popular vote. This is not a blow at representative government, as Mr. Wickersham would have us believe, but an attempt to restore it. For the past 20 years, the progressives contend, the Senate has not represented the people. Many Senators who could never have been elected by popular vote have been chosen by legislatures amenable to "influence." Deadlocks have been frequent and have prevented legislatures from attending to their business. Scandals have been frequent and bribery by no means uncommon. Such cases as that of LORIMER have severely shaken confidence in the present method of electing Senators, and there is little doubt that the preponderance of thoughtful sentiment favors the proposed change.

Mr. Wickersham will find that the vast majority hold with Woodrow Wilson that "we, the people, have not free enough access to our own agents or direct enough control over them." Gov. Wilson states clearly the purpose of the progressives when he says, "We are cutting away anomalies, not institutions; we are clearing away the jungle and letting in the pure light and air, not destroying the wholesome forces or creating waste places where there was productive growth."

The effort of the progressives of both parties, and those of no party at all, is not to tear down, but to build up; not to cumber the statute books with more laws, but to simplify those we have and displace obsolete laws with new legislation that experience shows is necessary to cope with changed conditions, and to remedy defects in the governmental machinery. "By one means or another," says Gov. Wilson, "the Governments actually have been deprived of their representative character. They do not represent us." He sets forth the position of the true progressives—and they are rapidly becoming the most numerous element in both parties—which is not to destroy representative government, but to make our Government more truly representative.

RULINGS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on the 6th day of April I offered a resolution (S. Res. 10), which the Senate adopted, that the Postmaster General be required to furnish certain information as to why he discriminated against certain newspapers, notably the Woman's National Weekly. Thirty days have elapsed since the adoption of that resolution and yet Mr. Hitchcock, the Postmaster General, has paid no attention to it.

I want to know if Mr. Hitchcock is bigger than the Senate of the United States. He has set on foot a diabolical, deliberate effort which has resulted in the ruin of Mr. Lewis, the editor of the Woman's National Weekly. The methods that have been employed by Mr. Hitchcock and his subordinates are the most despicable, indeed, and call for the severest condemnation not only of the Senate but of the country itself. They have absolutely hounded this man from Maine to California, and have cut off 103,000 valid, paid subscribers. They have destroyed his property. They have bankrupted the man, destroyed his bank, all under governmental sanction and governmental authority; and when the Senate of the United States calls for simple, plain information as to why it is done, Mr. Hitchcock turns up his nose and refuses to answer.

I say I want to know if Mr. Hitchcock is bigger than the Senate of the United States, and I want to serve notice on him now that if this resolution is not answered by to-day a week I am going to offer a resolution in the Senate condemning him as a public servant and asking the Senate to request the President of the United States to discharge him from the public service. Now I hope he will get busy.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I think we ought to have an executive session, and I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 8, 1911, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4, 1911.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Harry A. Well, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. George L. Byram, Sixth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. George H. Morgan, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Capt. Charles W. Farber, Eighth Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Horatio G. Sickel, Twelfth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Selah R. H. Tompkins, Seventh Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Herbert J. Slocum, Seventh Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Sedgwick Rice, Third Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. William J. Nicholson, Seventh Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Arthur Thayer, Third Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Fred W. Foster, Fifth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. John T. Haines, Eleventh Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Edwin P. Brewer, Seventh Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. John T. Nance, Second Cavalry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Henry J. Goldman, Twelfth Cavalry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Charles F. Martin, Fifth Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. George L. Byram, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert E. Wood, Third Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Charles W. Farber, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Willis V. Morris, Sixth Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Selah R. H. Tompkins, Seventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Walter S. Grant, Third Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Sedgwick Rice, Third Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles M. Wesson, detailed as captain in the Ordnance Department, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Arthur Thayer, Third Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Morton C. Mumma, Second Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Charles M. Wesson, whose detail in the Ordnance Department was continued from March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Frank P. Amos, Eleventh Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. John T. Haines, Eleventh Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. Julian A. Benjamin, Third Cavalry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. John T. Nance, Second Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harry L. Hodges, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Charles H. Martin, Fifth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Victor S. Foster, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Robert E. Wood, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Oscar Foley, Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Willis V. Morris, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederick D. Griffith, jr., Sixth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Walter S. Grant, Third Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Emmet R. Harris, Eleventh Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Joseph A. Baer, Sixth Cavalry, promoted.

Second Lieut. John C. Pegram, First Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. Frank O. Whitlock, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Capt. Le Roy S. Lyon, Fourth Field Artillery, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Samuel D. Sturgis, First Field Artillery, promoted.

Capt. Tiemann N. Horn, Third Field Artillery, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Lucien G. Berry, Third Field Artillery, promoted.

Capt. Charles P. Summerall, Second Field Artillery, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. T. Bentley Mott, Fourth Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. William M. Cruikshank, detailed in the Signal Corps, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. William L. Kenly, Fifth Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Otho W. B. Farr, Fifth Field Artillery, to be major from April 13, 1911, vice Maj. George Le R. Irwin, Third Field Artillery, detailed as quartermaster on that date.

First Lieut. Dennis H. Currie, Fourth Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Le Roy S. Lyon, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Beverly F. Browne, Sixth Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Tiemann N. Horn, Third Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Raymond S. Pratt, First Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Charles P. Summerall, Second Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Alden F. Brewster, Second Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Dwight E. Aultman, Second Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Edward H. De Armond, Sixth Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Thomas E. Merrill, First Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Norton E. Wood, Sixth Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Fox Conner, First Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Albert S. Fuger, Fourth Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Dan T. Moore, Sixth Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. William N. Michel, Fourth Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Harry C. Williams, Second Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Ernest S. Wheeler, Fourth Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Walter V. Cotchett, Second Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Thomas W. Hollyday, Third Field Artillery, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Morris E. Locke, Third Field Artillery, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. John B. W. Corey, Fifth Field Artillery, to be captain from April 13, 1911, vice Capt. Otho W. B. Farr, Fifth Field Artillery, promoted.

First Lieut. Marlborough Churchill, First Field Artillery, to be captain from April 13, 1911, vice Capt. Richard H. McMaster, First Field Artillery, detailed as quartermaster on that date.

First Lieut. William F. Jones, Second Field Artillery, to be captain from April 13, 1911, vice Capt. William P. Ennis, unassigned, detailed as quartermaster on that date.

Second Lieut. Charles P. George, jr., Second Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Dennis H. Currie, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Harlow, Second Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Beverly F. Browne, Sixth Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harold S. Naylor, First Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Raymond S. Pratt, First Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. William H. Rucker, Second Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Alden F. Brewster, Second Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. William H. Shepherd, Third Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Edward H. De Armond, Sixth Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Marshall G. Randol, First Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Norton E. Wood, Sixth Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. John N. Greely, First Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Albert S. Fuger, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Webster A. Capron, Fifth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. William N. Michel, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas D. Sloan, Sixth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Ernest S. Wheeler, Fourth Field Artillery, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederick M. Barrows, Fourth Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Thomas W. Hollyday, Third Field Artillery, promoted.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. Carl E. Wiggin, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Joseph P. Tracy, promoted.

First Lieut. Glen F. Jenks, detailed as captain in the Ordnance Department, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Percy M. Kessler, promoted.

First Lieut. Edmund T. Weisel, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Glen F. Jenks, whose detail in the Ordnance Department was continued from March 11, 1911.

First Lieut. Clarence B. Ross, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Johnson Hagood, promoted.

First Lieut. Richard H. Jordan, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. George T. Patterson, promoted.

First Lieut. William S. Bowen, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Frank K. Fergusson, promoted.

First Lieut. John M. Page, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Robert S. Abernethy, promoted.

First Lieut. Samuel C. Cardwell, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Benjamin M. Koehler, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. James B. Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Andrew Moses, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Brainerd Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. James B. Mitchell, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Guy B. G. Hanna, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Henry J. Hatch, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Richard P. Winslow, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Clifton C. Carter, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Avery J. Cooper, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Richard T. Ellis, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Frank Geere, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Harry W. Newton, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. George L. Wertenbaker, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Albert C. Thompson, jr., detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Walter C. Baker, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Ellison L. Gilmer, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. George P. Hawes, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Samuel G. Shartle,

detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Richard I. McKenney, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. John L. Roberts, jr., detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Charles A. Clark, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Clifford C. Carson, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. James M. Fulton, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Henry R. Casey, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Charles E. Wheatley, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Clarence M. Condon, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. William Paterson, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. James D. Watson, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Earl Biscoe, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Marion S. Battle, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Lawrence C. Crawford, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Arthur L. Keesling, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Wade H. Carpenter, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Hartman L. Butler, detached from his proper command under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Second Lieut. Warren R. Bell, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Ralph E. Herring, promoted.

Second Lieut. Arthur G. Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. William E. De Sombre, promoted.

Second Lieut. John T. Rowe, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Carl E. Wiggin, promoted.

Second Lieut. Frederick L. Martin, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Edmund T. Weisel, promoted.

Second Lieut. Harold L. Gardiner, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Clarence B. Ross, promoted.

Second Lieut. Marcel S. Keene, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Richard H. Jordan, promoted.

INFANTRY ARM.

Capt. Charles E. Tayman, First Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Willis T. May, Fifteenth Infantry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. James W. McAndrew, Third Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Lawrence J. Hearn, Third Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Edward R. Chrisman, Sixteenth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Edwin P. Pendleton, Twenty-ninth Infantry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Peter C. Harris, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1911, vice Maj. Daniel L. Howell, Eighteenth Infantry, advanced to the grade of lieutenant colonel under the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 3, 1911.

Capt. Munroe McFarland, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be major from March 10, 1911, vice Maj. Walter K. Wright, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William T. Wilder, detailed paymaster, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Charles W. Penrose, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William R. Sample, Third Infantry, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Francis J. Kernan, Twenty-fifth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William R. Dashiell, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Chase W. Kennedy, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Eli A. Helmick, Tenth Infantry, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Thomas W. Griffith, Twenty-eighth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Robert W. Rose, Twenty-first Infantry, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. George W. McIver, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William C. Bennett, Sixteenth Infantry, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Wilds P. Richardson, Thirteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Frederic H. Sargent, Eighth Infantry, to be major from March 11, 1911, vice Maj. Charles H. Barth, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Thaddeus B. Seigle, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Charles E. Tayman, First Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William A. Carleton, Thirtieth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. James W. McAndrew, Third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. George Steunenberg, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Edward R. Chrisman, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William Taylor, Tenth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1911, vice Capt. Peter C. Harris, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Lochlin W. Caffey, Fifteenth Infantry, to be captain from March 4, 1911, vice Capt. Archibald A. Cabaniss, Twenty-fourth Infantry, retired from active service March 3, 1911.

First Lieut. Ernest H. Agnew, Sixth Infantry, to be captain from March 10, 1911, vice Capt. Munroe McFarland, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Robert O. Ragsdale, Third Infantry, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. William R. Sample, Third Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Austin A. Parker, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. William R. Dashiell, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Rhees Jackson, Twelfth Infantry, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Eli A. Helmick, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles M. Gordon, jr., Sixth Infantry, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Robert W. Rose, Twenty-first Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Fred V. S. Chamberlain, Second Infantry, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. William C. Bennett, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. William N. Hughes, detailed in the Signal Corps, to be captain from March 11, 1911, vice Capt. Frederic H. Sargent, Eighth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. James G. McIlroy, Ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911 (subject to examination required by law), vice First Lieut. Thaddeus B. Seigle, Twenty-seventh Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Jay L. Benedict, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. William A. Carleton, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph W. Stilwell, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. George Steunenberg, Twenty-eighth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Richard J. Herman, Twenty-third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1911, vice First Lieut. William Taylor, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward L. Hooper, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 4, 1911, vice First Lieut. Lochlin W. Caffey, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Irving J. Phillipson, First Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 10, 1911, vice First Lieut. Ernest H. Agnew, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edmund B. Gregory, Fourteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Robert O. Ragsdale, Third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Wilber A. Blain, Twenty-third Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Austin A. Parker, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert B. Parker, Nineteenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Rhees Jackson, Twelfth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Gordon R. Catts, Tenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Charles M. Gordon, jr., Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Ursa M. Diller, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 11, 1911, vice First Lieut. Fred V. S. Chamberlain, Second Infantry, promoted.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. George E. Bushnell, Medical Corps, to be colonel from May 1, 1911, vice Col. Blair D. Taylor, retired from active service April 30, 1911.

Maj. Merritte W. Ireland, Medical Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from May 1, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. George E. Bushnell, promoted.

Capt. Wilson T. Davidson, Medical Corps, to be major from May 1, 1911, vice Maj. Merritte W. Ireland, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 29, 1911.

Shelley Uriah Marietta, of Iowa.
Blase Cole, of New Jersey.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Douglas E. Dismukes to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Herbert G. Sparrow to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of January, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John E. Pond to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Machinist Raymond L. Drake to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as a machinist.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill vacancies:

Albert P. Niblack and
William S. Sims.

Lieut. Commander Henry J. Ziegemeier to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

KANSAS.

Fred S. Hazelton to be postmaster at Norton, Kans., in place of Fred S. Hazelton. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

Charles G. Webb to be postmaster at Stafford, Kans., in place of Charles G. Webb. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1911.

MAINE.

Harry E. Reed to be postmaster at Millinocket, Me., in place of Charles H. Eastman, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

A. J. Glover to be postmaster at Galien, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

MINNESOTA.

Herman Nelson to be postmaster at Slayton, Minn., in place of James Ruane. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

MONTANA.

Thomas J. Waddell to be postmaster at Stanford, Mont. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John W. Armstrong to be postmaster at Belmont, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

J. Rufus Dorsett to be postmaster at Spencer, N. C., in place of James D. Dorsett, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

Martin Baswell to be postmaster at Poteau, Okla., in place of William H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1910.

William H. Cleveland to be postmaster at Mountain View, Okla., in place of William H. Cleveland. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4, 1911.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

William R. South, Baypoint.

MISSISSIPPI.

Robert L. Bradshaw, Moss Point.
Martha H. Talbert, Pelahatchee.

NEVADA.

Callie B. Ferguson, Fallon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 4, 1911.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Blessed be the name of the Lord, our God, whose glory shines around about us with ever increasing brightness and whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting, poured out in a thousand blessings anew every morning and fresh every evening. Help us by the rectitude of our behavior and with unswerving devotion to duty to prove ourselves worthy of such love and devotion. And Thine be the praise, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to put agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, without indorsing or criticizing his address, for I have seen a newspaper account only of it, let me say that no truer or more timely expression was ever uttered than that attributed to Hon. Woodrow Wilson when he said, at Norfolk, Va., a few days ago that—

> Programs are taking the place of philippics; and programs can be soberly examined and assessed, as unqualified criticisms and denunciations can not be.

I believe that it is but just to say that this Democratic House has furnished a conspicuous example of the truth of that assertion. For whatever questions which may have heretofore divided Democrats, it must be admitted, as a subject for Democratic felicitation at least, that the Democratic Party here has determined to bring about a reduction of import duties and a reform of the tariff system, and that to this end the majority is living up to a definite program. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That program is in harmony, as we must believe, with the latest expressed will of the majority of the American people. The program and the action under it were brought about because the people have evidenced the fact that they are no longer to be deceived by the false teachings of the Republican Party and are at the same time disgusted with the broken promises of some of its trusted leaders made before elections and for the purpose of gaining votes to keep that party in power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The people have determined to control the Government according to the will of the majority and for the benefit of all, rather than in the interest of the few who profit by inequitable laws. The presence of the Democratic majority in this House attests the truthfulness of this statement, and it is not too much to hope that Republican economic heresies and Republican bad faith will be further condemned next year by the election of some great Democrat to the high office of President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

FURTHER DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY.

It is not necessary to admonish the Democrats here or elsewhere to continue to assert simple and admitted Democratic principles and to continue to endeavor to put these principles into law and practice whenever and wherever possible. The courage and unanimity of action, and the action itself, that have characterized the conduct of the majority of this House during the last 30 days have pleased the disciples of Thomas Jefferson everywhere and given new emphasis to the old faith that in government there ought to be "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and that there "must be economy in the public expenditures that labor may be lightly burdened." [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Democratic Party has been triumphant when it demanded retrenchment and reform and has succeeded in two presidential elections in late years when it fearlessly proclaimed that a tariff law is a tax law, and that neither a tariff tax nor any other kind of a tax should be levied except for the support of the Government in all of its vigor and under economical and honest administration. It is not to be controverted that no patriotic man objects to paying taxes for the support of the Government. And it is equally true that every right-

thinking man ought to admit that any system of taxation designed to favor individual or special interests and not for public revenue is an abuse of the taxing power of the Government, and therefore a vicious system.

Who is it that will justify the conferring of special benefits under the form of tax laws upon favorites at the expense of the masses—the masses from whom must be exacted the legitimate expenses of the organization and maintenance of the Government and the masses who must furnish the money bestowed upon the favorites by these laws? It is forever fundamentally true that taxation is not, never was, and never can be a productive force in any organized society; rather it is subtractive from the taxpayers and necessary and justifiable for the sole reason that it is essential for public governmental purposes. And this Democratic House can do its part in honest endeavor to observe these correct principles in legislation affecting the tariff.

RESPECTIVE POSITIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES.

It is difficult to define the present attitude of the Republican Party with respect to the tariff. In this House that historical party is divided into two hostile camps, known in the common parlance here as standpatters and insurgents. And the same division obtains in another distinguished body which I am, perhaps, precluded by the rules of the House from mentioning by name. In this Chamber that party recently evidenced a decided division in respect to the Canadian reciprocity trade agreement, for on the vote on that measure 60 Republicans voted with the Democrats to approve and 80 Republicans voted to disapprove that agreement, which was negotiated by the Republican President and proposed by him to the Congress. This was done in the face of repeated Republican platform declarations in favor of reciprocal trade agreements, and if the indications are borne out there will be a division in the Republican ranks when the pending bill is passed. I shall not impugn the motives of any Republican, but I hazard the prediction that the next Republican platform will at once declare for protection and for some sort of tariff reform, so that the next tariff utterance of that party will be an artistic straddle, designed to fool some people, just as their last platform sought to do when it declared—

unequivocally for the revision of the tariff by special session of the Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President.

And also said at the same time that—

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

It has been ascertained that the cost of production of American manufactures is, as a rule, not greater than the cost of production of similar manufactures in foreign countries, because of the superior skill and efficiency, machinery, and methods employed by Americans. If American labor is paid more, the greater pay is more than compensated for by its greater earning capacity.

Just how there could be any real revision of the tariff in the interest of the general public and at the same time preserve the prohibitory schedules, as was done in the Payne bill, and guarantee by the same statutory law a reasonable profit to manufacturers, is a problem unsolved and apparently not capable of solution, for the Republican Party, in full control of the Congress for two years after the promise was made, did not work out that problem. And it is not to be forgotten that the special session of Congress was held and that the revision accomplished was a substantial revision upward and not downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is not too much to say that the Republican Party stands now and will continue to stand for a high tariff, for a tariff so high as to altogether prohibit importations in many cases, and thereby in such cases to restrict and fence in the American market as the special field for the operation of trusts and other trade conspiracies, which Republican legislation has caused and enabled to grievously afflict the great body of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican Party has always been the champion and the servile tool of the protected interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In speaking of protective tariff, Alexander Hamilton in his celebrated report to Congress in 1790, and Albert Gallatin, the author of the Philadelphia Memorial of 1831, referred to it as restriction, trade restriction. And such is Republican protection—not protection but restriction—not wise and just taxation, but burdensome and unjustifiable trade restriction, the fruit of which is favored combinations and interests exploiting our home markets for their benefit and at an increased expense to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I may be permitted to say that a law which enables one citizen to exact tribute from another citizen under the guise of taxation is governmental authorization for the practice of a wrong. The trouble with the Republicans is that they do not write tariff laws primarily for the purpose of raising public revenue. They frame such laws for the paramount object of restricting the American market and to lay unnecessary burdens upon the American people, and in order to give, and for the real purpose of giving, unnatural and unearned increment to the business of favored manufacturers and corporations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It may be that from the laying in some instances of an import duty for revenue there may be some advantage to the domestic manufacturer when his goods come into competition with those of the foreign manufacturer in our markets. But this is incidental and inseparable from the tariff laid in such cases for revenue. A Democratic tariff bill, covering the whole subject, ought to be defined as a measure to impose and collect duties for the purpose of raising the necessary money for the support of the Government honestly and economically administered; and such a measure would fix every duty at the lowest rate consistent with the public necessity. Such a measure would distribute equally, as nearly as practicable, the burdens of taxation, and would reduce to a minimum the incidental protection which can not be avoided under a purely revenue tariff.

The difference between the two parties is that the Democrats assert that the Government ought to levy duties primarily for the sole purpose of raising public revenue, and that this is the only rightful use of the power of taxation [applause on the Democratic side], whereas the Republicans say protection shall be the real object—protection from competition with foreign-made goods, protection to those combinations and interests which have been fostered under a high tariff and allowed to exploit the American people by increased prices at home—a system that has enabled protected manufacturers to charge the American consumer more for their goods than they charge the foreigner for the same goods in a foreign land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The raising of public revenue is merely the incident of a Republican tariff law—an incident necessary to furnish colorable constitutional authority for upholding Republican abuses of the taxing power. And in this connection it is well to recall the fact that Mr. Dingley, in explanation of schedules of the Dingley tariff law, frankly avowed that the rates fixed in some of its schedules were designedly made so high as to prohibit importations and were not intended to raise revenue. And let us be mindful of the fact that every champion of a protective tariff gives as the chief reason for the beauty of the protective system the benefits which accrue to the interests cared for in the Republican tariff bills.

Subtle and persuasive arguments and appeals are made to these beneficiaries, and in response to such arguments and appeals organized greed has furnished influence and campaign contributions to the Republican Party in the elections. And that party has been kept in control and has long since ceased to regard the rightful use of the taxing power, and has been unmindful of the taxpayers and the consumers. And that is what is the matter with the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In contrast, the Democratic Party asserts that a tariff law is justifiable because it is necessary to raise revenue to defray the expenses of the Government. In dealing with present conditions, however, grown up under a vicious and exaggerated system, it must be admitted that wholesale or radical changes would be an unwise rule, but the free list can be added to and many substantial reductions in the rates fixed by schedules can be had without doing violence to the business world or to the Public Treasury. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Perhaps it is well to state that the report made by Alexander Hamilton in 1790, the speech of Mr. Clay in the House March 30 and 31, 1824, and the speech made by Mr. Webster in the House on April 1 and 2, 1824, furnish the argument of every Republican utterance made in defense of Republican protective tariffs.

And those who hold as I do, that the Federal Government is not paternal and not authorized to bestow favors upon individuals or corporations through the medium of impost duties or other taxes do not believe that the sound economic principles of tariff taxation advanced by Robert J. Walker in his report of December 3, 1845, have ever been refuted. They are familiar to the Members of this House, but let me state some of them:

That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government economically administered.

That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

That below such rate discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties; or, for imperative reasons, the article may be placed in the list of those free from duty.

That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

That all minimum and all specific duties should be abolished and ad valorem duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluations and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

RECENT EVENTS.

Mr. Chairman, it is pertinent in discussing the tariff to consider some recent events and to take our bearings in order that we here may be better guided in our conduct, and I believe it will serve the purpose of putting more courage into the hearts of the Democratic Party. I believe that the trend of events, as is evidenced by the recent occurrences, foretell further Democratic triumphs in the near future. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, these events have accentuated the difference between the Republican and the Democratic theories of taxation, and have tended to make more manifest the righteousness of the Democratic position. Let us not forget that in the beginning, before highly protective and prohibitive tariffs were enacted, there was not a millionaire within the confines of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now there are probably more than a dozen multimillionaires, whose aggregated wealth runs into the billions. To call the roll of the mere millionaires of our country would weary the patience of the House, for they are too numerous and common. Republicans have admitted in their platforms and elsewhere the burdensome injustice of our tariff laws, and have time and again promised correction, and have just as often broken those promises. Corrupt and corrupting contributions have been made by the great insurance companies and other corporations to the election of Republican candidates for office. Extravagance and wastefulness in public administration was admitted by Senator Aldrich, when he declared that the Federal Government could be properly conducted for $300,000,000 per annum less than what is now expended. The stocks of transportation companies have been frequently watered, and yet the Republican Party has repeatedly refused to pass laws for the physical valuation of the property of those corporations, in order to prevent a just determination of a reasonable income to them from the property fairly valued.

In this connection, let me call your attention to Senate Report No. 912, Sixty-first Congress, second session, part 1, page 125, presented by Senator LODGE, a distinguished Republican statesman, on June 23, 1910. There it is stated that overcapitalization of transportation and industrial companies has the effect of advancing prices. The effect of overcapitalization may not be to immediately increase the amount of dividends paid, but an increase of capital usually results in a greater amount of dividends. Increased dividends must mean increased earnings, and the increased earnings come from the consumer. The increased and high cost of living is universally admitted. The easy access of the manipulators of high finance to Republicans in place and power and the baleful influence of those manipulators have been made manifest in our statutory laws. These and other causes have, let us hope, aroused the people so that the Republican Party, arrogant and reckless on account of too long lease and abuse of power, will soon be driven from the control of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The tariff ought to be so reformed as not to afford shelter to its evil progeny, the trusts and unlawful combinations, and so reformed as to afford needed governmental revenues only. If the Standard Oil Trust is cited, as it has been in the past, as a case in refutation of Mr. Havemeyer's famous statement that the "tariff is the mother of trusts," let us recall the exposure of the "joker" in the Republican tariff laws which furnished protection to the extent of prohibition of competition to that combination. Upon examination it was found that while petroleum, or oil, was put on the free list there was a proviso in the tariff bill to the effect that such products coming from any country that levied a tax on the same products should be taxed in like amount when brought into this country; and it was then further ascertained that the only oil that could be imported into this country in competition with the product of the Standard Oil Trust was amenable to the taxation under this proviso at a prohibitive rate.

Public sentiment forced the Republican Party to adopt, in part, the Democratic demand for publicity of campaign contributions to the extent that the publication after elections of these contributions is now a requirement of the law approved by a Republican President. Within the last 30 days a Democratic House has gone further in the Democratic demand and passed here a measure requiring the publication before elections of contributions to campaign funds. This same measure has been brought before this same House when it was Republican, by Democrats, and Republicans have refused to give it their sanction. It is to be hoped that a Republican Senate and a Republican President will now further yield to the sentiment of the country against corrupt practices, so that this measure will become a law.

Another encouraging fact is the submission to the States for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to levy a tax on incomes.

For more than 100 years the power of Congress to levy a tax upon incomes was vindicated by the decisions of the courts; and it may not be too much to hope that this power will be restored to Congress by the ratification of the proposed sixteenth amendment of the Constitution. Should this be done and an income tax levied, so that millionaires and monopolists, domestic and expatriated as well, shall be compelled to contribute to the expenses of the Government, then the time will perhaps come which he avowed had not come, but which was anticipated by Mr. McKinley, when, on May 7, 1890, he said:

We have not been compelled to abolish the internal-revenue system that we might preserve the protective system, which we are pledged to do in the event the abolition of one was essential to the preservation of the other.

That is the Republican doctrine of intoxicating beverages free of taxation, and carries with it the Republican corollary that the clothing and other necessaries of life of the men, women, and children of the land shall forever be taxed, not for the purpose of raising public revenue, but for the purpose of adding to the profits of those engaged in the manufacturing industry. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE MORALS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Briefly let me refer to the morals of the Republican Party. In the beginning, when it was formed, in 1856, it pretended to be the party of God and morality. It made no utterances then on such sordid questions as the tariff. It spoke of and dealt with things that it claimed to be higher than mere taxation. Now it worships chiefly at the shrine of special interests and bows down before the money power, forgets the people, and resolutely praises the system of protection, which exacts tribute from the poor men, women, and children of our land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," was the morality of our fathers. Republican ethics admit, in the framing of the tariff laws, that it is proper for one man to take money from another man, provided it is done in the shadow of a protective-tariff wall. Jugglery of figures, enlarged and confusing tariff terminology, ad valorem duties, specific duties, compound duties, compensatory duties, joined together with mystifying percentages, drawbacks, bounties, lengthy and misleading testimony, specious arguments, and adroit appeals to selfish interests are resorted to by the Republicans in presenting their case "against thy neighbor"—the masses of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I will not say that they have been guilty of bearing false testimony against their neighbors, but I do say that Republican speeches and arguments and their statements in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee justify the assertion that Republicans have exhausted all the ingenuity or inventive skill of the ablest falsifiers that were ever created. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

PROTECTIONISM A GROWTH.

Protectionism is not a sudden creation, but an insidious growth; and many of our fellow citizens never comprehended its vice until the growth became malignant. In the sixties high tariffs were enacted upon the ground that they were necessary war measures, and repeal of them was promised when the necessity for their enactment should pass. But under those high tariffs, and under the McKinley higher tariff, and under the Dingley still higher tariff, and under the Payne tariff yet higher, special interests found shelter and multiplied. At every stage additional burdens were imposed upon the people. But in the year 1910 the majority of the American people realized that the constitutional power of taxation for the support of the Government was being exploited for the benefit of the comparative few who had dictated the tariff laws and to the injury of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While in the beginning comparatively few interests found shelter behind the tariff law, it has become indisputable that in every succeeding Republican tariff enactment these beneficiaries of the law have systematically and cunningly reached out and gathered into their fold other interests, to be artificially stimulated at the expense of the taxpayers and for the purpose of increasing

the strength of the combination and making it more difficult to dislodge from control the system of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Long ago the Republican Party was forced to abandon the defense of infant industries, for American labor, genius, skill, and enterprise had brought American industrialism to such a vigorous estate that American products could successfully compete, not only at home but in every land, with the industrial fruits of the world.

LABOR AND THE TARIFF.

The argument advanced that Republican tariffs are framed for the benefit of American labor is founded not in fact but in mere pretense. Comparison of the wages paid in high-tariff Germany and those paid in free-trade England will shed light on the subject. Let me give two or three illustrations. In 1905 combers employed in woolen factories were paid upon an average in Germany $4.38 per week, while in 1906 the same character of employees were paid in the United Kingdom (Great Britain) $4.87–$5.60 per week. In cotton manufacturing in Germany in 1905 there was paid to male weavers $4.01–$4.74 per week, while the same employees were paid in England and Wales $5.35–$7.06 per week.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, and the laboring man now understands it, that the protected manufacturer has not been making a fair division of profits with him. Moreover, the American laborer, considering his skill and efficiency and the fruits of his industry, has not been fairly treated. This is the case: The protected manufacturers have, under the abuses authorized by tariff laws, exacted from the laboring man exorbitant prices for what he consumes—prices greater than those charged the foreigner in foreign markets. The laboring man has been burdened with the increased cost of living, and, furthermore, under the policy of the Republican Party, the cheap labor of foreign countries has been imported by protected manufacturers to compete with the American laborer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Thus the laborer is burdened, under the policy of the Republican Party, with the higher cost of living on one shoulder and the competition of the imported cheap foreign labor on the other shoulder. This reminds me of Jacob's blessing to his sons, told about in the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis.

I want to read it from the Bible, not so much for the edification of our Democratic brethren, but in order that Republicans on that side may not dispute my authority. The Republicans are so in the habit of contradicting anything that does not harmonize with the Republican theory of robbing the people that I want to quote from the Book of Books. If our worthy Speaker, Mr. CLARK, were present to verify the quotation it would not be necessary to produce my authority. He is, I believe, one of the best Biblical scholars in the House. [Applause.] But he is away. I am going to verify what I say by reading from the Bible itself. You old sinners who never go to church and do not know anything about the Bible, bear with me a moment while I read from the Book. [Applause.] I will read from that chapter where Jacob calls together his sons to receive his blessing and blesses Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, and so forth. In the fourteenth and fifteenth verses he pronounces some sort of a blessing on Issachar, his fifth son by Leah. He had many more sons. I do not know how many sons Jacob had altogether [laughter], but he had many. Issachar was the fifth son born to him by his wife Leah, and the Republican Party has blessed the laboring man just as Jacob blessed this son. [Laughter.] Now, then, listen.

I read the fourteenth and fifteenth verses. Jacob said:

Issachar is a strong ass couching down between two burdens: And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute.

I might interpolate the words "Republican tribute." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Under the blessings of the Republican Party the laboring man has indeed been treated as a strong ass couching down between the Republican burden of increased cost of living and the Republican burden of competition with cheap imported labor. And the Republican Party has said that the rest is good and the land is pleasant, and has made the laboring man bow his shoulder to bear and become a servant under tribute imposed by Republican laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ELLERBE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. ELLERBE. Does not the gentleman think it is time for us to sing for the benefit of our Republican brethren the old familiar hymn—

Come, ye sinners, poor and needy,
Weak and wounded, sick and sore.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; especially for the benefit of insurgents and near-Democrats, who are sick of Republicanism and yet a little too timid to avow themselves Democrats. [Applause.]

It is now manifest that the Republican Party does not by the laws it has enacted favor or protect the American laborer. Perhaps the use of sophistry by the Republicans is nowhere more evident than in their argument of "protection for American labor."

It is interesting to note that in their platform of 1868 is the following expression on the question of the tariff and its relation to the laborer: "It is due to the labor of the Nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced * * *."

When the infant-industry appeal had lost its force, and labor began to protest against the tribute exacted of it in favor of its employers, it was necessary to discover the protection-for-American-labor argument, now proclaimed so loudly by the party of greed. But it is impossible to comprehend that a high tariff in 1868 could be to his detriment by the avowed expression of the Republican Party and yet in 1876 and 1908 be beneficial to him. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The theory of taxation as to its effect upon the masses, of whom the laborers constitute a very large proportion, could not so change in 10 or 20 or 50 years as to render beneficial what was detrimental. Principles do not change.

The measure, Mr. Chairman, in which Republican protection, so called, is claimed to be levied, is the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, and this argument is so manipulated as to attempt to deceive the laborer into the belief that the difference is the discrepancy between the foreign and American wage schedules. To adhere to such a belief would be to profess that the American laborer is not the superior of the foreign laborer.

The per diem wage is ordinarily used in making comparisons between domestic and foreign labor. Now, it is an admitted fact that the intelligence, skill, and industry of the American laborer excels that of the foreign laborer in greater proportion than the relative wages paid. Then no patriotic American will deny that the American laborer engaged in a certain pursuit will produce in a day three to four times as much as the foreign laborer plying the same trade. The following figures, taken from the Engineering Magazine for May, 1904, based on official data and prepared by Prof. William G. Clark, who is indorsed by Senator GALLINGER as an authority, will serve to illustrate the comparative productive capacity of the American laborer and the foreign laborer. The amounts represent the value of the average annual output per laborer of the respective nationalities:

American	$2,450
Canadian	1,455
Australian	900
French	640
English	556
German	460

Is it fair, in view of this, to say that the American laborer is better paid than the foreign laborer? If he can produce in one day as much as his foreign brother can produce in three days, he is entitled to more pay. Is it fair to say that he receives more than his due, that you are giving him a bonus? Who pays the bonus, anyway? His brother laborer, who also reaps the profits of this beneficent system of "protection" designed especially for his benefit, and then the latter in his turn must give back to other protected industries, whose products he must have, the excess which he has derived from this system so that the former laborer may profit thereby.

This so-called difference is simply a will-o'-the-wisp, shifting back and forth from one laborer in a protected industry to another laborer in another protected industry. And in the meantime, admitting for the sake of argument the soundness of this contention, what becomes of a laborer not employed in a protected industry? He must pay his tribute to the protected manufacturer for the alleged benefit of his brother laborers, and receive nothing in return from them. As much as 75 per cent of the employee class of the United States are not engaged in industries that have the benefit of Republican protection laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What protection do the thousands of railroad employees and the millions of other laboring people not engaged in the manufacturing industries derive from the tariff protection enjoyed by the manufacturers? What benefit to the millions of farmers, tillers of the soil, who plant and sow, gather and reap the great crops of our country, get from the high tariff laws enacted in the interest of the trusts and monopolies which own or control the manufacturing industries?

Again, of what force is the reference to the modern increase in wages when coupled with the increased prices of the necessaries

of life? Along with an increase of wages of 22 per cent in the last 10 years there has been an increase in the cost of necessaries of 60 per cent. Thus the laborer is 38 per cent worse off than he would have been had there been no increases. The Payne bill has not given any relief in the matter of the present high cost of living. The Democratic bill now under consideration, if the Republican Senate and the President will let it become a law, will give a large measure of relief.

Let me refer to the latest figures prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, those of 1905, and you can make your own comparisons. It is to be regretted that this bureau has been so busy since 1905 with other matters that it has not had time to give us later figures.

In that year the aggregate value of the finished product of all the manufacturers of the country was $14,802,147,087. The aggregate amount of wages paid for labor in such production was $2,611,540,532. You will thus see that the total amount paid to labor was only 17 per cent of the value of the manufactures, and the lowest rate of tariff on any of such manufactured articles was 30 per cent, ranging from that figure upward to 100 per cent. The discrepancy between domestic and foreign labor, if there be any such real discrepancy, was covered, and, more, the entire cost of labor is doubled, tripled, and even more than quadrupled by the tariff taxes.

Two or three examples will serve to show that the argument of "protection for American labor" advanced in support of the high tariffs is not sustained by the facts:

First. Silk manufactured products in 1905 amounted in value to $133,288,072. For labor there was paid out in their production $26,767,943 in wages to employees, or 20 per cent, and the tariff rates amounted to more than 30 per cent more than the entire cost of labor.

Second. Manufactures of iron and steel were valued during the same period at $941,071,093, and in their production but $143,809,576 was paid to the labor employed. The Payne-Aldrich law "protects" these products at more than twice the entire 15 per cent paid to the labor.

Third. Woolen manufactures in 1905 were valued at $380,934,003, and the manufacturers paid out for wages $70,797,524, or 18 per cent. Under the Payne law these products are provided with 40 per cent of "protection," thus showing that the "protection" amounts to more than twice the entire cost of labor.

Fourth. In 1905, 21 per cent of the value of cotton manufactures was spent for labor, and yet under the Payne bill protection of more than 50 per cent is afforded. And no "protection" is given the laborer who produces the raw cotton from which such manufactures are made, although that commodity furnishes the balance of trade in favor of this country.

What I have said illustrates the unfairness of Republican tariff framers to the American laborer. This unfairness on the part of the protected interests themselves for their faithful employees may be shown by the following examples of the percentages for 1905 of the wages paid to such employees in certain highly protected industries: (1) In the production of food products there was paid to the laborers employed in that industry 5.7 per cent of the gross value of such products, while the employers took for themselves a profit on their capital invested of 16.4 per cent; (2) the capital invested in the production of liquors and beverages took for itself 10 per cent and gave to their laborers 8 per cent of the gross value of all products; (3) manufacturers of chemical products took 9.9 per cent on the capital invested and gave to their employees only 8 per cent of the value of the gross products.

Numerous other illustrations might be given of the extreme injustice to the American laborer which is evinced by Republican champions in all of their "protection" measures. The interests urge the imposition of the high-tariff duties so that they may be able, as they claim, to pass on to their laborers the unearned and artificial profit which comes to them thereby.

Now, the laborer's gratitude must assume enormous proportions to-day when he realizes that, to live as well now as he did 10 years ago, when his wage was $1.50 per day, he must have now $2.40 per day, whereas his wage has increased to only $1.83 per day. Under the high protective tariff laws the manufacturer has exacted tribute from the consumers, but he has not divided fairly with his laborer. Neither the law nor his promptings of conscience compel him to so divide.

And if it be conceded that "protection" is right and proper in so far as it equalizes the alleged difference between the cost of American and foreign labor, let me quote a distinguished Senator of Republican faith, who avows his allegiance to the aforementioned test in drafting tariff schedules. Senator CUMMINS thus indicts his party:

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the duties imposed in the bill [the Payne bill] upon which we are about to vote are generally too high. I regret that they so far exceed the test established by the party to which I belong that it will become impossible for me to give them my approval by my vote. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 8, 1909.)

MANUFACTURERS USE FOREIGN LABOR.

So far from being protected, labor is the one unprotected class of our citizenship, and labor is unprotected by the express or implied provisions of the very statutory enactments of the Federal Government. Brief reference to our immigration laws will bear out this assertion, and a visit to the various immigrant stations of the United States would serve to reveal the protection which the American laborer gets from the liberal immigration laws of the United States. At Ellis Island will be seen daily hundreds and hundreds of the worst class of immigrants coming into this country to compete with the American laborer and to run down the price of his wage.

The compilation made and published by the Immigration Commission as to the amount of foreign-born labor that is being used by American manufacturers furnishes some very significant facts and shows unjust treatment of the American-born laborer. Without any care for the good of the American laborer, the American manufacturer is preferring foreign labor over him.

Figures collected from the abstract of the Report of the Immigration Commission submitted December 3, 1910, on "Immigrants in manufacturing and mining," pages 45 and 46 show that upon information received for 507,256 wage earners in mines and manufacturing establishments of 22 classifications 17 per cent of such wage earners are born in this country of foreign fathers, 57.9 per cent are foreign born, and only 42.1 per cent are native born. The manufacturing and mining classifications in which they are engaged are as follows:

Agricultural implement and vehicle manufacturing.
Boot and shoe manufacturing.
Cigar and tobacco manufacturing.
Clothing manufacturing.
Coal mining, anthracite.
Coal mining, bituminous.
Collar, cuff, and shirt manufacturing.
Construction work.
Copper mining and smelting.
Cotton goods manufacturing in North Atlantic States.
Furniture manufacturing.
Glass manufacturing.
Glove manufacturing.
Iron and steel manufacturing.
Iron ore mining.
Leather manufacturing.
Oil refining.
Silk goods manufacturing and dyeing.
Slaughtering and meat packing.
Sugar refining.
Woolen and worsted manufacturing.
Diversified industries. (Page 14.)

At pages 70 and 71 of the report above referred to it is shown that concerning the wage earners of the following respective industries canvassed the following results were shown: In carpet manufacturing there were employed 21 per cent of laborers of native birth but of foreign fathers, 58 per cent of foreign birth and only 42 per cent of native-born wage earners. In car building and repairing only 45 per cent of native-born labor is employed, while 54.9 per cent of foreign born labor was employed, and 16 per cent is native born but of foreign fathers.

In cutlery and tool manufacturing only 36.9 per cent of native-born labor is used, while 63.1 per cent of foreign labor was employed and 18.4 per cent of the wage earners were American born but of foreign parentage. In the manufacture of foundry and machine-shop products the American-born wage earners employed constitute 45.5 per cent of the labor, while 54.5 per cent are foreign born and 21.3 per cent are native born of foreign parentage. In manufactures of rope, twine, and hemp 77.8 per cent of foreign-born labor is used, only 22.2 per cent of American-born wage earners, while in addition to the foreign-born labor used 10.3 per cent of labor native born of foreign parents was employed. In the manufacture of sewing machines only 44.1 per cent of native-born labor was utilized, while 55.9 per cent of foreign born and 27.7 per cent of native born of foreign parentage were employed.

And, Mr. Chairman, before I leave this subject of the importation of foreign labor by manufacturers to compete with American labor, permit me to remark that I have observed a suggestion made by British cotton spinners and made by some of their agents in this country, that it would be in the interest of the cotton spinners, who want cheap cotton, to have imported into the United States cheap foreign labor for the production of cheap cotton. The cotton grower gets now no more than a fair price for his cotton—a crop of which more than 60 per cent is produced by the labor of sturdy white men, assisted by the members of their families; these constitute "a bold peasantry, their country's pride." This is merely another scheme of manufacturers engaged in spinning cotton to oppress labor, and to it I am opposed. [Applause.]

THE FREE-LIST BILL.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is for the purpose chiefly of lifting a part of the burden of Federal taxation from the American farmer and to give him a chance to buy his implements at prices as low as the prices accorded by our manufacturers to foreigners, and is, I believe, consistent with the idea that sufficient revenue can be raised from impost duties upon articles not mentioned in this bill and from internal-revenue taxes and from the taxes required of corporations, and will not encourage American manufacturers to sell their American-made goods in the American market at prices greater than the prices received by them for their goods sold in foreign markets in competition with foreign-made goods. That American-made goods have been sold in foreign markets to foreigners cheaper than they are sold at home to Americans, let me cite as proof this statement, taken from the Republican campaign book of 1906:

It is possible that some of these markets (foreign ones) have been gained in the first place through a resort to lower prices—that is, a selling of an article at a lower price abroad than at home—a practice resorted to by every other manufacturing nation with whom we must come into competition. If this has been done, it is to the glory and honor of every American manufacturer who has done it that he has increased the sales of his wares abroad, thereby increasing the volume of his output, the employ of labor, and the wages of his men, for be it understood that American workingmen get precisely the same wages for any goods that may be sold abroad at a lower price as they do for those sold in the home market.

The argument contained in the latter part of this statement quoted is not true, for it is known that the Steel Trust in the manufacture of tin since 1892 paid its employees for goods made for export 25 per cent lower wages than for making tin plate for American consumption. The authority for this is the pamphlet entitled "Export Prices to Date," by Byron W. Holt, issued by the Tariff Reform Association in October, 1906.

I insert in the RECORD the testimony given by Mr. Charles M. Schwab, president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., on December 15, 1908, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives (tariff hearings, 60th Cong., pp. 1661, 1662):

Mr. CLARK. Do you know of your own knowledge what is the greatest discrepancy there ever was between the home price of steel rails and the foreign price?
Mr. SCHWAB. The greatest discrepancy?
Mr. CLARK. Yes.
Mr. SCHWAB. You mean how high in this country and how low in Europe?
Mr. CLARK. How much lower did American manufactured steel rails sell for abroad as compared with what they sold for at home?
Mr. SCHWAB. I should say probably $10; I am not sure of that, however; that is merely a guess.
Mr. CLARK. It is a habitual process to sell them cheaper abroad, is it not?
Mr. SCHWAB. Yes, sir; and a very wise process.

And, further, on page 1667 of the hearings, Mr. Schwab gave the following testimony:

Mr. COCKRAN. You said that they are selling abroad cheaper than here?
Mr. SCHWAB. Yes, sir.
Mr. COCKRAN. You said that it is a very wise process?
Mr. SCHWAB. Quite.
Mr. COCKRAN. Could you explain the wisdom of it to the victims of it as well as to the beneficiaries of it? From the point of view of the American consumer, where does the wisdom of it come in?
Mr. SCHWAB. I am not thinking of the consumer. I am thinking of the manufacturer. [Laughter.] I presume there is no argument there.
Mr. COCKRAN. There is no argument there. The more you get the merrier.
Mr. SCHWAB. I have said it was a wise provision for the manufacturer. You can not let a steel plant stand idle. The fires in your furnaces and the heat costs go on whether you are making steel or not.
Mr. COCKRAN. You said as a matter of fact that there are different rates charged for your products abroad, and you charge less abroad than you charge at home?
Mr. SCHWAB. We usually charge abroad what we can get.
Mr. COCKRAN. You do that at home, do you not?
Mr. SCHWAB. Yes; of course.
Mr. COCKRAN. You can not, of course, put a pistol to a man's head and take all he has.
Mr. SCHWAB. You can in some instances; yes.

And on pages 1729 and 1730 of the same hearings Judge Elbert H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors of the Steel Trust, gave the following testimony:

Mr. CLARK. Your selling price for the United States is $28 a ton. What is your selling price abroad?
Mr. GARY. For 1907, the last figures made up, the price of export rails was, on the average, about 22 cents per ton higher than the domestic price.
Mr. COCKRAN. How much higher?
Mr. GARY. Twenty-two cents per ton.
Mr. COCKRAN. Higher?
Mr. GARY. Yes.
Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is that at the factory?
Mr. GARY. Yes; at the factory.
Mr. CLARK. What was it in 1906—how did it run?
Mr. GARY. In 1906 it was $24.08.
Mr. CLARK. Higher?
Mr. GARY. No; that would be lower, you see—$24.08 at the mill.
Mr. CLARK. That was $3.92.
Mr. GARY. The average of the domestic was $27.52; therefore that would be $3.44 lower on the export.
Mr. CLARK. In 1905?
Mr. GARY. In 1905 there was a still greater difference. The export price was $20.98, or a difference of——
Mr. COCKRAN. Seven dollars and two cents.
Mr. GARY. No; $20.98 deducted from $27.37.
Mr. COCKRAN. That would be $6.39, would it not?
Mr. GARY. I presume so.
Mr. CLARK. In 1904?
Mr. GARY. I have not gone back that far.
Mr. CLARK. Was there generally more difference or less difference, do you think, back for 10 years?
Mr. GARY. Ten years?
Mr. CLARK. Beginning in 1897; we have got into the habit of beginning there.
Mr. GARY. I should think fully as much as the figures I gave you.
Mr. CLARK. You sell all of your steel products abroad, as a rule, cheaper than you do at home?
Mr. GARY. Sometimes we do. I think maybe I can give you the figures on the average for 1907.
Mr. CLARK. We would be glad to have them.
Mr. GARY. The average mill price per ton received for exported materials was 7½ per cent less than the average price for domestic shipments.
Mr. CLARK. Now, you sell this stuff that you ship abroad at a profit, do you not?
Mr. GARY. We do, yes; our company, some of the companies we own here, at times shipped at less than profit, I think, taking into account depreciation and administration charges, and all that sort of thing. But it is a fact that manufacturers at times export at prices down to or below cost.
Mr. CLARK. Why do they not reduce the price for the domestic consumer so as to use up this surplus?
Mr. GARY. That probably would not be the result.
Mr. CLARK. There would not be any result?
Mr. GARY. I say that probably would not have the result of increasing the domestic sales. As a rule, the consumers supply their demands at the best price they can get.
Mr. CLARK. Certainly.
Mr. GARY. Then reducing the price would not increase the quantity, and, therefore, you would have the same surplus.
Mr. CLARK. There might be somebody around who wanted to use steel, who was prohibited from using it by the higher price.
Mr. GARY. There might be, but I think that would be exceptional.

Mr. James G. Parsons, secretary of the Tariff Reform Committee of New York, makes the following pertinent comment on Judge Gary's testimony:

THE STEEL TRUST'S JUGGLED AND MISLEADING FIGURES.

Judge Gary's statement here that the "average mill price per ton received for exported materials was 7½ per cent less than the average price for domestic shipments" in 1907 is taken from the annual report of the Steel Corporation for 1907. It is a misleading statement, apparently shrewdly prepared to convey the idea, as it seemed to do before the Ways and Means Committee, that the export price was only 7½ per cent lower than the domestic price of the same goods. This, however, is a piece of deception undoubtedly intended to conceal the extent of this difference. The trick, involving a juggle with the words "average" and "mill price," was clearly exposed by Mr. Byron W. Holt, chairman of the tariff reform committee of the Reform Club, in a specially prepared article published in Thomas Gibson's market letter of June 9, 1908, entitled "The Probable Effect of Tariff Revision on Securities." Mr. Holt said:

"The Steel Corporation has greatly increased its exports since the panic, notwithstanding that the prices of steel in foreign markets have declined far more than at home. In one instance this year 100,000 tons of tin-plate bars were exported to Wales at about $12 a ton below the home price. Tin plate, barb and other wire, and wire nails are probably exported now at from $10 to $20 a ton less than the home price.

"The report of the Steel Corporation for 1907 says (p. 29):

"'The average mill price per ton received for all exported materials was only 7½ per cent less than the average price received for all domestic shipments.'

"As the average selling price of these steel products is about $40 a ton, an average difference of 7½ per cent would mean $3 a ton. This word 'average,' however, may be, and probably is, very misleading. It is undoubtedly true that the goods exported in 1907 were, as a whole, much more highly finished than was the bulk of the goods sold at home. They consisted largely of barb and other wire, wire nails, plates, tin plates, etc. The average domestic price of this class of goods is, perhaps, $45 per ton. If they were sold for export at an average of $35 per ton, they were, in reality, sold $10 per ton below the home price, though they might have been sold only $3 per ton below 'the average price received for all domestic shipments,' which were composed largely of steel rails, billets, merchant steel, tubing, structural material, etc. The per ton price of the exported goods might easily have exceeded the per ton price of the domestic goods and still have been $10 per ton below the domestic price for the class of goods exported."

This would make the difference between export and home prices nearly 30 per cent, instead of "only 7½ per cent." It is reasonably certain that the average difference was not less than 15 or 20 per cent, even in 1907, when, as the report admits, foreign prices were nearer to domestic prices than at any time since the Steel Trust was formed.

In 1908 the difference between export and domestic prices of steel was probably much more than 30 per cent. It is known that in January, 1908, in the transaction referred to in the above quotation from Gibson's market letter, the United States Steel Products Export Co. sold for export 100,000 tons of sheet bars at 81 shillings per ton, delivered in Wales. Deducting $3.50 for freight, the Pittsburg price for these exported goods was $16 against $29, the home price. In this instance the domestic price was 80 per cent above the export price.

There has been another juggle with figures in the Steel Trust's annual report, which served to aid in concealing the enormous earnings of the trust until it also was exposed by Mr. Byron W. Holt, then editor of Moody's Magazine, in the issue of that magazine for August, 1906, and in subsequent articles. In Moody's Magazine for April, 1907, in discussing this matter editorially, Mr. Holt said:

"Our readers will remember that we, last August, called attention to the fact that the 'gross sales' and 'costs' were fictitious and that they were undoubtedly juggled to conceal the actual rate of profit. We challenged the accuracy of these two items and gave most convincing reasons for thinking that 'gross sales' and 'costs' included

sales and charges between the subsidiary companies, although there was nothing in the report to indicate this fact. We expressed the opinion that these items were padded to disguise the tariff profits of this most highly protected trust.

"The present report confesses that the 'gross sales and earnings' represents 'the aggregate gross value of the commercial transactions conducted by the respective companies and receipts of the transportation companies for services rendered both to subsidiary companies and to the public.'"

"This statement shows that our reasoning and conclusions were sound, although some of our subscribers who were stockholders were unwilling to believe that their corporation would practice deception and mislead them in this way. It is undoubtedly because of our criticism that this report admits this most peculiar and damaging fact. View it in as favorable light as we can, these figures are made to conceal facts not only from stockholders, but from the public at large, which is taxing itself nearly $100,000,000 a year for the benefit of this giant "infant" and tariff beneficiary.

"It is ridiculous that the financial statement of the Steel Corporation, a holding company and a distinct entity, should give us the gross results of all the transactions which its subsidiary companies have with each other and should not distinguish between such fictitious bookkeeping and meaningless transactions and their transactions with the outside world. And yet the report says:

"'As in previous years' reports, the statement of account, statistics, etc., presented in this report comprehend the combined results for the United States Steel Corporation and all the subsidiary companies * * * liabilities from one company to another are omitted from both liabilities and assets.'

"Of course liabilities from one company to another had to be canceled, but why were other transactions between the companies not also canceled? They are like transfers of dollars or marbles from one pocket to another.

"A street fakir may sell a penknife to Mr. E. Z. Mark for $1 that he ordinarily sells for 50 cents and that costs him only 30 cents. He then, if he is familiar with reports of the Steel Corporation, may ease his conscience by transferring the dollar from one pocket to another until he has run up gross sales to $7. His profits will then be 70 cents, or at the rate or 10 per cent on gross sales.

"Or he may transfer the knife from pocket to pocket before it is sold, charging 10 cents (in his mind) for each shift, until the 'cost' of the knife has increased from 30 to 90 cents. His conscience will then permit him to sell the knife for $1. Great head, good bookkeeping! But the ordinary fakir is too practical to waste his time and wear out his pockets in this way. However, if he had a license that gave him a monopoly of the sale of penknives in a city, and if he had to make reports of sales and profits, he might see a new light and think more favorably of the methods of the Steel Corporation for concealing profits."

And again, on another occasion, in referring to this same deception in the Steel Trust's annual report for 1907, Mr. Holt said:

"The recently issued report of the Steel Trust tells us that the gross sales and earnings for the year ending December 31, 1907, were $757,014,767 and that the net earnings, after deducting $35,000,000 for maintenance and repairs, were $160,964,673. Apparently, then, this trust sold its products at a profit of only 27 per cent on their cost price. This rate of profit does not look large to us when we consider how heavily we tax ourselves to support this prince of paupers.

"But in reality the rate of profit was about twice 27 per cent. In another part of the report we are informed that 'gross sales and earnings' include 'sales made between the subsidiary companies' as well as those to the outside world. This is ridiculous, of course, and is done for the purpose of disguising tariff profits.

"Just what were the 'gross sales' to the public the report nowhere tells us. It does, however, tell us that the total tons of 'rolled and other finished products for sale' were 10,376,742. We know the quoted prices for nearly all of these products, and we know that the average price was not, as the figures indicate, over $70 per ton. We know that it was not $60 or even $50 per ton. It probably did not exceed $40 a ton, or about $414,000,000. Adding $46,000,000—a liberal estimate—for all other possible sales and earnings—from its railroads, sales of cement, spelter, etc.—we have $460,000,000 as the total amount of the gross sales to the public.

"Deducting the net profits, we have less than $300,000,000 as the total cost of the products sold. The actual rate of profit, then, we are proud to say, was 54 per cent on the cost price of the products sold."

GARY'S FIGURES NOT RELIABLE.

These tricks of misrepresentation, characteristic of the Steel Trust's reports, must be kept in mind in considering Judge Gary's statements before the Ways and Means Committee. What he said on that occasion, however, constitutes a conclusive and authoritative admission that practically all steel products are regularly sold abroad at substantially lower prices than at home; that this practice has been going on for years and still continues; that practically all these export sales at lower prices were made at a profit to the manufacturers and from domestic materials, without any reference to drawbacks, and that the manufacturers are regularly "holding up" the domestic consumers for "the best price they can get." Of course, practically all manufacturers do, now and then, both in domestic and export trade, sell certain lots of certain articles at cost, or even less than cost, for special reasons; but Judge Gary makes it clear that any such sales of steel products for export are exceptional. He also shows that the figures quoted in the Republican Campaign Textbook for 1908 (from his statement before the House Committee on Merchant Marine in 1906) can not be depended on for accuracy. The campaign textbook figures, which did service in the presidential campaign of 1908, stated that in 1906 the price of steel rails in the United States for export was "about $26.60" per ton. In December, 1908, after the election, Judge Gary tells us under oath that it was $24.08 in 1906 and much lower in 1905. (Taken from a pamphlet prepared by Mr. Parsons, entitled "Protection's Favors to Foreigners," and printed as S. Doc. 54, 61st Cong., 1st sess.)

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, let me say, provides that the following articles and necessary utensils employed by farmers in the greatest and most useful of all business pursuits, agriculture, shall be exempt from tariff taxation:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough, and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

It is an established fact that plows and the other implements mentioned, boots and shoes, fencing wire, sewing machines, and the other articles named in the bill, are made or produced in the United States and sold in foreign markets for a lower price than at home. There is no justice in that sort of protection which enables the manufacturer to exact of Americans a greater price for plows and other things than he charges the foreigner in foreign lands.

COTTON BAGGING AND TIES.

Mr. Chairman, I must confine myself at the present time to the articles of bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton. I am glad to note that these two articles, the duty on which has cost the southern cotton farmer a million or more dollars annually, are by this beneficent measure placed upon the free list. And I sincerely hope that a Republican Senate will allow them to remain in the bill and pass the measure, and that the President will approve it. Our farmers are entitled to this consideration and to all the relief provided in the bill.

This matter of removing the duty from bagging and ties has been several times heretofore advocated by me. I beg leave to call attention to the following remarks made by me on April 7, 1909, during the consideration of the Payne bill, on that subject:

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, we are operating to-day in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and considering the tariff bill under a rule that I think not short of infamous, that denies the rights of Representatives here to offer amendments to this tariff bill, which amendments are in the interest of the people. Under this harsh rule it is probable that I will not be allowed at any time to offer amendments to put bagging and ties, in which the great cotton product of our country is baled for the market, on the free list. If I shall have the opportunity to offer these amendments, I shall offer one putting bagging on the free list, in the following words:

"Strike out all of section 350, covering bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, and transfer the same to the free list."

Then I shall offer another amendment putting cotton ties for the baling of cotton on the free list, which is in the following language:

"Strike out section 123, covering hoop or band iron, or hoop and band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton, and transfer the same to the free list."

Mr. Chairman, I elaborated what I had to say on this subject last Friday in the discussion of the pending tariff bill. I desire now to make a brief statement.

Under the Wilson tariff there were nine mills in this country making bagging for cotton. Under the Dingley bill the Bagging Trust reduced the number to three, and this trust now has a monopoly of the cotton-bagging business. The cotton farmer is compelled to pay a duty on 6¼ yards of bagging per bale or a duty which is a tax of 4¾ cents on the bagging in each bale. Now, I ask that bagging be put upon the free list, because it is not an American product—the jute is raised in foreign lands—because it will benefit the great cotton industry of our country, and because it will tend to destroy the Bagging Trust.

There are about 100,000,000 yards of bagging consumed by the cotton growers in this country per annum. In 1897, 20,000,000 yards were imported before the Dingley law went into effect, paying a duty of $118,000, having a foreign unit value of 6¼ cents a square yard. The three companies having a monopoly of this bagging business are located in New York, Boston, and Indiana.

The cotton farmer, I repeat, pays a duty on 6¼ yards of bagging per bale, or 4¾ cents duty, and on cotton ties, which were free under the Wilson bill, the duty under the present bill is three-tenths of a cent per pound, instead of five-tenths of a cent per pound under the Dingley bill. There were imported into this country, in 1907, 716,819 pounds of cotton ties, paying a duty of $3,584; 16,216,000 pounds came in in the last year of the Wilson bill. The Dingley bill favored the Steel Trust, and the pending bill still hands out favors to this and other monopolies.

No opportunity to offer the amendments mentioned was given me, but when the distinguished gentleman now our Speaker, then the minority leader in this House, was preparing his resolution to recommit the Payne bill with instructions, he included therein at my request the following paragraphs which were prepared by me:

Fifth. Amend as follows: Strike out all of section 350, covering bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, and transfer the same to the free list.

Sixth. Amend as follows: Strike out section 123, covering hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly

manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton, and transfer same to the free list.

The resolution to recommit was offered by Mr. CLARK of Missouri on April 9, 1909, the day the Payne bill passed the House of Representatives, and that resolution, including the above paragraphs relating to bagging and ties, was rejected by a Republican House.

Under the Payne law the cotton farmer must pay duty on a bale of cotton as follows:

	Cents.
6½ yards of bagging, per bale	4½
Steel cotton ties, per bale	2½
Total, per bale	7 5/10

Under the Payne law the duty on cotton bagging is six-tenths of a cent per yard. Six and one-half yards of cotton bagging are required for a bale of cotton, so that the duty on the bagging required to cover a bale of cotton is 4¾ cents. On a 13,000,000-bale crop of cotton the duty on the bagging required will amount to $617,500.

Under the Payne law the duty on cotton ties is three-tenths of a cent per pound. Eight and one-half pounds of ties are required for each bale of cotton, so that the duty on the ties for a bale of cotton is 2 1/10 cents. On a 13,000,000-bale crop of cotton the duty on the ties required will amount to $331,500.

It will thus be seen that the total duty imposed upon the baling of a 13,000,000-bale crop of cotton will amount to $949,000.

BINDER TWINE AND GRAIN CROPS—COMPARISON BETWEEN COTTON AND GRAIN CROPS.

Yet no duty is placed upon the binder twine used by the grain farmer in harvesting his crop, and here will be seen the unjust discrimination in favor of the grain farmer and against the southern cotton farmer which is perpetrated by the Payne law.

The following table, taken from a table furnished by Mr. O. P. Austin, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, to me under date of April 26, 1911, will illustrate the relative importance of the cotton crop, compared with grain crops, both severally and jointly:

Production and exports of domestic cereal crops and cotton during the year 1910.

Articles.	Production, calendar years.		Exports, domestic, fiscal years.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Bushels.		*Bushels.*	
Wheat	695,443,000	$621,443,000	46,679,876	$47,806,598
Oats	1,126,765,000	384,716,000	1,685,474	794,367
Rye	33,039,000	23,840,000	219,756	168,666
Barley	162,227,000	93,785,000	4,311,566	3,052,527
Buckwheat	17,239,000	11,321,000	158,160	103,138
Total	2,034,713,000	1,135,105,000	53,054,832	51,925,296
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*	
Cotton	5,551,790,000	820,320,000	3,206,708,226	450,447,243

By this table it will be seen that of cotton there was produced 5,551,000,000 pounds, with a value of $820,320,000; that there were exported for the fiscal year 3,206,000,000 pounds, having a total value of $450,000,000. [Applause.] While the entire exports for the same period of wheat, oats, rye, barley, and buckwheat aggregated $51,925,000. As I have shown, cotton exports for the same period reached the enormous sum of $450,000,000. So that the chief item of our exports, keeping up the gold supply, furnishing the balance of trade in favor of this country, is the item of cotton produced by the southern farmer. [Applause.]

I shall print in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks the table furnished to me by Mr. AUSTIN.

And, Mr. Chairman, the same consideration that has been shown to the grain grower of the West, which was a right and proper consideration, in giving him free binding twine for his grain, should be shown to the cotton farmer of the South. We contend that there should be free bagging and ties for the southern cotton farmer. [Applause.] I have here a letter, written by Mr. Rochester, explaining this whole matter of the Bagging Trust and the burdensome operations of the law made for the benefit of that trust.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 25, 1911.*

Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pursuant to our conversation regarding cotten bagging, I thought well to call your attention to the following features in connection with the American Manufacturing Co. and the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, better known as the Bagging Trust.

These concerns, by their pooled arrangement under which the American sells about 82 per cent and the Ludlow about 18 per cent of the cotton bagging used to cover the crop of the country, by dint of the protection afforded them under the present iniquitous tariff law, are enabled not only to maintain their own price by reason of having stifled all other independent competition, but there seems to be, along with the gradually increasing price of the bagging, a corresponding decrease in quality.

The American's mills in Brooklyn being located on the East River, that copious estuary furnishes a very large percentage of the weight which goes to make up the Patent Fire-Proofing Compound, by which they set so much store, and the other ingredients of this famous "fire-proofing compound" are common salt, lime dust, barytes, and other similar cheap makeweights. The planter in buying this American-made bagging is paying about at the rate of 4 to 5 cents per pound for East River water and the other ingredients above mentioned, though he gets no benefit whatever of the water, for after the bale of cotton has stood in the sun for a few days the water has all evaporated, and even though he should sell his bale at gross for net, as claimed by some of our Republican friends—but which is not a fact—he would have no show on earth to get back the water, which evaporates into the air.

In an article in the New York Evening Mail of April 22, a notorious high-tariff trust organ, and which article is copiously illustrated with cuts, it is there claimed that the cotton-bagging industry in this country gives employment to 50,000 American laborers. The fact is that it gives employment to less than 3,000 of the poorest and most ignorant little Hungarian, Polack, and Bohemian children—mostly girls. The article in question I am handing you with this letter so that you may see from their own picture the character of American labor that, in their argument of injured innocence, they are seeking to protect.

The fact is that many of these children have no business, under our child-labor laws, to be working in a mill at all on account of their tender age. Moreover they are not American citizens in the strict sense of the word, as these corporations have their agents to take them at the piers as they land from the immigrant ships and steer them into their jute mills at starvation wages of 60 cents per day up to about $1, according to the age and time of service.

These people can not even speak English and have no voice whatever in their contract, for compensation being thankful to get anything whatever once they have landed in America and being incompetent to demand by reason of their ignorance and incompetency any fair wage.

You will also note the claim that there is $8,000,000 invested in this business. The American Manufacturing Co.'s capital stock is $2,000,000, it having cut down its capital stock by $1,000,000 a few years ago and passed it around to its stockholders with a letter of explanation that they were making money so rapidly that they could not use the extra million dollars. And this, under the Wilson law, when they claimed that they were only able to exist by dint of a cut in wages and personal overtures to their operatives to stick by them until the crisis was over.

The Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, while capitalized at a larger amount, it is fair to assume has not employed in this bagging industry more than $500,000, which, you will see on a basis of the pooled ratio above referred to, would be an ample percentage of capital for Ludlow with 18 per cent, as against the American Manufacturing Co.'s $2,000,000 to handle its 82 per cent of the bagging to cover the cotton crop of the country.

POOLED ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE AMERICAN MANUFACTURING CO. AND THE LUDLOW MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATES.

FALSE OR FAKED COMPETITION MAINTAINED TO DECEIVE THE PUBLIC.

These matters are thoroughly covered in my letter to Mr. Roosevelt of November 28, 1908, and recorded in tariff hearings of the Sixtieth Congress at pages 4892 and 4893, and the status of which is to all intents and purposes unchanged at this time.

QUALITY OF BAGGING.

I have requested shipped to me by Mr. Harvey Jordan, of Atlanta, samples of the American Manufacturing Co.'s Dundee and the Calcutta bagging, which will be left with Mr. UNDERWOOD when I go back home, and should be glad for you to contrast the qualities of these baggings, which will more forcibly illustrate the imposition than any word of mouth or pen could.

I was glad to see, that when this question came up before, you had gone so fully into the quality of the bagging, and I know that you will give that phase of the question due consideration now, for, under existing conditions, the American cotton bale enjoys to-day the unique distinction of being the most disreputable package of merchandise shipped from any market on the face of the habitable globe. Not because good bagging could not be made and is not made, but because our tariff arrangements are such that they encourage an unscrupulous trust to force down the throat of the helpless farmer or factor the article which to them pays the greatest profit, irrespective of quality or fitness for the purpose.

FIBERS.

You are doubtless aware that the jute fiber all grows in India and comes into this country free of duty, and is used principally for the manufacture of jute bagging, though, to a smaller extent, for jute twines, carpet yarns, and so forth.

Sisal fiber is taken from a species of the cactus plant which grows in Mexico and also comes to this country free of duty, being used principally for the manufacture of binder twine and, to a smaller extent, for rope.

Manila fiber, so called (Abaca), is a product of a species of the banana plant grown, solely for commercial purposes, in the Philippine Islands, and is not only imported into this country free of duty, but ever since we have been in control of the Philippine Islands, by an act of Congress, the cordage manufacturers here have received a bounty of three-eighths of a cent per pound on every pound of Manila hemp shown to have been manufactured here into cordage or binder twine.

Russia hemp is grown in Russia, Austria, and Belgium, principally, and is imported into this country, in very small quantities, free of duty, for use in the manufacture of tarred and untarred rope or cordage.

American hemp is grown chiefly in Kentucky, California, and, to some extent, in Wisconsin, and is used principally in the manufacture of commercial twines.

You will thus see the discrimination against the southern cotton grower and in favor of the western or northern grain grower, which was so forcibly brought out in your speech on the subject during the debate on the Payne-Aldrich bill.

Yours, very truly,

R. ROCHESTER.

I desire to read the following statement made by Mr. C. Lee McMillan, of New Orleans:

I also send you a photograph showing how first bale (1908) new grown Laurel, Miss., cotton looked upon its arrival by express at the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. This cotton was covered with the inferior domestic made bagging, and although it had never been touched with a cotton hook, you can easily see why the farmers loss in weight is often very great. Give the cotton farmer the chance to cover his cotton with bagging such as our Calcutta sample represents, and you will save the South millions of dollars every year.

Mr. GILLETT in his speech last week (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 835) told Congress that "the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates were in no combination with the American Manufacturing Co."

In answer to the above I will say that for about 15 or 20 years past the Ludlow people and the American Manufacturing Co. have invariably opened the bagging market upon the same day each year, and both concerns have asked exactly the same price for same quality and weight of goods to every point they did business.

The same plan exactly is followed by the cotton-tie people, and I may further state that what cotton ties the Ludlow people require they get from Messrs. Warren, Jones & Gratz, who are the selling agents for both the Carnegie Steel Co. and the American Manufacturing Co.

Mr. GILLETT also said, "We would be willing to compete with England even with the present low duty." As a matter of fact, more bagging for covering cotton during the past 20 years has been made in Great Britain than in India. One mill (Cleghorn's) of Dundee during the past five years made more cotton bagging than all Calcutta mills put together made.

There are other Dundee mills, also one in Liverpool, engaged in making this bagging for American cotton, and every one of them employs white labor.

Ask Mr. GILLETT how many of those engaged in making bagging at Ludlow own their own homes? How many speak English, and how many are voters? As a matter of fact, Ludlow has the very lowest class of eastern Europe labor, and as making bagging is the easiest of all work in fabrics, little skill is required, and the poor Hungarian gets very small wages.

The best wages paid by Ludlow doubtless goes to those who are engaged in the five other departments Ludlow so fully covered in its signed statement, which you can see if you will kindly refer to the afternoon session before Ways and Means Committee, Monday, November 30, 1908.

Mr. GILLETT stated that "all of the machinery has to be imported from England, because there is none made in the United States, and they have to pay 45 per cent duty on their machines."

I beg to inform you that the Smith & Furbush Machine Co. of Philadelphia, makes all kinds of machinery for cotton bagging, and further, I am pleased to state that the Americans did buy a lot of secondhand bagging machinery in Dundee, which can be imported free of duty.

All of the American bagging mills use a certain percentage of secondhand bagging in making yarns to go into new bagging, and the cost of the secondhand stuff is very low indeed.

The Bagging Trust did buy and dismantle the bagging mills of Louisville, New Orleans, and Galveston. The only mill in the South engaged in making new bagging is the one at Charleston, S. C., which is owned by the American Manufacturing Co., known as the trust.

Those other mills Mr. GILLETT refers to as being in the Southeast are not makers of new bagging, but said mills are engaged in making over and piecing secondhand bagging they buy from the cotton mills as it comes off cotton, and I may here state that all of those little mills put together make up not more than two or three million yards, while the American Manufacturing Co. makes new bagging and new patches for sample holes, say, forty-five or fifty million yards, and the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, according to its signed statement (see, if you please, afternoon session of Ways and Means Committee, Monday, Nov. 30, 1908), can make 25,000,000 yards.

You will remember that both the American and Ludlow concerns are by no means dependent upon the bagging industry, as both concerns do more along other lines of manufacture than in bagging.

The Bagging Trust for years has been a buyer of Calcutta baggings, and it is now receiving Calcutta-made bagging at its Brooklyn mill. You might ask Mr. Gratz, of the American Manufacturing Co., why do they send Calcutta bagging to the Brooklyn mill? What is its weight upon arrival there? And what is its weight when it is sold and shipped south to their customers? I am sure the Bagging Trust will not protest against salt being put upon the free list, and if you will kindly examine carefully the sample marked "No. 1," I think you will detect salt contained therein, the weight of which would disappear under the rays of the sun.

Mr. Chairman, an amusing thing has been sent to me from Henderson, N. C., under date of April 24, 1911, in which an appeal is made to save the Bagging Trust. It is a circular letter over the printed signature of the Carolina Bagging Co. This circular says that a large amount of capital is invested in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and so forth, in the manufacture of bagging, and that "admitting jute into this country free of duty would ruin and close these factories and throw all their labor out of employment." Why, Mr. Chairman, the author of this lamentation and prediction did not know that jute has been admitted for years into this country free of duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Jute and jute butts were put on the free list in a Republican tariff for the benefit of the Bagging Trust. It is now the duty on the bagging that we want taken off for the benefit of the consumer, the farmer. Yet these factories have not been closed.

Let me quote from the free list of the act of August 5, 1909, known as the Payne bill:

FREE LIST.

That on and after the day following the passage of this act, except as otherwise specially provided for in this act, the articles mentioned in the following paragraphs shall, when imported into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the Islands of Guam and Tutuila), be exempt from duty:

* * * * * *

578. Grasses and fibers: Istle or Tampico fiber, jute, jute butts, manila, sisal grass, sunn, and all other textile grasses or fibrous vegetable substances, not dressed or manufactured in any manner, and not specially provided for in this section.

Jute and jute butts were put on the free list away back in the days when the McKinley bill (see H. Rept. 1466, 51st Cong., 1st sess., p. 15) was enacted, and were retained on the free list in the Dingley law and embodied in the free list in the Payne law, as shown above. This suffices to illustrate how ignorant some tariff prophets are or how forgetful of facts they can be in making arguments for the retention of tariff duties which enable a trust—the Bagging Trust, for instance—to rob the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress I saw a man hanging around the doors of this House and about the rooms of the Committee on Ways and Means. I was told that he was the agent or lobbyist of the Bagging Trust. At the first session of the next Congress I saw that same man sitting as a Republican Member of Congress in this House. I do not know what has become of him latterly, but whether the Bagging Trust has a representative in this Chamber or not, the fact remains that that trust is furnished protection in the present tariff law, and the merchants and the farmers of the South know that methods similar to those which have been practiced by the Tie Trust are practiced by the Bagging Trust. It will be remembered that in the spring of 1906, after the cotton plant had begun to grow, it seemed apparent that there would be a very large crop on account of a large acreage and weather conditions. There were about 2,500,000 bundles of cotton ties ready for shipment, but the Steel Trust in one day sent out telegrams over the entire cotton belt raising the price of ties 10 cents per bundle, thus taking from the pockets of the cotton growers $250,000 at one time on cotton ties. If the pending bill should become a law we hope and expect to get rid of the burdensome exactions made by that trust and the Bagging Trust under the protection afforded them by the present tariff. [Applause.] Thereby the producer of cotton will be put upon the same footing as the producer of grain, who is furnished with untaxed binder twine.

Now, lest some man will say that the purchaser of the farmer's bale of cotton pays for the bagging and ties, let me refute that. Everybody knows that the great bulk of the cotton crop is exported, and wherever the bulk of any product is exported necessarily the price of that article so exported is fixed according to the foreign demand and the foreign price. So we can correctly contend that the price of cotton is fixed by the Liverpool market. Everybody knows that the price is fixed in that way and that the cotton trade does not reimburse the farmer for the amount he expends in the purchase of bagging and ties. The farmer takes that money directly out of his pocket and pays it to the retail merchant every time he has a cotton bale packed. He is out that amount for bagging and ties. Does he get it back? Not so. The consumer of the cotton—the spinner—deducts the weight of the bagging and ties as tare from the cotton when he pays for the cotton. That tare has ranged from 22 to 30 pounds per bale, according to the estimated weight of the bagging and ties. Therefore it is a total loss to the farmer; he is never reimbursed.

I have here copies of a number of letters sustaining that statement, written by the President of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange and Secretary Hester, of the same exchange, and others, and one just received by me under date of May 2, 1911, from Mr. McMillan, of New Orleans. Let me read Mr. McMillan's letter:

C. LEE MCMILLAN & CO. (LTD.),
New Orleans, May 2, 1911.

Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please permit me to state that those small bagging mills in the Southeast that are protesting so strongly against the removal of the duty on bagging are not engaged in making new bagging out of new jute, but are engaged in piecing or making over the old bagging after it is taken off cotton at the mills.

The output of such mills as described above is a very poor stuff, indeed, and it is the cause of much of the complaint heard about improper covering for American cotton.

To those who are upholding the claim of the United Steel Co. that the cotton planter reaps a large profit upon the ties he uses you may say that all European or foreign cotton buyers figure the tare for bagging and ties as being 6 per cent. The majority of the American spinners figure this tare at 5 per cent, while none of them calculates tare at less than 4 per cent.

The average bale of cotton has on it—

	Pounds.
7 yards 2-pound bagging, say	14
6 steel bands, weighing 1½ pounds each	9
Making a total of	23

so you will see that the planter gets back nothing whatever for his bagging and ties.

Yours, respectfully, C. LEE MCMILLAN.

And I now read the others:

SAVANNAH, GA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. C. L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Offers from Europe name a price which includes cost of freight, marine insurance, and 6 per cent tare on a 500-pound bale. Six per cent would be 40 pounds, which covers 16 pounds for 8 yards of bagging, 8 pounds for 8 ties, and 6 pounds for natural drying of cotton and consequent shrinkage in weight; nominally the farmer is paid for bagging and ties, but the spinner can't spin them. He sells them for junk; consequently the price he offers is a figure arrived at after deducting what his loss will be on the bagging and ties; also is true that farmer in reality is not paid for bagging and ties. American spinners usually get 28 pounds tare, and also deduct from price they pay for cotton the loss they will sustain on the bagging and ties.

W. W. GORDON.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your contention in dispatch concerning tare on cotton is true. When the farmer buys bagging and ties he pays therefor some 9 cents per bale more than he would pay if free. When the spinner buys from the farmer he deducts from the worth of the cotton the amount of his loss by bagging and ties. Therefore the spinner does not pay the tariff profit that goes to the manufacturers of bagging and ties and the farmer does. But even if spinner did pay, antagonists' argument is not strengthened, because spinner would add excess to manufactured product and thus increase the cost to consumer. In either case the trust collects the profit and the people pay.

W. B. THOMPSON,
President New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

It is a well-known fact that all buyers on both sides of the Atlantic allow in the prices they pay fully enough, if not more than enough, to offset the weight of bagging and ties on a bale. As a general thing 6 per cent is allowed for tare by foreign spinners. While all spinners practically buy on the basis of tare, care is generally taken that allowances always equal and frequently exceed actual tare.

HENRY G. HESTER.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

All cotton sold for export deducts 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties; domestic mills claim 4 to 5 per cent tare.

NORMAN EUSTIS,
Acting Chairman Cotton Factory Association.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton sold for export carries 6 per cent deduction for tare; domestic mills calculate about 5 per cent.

NEW ORLEANS COTTON BUYERS' AND EXPORTERS' ASSN.,
A. J. WEST, *President.*

Every man familiar with the production, handling, and sale of cotton knows what I have said to be true. It has never been challenged by any man who has witnessed the growth of the cotton plant from the time it shot up its two tender leaves, from the time it blossomed into whiteness, from the time that the pink blossoms came into the beautiful green and graceful foliage. No man who has witnessed its development into the full-grown boll; who has witnessed in the fall, as if touched by magic, the whole field becoming like an expanse of snow in its whiteness and purity—no man who has ever witnessed all these things has ever challenged the statement that under Republican tariff laws the farmer who makes the cotton loses the sum that he pays out for the ties and bagging in which he wraps his cotton, the cotton which is the common raiment of mankind and is at the same time well-nigh all the "purple and fine linen" of the poor, God's poor that our Savior loved so well. It is the learned Republican tariff doctrinaire, the pretentious disseminator of secondhand misinformation, who asserts that the spinner pays for the bagging and ties used in preparing the great cotton crop for the markets of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I thank you for your courtesy and indulgence. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Production, imports, and exports of domestic cereal crops and cotton during the years 1909 and 1910.

Articles.	Production, calendar years.		Exports, domestic, fiscal years.		Imports, fiscal years.	
	Quantity.	Value.[1]	Quantity.	Value.[2]	Quantity.	Value.[3]
Wheat:	*Bushels.*		*Bushels.*		*Bushels.*	
1909	737,189,000	$730,046,000	66,923,244	$68,094,447	41,082	$36,741
1910	695,443,000	621,443,000	46,679,876	47,806,598	164,201	150,561
Corn:						
1909	2,772,376,000	1,652,822,000	35,853,412	25,194,466	258,065	189,465
1910	3,125,713,000	1,523,968,000	36,802,374	25,427,993	[4] 117,934	72,341
Oats:						
1909	1,007,353,000	408,174,000	1,510,320	804,759	6,666,989	2,651,699
1910	1,126,765,000	384,716,000	1,685,474	794,367	1,034,511	400,920
Rye:						
1909	32,239,000	23,809,000	1,272,559	1,049,809	51	51
1910	33,039,000	23,840,000	219,756	168,666	[5] 28,374	19,265
Barley:						
1909	170,284,000	93,971,000	6,580,393	4,672,166	2,644	1,440
1910	162,227,000	93,785,000	4,311,566	3,052,527	[6] 3,989	2,650
Buckwheat:						
1909	17,438,000	12,188,000	186,702	137,413	[4] 19,514	12,231
1910	17,239,000	11,321,000	158,160	103,138	[4] 9,186	5,658
Cotton:	*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
1909	4,783,220,000	688,350,000	4,447,935,202	417,390,665	86,518,024	13,622,802
1910	5,551,790,000	820,320,000	3,206,708,226	450,447,243	86,037,691	15,816,138

[1] Farm value December 1.
[2] Export values are those of the markets from which exported.
[3] Markets are wholesale market values of the countries whence imported.
[4] Imports for consumption.
[5] In addition 811,529 pounds of barley, pearled, patent, or hulled were imported.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
April 26, 1911.

For Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON,
House of Representatives.

O. P. AUSTIN, *Chief of Bureau.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.

THE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, this house has had under discussion during recent years few measures that have occasioned as exhaustive, illuminating, and interesting debate as the Canadian reciprocity and free-list bills. Both of these measures deal with that great subject, the tariff, with which this Nation has been struggling since George Washington affixed his signature in 1789 to the original Federal tariff, the second act of the First Congress of the United States, down to the present moment, when the Sixty-second Congress is discussing the pending free-list bill. No question of governmental policy has been as continuously and widely discussed or as repeatedly advanced as a political issue. While I approach the subject from the standpoint of one who firmly believes that protection is the fixed economic policy of the Nation, it is my purpose in the time allotted to deal with the question of methods rather than the subject of schedules.

OUR TARIFF METHODS OBSOLETE.

During the 122-year period, to which I have just alluded, the progress of the country has been by leaps and bounds. In every governmental department we have striven to keep pace with the enlightened and progressive spirit of the age by adopting improved and modern methods. In the manner of framing tariff laws, however, we still follow practically the same antiquated, obsolete, and primitive methods in vogue for over a century and a quarter.

TARIFF AGITATION INVARIABLY DISTURBS BUSINESS.

The tariff affects practically every line of business in the country. It involves economic and industrial questions of the gravest importance. When a tariff agitation is on, even before the actual framing of a tariff bill commences, business is at a standstill. The mere knowledge that a revision is contemplated upsets all lines of industry. Merchants hesitate to place orders, investors are cautious, and new enterprises are delayed. Having had some little experience with financial institutions, I fully appreciate how little it takes at times to disturb conditions. When finally Congress undertakes to revise the schedules there is an impatient clamor all over the country for an early settlement, and Congress is bound to be somewhat responsive to that demand, and undue haste invariably results. And still we go along in the same old rut, failing to profit by the experience of a century and a quarter.

GROWING SENTIMENT FOR IMPROVED METHODS.

I mistake the temper of the American people if the day is not rapidly approaching when they will insistently demand that more enlightened and scientific methods be adopted in dealing with this great question and a public sentiment, national in scope, will crystallize in favor of a nonpartisan, but permanent, tariff board—a body that will confine itself to the important and necessary preliminary work of gathering and sifting information and performing the technical work so essential in placing before Congress data necessary in dealing with the various schedules, practically all of which are intricate. [Applause.]

LITTLE CHANGE IN METHODS SINCE 1789.

Let us here hastily review our system of tariff making for the last 125 years. The rather meager accounts we have of the debates upon the first tariff act reveal the fact that there existed then the same wide divergence of views and that the demagogue was in evidence even in that day, as illustrated when a duty on candles was proposed of 2 cents per pound, affording opportunity for one of the South Carolina Representatives to wax eloquent over tallow candles, protesting in the name of the people—whose spokesman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has lately become—against "a tax on light." History does not record whether the people's champion from South Carolina nursed an ambition, like the gentleman from Kentucky, to occupy a seat in another branch of Congress and grasped at the candles to light his way thither. [Laughter.]

The ancestors of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] were agitated over fish, New England being engaged in a profitable trade with the West Indies, furnishing those tropical islands with low-grade fish and receiving in return rum and molasses, principally rum, and with their usual ability and strenuousness the New Englanders opposed any restriction on imports from these islands. From early April until July our forefathers struggled with the items in this first bill. They were handicapped then, from all accounts, as we are to-day by the scarcity of accurate and technical information.

MANY TARIFF CHANGES—LOGROLLING INTRODUCED.

Between the passage of the acts of 1789 and 1816 fully 21 changes were made in the tariff, demonstrating that our early statesmen were still groping in the dark. When it came to the act of 1816 Congress established a speed record not since equaled in tariff making. It was only 39 days from the date of introduction until the act had received Executive approval. In 1824 we find that Congress was again debating the great question and the whole country was agitated. Business was disturbed and party feeling ran high. Clay and Webster were principals in the memorable debate. The system of log-rolling between different sections and States is not a new condition, apparently, for we find that during the framing of this act New England rum and Kentucky whisky formed a partnership. Evidently sectional lines were eliminated when whisky and rum joined hands. The interest manifested was so keen and the vote so close that sick Members were brought into the House on stretchers to vote.

POLITICS ALWAYS PLAYED IMPORTANT PART.

The act of 1828—the "tariff of abominations," as it was opprobriously termed—was an illustration of tariff tinkering for political purposes. A wit of that day suggested an amendment to the title so that it would read "An act to encourage the manufacture of a President of the United States" instead of "An act for the encouragement of certain manufactures." The suggestion of a similar amendment to the pending free-list bill might cause a blush to mount the cheek of the present and popular Speaker of the House.

It is needless to go into the history of the various acts which followed, including the Clay compromise measure of 1833, when politics played an important part and caused the charge of inconsistency to be made against Clay; the Whig tariff of 1842, when the Chief Executive and Congress clashed, President Tyler vetoing two bills before one reached him that met his approval; the Walker revenue tariff of 1844, which remained in force 11 years, longer than any act with the exception of the Dingley law; the Hunter bill; the Morrill tariff of 1861; the Civil War measures of 1862 and 1864, followed by the acts of 1870, 1872, and 1875. Then came the acts of more recent date, including the McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley laws.

In the framing of each of these many acts conditions were strikingly similar. There was frequently undue haste, log-rolling was common, accurate information was difficult to obtain, business conditions were disturbed while the bills were under discussion, and politics played too important a part in determining rates of duty, as will invariably be the case, to a greater or less degree, until some nonpartisan and impartial body presents to Congress unbiased and unsuppressed facts regarding schedules, brought to light after exhaustive inquiry by a force trained in obtaining statistical and technical information. [Applause.]

RECENT TARIFF BILLS.

In framing the Payne bill, I think, it is generally admitted that more information was placed before Congress and the country by the Ways and Means Committee than by any committee in the history of previous tariff legislation. The committee first met on November 10, 1908. The bill became a law on the 5th day of August, 1909, nearly nine full months of consideration being given to the measure by the committee and Congress. The testimony before the committee covered 10,000 pages, and yet the information—the character of information so essential in the framing of any tariff bill—was of necessity incomplete. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] himself stated on this floor that if the committee had been given more time the information would have been more complete. The Payne bill contained 718 paragraphs, and the index shows upward of 4,000 articles listed.

In the hurried framing of the pending free-list bill, upon which no hearings were had, we are informed in the report of the minority that the statement was first made in the Ways and Means Committee by the sponsors of the bill that it would reduce the revenues only about $1,500,000 annually, but they now acknowledge that it will cut down the annual revenues more than $10,000,000. Is this the character of information upon which we should proceed to revise schedules? [Applause on the Republican side.]

EFFORTS IN CONGRESS TO CREATE PERMANENT TARIFF BOARD.

The sentiment for a tariff board has been given great impetus as the result of recent attempted legislation. Responsive to an enlightened public sentiment, the Republican Party, always progressive, endeavored at the last session of Congress to create a permanent nonpartisan tariff board, but as a result of a Democratic filibuster in both branches of Congress the bill finally failed of passage.

The measure passed the House on January 30 of this year by a vote of 186 to 93, only 2 Republicans being recorded in the negative, while 91 Democrats placed themselves on record in opposition to the policy of dealing with our tariff question in a businesslike manner. The bill passed another body but four hours before final adjournment by a vote of 56 to 23, a Democratic filibuster in that body preventing an earlier vote. Only 3 Democrats voted for the bill and but 2 Republicans against. When the bill, with slight amendments, reached the House a special rule was adopted for its immediate consideration with a view to concurrence in the Senate amendments; but Democratic Members, under the able leadership of one of the best parliamentarians in this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], by dilatory motions prevented a vote.

PROVISIONS OF TARIFF BOARD BILL CONSIDERED LAST SESSION.

This bill provided for a permanent tariff board of five members, not more than three to be of the same political party. Section 1 of the bill fixed the term of office at six years, the chairman to be designated by the President and to receive a salary of $7,500, the other members $7,000 each.

Section 2 provided that the principal office was to be in the city of Washington, but the board was empowered to sit in any other section of the United States or in foreign countries.

Section 3 set forth the scope of the work of the board. It was to investigate the cost of production of all articles now or hereafter the subject of tariff legislation, with special reference to wages paid domestic and foreign labor and the the prices of raw material, domestic or imported, entering into manufactured articles. The condition of domestic and foreign markets affecting American products was to be a subject of careful inquiry.

Section 4 empowered the board to investigate and furnish the President information as to the effect of tariff rates, restrictions or regulations imposed by any foreign country, and as to export bounty paid or export duty imposed upon the exportation of any article to the United States, and to assist in the application of the maximum and minimum tariffs.

Section 5 provided for the subpœnaing of witnesses and the procuring of books and papers.

Section 6 provided for the protection of confidential information obtained by the board.

Section 7 provided that the board should report the facts obtained to the President and Congress when called for, and the last section, section 8, provided that the new board should succeed the present Tariff Board.

Notwithstanding the regrettable failure of this bill, there now exists, temporarily at least, a Tariff Board created by authority of section 2 of the Payne Tariff Act, containing the maximum and minimum provisions, the concluding sentence of that section reading as follows:

To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section, and the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

This board was appointed in September, 1909, and then consisted of the following named: Henry C. Emery, former professor of political economy at Yale College; James B. Reynolds, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of customs, and Alvin H. Sanders, publisher of the Breeder's Gazette. The sundry civil bill approved June 25, 1910, carried an appropriation of $250,000 for the expenses of this board, enlarging its powers as follows:

To enable the President to secure information to assist him in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by section 2 of the act entitled—

The Payne Act is here designated—

and the officers of the Government in administering the customs laws, including such investigations of the cost of production of commodities, covering cost of material, fabrication, and every other element of such cost of production, as are authorized by said act, and including the employment of such persons as may be required for those purposes; and to enable him to do any and all things in connection therewith authorized by law, $250,000.

The board has since been increased to five members, two Democrats being added—William M. Howard, of Georgia, an ex-Member of this body, and Thomas N. Page, formerly a professor of political economy in the University of Virginia. The sundry civil act of this year carried an appropriation of $225,000, the language of the item corresponding with that contained in the previous sundry civil bill, which will enable the board to continue in existence at least until June 30, 1912. Before this date, however, it is earnestly hoped that public sentiment, and an appreciation by Congress of the value of the board's work, will result in further provision being made for its continuance. [Applause.]

Neither under the language of the Tariff Board bill of last session nor that contained in the sundry civil bills would or does Congress surrender any of its legislative prerogatives. In framing tariff acts Congress needs facts presented by an authoritative body composed of men who command the respect not alone of Congress but of the country as well.

WORK OF THE PRESENT TARIFF BOARD.

I would suggest to Members of Congress who entertain a doubt as to the necessity of a Tariff Board, or who are unfamiliar with the scope of the investigations under way, that they visit the offices in the Treasury Building, where they will be afforded every facility to familiarize themselves with the methods adopted and learn of the intelligent, painstaking, and successful efforts of this board to obtain facts.

It should be borne in mind that the first appropriation under the language enlarging the powers of the board was passed the latter part of June of last year, so that the board has really only had about 10 months in which to conduct investigations upon any extended scale. The first work, for which an appropriation of $75,000 was made at the time of the passage of the Payne Act, was the study of foreign tariffs in connection with the maximum and minimum clause.

Experts here and in Europe are preparing reports and making analyses of different items in the tariff schedules. Experienced and competent men are employed in this work. Chemicals, earthenware and pottery, iron and steel, wool and woolens, and many other items are included. There has been undertaken a glossary of the tariff act which has been appropriately designated "a translation of the tariff into English." It permits anyone to read a complicated schedule and understand the technical and commercial facts regarding the articles put in simple language.

In conversation with the expert in charge of the work on Schedule A—the chemical schedule—he explained that for this glossary he was taking every chemical enumerated, the process by which it is manufactured, the States and countries from which the supply comes, the chief markets, figures of production, imports and exports in this and leading competing countries, and a calculation of duties collected in ad valorem terms. I doubt if there has ever been undertaken such a complete and accurate report.

Samples of foreign and domestic woolen goods are being collected with relative prices here and abroad. Costs of making the American fabrics abroad will be investigated. Agents of the board are now at domestic mills looking into the question of costs. Inquiries abroad are under way on shrinkage of foreign wools as a basis for the compensating duty, and one into foreign wages and labor efficiency in the textile industries.

In every section of the United States where wool is grown agents have been gathering information as to costs, quality, and other important facts. This investigation has been extended to Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Chile. This is but a mere outline of the work.

TARIFF COMMISSION OF 1882.

A tariff commission was provided by an act of Congress in 1882, and both the advocates and opponents of this method of solving the tariff problem cite our experience in 1882 both in favor of and against the policy of creating a permanent tariff board. I have gone into the history of this commission quite exhaustively.

The Tariff Commission of 1882 was created by an act of Congress approved on May 15 of that year. Under its provisions the President was empowered to appoint nine commissioners from civil life. The act did not provide that the commission should be nonpartisan. It was to investigate all the various questions relative to the agricultural, commercial, mercantile, manufacturing, mining, and industrial interests of the United States, so far as the same "might be necessary to the establishment of a judicious tariff, or a revision of the existing tariff, upon a scale of justice to all interests." The commission was empowered to visit different sections of the country, and to report its investigations not later than the first Monday of December of the same year, which it did, the report, including the testimony, consisting of two large volumes which I now hold in my hand.

The work was necessarily hurried, the commission holding its first meeting in July and reporting in December, a period of five months. No foreign investigation was made, but over 29 different localities were visited, 600 witnesses examined, and 2,625 printed pages of testimony taken.

The commission drew up a provisional scale of duties, which was made the basis of the tariff act of 1883, which remained in force until 1890, a period of over seven years. A comparison of the recommendations of the commission with the act of 1883 shows that Congress adopted a large majority of the rates suggested without change. It made the first scientific classification, which, in the main, has been retained to the present day. Its recommendations as to administrative features were likewise adopted and have become permanent law. It advocated and proposed a bill establishing a customs tribunal for the determination of disputed questions arising under our tariff laws.

This Tariff Commission of 1882, created only as a temporary body, was unquestionably a success, performing excellent service, considering its limited powers for investigation and the short time in which it was compelled to perform its work.

EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Foreign countries, riper in experience, have come to realize the futility of longer adhering to archaic methods in dealing with the tariff question. Germany leads with her "Special Commission for the Elaboration of Measures for Furthering Commerce." This commission consists of 30, the following organizations each having 5 members: The German Agricultural Association, the German Association of Chambers of Commerce, and the Central Association of German Manufacturers. The other 15 members were appointed by the chancellor, 6 representing the agrarian interests, 5 the manufacturers, and 4 the wholesale trade. In its entirety it is a most representative body.

This commission met for the first time in November, 1897. The new tariff bill was not ratified until December 25, 1902.

Five years of investigation! Compare this with our present methods.

The Government of Austria called into consultation a committee of the associated chambers of commerce, who rendered most valuable service in solving the tariff problems of that country. Similar enlightened methods are being adopted elsewhere. Shall we profit by their experience?

CALIFORNIA'S POSITION.

In advocating legislation for a permanent tariff board I am not alone voicing my own strong convictions upon the subject, but am likewise expressing the progressive sentiment of the Republican Party of California as affirmed in the last State platform. After declaring its "unswerving adherence to the Republican doctrine of protection without which the American standard of living can not be maintained," and expressing the opinion that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production and distribution at home and abroad, the California Republican tariff plank, after deprecating the methods heretofore prevailing in framing tariff acts, contained the following indorsement for a permanent tariff board:

We therefore join with the President in demanding the appointment of a permanent tariff commission, wholly removed from the possibility of political pressure or improper business influences. Such commission should ascertain the difference between the cost of production, which is mainly the difference of labor cost, and the distribution here and abroad. As fast as its recommendations are made Congress should revise one schedule at a time. We oppose any future general revision based upon insufficient data to determine the amount of protection actually needed.

No State in the Union has enjoyed a larger share of the prosperity resultant from the Government's policy of protection than the Commonwealth of California. This policy has been of almost incalculable benefit to our hop growers, to our sheep raisers, to our wine producers, to the raisin, Zante currant, olive, prune, lemon, orange, dried-fruit, and fig industries. All we ask, or expect, is the imposition and maintenance of such duties as will permit us to successfully compete with foreign countries where the scale of wages is so low that to admit these competing articles free, or at too low a rate of duty, would spell ruin to these industries. We court a fair, intelligent, and thorough study of conditions by an impartial tariff board, and for one I am willing to abide by the result of such an investigation, and the Representatives of any other State, or the champions of any industry, should be likewise willing to submit to facts obtained through a nonpartisan body composed of high-class men interested only in obtaining facts. It will mean the sustaining of just schedules, while those which can not stand the light of day should not survive. [Applause.]

I voted for reciprocity with Canada, and for this vote have been severely criticized—as have likewise my Republican colleagues from California who supported the measure—by certain ultra protectionists, and reprisals have been threatened against protected industries of California. The last California Republican State platform declared—

the allegiance of the Republicans of California to the policies enunciated by President Roosevelt and reaffirmed and already in part enacted into law under the administration of President Taft.

The platform continued:

We commend President Taft in his efforts and announced intentions further to carry out these policies, and look to our Senators and Representatives in Congress to cooperate with him to that end.

Reciprocity has been one of the policies most strongly urged by Theodore Roosevelt and reaffirmed by President Taft. When I can not stand upon the platform of the Republicans of the State which I in part have the honor to represent, refusing to carry out the expressed wishes of the majority, I shall so announce and immediately resign my seat in this body.

I might remark, however, that, in my opinion, our "stand-pat" friends and certain insurgents from the border States are unduly alarmed over the possible detrimental effects of this proposed trade agreement. We should deal with this question upon the broad grounds of closer relationship with a people who are naturally drawn toward us by ties of tradition and common aspirations. I certainly regard the policy of Canadian reciprocity as progressive and enlightened. [Applause.]

PRESENT DEBATE ILLUSTRATES NECESSITY OF HAVING AVAILABLE RELIABLE FACTS.

The debate upon Canadian reciprocity and the pending free-list bill illustrates the necessity of having available reliable facts. Every item in these bills has been discussed, and those holding opposing views have presented a different array of figures. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has had his facts challenged by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], while the statements of many gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber are strikingly at variance.

Statistics are quoted from newspapers, from farmers, from manufacturers, and from every conceivable source. I have heard myself twenty different prices of wheat and barley quoted, and in every instance with an assurance of their correctness. We want facts, and if reliable statistics were available much of the present confusion would not exist.

I shall vote against the free-list bill because it has been presented without careful consideration and investigation. It is a political bill pure and simple, hurriedly drawn, with its possible effects not inquired into.

The haphazard manner in which this bill was drawn reminds me of a game many of us have played in our younger years. A good-sized picture of a donkey is placed against a wall, and each participant in the fun is blindfolded and furnished with a representation of the caudal appendage of that animal, to which a pin is fastened, and then an effort is made to attach it at the right place. You grope in the dark, flounder about, stabbing here and there, the donkey in the meantime being punched full of holes. So it is in this instance. Our Democratic friends, in their haste to get this measure before the House, have gone at it blindly, each Member with an item for the free list in his hand, striving to properly decorate the Democratic donkey, but already the poor animal is badly punctured. [Applause.]

REVIEW OF ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF TARIFF BOARD.

Let us sum up the arguments in favor of the retention of the present Tariff Board as a permanent body. The history of tariff legislation in this country demonstrates conclusively that improved methods are needed. Our experience with the temporary tariff commission of 1882 is a strong argument in favor of this enlightened and scientific method of tariff adjustment. The success of the German and Austrian tariff commissions multiply the reasons already advanced. Evidence of the intelligent, thorough, and unprejudiced efforts to obtain facts which the present Tariff Board is exhibiting is a final reason why this Congress should rise to the occasion, make the board a permanent body, thus announcing to the world that this Government in the future proposes to solve its tariff problems along scientific lines, enabling justice to be done to all industries, interests, and localities. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS].

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, at this time, when the relations of the farmer to the consumer are so much in the public mind, a discussion in the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States for 1910 is of much value. It was made before the present questions as to removal of duties on foreign farm products had arisen, and therefore is not to be impeached by charges of bias on the particular questions at issue. It was made when the prices of farm products were at their highest point, from which they have already made a long recession, and therefore states at its strongest whatever case there may be against the farmer as related to the consumer. It seems to me to dispose effectually of any claim that substantial relief for the consumer is to be expected by proceeding against the farmer, to explode utterly the immature conclusion that the acres of the United States can not feed the people of the United States, and, finally, to show how brief has been the American farmer's respite of prosperity after long years of production at less than cost. The discussion is on pages 19 to 30 of the report and is as follows:

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS—FARMER'S SHARE OF CONSUMER'S COST—AN EQUALIZING PROCESS.

High prices was one of the subjects of my annual report for 1909. It was shown that for many years previous to about 1897, or a little later, the prices of farm products received by farmers were even less than the cost of production, and often little, if any, above that cost, so that during a long period of years the farmer was not thriving. It was shown also that in the upward price movement, which began about 1897, the prices received by the farmer have advanced in greater degree than those received by nearly all other classes of producers. That this should have been so was merely a matter of justice to the farmer to equalize the reward of his efforts with the rewards received in other lines of production.

INCREASE OF BEEF PRICES.

The price received by the farmer is one thing; the price paid by the consumer is far different. The distribution of farm products from the farm to consumers is elaborately organized, considerably involved and complicated, and burdened with costly features. These are exemplified in my report for 1909 by a statement of the results of a special investigation into the increased cost of fresh beef between the slaughterer and the consumer.

It was establish that in the North Atlantic States the consumer's price of beef was 31.4 per cent higher than the wholesale price received by the great slaughtering houses; 38 per cent higher in the South Atlantic States; and 39.4 per cent higher in the Western States. The average for the United States was 38 per cent.

It was found that the percentage of increase was usually lower in the larger cities than in the smaller ones and higher in the case of beef that is cheap at wholesale than of high-priced beef. It was a safe inference that the poorer people paid nearly twice the gross profit that the more well-to-do people paid.

THE DAIRYMAN GETS ONE-HALF THE MILK PRICE.

Another investigation into the increase of prices in the process of distribution was made in the last week of June, 1910. This time the object was to discover what fraction of the consumer's price was received by the farmer. It was a time of high prices, of high cost of living, and the aim was to ascertain to what extent the farmer received a return out of the high consumer's cost of farm products.

The investigation covered 78 cities scattered throughout the United States, and the information was contributed by a large number of the department's crop correspondents and by some of its special agents, who made inquiries in all of the 78 cities. The cities were divided into geographical groups for the purpose of computing averages, and these were combined into an average for the United States, all after proper weighting according to importance.

Milk was one of the commodities under investigation—a food product indispensable to a large fraction of the families of the Nation, and now a costly one to all consumers.

While it is true that the dairyman is receiving considerably more for his milk than he did before the present era of high prices, yet it was discovered in this investigation that throughout the United States he receives a scant 50 per cent, or one-half of the price paid by the consumer. The other half goes to the railway company for carriage, to the wholesale milk dealer, if there is one in the chain of distribution, and to the retailer who delivers at the consumer's door.

Freight charges for carrying milk vary according to distance, but their average may be regarded as approximately about 7 per cent of the consumer's price. With the farmer receiving about 50 per cent of that price and the railroads 7 per cent, the remaining 43 per cent of the consumer's price is received mostly by the retailer.

The milk wagon of the retailer has a long route. It stops at a house or two in one city block, perhaps passes several blocks without stopping, and so proceeds to serve customers thinly distributed along a route of miles. At the same time the milk wagons of other retailers are covering various portions of the same route, and so there is a great waste of effort and of expense in the distribution.

The division of States in which the cost of distributing milk from producer to consumer is the most is the North Central group, in which producers receive 44 per cent of the prices paid by the consumer. Next in order follow the Western States with 47 per cent, the North Atlantic States with 53 per cent, the South Central States with 55 per cent, and the South Atlantic States with 57 per cent.

The average price paid by consumers in the 78 cities is almost exactly 8 cents per quart. In the North Atlantic and North Central States the average is 7.5 cents; in the Western States, 8.9 cents; in the South Central, 9.1 cents; and in the South Atlantic States, 9.3 cents. These prices are for the last week in June, 1910.

BUTTER AND THE RETAILER.

Factory butter was included in this investigation of prices, in the three classes of creamery print, creamery tub, and renovated. Consumer's prices were taken in 78 cities in all parts of the country, and the facts were ascertained in the latter part of June, 1910.

In the distribution of creamery butter from factory to consumer the ultimate price includes the railway charge for transportation and the retailer's addition. The freight charge is about 0.6 of 1 per cent of the consumer's price.

As a general average for the 78 cities, the creamery receives 86.3 per cent of the consumer's price for creamery prints. The percentages are nearly the same in all geographic divisions, the lowest, 84.6 per cent, being found in the Western States, and the highest, 87.5 per cent, in the South Atlantic States.

In the case of creamery tub butter, the factories receive 86.5 per cent of the consumer's price in the 78 cities, the Western States again having the lowest percentage, 84.6 per cent. The highest percentage is 88 for the South Central States, and in the other divisions the percentage is between 86 and 87.

Factories that renovate butter receive a somewhat larger percentage of the consumer's price than in the case of creamery prints and tub butter. The average for the 78 cities is 88.3 per cent, with inconsiderable variations among the geographic divisions of the country.

EXHAUSTIVE INVESTIGATIONS.

The increase of price of farm products in their transfer from producer to consumer was thoroughly investigated in all parts of the country and for a large variety of products by the Industrial Commission. Although the facts obtained in that investigation are now about 10 years old, it is believed that the ratios between producer's and consumer's prices are approximately the same now as they were then. At any rate, it seems probable that the farmer is not now receiving a larger share of the consumer's price than he received 10 years ago, and he may be receiving a smaller share.

POULTRY.

Within the field of investigation it was found that poultry almost doubled in price between the farmer and the consumer; in other words, the farmer received only 55.1 per cent of the consumer's price. Inquiries were made concerning turkeys as distinct from other poultry, with the result that it was found that the farmers received 63.5 per cent of the final price. Chickens as a separate description are represented by the percentage of 68.4 when priced by the pound, and by 57.1 per cent when priced by the head.

Of the price per dozen paid by the consumer, the producer received 69 per cent in the case of eggs; dried beans, 75 per cent when bought by the bushel; cabbage, 48.1 per cent when bought by the head and 64.9 per cent when bought by the pound; cauliflower, 75 per cent when bought by the dozen; and celery, 60 per cent when bought by the bunch.

THE SMALLER THE RETAIL UNIT, THE LESS THE FARMER RECEIVES.

The general fact was that the producer's percentage of the consumer's price diminished as the quantity sold at retail was smaller. For instance, the apple grower received 55.6 per cent of the consumer's price when the consumer bought by the bushel and 66 per cent when the purchase was by the barrel. When the consumer bought corn by the bushel the farmer got 70.6 per cent of the price, but when the purchase was by the barrel the farmer received 81 per cent. The strawberry grower received 48.9 per cent of the consumer's price in purchases by the quart and 75.9 per cent in purchases by the crate. A still better illustration is found in the case of onions. In purchasing a peck at a time, the farmer received 27.8 per cent of the retail price; in purchases of a barrel, he received 58.3 per cent; and in purchases by the 100 pounds, he received 69 per cent. So in the case of oranges; when the purchase was by the dozen the grower received 20.3 per cent of the consumer's price, whereas when the purchase was by the box the grower received 59.3 per cent.

FACTS FOR MANY PRODUCTS.

Farmers received 83.3 per cent of the final price in the retail purchase of blackberries by the crate, 75 per cent in the purchase of cucumbers by the third of a bushel, 66.7 per cent in the purchase of eggplant by the crate, 60 per cent in the purchase of green peas by the quart, 70.5 per cent when hay was bought by the ton, and 82.2 per cent in the purchase of horses from retailers.

Among the many other products represented in this list are oats, with 73.6 per cent of the price going to the farmer when bought by the bushel; melons, 50 per cent when bought by the pound; parsnips, 60 per cent when bought by the bunch; potatoes, 59.3 per cent when bought by the bushel; string beans, 80 per cent when bought by the barrel; sweet potatoes, 60.8 per cent when bought by the barrel; turnips, 60 per cent in purchases by the bunch; watermelons, 33.5 per cent when bought singly.

In some cases there were purchasers from the farmer who were middlemen. It was found that cotton growers received 93 per cent of the price paid by cotton manufacturers for the raw cotton; 84.1 per cent of the price of broom corn paid by the broom manufacturers; 80 per cent of the price of calves and 91 per cent of the price of cattle paid by packers; 93 per cent of the price of hogs and 74.2 per cent of the price of lambs paid by packers; 87 per cent of the price of tobacco paid by the hogshead and 92.2 per cent when bought by the pound by manufacturers; 72.9 per cent in the case of wheat bought by millers; and 91.7 per cent in the case of wool bought by manufacturers.

FREIGHT CHARGES.

To the foregoing percentages that represent the share of the farmer in the consumer's price should be added the percentage standing for the freight charge in determining the share of the consumer's price that goes to the middlemen. With approximate accuracy it has been determined that when the farmer received 50 per cent of the consumer's price, the freight charge on butter is about 0.5 of 1 per cent of the consumer's price; eggs, 0.6 of 1 per cent; apples, 6.8 per cent; beans, 2.4 per cent; potatoes, 7.4 per cent; grain of all sorts, 3.8 per cent; hay, 7.9 per cent; cattle and hogs, 1.2 per cent; live poultry, 2.2 per cent; wool, 0.3 of 1 per cent. The foregoing allowances for freight are to be increased by one-half when the farmer receives about three-fourths of the consumer's price.

COFFEE PRICES.

The import statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor afford some striking comparisons between the original value and consumer's price. In the fiscal year 1910 four-fifths of the coffee imported into the United States came from Brazil, 17 per cent from other countries in South and Central America and from Mexico, so that 97.2 per cent of the imports were from Mexico and Central and South America. About 0.1 of 1 per cent of the coffee imports are from Aden and are the nominal Mocha coffee, and 1.3 per cent of the imports are from the East Indies and are the Java coffee.

In 1910 the coffee imported from American countries, which was 97.2 per cent of all coffee imports, had an import value of 7.8 cents per pound. To this should be added the ocean freight rate. From Rio Janeiro the rate is 0.28 of 1 cent, or about one-fourth of a cent per pound. For nearly all of this American coffee the consumers paid prices ranging from 20 to 35 cents per pound. In other words, the import value, plus the ocean freight charge, is only from 23 to 40 per cent of the principal range of prices paid for the coffee at retail.

PRICES PAID FOR TEA.

Tea may be referred to in the same way. In the fiscal year 1910 the average import value of tea was 16 cents per pound. It is assumed that nearly all of the tea consumed in this country is bought at retail prices ranging from 50 to 70 cents per pound, and, with this understanding, the import value of tea is from 23 per cent to 32 per cent of what the consumer pays.

CONSUMER'S PRICE AS AN INCREASE OF FARMER'S PRICE—PRICE GAINS FROM ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW.

In the consideration of this subject so far the aspect has been that of the producer; the farmer thinks of the price that the consumer pays for farm products and compares with them the price that he himself receives.

While the farmer is looking forward with regard to the prices of his products, the consumer is looking backard, and so regards the prices that he pays as increases upon what the farmer gets. This aspect of the matter may now be worth some attention.

It is established by the investigation of this department made last June that the milk consumers of 78 cities paid for milk an increase of 100.8 per cent above the price received by dairymen; in other words, the farmer's price was fully doubled. The lowest increase among the geographic divisions was 75.5 per cent in the South Atlantic States and the highest was 111.9 per cent in the Western States.

In the purchase of butter the consumer pays 15.8 per cent above the factory price in the case of creamery prints, 15.6 per cent above in the case of factory tub, and 13.3 per cent above the factory price in the case of renovated butter. The percentages of increase among the five divisions of States do not vary much from the averages for the United States.

Some large percentages of increase of prices were found by the Industrial Commission—135.3 per cent for cabbage bought by the head; 100 per cent for melons bought by the pound, for buttermilk sold by the quart, and for oranges sold by the crate; 260 per cent for onions bought by the peck; 400.4 per cent for oranges bought by the dozen; 111.1 per cent for strawberries bought by the quart; and 200 per cent for watermelons sold singly.

There were many cases of increase of consumer's price over farmer's price amounting to 75 per cent and over, but under 100 per cent, and among these were 90.5 per cent for apples bought by the barrel and 80.6 per cent for apples bought by the box; 75 per cent for chickens bought by the head; 83.4 per cent for onions bought by the pound; 80.5 per cent for potatoes bought by the bushel; 88.8 per cent for poultry, in general, bought by the pound; 95.8 per cent for strawberries bought by the box; 82.5 per cent for sweet potatoes bought by the bushel.

It may be worth while to extend the list of farm products that are sold to consumers at a large increase above farm prices. In the class of commodities selling for an increase of price amounting to 50 per cent and over but under 75 per cent above farm prices may be mentioned the following increases: 61.8 per cent for cabbage bought by the pound; 66.7 per cent for celery bought by the bunch,

turnips and parsnips bought by the bunch, and green peas bought by the quart; 54.4 per cent for chickens bought by the pound; 50 per cent for eggplants bought by the crate; 68.4 per cent for onions bought by the bushel; 68.7 per cent for oranges bought by the box; 60 per cent for potatoes bought by the peck; 59.8 per cent for turkeys bought by the pound.

The import price of coffee in the fiscal year 1910, which was 8 cents a pound, after the increase to 20 and 35 cents per pound to the retailer, has risen in price to the consumer from 150 to 337.5 per cent. So with tea of the same fiscal year; its import price of 16 cents per pound, after being increased to 50 to 70 cents per pound, cost the consumer an advance of 212.55 to 337.5 per cent.

Before assigning to middlemen the various increases of prices, it is proper to deduct the percentages due to freight rates. The freight charge for milk received in New York is about 18 per cent of the producer's price and in Chicago about 14.7 per cent. Of the import price of coffee, the ocean freight charge from Rio Janeiro is 3.6 per cent. The percentages of farm price for which freight charges stand in the United States may be estimated at approximately 0.9 of 1 per cent of the factory price for butter; 1.2 per cent of the farm price for clover seed; 1.6 per cent for cotton; 1.3 per cent for eggs; 13.6 per cent for apples; 4.8 per cent for beans; 14.8 per cent for potatoes; and 5 per cent for sweet potatoes. The rates for oats, rye, barley, and wheat are nearly the same, ranging from 6 per cent for oats to 7.3 per cent for barley and rye. The rate for corn is 9.2 per cent and the average for all grain is 7.7 per cent. For hay the percentage is 15.8 per cent; for cattle and hogs, 2.5 per cent; for live poultry, 4.5 per cent; and for wool, 0.6 of 1 per cent.

NO GROUND FOR COMPLAINT AGAINST THE FARMER.

From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays. The farmer supplies the capital for production and takes the risk of his losses; his crops are at the mercy of drought and flood and heat and frost, to say nothing of noxious insects and blighting diseases. He supplies hard, exacting, unremitting labor. A degree and range of information and intelligence are demanded by agriculture which are hardly equaled in any other occupation. Then there is the risk of overproduction and disastrously low prices. From beginning to end the farmer must steer dextrously to escape perils to his profits and, indeed, to his capital on every hand. At last the products are started on their way to the consumer. The railroad, generally speaking, adds a percentage of increase to the farmer's prices that is not large. After delivery by the railroad the products are stored a short time, are measured into the various retail quantities—more or less small—and the dealers are rid of them as soon as possible. The dealers have risks that are practically small, except credit sales and such risks as grow out of their trying to do an amount of business which is small as compared with their number.

PROBLEM FOR CONSUMERS AND NOT FARMERS TO REMEDY.

After consideration of the elements of the matter, it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroad to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment.

Why do not consumers buy directly from the farmers? A distribution of farm products in this simple way has already begun in England, where cooperative organizations of farmers are selling by direct consignment to cooperative organizations of consumers in cities.

Farmers' cooperative selling associations are numerous in this country, but cooperative buying associations among the people of cities and towns are few. Aside from buying associations maintained by farmers, hardly any exist in this country. It is apparent, therefore, that the consumer has much to do to work out his own salvation with regard to the prices that he pays. Potatoes were selling last spring in some places where there had been overproduction for 20 cents and in some places for even 9 cents per bushel at the farm, while at the same time city consumers in the East were paying 50 to 75 cents per bushel, although there was nothing to prevent them from combining to buy a carload or more of potatoes directly from the grower and for delivery directly to themselves.

POPULATION, CROP YIELDS, AND PRICES—PRODUCTION PER ACRE OVERTAKING INCREASE OF PEOPLE—IMMIGRATION AND BIRTH RATE.

The population of the United States has increased rapidly in the past. Our doors have always stood open to immigrants from other lands. Our ancestors had large families. Our numbers have increased one-third every 10 years until 1880, and afterwards one-fourth to one-fifth. Our expanding farm area has easily provided sustenance for our increasing numbers. But with the filling up of our unoccupied spaces some have begun to fear that in the near future we shall be unable to provide all our food from our own fields. Population increases; yields decrease (so it is said), and the time is at hand when we shall have to import foodstuffs; our economic independence will then be gone.

Immigration, however, is not to be counted upon permanently to furnish any considerable annual increase in our numbers. Three-fourths of a million may enter our ports in one year; but the very next year may see a financial depression, with the tide of emigration setting away from our shores. Only the birth rate may be counted upon as a permanent force acting toward increasing the population; and the increase of the native-born population by excess of births over deaths in this country is only about 1¼ per cent a year, with a tendency toward a decreasing birth rate.

The great question, then, is this: Are the products of our agricultural lands increasing or decreasing in quantity? Is the yield per acre of our fields keeping pace with this normal increase of population by births? To the latter question the answer is that the process has begun.

RISING YIELDS PER ACRE.

Dividing the period from 1866 to 1909 into four decades and a succeeding short period of four years, the yield per acre of corn is shown by a study made in the Bureau of Statistics to have declined 2.3 per cent from the first decade to the second, declined 8.2 per cent from the second to the third, increased 7.7 per cent from the third to the fourth, and increased 7.1 per cent from the fourth decade to the succeeding four-year period.

For wheat an even better showing is made, since the figures show a continuous increase in yield per acre, namely, 3.4 per cent from first decade to second, 3.3 from second to third, 6.3 from third to fourth, and 9.6 from fourth decade to final four-year period.

For cotton, the first figure, 2.8, is a decline, but the rest are increases, namely, 2.6, 3.8, and 0.3.

For tobacco, the first figure, 3.4, is an increase; the second, 2.0, is a decline; the third, 5.2, is an increase; and so also is the last, 9.7.

Similar facts are shown for 6 other leading crops, namely, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, hay, and potatoes. Not one of the 10 crops named declined in yield per acre from the third decade to the fourth, while oats was the only one to show a decline from the fourth decade to the last period of four years. The evidence is very plain that the yields per acre of our crops are now increasing, and if the facts were assembled in detail for the States it would be found that the percentage of increase in yield in many of them is greater than the percentage of normal increase in population; that is, the increase by births over deaths in the old native element.

Such is the fact with regard to wheat for the fourth decade, as compared with the preceding one, in 26 States, and 2 of the States are all but ready to joint them. In 14 States corn production per acre has increased faster than the normal increase of population, and this is almost true of 5 more States. The number of States in this list in the case of barley is 21; rye, 30; buckwheat, 19; cotton, 3; potatoes, 24; hay, 35; and more or less States are almost ready to enter this list in the case of all crops.

A demand that is more difficult to fulfill in production per acre is for an increase that equals or exceeds the actual increase of population, including the immigrants and the temporarily high birth rate of the foreign born. But, notwithstanding the fact that this difficulty is greater in the United States than it is in all other countries that have practically ceased to take much new land into cultivation, many of the States of this Nation are each maintaining an increase of production in the case of one or more prominent crops that is greater than the actual increase of population. Ten States are doing this in the case of corn; for wheat the number is 22; for oats, 16; for cotton and tobacco, 1 each; for rye, 21; for potatoes, 15; and for hay, 25.

We can not look for any other result than that the yields per acre of all our crops shall increase at an even faster rate in the future, in view of the intense interest with which our people are turning their attention toward agricultural improvement. If there are certain forces at work which, if unchecked and made more prevalent, will in the future compel us to bid against the world for food, the counteracting forces have nevertheless been already set in motion, with the promise of increasing effect.

INCOME PER ACRE.

The farmer has benefited more than others from the changed conditions which have manifested themselves in increased cost of living. For instance, the product of 1 acre of corn in 1899 was worth on the farm $8.51, but 10 years later it was worth $15.20, an increase in farm value amounting to 78.6 per cent. Similarly, wheat increased in farm value 114 per cent, tobacco 56.2 per cent, and cotton 65.6 per cent. Ten leading crops taken together—including, besides those mentioned, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, and hay—increased 72.7 per cent in farm value.

This, of course, is no advantage to the farmer if the increase in price of the things he has to buy is still greater. To ascertain the facts in this matter, the Bureau of Statistics sent a letter to a large number of retail dealers doing business with farmers. These dealers were asked to quote the prices which prevailed in 1899 and in 1909, taking care to compare articles of the same grades. In this way the percentage of increase in the prices of about 85 articles commonly used by farmers was determined.

In three cases the prices were less in 1909 than in 1899; in four cases they were the same; but in all other cases they had increased, the increases running from 2.7 per cent in the case of manure spreaders and mowers to 53.8 per cent in the case of brooms. Coffee increased 9.8 per cent; flour, 32.4; salt, 14.9; sugar, 8.7; overalls, 22.9; rubber boots, 29; calico, 26.9; muslin, 25; and so on. For all the articles considered the average increase was 12.1 per cent.

Now, compare this with the 72.7 per cent increase in the farm value of the 10 leading crops. The farmer has evidently benefited more than the rest of the community—taken all together—from the changes in values.

Put the facts in another way. The produce of 1 acre of corn was equal in value to 1.8 barrels of flour in 1899, but to 2.4 barrels in 1909; or it would buy 118.2 yards of muslin in 1899 and 168.9 yards in 1909. The average purchasing power of all crops similarly increased from 2 barrels of flour in 1899 to 2.6 barrels in 1909, and from 132.1 yards of muslin in 1899 to 182.4 yards in 1909. And so with the whole list of articles used by farmers.

The facts may also be put in the form of percentages by letting 100 represent the purchasing power of 1 acre of farm crops in 1899. Then, in 1909 the purchasing power of 1 acre of corn is seen to have increased 90 per cent when spent for coal oil, 62 for coffee, 33 for flour, and 64 for sugar. Now, take the average purchasing power of all crops. It increased 83 per cent when spent for coal oil, 57 for coffee, 30 for flour, 59 for sugar, and so on down the list. Taking the average of all articles, corn increased 60 per cent in purchasing power, wheat 91, and cotton 48, while the grand average increase in purchasing power of all crops is 54 per cent. In other words, the farmer has received a 54 per cent benefit from the changed conditions.

No one can pretend to understand all the forces at work in these matters. Possibly the farmer's present advantage is due, in part, to temporary conditions of supply and demand that may change to his disadvantage. If it is also due, in part, to a greater appreciation of the value of the farmer's work, that, too, is something upon which no calculations can be based.

But there is no sort of doubt that a great part of the farmer's prosperity rests upon the bedrock of a greater output, a higher yield per acre. That is to say, farmers and farming have become more efficient, not only to the benefit of the farmer himself but also to the safeguarding of our national independence. The wisdom of Congress in aiding agriculture in the past, through the Federal Department and the State colleges and experiment stations, as well as the advisability of giving even greater fostering attention in the future to our most fundamental industry, is thus made plainly manifest.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Alabama, my friend Judge CLAYTON, who first addressed the House this morning, I am extremely gratified that there is so large and intelligent an audience here at this time. [Laughter and applause.]

I think that fact is perhaps occasioned by reason of some one having given out the information that I was to endeavor at this time to make a speech upon this bill, and it being about the usual lunch hour the pangs of hunger may have overcome in the minds of many of the Members the thirst for intellectual entertainment. [Applause.] I regret exceedingly, under the circumstances, that I have not any carefully prepared remarks for this occasion, and I do not know that it will be possible for me to add anything of interest to the discussion that has been going on in this House for the past two weeks upon this bill, and I do not know whether we are any of us being enlightened so very much ourselves, or whether we are enlightening the country at all upon the tariff question. It is not an entirely new question, and yet it seems that an academic discussion of the principle of protection as opposed to the principle of free trade is now on the boards as of old, and must, from the necessities of the times and the political conditions prevailing, again demand our attention and the attention of the country. The President of the United States, under the authority given him by the Constitution and with the highest and purest motives of duty and patriotism, called this Congress together for a single purpose; and that purpose was to pass upon the trade agreement that under his direction had been tentatively made with the Dominion of Canada. It seems to me that it would have been wise if this Congress, under the circumstances, had foregone the opportunity to play politics and had disposed of that one question and adjourned and gone home. I know that course would have been for the benefit of all the people of the country, and I think would have commanded their unanimous approval. This running amuck with the business interests of the country is what might have been expected from past experience and past history when the Democratic Party has been in control of this House, and, so far as I have observed in the past, that course has never led to anything of advantage to the people of this country. So far as the reciprocity agreement, or the bill carrying that agreement into effect, was concerned, I can easily see how the Democrats might differ among themselves as to the policy of that bill, and I can also see how some Republicans might favor it and how some might not. For myself, I believe, and have long believed, in the principle of reciprocity and in reciprocal trade agreements with other nations.

I believe that when we open up our markets to the other countries of the world, we ought by some sort of reciprocal arrangement, to get some benefit ourselves for so doing [applause], some equivalent for what we give; and I am eternally opposed to the Democratic doctrine of free trade, because I believe most emphatically in American markets for Americans. [Applause.] I believe in protection to all American industries and to American labor, and that our own people should have the preference in our own markets at all times, and that if we yield anything as to that policy, we ought to get an equivalent for it. I believe that the agreement which this House, so far as it is concerned, has ratified with the Dominion of Canada will, if consummated, be to the material benefit of both countries. I do not believe that it will injure the farmers of this country or any class of our people. If I did so believe, I would not be in favor of it. I have some interests myself connected with the farming industry, and I represent here a great agricultural district, one of the greatest in the United States; and I fully and firmly believe that the interests of the agricultural population of my district will be materially benefited by the consummation of this Canadian reciprocity agreement. At the same time, I realize that I also represent other industries than that of agriculture alone, for that district is also one of the greatest manufacturing districts of the country, and has within its boundaries substantially every manufacturing industry that exists in the land, and substantially every item in the Canadian reciprocity bill, and every item in this free list or free-trade bill, is produced to a greater or less extent in my district. We there manufacture each year, millions of dollars worth of agricultural machinery and implements, sewing machines, and fence wire, besides pretty nearly everything else that can be manufactured or produced in this country. I regret that my distinguished and eloquent friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] should have seen fit to characterize the reciprocity agreement as an indication of the desire of the people of this country to be annexed to Canada, or for Canada to be annexed to the United States, whichever way you choose to put it, because there is just as much danger in the one case as in the other. [Laughter and applause.]

Also my genial friend and colleague from Chicago, Mr. MADDEN, had something to say about Canadian annexation and the flag of this Union floating all the way from the Great Lakes to the North Pole, discovered by Dr. Cook. [Laughter and applause.] Now, I want to assure both of my colleagues that I do not think there is any danger of Canadian annexation or any intention whatever or any desire on the part of the people of this country for annexation at any time in the future, and I do not think it will come until long years after our enthusiastic friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has fought to a finish his fight with Japan and wiped the Mikado and all his subjects from off the face of the earth, or off from the waters of the sea, whichever it may be. [Laughter and applause.] The time may come, and I am not sure but what it will come, when the dominions to the north of us will constitute an independent republic and when a new flag of freedom will float over all that great land from our northern border to the frozen seas of the north. That time, I say, may come, but annexation never, and all this talk of annexation is nothing more nor less than sensational bosh. The people of Canada are our friends; we have no designs upon their Government or their territory but to wish them well. Our relations can never be anything but friendly, and commercial reciprocity between Canada and the United States is in accordance with natural law and can only result for the good of the people there and here. Who would claim for a moment that unrestricted trade between our great grain-producing States in the Northwest and the other States of the Union is to the detriment of the other States. If it were possible that Minnesota and the Dakotas and Montana might be separated from the United States, and if we had a tariff barrier against their products, their grain, and their cattle, would either we or they be better off? Manifestly not. This reciprocity agreement only applies to a limited extent the same rules as to exchange of products with Canada that we now have between the several States. I would, if I could, wipe out all the trade barriers between Canada and the United States and have unrestricted trade in all the products of the soil and in all manufactures and all commodities of every name and kind the same as we have here between the several States. To my understanding, reciprocity is the natural sequence to the Republican policy of protection, and the two should go hand in hand together. Reciprocity was advocated by Blaine and McKinley and the other great Republican leaders of the past. If the Democratic Party have now taken it up, they have simply followed the wisdom of past Republican leaders and adopted past Republican platforms.

The Democratic majority in this House seem to now have taken up this doctrine of reciprocity and are supporting it with great enthusiasm. As I have read the Democratic platforms in the past I have understood that that party claimed always that all protection was robbery, and that reciprocity was only another name for protection. That that has been the doctrine of the Democratic Party, and is to-day the real belief of many of its leaders is confirmed by the speeches we have heard from that side of the House from day to day in support of the bill now pending. Let us stop and consider for a moment how wholly inconsistent the Canadian reciprocity measure is with the free-trade bill now under consideration. For, call it a farmers' free-list bill or whatever you will, this bill now under consideration is nothing more nor less than an absolute free-trade measure. There is no protection in it for any industry, and there is no reciprocity in it. In effect, the Democratic Party in this House are now saying to Canada, we have passed the reciprocity bill, but you need not ratify it there because we propose to give you more than you ask by subsequent bills and to ask nothing from you in return. That is to say, we will put on the free list, not only as to Canada, but as to all the countries of the earth, the very articles upon which we have just ratified a reciprocal arrangement for mutual duties. What consistency can there be in ratifying an agreement with Canada which fixes a certain rate of duty upon meats, agricultural implements and other commodities, reciprocal as to each country, and then before that agreement becomes effective, follow up immediately with a free-trade bill proposing to put those same things on the free list without any concessions whatever from the other contracting party. Is not this the height of Democratic inconsistency? Are you simply using this reciprocity measure, proposed by a Republican President, for the sole and only purpose of making political capital and for the purpose of having that agreement not ratified by Canada, because, if your policy prevails, they can then have our markets free without any concession whatever? Now, I thought awhile ago, and I do not know but I said once upon the floor of this House, that I believed it would be a good idea when the tariff was revised, that it might be revised schedule by schedule and one thing at a time. I have changed my mind about that. This bill shows how such a policy would work, and it is very much like cutting off the dog's head by commencing at his tail

and cutting off an inch at a time. This bill shows an intention on the part of the Democratic majority in this House to ruin certain industries one at a time, and to put certain articles a few at a time upon the free list without any protection whatever, and then to follow it up with some other articles one at a time, until the doctrine of free trade is universally established as the policy of the country and the policy of protection is gone forever.

My learned friend, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Judge CLAYTON, this morning said very truly that the line of demarcation between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party was never more clearly drawn than it is to-day; that the Republican Party was the party of protection and the Democratic Party for free trade or tariff for revenue only. That is absolutely true. No man with a drop of Republican blood in his veins can justify himself in voting for this free-trade measure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This bill, it will be observed, is a free-trade bill, pure and simple—at least simple. It is not even a "tariff-for-revenue-only" bill. It never could produce any revenue whatever for the Government, because it does not propose to reduce the rates of duty, but to admit all the articles mentioned absolutely free of duty. Under the Dingley law the duty on sewing machines was 45 per cent; the Payne law reduced this duty to 30 per cent. This bill puts sewing machines on the free list, not to permit competition with foreign-made machines, but to give an actual advantage to the foreign manufacturer, and thus seriously handicap, if not entirely ruin, a great home industry. Substantially, the same is true as to the shoe and leather industry. Why, in the name of reason, if our Democratic friends consider the duties too high, do they not propose to reduce them to what they consider a revenue basis, rather than deprive the Government of all revenue and the home industry of all protection?

That is the proposition before us to-day. That is the proposition upon which both political parties are to go before the country. It is the policy of protection to American industry and American labor on the one hand, that has made this country the most prosperous upon the face of the earth, or, on the other hand, it is the policy that has always brought stagnation in business and ruin and desolation to our people, the policy of Democratic free trade. It is proved now, so that there can be no misunderstanding about it, that the Democratic Party of to-day, as it always has been in the past, is a party of free trade; that if it was in power in all of the departments of Government, and could do so, it would level every customhouse in the land, and allow all foreign products to enter and compete in our home markets in competition with our own people and without requiring any tariff tax or payment of any kind for that great privilege.

Oh, my Democratic friends, when the people of this country understand your purpose, when they understand that that is the doctrine you are advocating piece by piece, they will again relegate you to the rear, and they will again reinstate in all the departments of this Government that party that has made this country the most progressive and the most prosperous upon the face of the earth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Let me cite you to one little thing—a little joker, so to speak—they put in this so-called farmers' free-list bill. I wonder why they call it a farmers' free-list bill. Have you done some injury to the farmer for which you propose to recompense him? You seem at least to not have done or proposed anything that by any possibility could injure any farmers south of Mason and Dixon's line. I observe that you do not put rice and peanuts and oranges and pineapples and other products of the South upon the free list, but instead, in order to fool the people, you pick out here and there some industry in the Northern States, not in the South, that you think it safe to attack, and say "If we can pass that and wipe that industry out of existence every section of the country interested in that industry will join us and demand the same treatment for such other industries as we may wish to attack." Among the items selected and put upon the free list in this bill is sewing machines. I wonder why you put sewing machines upon the free list in this bill and why this one industry was selected for your attack. I presume it is probably true that there is not a sewing-machine factory in the entire South and consequently you will find no opposition in that section of the country to free trade in sewing machines, but why did you not propose to put all other kindred machines, such as typewriters, knitting machines, and everything else of that same nature upon the free list also by this bill? True, there are not many sewing-machine factories in this country, very few of them. Perhaps you thought you would not antagonize very many localities by singling out sewing machines for your attack.

Now, it so happens, Mr. Chairman, that I come from a little town in the State of Illinois that is known far and near as the sewing-machine town. The little city of Belvidere, with a population of between seven and eight thousand people, has one of the largest independent sewing-machine factories in this country. The National Sewing Machine Co. in that town employs on an average probably a thousand men, and is the support of at least one-half the entire population of that little city; and under this bill you propose to put sewing machines on the free list without any reason whatever being given for so doing, so far as I can understand.

I do not understand that there is any such thing as a sewing-machine trust in this country. I know that the company in my town is not connected with any trust or any other company anywhere in the world. It is an independent factory, doing a large and fairly profitable business, although the profit on each sewing machine made, under the competition that exists, is so small as to be a mere trifle. There is one large sewing machine concern known as the Singer Co., and sometimes called the sewing-machine trust, although I do not understand that it is a trust or that it has connection with subsidiary concerns; but that great company probably manufactures more than 60 per cent of all the sewing machines made in the world. It has factories in several places in the United States. It has factories in Canada and in Scotland, and, I think, in other countries of Europe. It would not be affected at all by placing sewing machines upon the free list, because it could manufacture the same machines in its factories abroad with cheap foreign labor and send those machines into this country free of duty and at prices that would crush out absolutely every independent sewing-machine concern in the land. There is but one other country, under present conditions, that could compete with us in the manufacture of sewing machines, and that is Germany. I understand that sewing machines are manufactured there on a large scale and that labor is very much cheaper than it is here, and without any tariff protection they could send their machines into the United States duty free and crush out of existence every sewing-machine company in the land except the Singer Co., which would be their only competitor, and all that, too, without making sewing machines any cheaper to the purchaser than they are to-day; and that is what would happen should this bill become a law in its present form—if our Democratic friends succeed in getting it passed and upon the statute books, which I do not believe they even hope to do. There is very little profit in sewing machines now made by these independent concerns in competition with the Singer Co. The independent concerns sell their machines to dealers, and they are again sold at very low prices. If you will take up a catalogue of one of the great department stores or mail-order houses, you will find there the prices at which such sewing machines as are made in my district are sold. Two of the largest mail-order houses, perhaps, are in Chicago, namely, Montgomery Ward & Co. and Sears, Roebuck & Co. If you will examine their catalogues, you will find that you can buy a first-class sewing machine at retail at from $8 to $21, and the machine, Mr. Chairman, that is sold by these houses at retail to-day for $8 is as good a machine in every respect as my mother paid $100 for when I was a boy. If you want a fancy piece of furniture in addition to the sewing machine, you can pay as high as $21 to one of these concerns for such a machine.

The Singer Co. does business on entirely a different plan. They sell their machines through agents all over the country and on time, with payments of from 50 cents a week to a dollar a month, or something of that kind. They have great capital and can afford to do business in that way, and thereby they get higher prices for their machines. It would not affect that company a particle to put sewing machines on the free list, but it would crush out absolutely the one great industry of my town and county and throw out of employment in that little town a thousand men, while half the people of the town would be deprived of a livelihood and forced to seek other employment. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is only one example of what our Democratic friends are proposing to do by the passage of this bill. It is only one industry that is picked out for attack, but if we are to believe what they tell us it is to be followed up by attacking other industries, one at a time, all along the line, until no vestige of protection shall be left and until foreign countries may send their manufactured products into the United States without let or hindrance in competition with our own industries, and thereby force out of employment our own people, who are now the best-paid laboring people in the world. Is that what we want? They tell us in the report on this so-called farmers' free list bill that its passage would reduce the revenues of the Government something over $10,000,000 a year, and, Mr. Chairman, the revenue we should lose is nothing compared

to the greater injury that would necessarily follow. Ten million dollars' reduction in the revenues of the country is, of course, no small item, but we could stand that if it were not for the fact that under the free-trade provisions of this bill hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of manufactured products from abroad each year, made by the cheap labor of other countries, would come into the United States in competition with our own industries, and that just so much less would be manufactured in our own factories and by our own people, so that necessarily thousands and hundreds of thousands of laborers who are dependent upon the success of American industries and American factories would be forced to seek other employment or to accept a very great reduction in wages, and possibly both. That is what the Democratic Party in this House, under its present leadership, is proposing to do to the American people. It is only a beginning, but already we can see what the effects are sure to be.

My time is almost up, and before I get through I desire to say a few words in regard to some remarks made by my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] the other day. He is honest and sincere and means what he says. He seems to think that one evil of the protective system is that it provides means whereby the Government may pay pensions to its old soldiers, and that does not seem to please him. Let me quote from what he said in his speech the other day:

> But as I said when I started out, we are not limited to a tariff tax; we can resort to other taxes, as we have resorted to other taxes. Internal revenue brings, I believe, something over $300,000,000. The corporation tax brought over $25,000,000 last year. Now, my friends, there is going to be a demand, I suppose, for the passage of a general pension bill, to increase the pensions of the soldiers, which will run into many millions of dollars. I have no criticism to make of the motives behind it. There were not enough gentlemen to get an aye-and-no vote in opposition to the bill that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] presented in the last Congress. If we are going to increase any kind of an expenditure by millions of dollars, we have got to raise revenue by millions of dollars to meet it. Now, there is going to come business stagnation.

Is that what you are working for? Is that what is proposed in the passage of this bill. Let me go on. I quote again from Mr. SIMS's speech:

> Now, there is going to come business stagnation. It will be impossible to avoid it. * * * You may just as well get ready for it.

Yes; that is what the Democratic majority of this House promises us, is it? Business stagnation. Yes; I am afraid it is going to come. I know, and every man in this House knows, that it is already on its way, as you can find by looking up the reports of business concerns all over the country to-day. The very threat that you make to take off tariff duties, to reduce the revenues, to wipe out of existence boot and shoe factories and sewing-machine factories and other industries, the very threat that you make to inaugurate your doctrine of free trade is already bringing business stagnation throughout this country. Oh, yes; if you have your way and the old soldiers are paid the pensions which they ought to be paid, we shall have to issue bonds, or shall have to increase the internal-revenue taxes, or we shall have to impose a stamp tax, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] says.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. FULLER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. SIMS. In order to have that pension law passed, if the revenues from imports are not sufficient, would you be willing to increase the internal-revenue taxes in order to do it? Would you?

Mr. FULLER. Yes; if that became necessary. I am willing to raise taxes in any way necessary or that may be possible to pay the debt we owe to the defenders of this Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor rather of raising the revenues by the indirect method of taxation upon imports, so that no man in all this country will feel that he is burdened with a tax, as he would feel it if the tax collector were to come around and ask him to plank down so much money.

Mr. SIMS. Is not the tax on whisky and on beer and on tobacco and on cigars an indirect tax?

Mr. FULLER. Certainly; it is an internal-revenue tax, levied on certain industries of this country. I am willing to increase that tax at any time when it may be necessary.

Mr. SIMS. Nobody pays it directly.

Mr. FULLER. But I say here and now that I am not willing to enter upon a period of business stagnation such as you say is sure to come for the purpose of not having revenue enough to pay the pensions that we owe to the old soldiers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman just one more question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I will ask the gentleman if he is opposed to revising any of the schedules of the tariff so as to reduce it at all, and if he would reduce it at all, would it not to some extent bring about the stagnation I have referred to?

Mr. FULLER. I will say that if you gentlemen on the other side of the House had not entered upon a filibuster upon the last day of the last session of the Sixty-first Congress, we would now have had an expert tariff commission and provision would have been made to revise the schedules of the tariff law from time to time in a scientific manner so as not to interfere with any of the industries of this country. That is what I am in favor of. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am not in favor of firing in here a bill of this kind that has never even been considered in committee and where there are no figures or statistics to support it. I am not in favor, simply to play politics, of picking out one little industry here and there, such as exists in my town, and say we will wipe that out and tell the people of this country how we are revising the tariff downward in the interest of the people. If you want to revise the tariff, go at it systematically and act upon some consistent and definite theory. I want to say to you now that I am opposed forever to what you call a revenue tariff or a free-trade tariff. I am not opposed to revising the schedules whenever they need revision, so as to equalize duties upon all products and treat all industries, all classes, and all sections of this country alike. I am in favor of just such a tariff as we have had heretofore. Just such a tariff as has built up the industries of this country and made us what we are to-day, and I agree most emphatically with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] that the line is drawn so that no man claiming to be a Republican can for one moment think of joining in this policy of destruction that you gentlemen on the Democratic side of this House are now proposing. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, this is a great question which has been thrashed out time and again and will be discussed time and again in the future. There is a great deal of information yet to be had upon the question that we do not now have. I do not say that I am not in favor of revising certain schedules of the tariff and reducing the tariff upon certain articles, or of adjusting the tariff from time to time according to just and proper conditions. But I do insist that at all times when revision is made, it shall be scientifically done, and so as to not unjustly injure any American industry. I desire to see a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission, but at the same time I will never, while I live, consent to the passage of any bill upon the tariff question that does not maintain the principle of protection to American industries and American labor. I am unalterably and forever opposed to the doctrine of free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.] That doctrine which, whenever and wherever tried, has brought about stagnation in business, closed factories, made idle laboring men, hard times, ruin, and desolation. This is what the Democratic Party offers us now. I prefer the Republican doctrine of protection, that has always given us prosperity, employment, and good wages, prosperous farms and factories, and millions of happy homes. It is a good time for all Republicans to get back to the solid foundation of reason and common sense. [Applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, for some days we have listened with great interest to the discussion of what has been denominated a "farmers' tariff bill," and it has not all been wasted effort, even though Carlyle declared "Silence is the eternal duty of man," and that "England and America are going to nothing but wind and tongue." There has been every courtesy, as well as "reciprocity," extended on both sides, wide apart as may be the declaimers from unanimous agreement, and instructive and pleasurable have been the discourses to audiences in the galleries, notwithstanding the fact that one authority said he "felt intensely the social misery which a single declaimer with a powerful memory, leathern lungs, and a fluent tongue may inflict on the public."

In my home town in Pennsylvania some years ago we had a Republican club, and the president of the club was an ambitious young man named Showers. The president was a great believer in the efficiency of public meetings and held them whenever he thought an audience could be drummed up. On one occasion we had there as the orator of the evening Mr. Warwick, then mayor of Philadelphia. In introducing the mayor

Mr. Showers stepped into the spot light, put his best foot forward, and said:

Ladies and gentlemen, before presenting the speaker of the evening I wish to say a word about contrasting conditions under two national administrations. Under the administration of President Harrison you saw the mills and factories booming, employment for everybody, peace and contentment everywhere, while prosperity crossed every man's dooryard and took a seat by the glowing hearthstone of everybody's home. Under the administration of Grover Cleveland you witnessed closed shops and forges, smokeless stacks, an empty Federal Treasury, and honorable citizenship driven into the street without work, almshouses filled, soupkouses overflowing, and gloom and despair written across the horizon with every setting sun. Now, which do you prefer? I think not.

[Laughter and applause.]

To-day, after weighing what I have heard on both sides of this "phony" bill, like Mr. Showers, I am constrained to say concerning this measure, I think not. And while a poet has seen fit to refer to oratory as merely "mouthfuls of spoken wind," it may be nearly so in estimating or measuring results, since a distinguished Member on the Democratic side has given notice by stronger assertion than mere inference or innuendo that this bill is a Democratic campaign document and a little political joker. This measure provides for a reduced tariff, and, of course, reduced revenue must follow, and it must also be a fact that every manufactured article imported from another country displaces that much production and labor in this country and sends the cost price in gold abroad.

After hearing what I have on both sides of this, I do not believe that the Democrats themselves regard it as the kind of a bill they would want to pass if they felt that it would be enacted. Having had notice that it is not to pass, I am not reflecting upon anybody's intelligence, but I rather compliment the Democrats when I say that I look upon it as a farce and a fraud, because it is not seriously considered; and surely it is an imposition upon the people and their time and their patience and a waste of money, if it is true that it costs $10,000 an hour, for the Members of this body to discuss a bill that is not intended to be enacted into law. So, like Mr. Showers, I think not. For one, instead of going into the merits or demerits of something that has no merit, I will pass on to another phase of this question and allow this to go, as I think should have been done at the start, paying no attention whatever to it, allowing the Democrats to talk and talk away the time, without making reply from this side.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, statements are frequently made here by Members, which are carelessly made, just like the one the gentleman has made about the debate on this bill costing $10,000 an hour. We are all paid the same salary, whether Congress is in session or not. Is not the gentleman willing to modify his remark, because it conveys the idea that in sitting here and debating this bill we are wasting an enormous amount of money, when the expense would be just the same if we did not open our mouths or were not here at all?

Mr. FOCHT. The fault is not ours. We did not call the extra session. You had to make your agreement with the White House that you would pass the "reciprocity" bill. We have nothing to do with that. You are surely responsible for printing the bill and other waste.

Mr. SIMS. Whose White House is it?

Mr. FOCHT. You claim that and everything else in sight.

Mr. SIMS. Who owns the White House?

Mr. FOCHT. You act as though you did; you act as though you really had the President now. I believe you have discounted Democratic success for 20 years ahead—or at least 16—but you are entirely mistaken.

The optimism of these Democrats reminds me of the man who jumped off the thirty-second story of the Singer Building in New York. When he got down to about the fifteenth floor he cried out, "I'm all right so far," but when he landed on the sidewalk there was not enough left of him to hold a postmortem upon, and so it will be with you when you hit the sidewalk in 1912. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman repudiate his own President and no longer lay any claim to him?

Mr. FOCHT. I may regard a man a great statesman, a great lawyer, thoroughly honest, with a great heart, a genius, and yet he may not be perfect, and this may be the moment that our President has made a mistake, and I believe he has. I believe as patriotic, as intelligent, as loyal Republicans as live on the face of the earth will sustain what I say here now in the next election when I run for Congress.

Mr. FINLEY. How about President Taft when he runs?

Mr. FOCHT. Just give you full swing and there will be no trouble about a Republican majority.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman think the people will sustain the President?

Mr. FOCHT. Gentlemen on that side need not flatter themselves that they were really sent for. It was only by reason of the fact that Republicans remained away from the polls that they were elected.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman has stated that he himself will be sustained in the next election.

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. What is the opinion of the gentleman as to President Taft, when he runs for reelection?

Mr. FOCHT. Why, he will be elected, too. People will overlook a little mistake. In the main, he is all right. He is thoroughly honest, and we understand what he is doing; he is at least 99 per cent all right.

What the American people want to know is how much it is. They must see the bottom of things. As somebody stated about the graft in New York, that Tammany satisfied the reformers that it was only 5 per cent, and they said: "All right; we only want to know how much it is."

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Well, have they found out how much?

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman is from New York, is he?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. No; from New Jersey.

Mr. FOCHT. Well, you have a fine State; you issue charters for trusts there, but I understand you have been converted.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I hope we will be able to convert Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. We are the representatives of the people. We gather to confer, discuss, exchange views, and to ultimately arrive at compromise conclusions. Therefore I see no reason why, if I have a thought with respect to the policy, the prudence, and the wisdom and the statesmanship of events looking to annexation of Canada, I should not state it.

Now, do not think that this is such a far call, this question of Canadian annexation. While I have descended from a race of preachers back in the days of the Reformation and might quote scripture, and also tell you why Canada did not become a part of this Republic originally, I will refrain from introducing religious matters here since your forefathers eliminated this subject from the Declaration of Independence and from the Constitution.

There are enough people ready and willing to come over any day, and that can be done without any contest. It will be purely a commercial conquest. The fusion and amalgamation and complete assimilation of the great Anglo-Saxon race, the real Teuton, who must dominate the world, I say here, whether President Taft believes it or whether he likes it, that ultimately that will happen. It could happen as well to-morrow as in a hundred years. The fusion would be complete and serenely accomplished without conflict. Mighty few changes would have to be wrought to have us one people. There is but one point to which I referred that would seriously interfere, and that is worthy of deep consideration.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not there one necessary prerequisite to the annexation of Canada, and that is desire?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; and the desire is there.

Mr. SHERLEY. I spend from two to three months in Canada every year, and in the part that the gentleman speaks of. I have not found it so. Kipling voiced the Canadian sentiment when he said:

Daughter am I in my mother's house,
But mistress in my own.

Canada is feeling her sovereignty, and does not desire annexation.

Mr. FOCHT. No country has sovereignty that is obliged to send a treaty to a mother country for final ratification. The only country where real sovereignty resides with the people is the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. FOCHT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. There has not been an instance in the gentleman's lifetime when a matter peculiar to Canada alone has not been settled by the will of Canada.

Mr. FOCHT. I do not see what that has to do with present momentous exigencies. I want to say that in visiting Toronto I had business with the president of a large trust company. He seemed like the high-class business men, as they all are in my State—like a bank president, or a high-class merchant, or a doctor, and I might include the lawyer. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. And do not forget the newspaper profession. [Laughter.]

M. FOCHT. And, I will say, consistent newspaper editors—those who are for free print paper and against some other things. [Laughter.] I said, "My friend, you look like a good

American, a Yankee; I do not see that you are particularly marked up with the union jack." He said, "No; I know what you mean, and that would have happened by this time had it not been that in the McKinley tariff bill you cut off our market for barley, and that incensed our people, and not only the people who raise the barley, but the great financial interests who had to help find a market and an outlet for that great product; and since then we have not warmed up very much on the question of annexation." But, Mr. Chairman, dismiss Canada. That is easy at any time.

If we want empire, however, my friends—and it looks very much as though we are very near the occupation of some other country; if we want empire, and we want to follow the lure of gold and the call of adventure—turn in another direction. You can see what is going on on the border in a land where there is no sovereignty, where the sovereignty resides in one man, and he is old and trembling and about ready to quit. With his passing from earth or earthly power the State also passes.

Now, what are we going to do if we are the policemen of the Western Hemisphere? That is the way to look at it, and our southern friends truly will not object. It will be much easier than in 1847. In fact, there will be no resistance whatever in that direction. I have a young man associated with me who just came from there, an officer of the Army, and he says they are going over and going over to stay, and we are going over to add one more little burden to the white man. From all indications the American soldier will soon stack arms on the plains of Mexico; and if he does not, it will be a close call. I would not think that the President would object. We have been absorbing everything not wanted in southern Europe for years and years, have we not? We have taken what nobody wanted in the Pacific seas—another white man's burden. We added a little more down there in the West Indies. Why could we not occupy something that is worth having and where we could be of some great good to humanity. [Laughter.] I am not a soldier of fortune. I do not expect to be at the head of the Army, but we are called upon to discuss occasionally paramount questions, and I believe this will be a mighty interesting one before Congress adjourns.

Now, to pass on, I do not want to take up too much time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] gave me one-half hour, and since I have only 10 minutes left I do not like to be pressed too hard. There is a young man over there on the Democratic side, a very eloquent young man from Georgia, who made a speech yesterday, and he, like the President, could be mistaken in his conclusions. He would have this House believe that Alexander Hamilton was a free trader. He even referred to the report he made in 1791 as Secretary of the Treasury and by the direction of Congress, and never said a word about the construction of the tariff bill or the character of it that followed. Now, it would appear that my Democratic friends stand on political ancestry, and that calls to mind a story of a young man who wanted to get the genealogy of his family and join the four hundred. So he had a high-priced professor go to work and get it up. About the time he thought he had the documents in good shape he was advised that he was an adopted son. [Laughter.] And so it is with my Democratic friends when they quote Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson and James Buchanan and Grover Cleveland. They are talking about people who are not their political ancestors, for every one was a protectionist, and you can find confirmation of this in the Messages and Papers of the Presidents in any library.

Every utterance of these Presidents was for protection, and I dare say that one-fourth of the membership on that side of the House, men who come from the active industrial centers of the South, are also protectionists, or their constituents are. I want to say that every man from the North who sits on that side of the House has a constituency that are protectionists; and as for the rest of them, as soon as we send enough energy and capital to the South to arouse the slumbering forces of that great section the whole South will be for protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, my friends, we have discussed tariff for taxation, for revenue, for protection, but I do not know, not having been here during all of these discussions, what has been said in reference to a market for what we produce. After all, is that not most important? It must be conceded as the common-sense thing, as the result of every tariff law that looked toward lower duties, that we must have a measure of protection. I can not conceive that any intelligent man would undertake for a moment to go on record as saying that we must not at least have protection against the surplus product of Europe.

And believing that to be true, then every man is in some measure a protectionist. Now, if we protect our industries and regulate the irregularities inside, and after all, my friends, I will admit that Democrats—I do not need to admit that, but I admit that any farsighted, observant citizen——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Do not admit they are farsighted; do not admit that.

Mr. FOCHT (continuing). Will say that in your attempted tariff revision, in the one instance it strikes at the farmer and in the other instance it strikes at the manufacturer and at the workingmen. You have stuck the wrong pig, you have stuck the thing that will destroy every vital commercial interest in this country; take away your revenues, take away the pension from the soldier because you have not revenue to pay it, of which we have had notice this morning, put out the fires of our factories, and drive men to idleness in the streets. Keep up this tariff properly regulated, and pursue diligently and relentlessly what the Republican Party has started to carry out—and that is the regulation of the great combinations of wealth and power at the bar of the court. And I will stop to say that at the other end of this Capitol are two great trusts standing ready, I believe, to be dissolved, and I hope that one after another may be brought there and properly regulated—not destroyed, not confiscated, but brought within reasonable bounds, so that there may be left some opportunity for individual enterprise and effort—and that they may operate within the law, that there may result a better distribution of the rewards and blessings of this great country and of its great resources. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In a conversation with the then Secretary of State, Mr. Root, coming from New York one day shortly after his return from a visit to South America, I made the observation that I hoped he had been successful in accomplishing some reciprocity treaties with those Republics, having in mind the fact that we did have a trade arrangement with southern Republics which gave us a good market for our products until the treaties were abrogated by our Democratic friends, when this market was largely lost. This comes directly home to me from the fact that a large flouring mill in my home town in Pennsylvania enjoyed an extensive South American trade under the reciprocal arrangement but lost it when the treaties were nullified. Then it naturally, logically follows that if we look for an opening for our products, if we maintain the Monroe doctrine there, if we are the policemen of the Western Hemisphere, let us seek it there; and I wanted to see what effort was being made on the part of the State Department to accomplish that result. The Secretary did not enter extensively into a discussion, being a State matter, but he did say that he hoped his visit would result in large commercial benefit to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to have a few more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is not here.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to have unanimous consent for a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to have his time extended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Until he concludes.

Mr. FOCHT. For five minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, for 5 minutes or 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. Following that, my friends, was the trip of an American armada that would have made that of King Philip of Spain look insignificant, along the coast of South America, around the Horn, over the Pacific, through the Mediterranean, and home. Now, you can imagine what the object of that was. I understand the South American Republics believed that we were not strong enough to support and sustain them in the maintenance of their national integrity in case they would withdraw their trade with European countries and we were admitted to their markets. When that fleet went around there they had evidence, but it seems there is something in the way, something does not work right, and while we have a most excellent Consular Service, excellent men in that service, and an increase in the appropriation, yet we have not been able to fully reach the market. The fact is, they might reach it if they take advantage of the machinery which the State Department places at their service, and to that subject I will for a moment address myself.

For a few minutes I wish to talk about a phase of American commerce which, I believe, is entitled to far more consideration than is any tariff, which at best is never altogether satisfactory, although the principle should by this time be better understood by my friends KITCHIN, of South Carolina, SIMS, of Tennessee, and HEFLIN, of Alabama. My Chairman, Mr. FINLEY, I suppose, is as badly informed as the rest, but until he goes on record I will not include him.

To my mind the most essential requisite for American prosperity is to keep our manufacturing establishments running at maximum capacity, and to do this is to first hold our own market for what we produce and find sale in foreign countries for our surplus.

The most important question is to reach the foreign consumer direct if this much-discussed surplus of American manufacturers is to be readily disposed of. Are the manufacturers of the country aware of the machinery that now exists enabling them to approach the foreign buyer direct? Are they aware of the great and valuable facilities that the Department of State and the Department of Commerce and Labor have provided? The general and insistent demand during the first half of the last decade from all sections of the country and from all classes of business concerns, from commercial bodies and the press generally, for a reorganization and the improvement in the Consular Service has resulted in bringing this branch of our Government up to a high state of efficiency. Are the manufacturers of the country aware of this efficiency? Are they making use of it?

This improvement has been attained at a considerable increase in appropriations. In 1900 the annual expense for the Consular Service was approximately $1,250,000; to-day it is $1,900,000; but the actual tangible results have more than warranted this increase. To-day, through our present efficient Consular Service, every possible market of the world for American products has been studied and reported upon. Any manufacturer may know not only the requirements of each commercial center of the world, but has published for him a carefully compiled directory of all the important business houses the world over, with information as to classes of goods each house is engaged in importing. This directory has been compiled by the Department of Commerce and Labor from reports and data furnished by the various American consuls.

In short, the organization and dissemination of commercial intelligence respecting foreign markets on practical and systematic lines for the benefit of the American manufacturer is a problem which has been fairly well worked out by the Department of State through the Consular Service, and the Department of Commerce and Labor through the Bureau of Manufactures. But it is evident that only a small portion of our manufacturers are aware of the great advantage and assistance that is available through these Government departments. The Daily Consular Reports are full of valuable information for all classes of our business houses. Information respecting foreign markets and business houses is therefore well provided for the American manufacturer, if he cares to avail himself of it.

And now the other essential service in developing our foreign trade is about to be provided. Through the plan now adopted of equipping each American consulate with card-index files every manufacturer of the country is permitted to have a brief of his catalogue prepared on cards for classifying and filing in card-index files, in the various commercial languages of the world, without any cost or fee other than the cost of printing or preparing his cards for these files. It is now up to the manufacturer seeking a foreign market to take advantage of these great privileges. This plan of providing full information respecting every line of goods produced in America in the language of the various countries in such shape that every foreign buyer may have this information not only at any American consulate, but such portion of it as his individual requirements demand, in his own office at the cost of postage in mailing it to him, is the completion of an almost perfect system in developing our foreign trade. The facilities are all at hand; it is now not only the privilege but duty of every manufacturer to use it to his utmost capacity, for in developing foreign commerce it is true, as in all other efforts, combined and persistent action is what tells.

Possibly not more than one manufacturer out of 10 throughout the United States knows that these various aids on the part of the Government exist. Just think of the result to our foreign trade if any foreign merchant in any part of the world can step into the nearest American consulate and consult a file in his own language that will give him full and accurate information respecting every line of goods manufactured or produced in the United States, and then have a duplicate of such portion as he may wish of these files placed in his own office for his constant use. Just think what a tremendous impetus this will give to our foreign commerce, and all this is possible if the press of the country will make this service known to each manufacturer, and then each manufacturer does his part in preparing the information in the required form for the consulates.

This work is undertaken by a private concern, for the reason that the special and individual service to each manufacturer and the distribution of this information to individual buyers is a work that is manifestly outside of the domain of a government office. This private organization is the Commercial Bureau Co., which has made an offer to the Department of State to equip all American consulates with a system of card-index files containing complete digests of the catalogues of all manufacturers of the United States without expense to the State Department and free to the manufacturers. The Department of State has therefore given the Commercial Bureau Co. the privilege of placing these files in each American consulate, providing no preference is shown and no fee charged to the manufacturers for the filing of these cards in the consulates. The department has no part in the service, and any manufacturer desiring to take advantage of the free service in the consulates must communicate direct with the Commercial Bureau Co., 50 Church Street, New York. But the broad policy of the Department of State in permitting a private organization to render this service to the consulates is to be commended. It is not only commendable from the standpoint of broad-minded statesmanship, but from a business point it is a great economy.

Much time and attention is now given by our consuls in transmitting inquiries to the department that can be answered instantly by these files, thus not only saving time, but a considerable expense in clerical hire and other expenses. The Government has done its part well; it is now the manufacturer who must do his part. The advantages of this publicity should be very great to all American manufacturers in all lines, and this arrangement should be studied with care by them.

It is evident from what has been said during the prolonged debate on this subject of trade with Canada, whether reciprocal or otherwise, or whether or not we are to have this proposed free list, the thing we want more than anything else, the thing that will keep our mills and factories busy and our workmen employed, is a market for our surplus products. The means of finding these markets is furnished by the Government; it is now up to the enterprise of our manufacturers to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill providing for a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada has passed this House. It has been charged by those opposing the reciprocity bill, that it was not fair to and that it discriminated against the great farming class, and particularly the farmers of the West. And it is true that there does exist among some of the farmers of the West a fear that injustice will be done them, unless some legislation is passed by this Congress manifestly in their interest. The charge has been boldly and aggressively made here by Members opposed to reciprocity, that the treaty agreement advocated by the President, and for the consideration of which Congress was called into extra session, would work an injury to the farming class, and therefore ought to be defeated as a matter of justice to that element; and this charge has been principally made by the high protectionist, who in all the years past has never heeded the prayer of the man upon the farm; and it has been further urged that it ought not to become a law, because the principle of protection was endangered or violated thereby. Regardless of these claims, the reciprocity bill passed the House by a very large vote of 267 votes for and 89 against—a majority of 178 votes. Many, however, voted for reciprocity who probably would not have been willing to so vote were it not for the fact that there was pending in the House what is known as the farmers' free-list bill—a companion measure to Canadian reciprocity—and reported at the same time, hoping by the passage thereof to remedy whatever harm, if any, there might be in the reciprocity bill; and now the opportunity is given to those who voted for and those who voted against reciprocity to help pass this free-list bill.

A majority of the Republicans voted against the reciprocity bill, alleging it was a stroke at the principle of protection—a breach in the wall of protection, if it should become a law—and that the President in proposing it was espousing a Democratic proposition. I take it that a large percentage of them will vote against this free-list bill for the same reason; but those who based their objection upon injustice done the farmer can now, at least, help the situation by voting for this bill, which seeks to do substantial justice to the farming class.

I ask to insert here the free-list bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act the following articles shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, sea, Russian sea, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

I hope the bill will pass this House and become a law as a matter of simple justice to this class who ask only for fair treatment, a square deal, equal and exact justice to all, and special privileges to none. The farmers of the Central West feel that if reciprocity with Canada passes Congress, causing free trade in farm products between the United States and Canada, that a free-list bill should also be passed, putting upon the free list the products of manufacture used by the farmers in the raising of food products to be used by all the people.

Many feel that it is wrong to let in farm products free, unless manufactured goods and implements used by the farmers should also be free of duty. They do not ask for protection, only fair treatment, and they demand that you put on the free list the manufactured articles they daily purchase and use in the production of these food products. They know that legislation heretofore has not been in their interest. They remember that hides were put on the free list under the promise that cheaper shoes and leather goods would result, and they now point to the fact that shoes, harness, and leather products sell higher; and they urge that, since hides are free of tariff, the tariff be likewise taken off of leather products. They will not be satisfied unless this or a similar free list be passed. It may be that this free-list bill should be amended before final passage.

Many wanted the reciprocity bill amended in the House and now hope that it may be amended before it finally becomes a law by adding the free-list bill to the reciprocity bill. But in any event it is hoped that the free-list bill will be passed as a simple act of justice to that great class to which this Nation owes its support and existence. You can not get along without the farmer. You can not afford to have him dissatisfied. You have been friendly all these years to the manufacturer; never to the farmer. The farmer is more alert and restless to-day than ever before. He has grown tired of the high protective tariff walls. You will have to reckon with him in the future. If the relief asked for in this bill is withheld, if remedial legislation asked for by him is not provided by this Congress, either at this extra session or in the coming regular session, the responsibility will be upon the Republican Party for such failure. It will not be the fault of this Democratic House. At the other end of the Capitol sits a Republican Senate, and in the White House a Republican President.

The farmer wants cheaper agricultural implements, cheaper shoes and harness, cheaper wire fencing. He wants cheaper lumber, and better clothing at reasonable and honest prices. He wants cheaper sugar. These demands must be met by Congress. Old conditions will not longer be tolerated. The time will come, and is near at hand, when both branches of this National Congress will respond to the wishes and demands of the producing and consuming classes.

Direct election of Senators is a reform measure pressed to the front by the masses, not for its own sake, but in order that laws may be enacted in the interest of all the people. An income tax will in the near future become a part of the law of the land, under and by virtue of which a hundred million dollars can reasonably be collected annually from incomes of those possessed of great wealth, to help bear the burdens of the Government, and then there will be no excuse for high protective laws.

This House has made progress, responsive to the progressive thought of the masses of the people, having passed a joint resolution providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people of the States; having passed a bill providing for publicity of campaign expenses and contributions before election, so that Federal elections can not secretly be controlled by the undue use of money contributed by great corporate interests for selfish purposes; having also passed the reciprocity bill and the apportionment bill. All of these bills have been sent to the Senate, and there is now about ready to pass this free-list bill, a companion bill to the reciprocity bill.

I voted for reciprocity, with an almost unanimous Democracy, and I believe it will redound to the mutual benefit of both countries if it should pass and become a law. I do not believe that any harm will be done to the great State which I have the honor in part to represent, nor any substantial injury to any part of our Republic.

The entire delegation of my State voted for reciprocity, and every Democrat from Missouri will vote for the free-list bill. The right of repeal is reserved in the treaty, and if experience should prove that its enactment is injurious to American interests, a future Congress can and will repeal it. The bill has been fully discussed from every viewpoint and the probable effect it would have upon farm products in every section

Now, while the treaty might have been amended by the House and thereby better satisfied the views of many, yet it would have been charged that the amendment was put on the bill in the House for political purposes; and the Democratic Party, acting with substantial unanimity, decided to pass the bills through the House separately, and has sent the reciprocity bill to the Senate, where it can be amended by adding the free list or both may be passed as separate measures.

Expressing my personal views, and, I believe, the sentiment of many of my colleagues, I can not refrain from saying that I hope the bill will be amended in the Senate, or, rather, that the two bills will be combined by adding a new section to the reciprocity bill that will include the free-list bill, unless assured that this free-list bill shall pass and become a law, in which event it may be immaterial whether it becomes a law by attaching it to the reciprocity bill or by a separate bill.

The amendment of the reciprocity bill, by adding another section embodying the free-list bill, can be done without affecting the treaty with Canada.

In a recent speech made by President Taft in New York, and which speech is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29 as a part of the remarks of the Representative from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], the President says:

> Of course a mere reduction of our tariff or the putting of any article on the free list, without insisting on a corresponding change in the Canadian tariff, will not interfere with the contract as made with Canada.

The amendment of the bill by attaching the free list thereto will not invalidate the treaty nor interfere with ratification of the reciprocal agreement by the Canadian Parliament. It will simply require the President to approve the free-list bill at the same time he attaches his signature to the treaty, and he will be stronger thereby with the people of the West and the farmers and consumers everywhere by approving the free-list bill as an amendment or as a separate bill and immeasurably weaker before the American people if he defeats the free-list bill by the exercise of his veto power. And he can well afford to meet the wishes of the Democratic Party, that advocates this free-list bill, and thereby acknowledge his indebtedness to that party for the passage of the reciprocity bill, without whose aid it would have utterly failed.

If the free-list bill be attached to the treaty, it will operate as a free-list bill for all the world, but would not invalidate the reciprocity agreement. And who will be harmed thereby? The manufacturers are already selling their articles in foreign markets in competition with all the world; the putting of them upon the free list will simply prevent the manufacturer from longer extorting from the consumers of our country higher prices than he secures abroad. And why should the President

object if the people of the United States desire this legislation and should insist on procuring it at the same time he procures reciprocity with Canada? Why not have both by act of the same Congress? By attaching the free list to the reciprocity agreement it will insure the enactment of the free-list measure at the same time he signs the Canadian agreement. Give the President what he asks and let him at the same time give the American consumer what he demands.

However, I do not entertain any fear of harm resulting from closer and freer trade relations with a friendly neighboring people. The trade balance is now, and always has been, in our favor, and I know of no good reason why the trade balance should not continue in our favor.

I quote from a carefully prepared statement, which I will insert as a part of my remarks.

During the last five years ending June 30 last, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

These figures show that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys more from us than it sells to us is a good country to trade with. No tariff wall should stand between us and such a country.

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Meat and dairy products:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672
Corn:	
We sold in Canada	21,704,572
Canada sold to us	14,350
Difference in our favor	21,690,222
Wheat:	
We sold in Canada	4,442,307
Canada sold to us	766,254
Difference in our favor	3,676,053

Canada needs our products and must buy from us, and we need her lumber and forest products. She can not produce corn sufficient for her wants. Canada in 1910 raised about 25,000,000 bushels of corn, while the United States raised over 3,000,000,000 bushels in the same year—more than 100 bushels to 1. Canada has a population of less than 8,000,000, the United States about 92,000,000—3 bushels of corn for each inhabitant in Canada, while the United States has about 32 bushels for each inhabitant—and the Canadian yield is principally in Ontario, no corn of moment being raised in western Canada. Where corn is raised hogs and cattle are fattened. As to wheat, we raise a surplus, so does Canada, and the surplus of both countries is shipped abroad, where the price is fixed, based upon the surplus and production of all the world. What would be the effect of taking the tariff off of wheat?

The present tariff on wheat is 25 cents a bushel, but is really one-fourth of 1 cent a bushel when purchased to be ground into flour for export. Under the present law the American miller pays a duty of 25 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat imported from Canada, but when he grinds it into flour for export trade he draws back 99 per cent of the 25 cents on each bushel, leaving one-quarter of 1 cent a bushel tariff on Canadian wheat.

It is true that if imported into the United States to be ground into flour and sold here, the importer must pay 25 cents a bushel, a prohibitive tariff, and none is imported, I am informed, except for seed or to be ground into flour for export trade. Nor is there any demand for it, for we have a surplus of wheat grown in the United States, which alike is exported and sold abroad to help meet the demand for wheat and flour in the world's markets. Of what benefit to the farmer is the present tariff on wheat? Why not take off the tariff on both wheat under the reciprocity agreement and flour under the free-list bill?

A great farm journal, edited in Des Moines, Iowa, and known as Wallaces' Farmer, recently, in an editorial on reciprocity in farm products, said:

When we come to look at the matter from the farmers' standpoint, divested of prejudice, it is pretty hard to see how this treaty can seriously affect the farmers of the corn belt one way or the other. There is no possibility of any competition in growing corn. Only in Ontario is there any chance of growing any amount of corn, and this will cost far more than it does in the corn belt, as much as it does in the New England States contiguous to the Canadian line. The great production in Canada is wheat. The reciprocity treaty can not affect us at all so long as we have a surplus of wheat to send abroad. It is quite as cheap to send it from Canada to Liverpool as from the wheat fields of the Northwest. Under these conditions the prices for both countries are fixed in Liverpool.

The same journal further states:

We anticipate that our readers, who are bitterly opposed to this treaty, will not be hurt half as bad as they expect.

And further says:

Probably if this treaty could have been ratified by the President, without saying anything about it and nothing had been published in the papers about it, they would not have noticed any change.

In another issue of this same farm journal it says:

The reciprocity treaty with Canada will not, in our judgment, seriously lower the prices of farm products in the West.

In a recent issue of the Commoner, a paper owned by William J. Bryan, three times nominated for President by the Democratic Party, and published at Lincoln, Nebr., the following statement is made:

The Democrats in Congress do well when they begin tariff revision by putting upon the free list something like 100 articles largely consumed by farmers. The farmer has been the chief sufferer from the principle of protection, and it is only fair that relief should begin with him. The reciprocity treaty is a godsend to him, not so much because it confers great benefits upon him, but because it leads to greater reductions. The opponents of the reciprocity agreement have tried to hide behind the farmer, but the farmers' free list will drive them from under cover and compel them to vote with the Democrats or quit talking about the farmer.

I submit to this body these recent utterances of this great agricultural journal, and of the Commoner, both published in the Central West, regarding the probable effects of this treaty, as against the utterances of those here and elsewhere who seek to play upon the fears of the farmers in their eager desire to defeat these measures and thereby perpetuate the control of those interests that speculate in the great necessities of life. This same agricultural journal calls upon Congress to "remove the iniquities from the wool and cotton fabrics" and other manufactured products, and these things this Congress will attempt to remedy by reducing the tariffs to a revenue basis. The attempt will be fought by the high protectionist, the same influence seeking at the same time to defeat both reciprocity and the free-list bill.

The high-protection Republican Congressman assumes a peculiar rôle. He pleads for the farmer in opposing reciprocity and pleads for the manufacturer in opposing the free-list bill. Half of them seek to sustain the President in his advocacy of a reciprocity agreement and the other half violently or sorrowfully criticize him and denounce reciprocity as a fake treaty.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the very high priest of protection, while opposing at the last session the reciprocity treaty, when the Republicans were in the majority, but divided as now on the treaty, offered a free-list bill as an amendment to the McCall reciprocity bill, and at this session he actively opposes the free-list bill presented by the Democrats. Does he not play politics with a vengeance, when he proposes a free-list bill as an amendment to reciprocity in the short session last winter, and now opposes the same measure offered by Democrats at this extra session?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] voted against reciprocity and spoke against the free list, and complained because the free list was not put on as an amendment to the reciprocity bill. Is it possible that, having opposed both bills separately, he feels aggrieved because he is deprived of the opportunity of voting against both at the same time? Anticipating an attack upon what is known as schedule K, the woolen schedule, denounced even by President Taft as indefensible, the high protectionists are sending to Representatives here a scarecrow picture of Congress personified as a man with a sword dagger in his hand, thrust through schedule K, and back of it through American labor and the American sheep raiser, warning Congress to "look beyond before you thrust." This same picture is doubtless being sent to the western farmer and sheep raiser.

These great tariff beneficiaries would play upon the fears of the farmer to-day and the laborer to-morrow, and rob both every day in the year, and sell them shoddy and cheap clothing at robber prices in order that high protection may continue to

extort and enjoy excessive profits upon inferior clothing. The American farmer and laborer wants only fair treatment, but he demands the right and opportunity to buy better clothing at reasonable prices. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So come also the manufacturers of shoes and other leather products and protest against that part of this free-list bill affecting shoes, harness, and other leather products—the same people who came two years ago to Congress asking for free hides, so they could sell better and cheaper shoes. Taking the tariff off the finished product may help to destroy the monopoly that extorts undue profits from the American consumer.

The Lumber Trust wants both reciprocity and the free-list bill defeated, but the American people are demanding free lumber so they can build homes with lumber bought at reasonable prices. On the Canadian side are almost inexhaustible forests to which our people should have access. Our forests have been in a large measure destroyed or are in the control of comparatively few owners, whose powerful hands hold the lumber supply in their grasp, and cupidity fixes the price consumers must pay. We need Canadian lumber. Free lumber we ought to have in exchange for our surplus products.

I have listened with interest to the speeches of distinguished Republicans who denounce both the reciprocity and the free-list bills. These Republicans representing agricultural districts have been telling their Republican farmer constituents about the protection given by the Republican Party to products grown on the farm, and have been calling upon them to remain loyal to the great friend of the farmer—the Republican Party. The Democrats have been saying to them that these tariffs on the products of the farm were mere paper tariffs, a delusion and a snare, and now comes the Republican President and tears the mask aside and reveals the nakedness of the professions of the Republican Party, and says in substance that these farmer tariffs are but a cloak for the speculator in farm products. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The reciprocity agreement fathered by the President angers the Republican Representative who now sees the dilemma in which he is placed, and he denounces the treaty as a fake agreement and would defeat both reciprocity and the free-list bill. When both become the law what will become of the Republican Representative who stands neither with the President nor with the farmer?

The farmer is beginning to see that their tariffs are mere paper tariffs and not real tariffs for protection. The Republican farmer who has been standing for protection is helping to bring about a reduction of the tariff, and when these paper tariffs are taken off the products he raises he will see what a sham and fraud has been perpetrated upon him all these years; or, if he feels that these tariffs were a real protection, he will want a square deal and equal treatment by reducing or taking the tariff off of the things he has to buy. And then the farmer, as never before, will become the greatest advocate in all the land for lower tariffs and freer trade and will help strike down high protection, under the shadow of whose walls trusts and monopolies have flourished and fattened at the expense of the toiling and producing masses of the American people.

Do you wonder that these Republican Representatives are maddened at their own President? Do you wonder that they see the handwriting on the wall when, with a divided party, they see before them a united and triumphant Democracy marching in complete harmony to certain victory in the early future? [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER].

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not allude to the size nor the intelligence of this audience. The one is apparent and, I trust, the other will become as evident as I proceed with my discourse. I do not speak, however, merely for the information of this House, but for that far wider audience which reads the daily newspapers and occasionally dips into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Before commencing upon the subject matter of my talk I wish to say a few words to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], who preceded me. He says that a great many of his Democratic friends hold their seats in this House on account of the abstention of the Republican voters. That may be true of some, but for my district I will say that the vote cast in this last election was over 1,000 larger than that cast in 1908, and that is true of all the vote in Massachusetts. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania also alluded to the expense which we would incur in this extra session. Now, the Democrats are not responsible one whit for this extra session, but it was the contumacy of the other branch of the Republican Legislature, the Senate, that caused it. But for my part I welcome this session, and I say that the slight expense to which we are putting the Government of the United States is well repaid by the relief which this House, at least, will offer to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Yesterday the House listened to the able and eloquent speech of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], a colleague whose district is adjacent to my own and whose district was enriched in redistricting in 1900 by several safe Democratic towns from the third congressional district, my own, trusting in the assured Republican strength of his and in the weakness which would come to the third district; but the Democratic incumbent at that time was successful in retaining the seat for the Democracy for the two terms which he occupied. He then voluntarily retired, and in this last election the calculations of the Republicans were again upset and the third district became again Democratic. Surely the Lord tempereth the votes to the shorn district. But I bespeak from my Republican colleague in this redistricting, which happened on account of the Massachusetts Congressmen being increased from 14 to 16, a redistricting which I opposed—I bespeak from him the return of my Democratic ewe lambs and I trust he will not give me back some of those deserted shoe villages with which his county, as well as my own, is so much encumbered. I would ask his reasons for the decadence of these shoe towns, if it is due to the high tariff which has been put upon their products.

In his discussion of the altruistic business methods of the United States Shoe Machinery Co., I asked him if he had in mind the act which was passed by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1907 forbidding a clause of their lease which restricted the lessees from buying or leasing any other machinery from any other vendors or lessors except the said company, and he said he had that in mind, but when I asked him to have that act read from the Clerk's desk he said he could not take up his time to do that. I will ask the indulgence of the House, in the performance of my public duty, to have read this act of 1907 and the supplementary act of 1908 against monopoly. I will ask that the Clerk read act 469 of 1907.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the act in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

"SECTION 1. No person, firm, corporation, or association shall insert in or make it a condition or provision of any sale or lease of any tool, implement, appliance, or machinery that the purchaser or lessee thereof shall not buy, lease, or use machinery, tools, implements, or appliances or material or merchandise of any person, firm, corporation, or association other than such vendor or lessor; but this provision shall not impair the right, if any, of the vendor or lessor of any tool, implement, appliance, or machinery protected by a lawful patent right vested in such vendor or lessor to require, by virtue of such patent right, the vendee or lessee to purchase or lease from such vendor or lessor such component and constituent parts of said tool, implement, appliance, or machinery as the vendee or lessee may thereafter require during the continuance of such patent right: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the appointment of agents or sole agents to sell or lease machinery, tools, implements, or appliances.

"SEC. 2. Any person, firm, corporation, or association, or the agent of any such person, firm, corporation, or association, that violates the provisions of this act shall be punished for each offense by a fine not exceeding $5,000.

"All leases, sales, or agreements therefor hereafter made in violation of any of the provisions of this act shall be void as to any and all of the terms or conditions thereof in violation of said provisions."

An act relative to monopolies and discriminations in the sale of articles or commodities in common use.

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. Every contract, agreement, arrangement, or combination in violation of common law in that whereby a monopoly in the manufacture, production, or sale in this Commonwealth of any article or commodity in common use is or may be created, established, or maintained, or in that thereby competition in this State in the supply or price of any such article or commodity is or may be restrained or prevented, or in that thereby, for the purpose of creating, establishing, or maintaining a monopoly within this State of the manufacture, production, or sale of any such article or commodity, the free pursuit in this State of any lawful business, trade, or occupation is or may be restrained or prevented is hereby declared to be against public policy, illegal, and void.

SEC. 2. The attorney general, or, by his direction, a district attorney, may bring an action in the name of the Commonwealth against any person, trustee, director, manager, or other officer or agent of a corporation, or against a corporation, to restrain the doing in his Commonwealth of any act herein forbidden or declared to be illegal, or any act in, toward, or for the making or consummation of any contract, agreement, arrangement, or combination herein prohibited, wherever the same may have been made. The superior court shall have jurisdiction to restrain and enjoin any act herein forbidden or declared to be illegal.

SEC. 3. In such action no person shall be excused from answering any questions that may be put to him, or from producing any books, papers, or documents, on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him, but no person shall be prosecuted in any criminal action or proceedings, or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing concerning which he may justify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, in any such action.

SEC. 4. Nothing in section 1 of this act shall be construed as impairing, repealing, or superseding any statute of this Commonwealth.

Approved April 28, 1908.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for 10 minutes longer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can only yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. THAYER. I do not know that that will be sufficient, but I will make it do. The discussion of this farmers' free-list bill has already been worn almost to attenuation, but this phase has not been extensively dwelt upon. The gentleman from Indiana has already referred to the fact that at the time my colleague was defending this trust at the Senate end of the Capitol its methods were being pitilessly disclosed. "Thus the whirligig of time brings about its revenges," but not often so quickly. It is more like that incident in the New Testament where, while one disputant was protesting against the facts the feet of those who had borne out the other protestant were already at the door, and in this matter I refer not to the protagonist but to the principal. The conditions of shoe manufacturing in Massachusetts had become so scandalous that in 1907 a movement was started to restrain the abuses which the United States Shoe Machinery Co. has injected into its methods. There were long and acrimonious hearings at the statehouse, in which the most eminent and expensive counsel took part.

The proponents of this act were represented by Hon. Herbert Parker, a former Republican attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Instead of business men of small means having the opportunity to engage in business with leased machinery, the United States Shoe Machinery Co. was but the controlling power in a long line of manufacturers compelling tribute of a greater part of the profits, and owning the body, soul, and brain of the hapless men who have been entangled in its net, a slavery as absolute as that of the Incas of Peru. These acts were passed, after a hard struggle, as a measure of relief to the manufacturers, but subsequent events have shown their futility. Recently an opponent named Plant attempted to start an independent organization and began operations on a great scale and with every prospect of success, but suddenly, almost before the promise of relief had been presented to the manufacturers, the Plant system was absorbed by the United States Shoe Machinery Co. It transpired that in order to finance his factory Mr. Plant had been obliged to borrow largely from the banks which had indeed solicited his custom, but in some mysterious way all of Plant's notes had found their way into the possession of the United States Shoe Machinery Co., and suddenly he was met by the demands for their payment.

There was no option but that which the United States Shoe Machinery Co. offered, and this independent organization was absorbed by the monopoly. This is instructive in itself as showing for what purposes the accumulated deposits of the common people are used, like the pinions of the eagle, to their own destruction. It is unnecessary to ask "upon what meat does this our Cæsar feed that he has grown so great?" There has been competent testimony that a machine which the United States Shoe Machinery Co. leases for $1,200 a year it sells outright to foreign purchasers for $400—a difference of $1,600 computed on a 6 per cent basis, of $2,000 computed on a 5 per cent basis, and $2,600 computed on a 4 per cent basis. And then we are asked not to remove the duty from the product because, perforce, the foreign manufacturer is using American machinery and will undersell our own manufacturers. If there are more elevated heights of impudence it remains for some Peary to discover them or some Cook to assume to. As to the reliefs we are entitled to, there are several. First, the removal of all duties from all products of monopoly, whether machinery or product. Second, the invocation of the United States law. I am inclined to agree with Senator Bailey and the United States Supreme Court, as enunciated in Continental Wall Paper Co. against Lewis Voight & Sons Co. (148 Fed. Rep., 939, 950), as pertinent.

> The consumer, at last, is the only real victim. It is the consumer who makes up the public, which it is the object of the law to protect against undue exaction through illegal combinations in restraint of freedom of commerce and fair play in commercial transactions.

It ill becomes monopolies like the United States Shoe Machinery Co., which is throttling independent manufacturers and become the arbitrary head of a great part of the shoe business, to cry out that we are destroying an American industry when we are reducing the cost of living to that class which works the hardest and receives the least reward for its labor. Conditions will not be bettered until we not only meet their challenge but remove, as above stated, the duties on their products, which are only an extortion on the American people, but further refuse admission to interstate commerce of all products of monopolies of whatever kind or nature.

> He that withholdeth corn—

And by corn I opine Solomon meant not only all cereals but all the necessities of life—

> the people shall curse him, but blessings shall be upon the head of him that selleth it.

[Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, as I look around this Hall I am very forcibly reminded of what I think will be the appearance of many an American workshop after the Democratic program is carried out. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There are more people in the galleries than on the floor, and, if I am not much mistaken, if this policy is carried to its legitimate conclusion there will be more American workmen on the streets than in the shops by and by. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Before taking up the bill I want to refer to one other subject, for I shall try to talk about the bill directly and see if I can get an idea from the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee as to what it means. When the present Speaker of this House delivered a most magnificent oration at the closing vote on the Payne tariff bill, after it came back from the Senate with the report of the conference committee, he said that the ad valorem average of all the schedules indicated that it was 1.71 per cent higher than the Dingley law. The newspaper press and the magazines of the country that desired to do harm to the Republican Party accepted that statement and have persisted in it ever since.

I did not believe that it was correct. I did not believe that it was possible to figure the ad valorem on a bill which had not gone into operation, and I asked of Treasury officials that a fair comparison between the two measures should be officially made. Six months after the law went into effect we knew the actual amount of money which had been paid into the Treasury as revenue under the Payne tariff bill, and I asked that those same identical importations, the same values, coming in at the same time, might be refigured on the basis of the Dingley tariff law, and it was done. At the State convention in Connecticut in September, 1910, I gave it authoritatively to my people, showing each schedule, exactly what had been received under the Payne law and what would have been received under the Dingley tariff rates. There could be no mistake in regard to it if the figuring of the Treasury Department was correct. I will not repeat the ad valorems of the various schedules. I will give them to anybody who desires them. The general average showed that there was received by the United States Treasury, and actually paid in, 6.4 per cent less money than would have been paid in if the invoices had all been refigured and reliquidated under the Dingley tariff law. That was made public. I sent it to the press of the country. I sent it, I think, to every Senator and Representative of the Sixty-first Congress, and there has been no excuse for the continued repetition of the statement that the last revision was upward instead of downward.

When the campaign of last fall began the very first thing that I met was the statement made by the Speaker. Now, I do not criticise him for making it. I will show you how it could have been honestly made and yet be an actual mistake.

Let me take an item in any of the schedules. Take the silk schedule, if you please, reading like this:

> Valued at not less than $1 a yard and not exceeding $2 a yard, $1.

Now, if the importation happens to be at $2 a yard, your ad valorem is 50 per cent; if it is $1.50 a yard, your ad valorem is 66⅔ per cent; if it is $1 a yard, your ad valorem is 100 per cent. So you can not make an estimate or a comparison between two tariff laws unless you figure the identical importation in both cases, and, of course, at the same value in both cases. And yet this erroneous statement is still being made, in utter disregard of the actual facts.

It went on all through the winter and in the discussion of the reciprocity bill during this session. Now I want to read a statement made the other day—innocently, of course—by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. He said:

> And when the bill prepared by the Ways and Means Committee of the Sixty-first Congress passed the Republican House it not only did not reduce the taxes, it not only failed to put the items in my bill on the free list, but it increased the taxes from about 45 to about 50 per cent. Hence I repeat again that when the people asked you for bread you gave them a stone.

And these are the kind of assertions faced by Republicans not only here in Congress but during the campaign last fall. I stated in the reciprocity debate that, in my judgment, the result of the election last fall was reached upon a series of mistakes which would in time develop themselves.

But I did not look for the development to come quite so quickly. It is here. A week ago last Saturday as I started for home I put in my pocket a copy of the report of the Ways and Means Committee upon this bill, the so-called farmers' free list. I read it on the cars going home—read it casually. Coming back I had nothing to occupy my time from New York to Washington, and again I casually picked the report out of my pocket and I have it here now. In that report, made by the Committee on Ways and Means officially, they contradict every statement that they have made in this campaign from the beginning to the end and contradict their own report. I ask the Republican Members of the House and such Democratic Members of the House as choose to gratify their curiosity—those who have the report—to take it in their hands for just a moment while I call attention to it.

On page 3 of the report is this language. I do not know who wrote it; I do not care:

REPUDIATED PROMISE OF DOWNWARD REVISION.

In its platform of 1908 the Republican Party announced the modification of its protection theory referred to by the President, and in deference to aroused public opinion against burdens imposed by the Dingley tariff of 1897, promised a downward revision of the tariff. On this promise the party secured from the people a further continuation of power. How this promise was repudiated in the enactment of the higher tariff act of 1909, and how the people, so far as their power extended at the time, in just resentment have driven the Republican Party from control in Congress are matters of history.

I now ask those who have a copy of this report with them to turn to page 11 of the same document. As I read this, getting along down toward Baltimore, my eyes were opened. I now call your attention to Table No. 4 in the Democratic majority report on this bill. The first thing I did when I came to Washington Tuesday morning—arriving at about midnight Monday night—was to try and find the author of these tables. I went to the Treasury Department, and the officials there repudiated them. I sent to the Statistical Bureau of the State Department, and they repudiated them. I sent to the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, and they repudiated them. I finally found him, located just exactly where I should have expected him to be, in the room of the Ways and Means Committee. He acknowledged the authenticity of this table that I am going to read to you to show whether the Payne tariff bill is lower or higher than the Dingley law, whether the Republican Party did comply with its promises, if it made any, and whether the Democratic committee has not absolutely repudiated their own statements in the identical report in which they made them. Let me read it to you:

Value of imports entered for consumption, duties, and ad valorem rate of duty, with relation to articles carried by bill H. R. 4413, for the years ending June 30, 1905 and 1910.

[From Democratic report.]

Articles.	Years.	Value of dutiable imports entered for consumption.	Duties.	Ad valorem rate of duty.
				Per cent.
Agricultural implements	1910	$79,602	$12,189	15.31
	1905	13,876	2,775	20.00
Cotton bagging, sacks, burlaps, etc.	1910	25,605,019	6,877,667	26.86
	1905	16,965,842	4,879,870	28.76
Cotton ties	1910	9,389	1,499	15.96
	1905	7,136	2,576	36.10
Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, etc.	1910	1,319,622	97,325	7.38
	1905	437,347	146,182	33.42
Barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, etc.	1910	1,825,088	514,410	28.18
	1905	1,041,230	293,913	28.22
Fresh and preserved meats	1910	736,165	159,863	21.71
	1905	477,755	114,476	23.96
Flour, cereals, and bread	1910	1,202,497	273,746	22.76
	1905	664,315	141,370	21.28
Lumber, laths, and shingles	1910	22,398,342	1,918,803	8.57
	1905	12,864,258	1,714,172	13.33
Sewing machines, and parts of	1910	76,964	23,089	30.00
	1905	[1]	[1]	[1]
Salt	1910	295,131	150,398	50.96
	1905	396,202	203,064	51.25

[1] Not separately reported.

Take the first item. The table is headed "Value of imports entered for consumption, duties and ad valorem rates of duty, with relation to articles carried by the bill H. R. 4413"—that is the bill we have under consideration, Mr. Chairman, and it takes up each schedule; I am going to take them up—"for the years ending June 30, 1905 and 1910"; 1905 was under the Dingley law and 1910 is under the Payne law. Take the first item—agricultural implements. Under the Dingley law the duty was 20 per cent, according to the Democratic authority, and it is right. Under the Payne law it is 15.31 per cent, the difference being 4.69 per cent ad valorem in favor of the Payne bill.

Take cotton bagging—the next item—sacks, burlaps, and so forth. The duty under the Dingley law was 28.76, by Democratic authority. Under the Payne law it is 26.86, making a difference of 1.90 in favor of the Payne bill.

Cotton ties, under the Dingley law, were 36.10 by Democratic authority. Under the Payne bill they are 15.96, the difference being 20.14 in favor of the Payne bill.

Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, and so forth, under the Dingley law, were 33.42. Under the Payne bill they are 7.38, the reduction being 26.04 under the Payne bill according to Democratic authority, and that is right.

Barbed wire and other fence wire, 28.22 under the Dingley law, 28.18 under the Payne law, a reduction of 0.04 of 1 per cent.

Fresh and preserved meats—I am taking every one of these schedules in this pending bill and giving you Democratic authority for it—fresh and preserved meats, 23.96 under the Dingley law; 21.71 under the Payne bill—a difference in favor of the Payne bill of 2.25.

Flour, cereals, and bread. Last fall I said in that very speech which I sent out to you, every one of you, that the agricultural schedule was raised under the Payne bill, being one of the four or five that were raised. I find the same thing stated under Democratic authority now; for in this schedule, flour, cereals, and bread, the percentage was 21.28 under the Dingley law and 22.76 under the Payne bill, or 1.48 higher under the Payne bill.

Lumber, laths, and shingles, 13.33 under the Dingley law, 8.57 under the Payne bill, or 4.76 in favor of the Payne bill.

"Sewing machines, and parts of," 45 per cent under the Dingley law, 30 per cent under the Payne bill, or 15 per cent in favor of the Payne bill.

Salt, 51.25 under the Dingley law, 50.96 under the Payne bill, or 0.29 in favor of the Payne bill.

So that every item but one in this bill which you are now putting forward as a reduction has had a previous reduction, and, figuring it all up, you will find that instead of 6.40, as I said six months ago and published to you, you now officially report the average reduction of the Payne bill at 6.38, within 0.02 of 1 per cent, or in almost exact accordance with the facts that you had placed before you a year ago; and yet you continue to repeat these statements and send them out to the people and to the press and the magazines of this country, and continue to discuss this question on the theory that the Republican Party raised the tariff instead of lowering it. Will you not accept your own authority, which you have furnished us in the report on this bill, and cease to make these statements in the future? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, there is another feature about this: All through this report the idea is conveyed—and you have always endeavored to impress it upon the country—that a tariff is a tax always added to the cost of the goods. I will not take your time to read all of the statements, because I have much that I want to say to you. I have much that I think ought to be said to you. Let me read one or two of these extracts, and see whether I have drawn a correct inference:

By this measure agricultural tools and implements of every kind are placed on the free list in order to remove or prevent any possible discrimination against our farmers—

I will talk about that later—

in the price of these necessary articles, and to place them on an equal footing with their competitors elsewhere in the world.

Also:

As our population has increased, our exports of foodstuffs and food products have declined and imports increased; under these circumstances, duties on these articles have become a heavier burden on the people.

If that language means anything, it means that every duty that is laid on an article coming into the United States adds an equal amount to the cost of the domestic manufacture or to the price which the domestic buyer pays. So I have followed this proposition a little further, and I have thought I would see how much the Payne bill, in the reductions which you yourselves now acknowledge were made—has saved to the American public—and I have taken Table 2, on page 10, which gives the domestic consumption of each one of these things which you propose to put upon the free list, and have applied to those amounts the percentages by which you admit the Payne bill was reduced, with the following results: Now, understand me, this is the Democratic argument carried to its logical conclu-

sion. If the Democratic contention is good for anything in the report—which I deny—it is good in this showing:

Articles.	Consumption 1905 (Table 2, p. 10).	Reduction in Payne bill (Table 4, p. 11).	Annual saving to people on these 10 schedules by the Payne bill, on Democratic authority.
		Per cent.	
Agricultural implements	$90,637,110	4.69	$4,250,880
Bagging for cotton sacks, burlaps, etc	26,031,644	1.90	494,601
Cotton ties, hoop or band iron	12,639,953	20.14	2,545,686
Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, etc	493,005,263	26.04	128,358,568
Barbed wire and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, etc	113,027,205	.04	45,210
Fresh and preserved meats	614,895,219	2.25	13,835,142
Lumber, laths, and shingles	699,599,293	4.76	33,300,924
Sewing machines, and parts of	8,497,464	15	1,274,619
Salt	9,540,824	.29	27,618
Total	2,067,873,975	.....	184,133,248
Flour and grist, cereals, and bread	665,041,533	[1] 1.48	.....
Total consumption	2,732,915,508	.....	.....

[1] Increase in Payne bill (Table 4, p. 11).

Annual saving to the people on these 10 schedules by the Payne bill, on Democratic authority	$184,133,248
Annual increase of cost to the people on flour and grist, cereals, and bread by the Payne bill, on Democratic authority	9,842,614
Total saving	174,290,634

Or a reduction of 6.38 per cent ad valorem.

This is the Democratic showing now for the Payne bill.

Are we as Republicans not entitled to a retraction of all statements heretofore made about upward revision and repudiated pledges?

The Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee are now meeting by themselves in a locked room, safely guarded by watchmen at the doors and in the corridors, refusing not only public hearings, but declining even to talk in confidence to the members of the press, and doing precisely as their Republican predecessors have been charged with doing in every respect. I do not find any fault with it, but it was thrown at the Republican candidates for Congress in Connecticut by our governor and other speakers on the stump that we made the Payne bill in secrecy. What are you doing? Let it go out to the country that you are making your free-trade bill precisely as the Republican Ways and Means Committee made the Payne tariff bill, in secrecy in guarded rooms.

Mr. MANN. And without a hearing.

Mr. HILL. And without hearings that were asked for by us.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will not the gentleman concede that there are about 10,000 printed pages of hearings taken only two years ago?

Mr. HILL. Taken by the Republican Ways and Means Committee; and for the last two years they have been denounced on every stump in the country as prejudiced and unfair. You now confirm the Republican position in that respect as you have confirmed it by your statement in regard to the upward revision. You acknowledge the hearings were fair and impartial. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will not the gentleman from Connecticut admit that the basis of the secret conclave of the Republican predecessors was leveled at the idea that the protected interests conspired in secret with them to produce the rate they gave us? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I admit nothing of the kind, and the gentleman will not charge it. Every hearing was public, and I admit you are just as fair as we were and no fairer, but we were denounced for it through the whole campaign. The only difference is that we gave open public hearings for two and a half months and you gave none whatever. That is another mistake that was made during the campaign. In view of these facts and as the Ways and Means Committee are now desperately struggling to make a tariff on wool which will not be reflected in the necessarily high rates on the finished fabric and so be distasteful to the American people, I will temporarily withhold a statement I prepared for publication to be signed by the members of that committee at their convenience. Let me read it:

To the people of the United States:

We the undersigned, OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama; CHOICE B. RANDELL, of Texas; FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON, of New York; WILLIAM G. BRANTLEY, of Georgia; DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, of Missouri; CLAUDE KITCHIN, of North Carolina; OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky; HENRY T. RAINEY, of Illinois; LINCOLN DIXON, of Indiana; WILLIAM HUGHES, of New Jersey; CORDELL HULL, of Tennessee; W. S. HAMMOND, of Minnesota; ANDREW J. PETERS, of Massachusetts; and A. MITCHELL PALMER, of Pennsylvania, having joined in a unanimous report in favor of H. R. 4413, and having with that report submitted Table No. 4, showing the respective ad valorem rate of duties with relation to articles carried by that bill for the year ending June 30, 1905, and the year ending June 30, 1910, and finding that such ad valorems show a reduction from the law of 1897 to the law of 1909, known as the Payne bill, on agricultural implements of 4.69 per cent, on bagging, etc., of 1.9 per cent, on cotton ties of 20.14 per cent, on leather, etc., of 26.04 per cent, on wire of 0.04 per cent, on fresh meat of 2.25 per cent, on lumber of 4.76 per cent, on sewing machines of 15 per cent, and on salt of 0.29 per cent, and an increase on flour, cereals, and bread of 1.48 per cent, making a net reduction under the Payne bill on these items of 6.38 per cent, hereby acknowledge that we have been mistaken in our estimate of the Payne bill from the time that it was passed by Congress until now, including the statements made on page 3 of said report, and admit to the people of this country that the campaign of last fall was made under this mistaken impression, and that we now are compelled by the document submitted by ourselves and approved by all of us, to admit our error, and will hereafter give due credit to the statements of the Republican Party of this country that the Payne bill as a whole was a substantial revision downward.

Do you not think they ought to do it? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will not the gentleman admit that many of the so-called reductions of the Payne-Aldrich bill were reductions only in name, and not in fact, because they left the rate still prohibitive?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; I do not admit anything. [Laughter.] I am making statements of my own and in my own way. Meanwhile, while the members of the committee are engaged in their arduous labors, I will hold this document for them to sign, and if there are any other repentant sinners on that side, who wish to get in early, an opportunity will be given now. Copies will be sent for their signatures to Gov. Baldwin, of Connecticut; Gov. Wilson, of New Jersey; Gov. Harmon, of Ohio; William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska; and Herman Ridder, of New York; and to the chairmen of both congressional committees, for publication in the next campaign textbooks of the two parties. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not mean by anything that I have said to claim that the Payne bill or the law as it now stands on the statute books has no mistakes in it. I do not mean even to claim that the reductions in rates of duty were made to the extent which I think the country expected, and such as I personally felt that the situation then justified. As the bill left the House of Representatives it was a most excellent measure, and if the conference report had come back to us for final adoption substantially on the lines of the original bill, I think the country would have accepted it with equanimity and a considerable degree of satisfaction, and, in my judgment, we would have carried the congressional elections last fall and the present tariff agitation would not have existed. But that is ancient history now. The question is, What is our present duty? Believing, as I sincerely do, that the Nation at large is in favor of a protective-tariff system fairly and equitably applied, I am in hearty sympathy with the President of the United States and the national platform of the Republican Party in the declaration, "that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," and I would subject every item and every schedule of the present tariff law to such a test at the hands of an impartial bipartisan——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If the gentleman pursues that rule to its logical conclusion, what is there that is going to induce the importation of anything into this country?

Mr. HILL. What is going to give you any revenue from the course that you are pursuing.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. HILL. And the gentleman has not answered mine [laughter]; and I would subject every item and every schedule of the present tariff law to such a test at the hands of an impartial bipartisan board of experts, and with such a report and after such a thorough and patient investigation, with the facts before us, I would correct any inaccuracies or injustice either to the producer—and there are some to the producers in the Payne bill—or to the consumer, that such an investigation might show.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has had his attention called to the fact that the Tariff Board now in existence has made a report upon the amount of farm wages paid in Canada?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; I have read the report thoroughly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. And that the Canadian board has made a similar report, and that they vary about 50 per cent.

Mr. HILL. Oh, I have read it thoroughly, and I have studied the Canadian Yearbook. But, using a slang phrase, "my eyes are fixed" on the reciprocity question, and there is no use of the gentleman saying anything about it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am not talking about reciprocity. I am talking about a Tariff Board that is 50 per cent away from the truth.

Mr. HILL. This is the policy, I will say to my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, pursued by our great commercial rivals in Europe——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not answer my question. I asked him if he thinks that a Tariff Board which has already made one report that is 50 per cent away from the truth could be of very much value to anybody in any other report it might make.

Mr. HILL. The logical inference of the gentleman's question is that there can be no basis on which a tariff is laid except guesswork, and I do not believe——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then what good will a Tariff Board do you?

Mr. HILL. I want them to do the work and ascertain the facts. This is the policy pursued by our great commerical rivals, and in my judgment it is one which we might well follow, and thus save ourselves from recurring periods of industrial stagnation such as we are now experiencing, alternating with prosperity or panic. So much for that.

I propose now, Mr. Chairman, to take up the bill itself and try to analyze it and discuss it as well as I can. It is a bill to place on the free list certain agricultural implements, cotton bagging, and so forth. There are in the world to-day three kinds of revenue systems—one English free trade, one a tariff for revenue, and one a protective system. English free trade means high duties on luxuries, but everything else free. A tariff for revenue only means high duties on luxuries and everything else taxed at the lowest possible point which will give sufficient revenue to maintain the Government. A protective tariff, like both of the other systems, means a high tax on luxuries, a duty on imported competing articles equaling the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, and everything else free.

I think in the last session of Congress the gentleman who now honors the House of Representatives and the American people by occupying the Speaker's chair made a speech on this floor in which he said that the Democratic policy would be to have a tariff on everything, and then in a low voice added, "There will be no free list, or a very small one, if any." Am I right about that? "No free list, or a very small one, if any." And yet the Democratic Party starts out with a policy which puts $2,700,000,000 of the annual consumption of the American people on the free list in one bill. "No free list, but a very small one, if any."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. That is the prelude to the play.

Mr. HILL. I want to know in which classification this bill comes, whether in English free trade, tariff for revenue, or under the protective-tariff system? It is a hybrid. It does not bear classification with any existing system in the world. This bill has none of these policies, and it is distinctly announced on this floor—oh, I regret it, and I think the American people will regret it—it is distinctly announced on this floor as the exercise of the taxing power of the Government in the interest of a class. It puts finished products on the free list and leaves duties on the raw materials from which they are made. Some of the manufacturers of Connecticut, as I happen to know, voted the Democratic ticket last fall under the assurance, freely given by the Democratic speakers throughout that State, that if the Democratic ticket was elected, and the Democrats were put in control of the House of Representatives, they would have free raw materials and the duties maintained on their finished products. I think they will wake up in surprise some fine morning, if this bill ever passes, when they find they have dutiable raw materials and free finished products. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But I stand here for the men and women who work in the factories of Connecticut as well as for the men who own them. [Applause on the Republican side.] This bill puts finished products on the free list and leaves the duty on the raw materials from which they are made. It is intended to hit the trusts, and it is openly announced so here, and the names of the various trusts are detailed. Gentlemen will wake up to the fact that this bill helps the trusts instead of hurting them.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Which one?

Mr. HILL. I will show you before I get through. You will not have any occasion to plead ignorance on that subject. It is intended to hit the trusts and helps them by giving them free finished or unfinished parts of their finished products, a thing that was never done before in the history of American tariff legislation.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Specify one of the things you are talking about.

Mr. HILL. I will when I get to it. I am making this speech in my own way.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. All right.

Mr. HILL. In one case it will be destructive of revenue and in the other will change our factories to mere shops for the assembling of the products of foreign factories. If I had my way, I would offer an amendment immediately after the opening clause of the bill.

Where is the man on this floor or elsewhere that can say that this amendment is not fair and right and just to the American people? Yet you will vote it down. You have already announced your intention to vote down every amendment. It would be this:

On page 1, at the end of line 5, insert:

"*Provided*, That all articles mentioned in this act, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this act."

Now, is not that fair? Is not that right? If we are going to surrender to Europe a market of 90,000,000 people with an annual consumption of twenty-seven hundred million dollars on the things named in this bill, is it not fair that Europe should give us a corresponding privilege there, or that we should have some consideration for it?

What about revenues under this bill? Well, at the Treasury a few days ago I was handed a copy of a statement prepared for the press, in which it showed that there would be a loss of revenue by this bill of $10,052,942.35, about 18 per cent on the entire volume of importations covered by this bill that we are going to throw away. Is that right?

Our Democratic friends have tried to whittle that down before the country. They started in with the idea that we were going to lose only a million dollars revenue by it. Then they got up to $10,000,000. Then they subtracted one and one-half million dollars, which would be covered by the Canadian reciprocity. Gentlemen, I tell you that forty or fifty or sixty million dollars will not cover the loss of revenue to the Government if you pass this bill.

If your theory is correct that large importations of these articles are coming in, what about the duties paid on the raw materials used in the manufacture of like articles which are now being made here? Will not those duties also go glimmering if you pass this bill? And how about finished and unfinished parts and repair parts, which are to be free? The Treasury Department, in making this statement, very wisely and very prudently and very cautiously submitted this observation:

While there are certain approximations and certain figures that can not definitely be obtained, the tables indicate the following.

Why did they say that? Because they do not know what is coming in under your bill, and nobody knows. There is not a man on this floor can answer the question, What will come in under this first item? And I am going to ask you very soon. If free, more will be imported, and duties will be lost on the materials entering into those articles formerly made here. No man can tell what the loss of revenue will be by this bill.

Now, let us take up the first item of the bill—

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers—

That is a new word not found in the old law—

Harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, threshing machines, and cotton gins.

The Dingley law stopped there, and the Wilson law stopped there, and the McKinley law stopped there. In fact, in the McKinley law agricultural implements were not mentioned at all. They came in under the blanket clause, I believe, at 45 per cent.

What did Mr. Wilson, chairman of the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means at that time, do? That committee was composed of good men. I will read you their names. You may have forgotten them. I want to tell you who they were and what they did on this particular question. The Committee on Ways and Means of that Congress consisted of William L. Wilson, of West Virginia; Benton McMillin, of Tennessee; Henry G. Turner, of Georgia, a splendid man and a great lawyer; Alexander B. Montgomery, of Kentucky; Justin R. Whit-

ing, of Michigan; W. Bourke Cockran, of New York; Moses T. Stevens, of Massachusetts; William J. Bryan, of Nebraska; William D. Bynum, of Indiana; Clifton R. Breckinridge, of Arkansas; John C. Tarsney, of Missouri; Thomas B. Reed, of Maine; SERENO E. PAYNE, of New York; Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan; JOHN DALZELL, of Pennsylvania; Albert J. Hopkins, of Illinois; and John H. Gear, of Iowa. What did they do? They stopped there, and then they added this clause:

Provided, That all articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this act.

That duty was 45 per cent. A Democratic Congress did that. A Democratic Ways and Means Committee did that under the leadership of William L. Wilson and during the administration of your patron saint and greatest President, Grover Cleveland. They provided that those articles "shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this act."

What happened then? Then came on the Dingley law, and in that law Mr. Dingley made a provision that reduced the duties on agricultural machinery from 45 per cent, with a possible free list, down to 20 per cent. What did the gentleman from New York, the Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, and his associates on the committee do? They cut that duty from 20 per cent to 15 per cent, and provided that agricultural implements should be free, specifying what they were, coming from any country which would admit our agricultural implements free. It was done at the request of the manufacturers of agricultural implements. You propose to give the market away without any consideration and without knowing what, under the terms of this section, you are giving away. I do not say it disrespectfully, but no man can possibly know. You are giving it away for nothing. Now, let us see what it is:

Farm wagons and farm carts.

What are they? An oxcart in Maine; a prairie schooner covered with canvas duck, drawn by a six-mule team, out in Arizona. There are on the farms to-day in Kansas, and I am glad of it, auto trucks. Every conceivable thing in the way of a wheeled vehicle can come in under that provision. That is not all. That is trivial compared to the language which follows:

And all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not.

That is broad enough, is it not? It sweeps every schedule. It does away with the provision of the law that a general clause is not effective where an article is specifically named, and it says here that everything in the whole range of tariff duties, among 4,000 items, that can be construed as an agricultural implement, is included; and your committee, in making their report, add the words "agricultural tools," so that they get them all in—tools and implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Could it be made broader? This bill ought to be recommitted to the committee for further enlightenment on that section alone, without reference to anything else in it, in justice to the American people. Why should we not have reciprocal free trade if we are going to have free trade at all?

We passed a tariff bill two years ago, and one of the principal features of it was a maximum and minimum rate. Why did not you fix the free list as the minimum and let the President negotiate with the other countries of the world for special advantages to American commerce in consideration of it? But no, you could not do that. In the eagerness to get to an absolutely free basis you used language in the first three lines which absolutely sweeps out of existence, so far as these items are concerned, the maximum system adopted in the Payne tariff bill. You say no duties shall be charged on these things. Could you not trust the present administration? Could you not trust the administration which you hope to have two years from now, but which you will never get with this policy, gentlemen? Make no mistake about that. [Applause on the Republican side.] Could not you trust such an administration to negotiate for the best interests of the American people and offer to make your free list the minimum, with the possibilities of negotiation by the administration for privileges and for trade relations which now they are wholly unable to get?

Finished and unfinished parts. A little while ago a gentleman asked me about the question of finished parts. A day or two ago I went down town to an agricultural machinery store. I wanted to know what this bill covered. I had repeatedly asked Members of the House on both sides what this language included, and no one seemed to know.

Agricultural implements of every kind and description, finished or unfinished, whether specifically mentioned herein or not.

I went into one store and asked for the International Harvester Co.'s catalogue. They said they had not got it; but they handed me out one after another these nine different pamphlets which I have here, and they had a lot more. I said I had as many as I wanted to carry. I have here the catalogue of the Bucher & Gibbs Plow Co. Look at it, gentlemen. Look at the different forms of manufacture of every kind and character. If I was a plow manufacturer and there was a duty of $2.50 a ton on pig iron, as there is now, and I wanted to escape that duty, I would send to Belgium or to England or to Germany and make a contract to have iron run directly from the blast furnace into the form of plowshares instead of pig iron, and import 10,000 tons of plowshares free of duty, under that clause "agricultural implements or parts thereof," and use them for what I saw fit when I got them here.

There would be no way to stop it, and nobody in the United States could stop its being done. [Applause on the Republican side.] "Parts of implements." Here are plows, a whole book full of cuts, and springs and wires and everything entering into the construction of plows and harrows. Here are corn planters, buggy planters. You can buy the wheels in Europe and put them together here. I say to the gentleman, the Speaker of this House, that with this bill in operation the zinc industry in Missouri will go a glimmering under the provisions for free finished and unfinished parts. There is not a mowing machine, a harvesting machine, there is not an auto cart, but that has steel antifriction ball bearings or antifriction journal boxes, the metallic parts of which are made of zinc, antimony, or lead. I can take the cast-iron journal boxes in the rough, made in Europe, run Babbitt metal into them, and the duties which I would escape under this bill of $12.50 a ton on lead, $27.50 a ton on zinc, $30 per ton on antimony, and $16 per ton on iron castings would more than pay for the cost of the work and the freight besides for getting them over here. This is only a single illustration of countless other things which can be done under that clause of the bill. Go and tell that, you men of Missouri, to your constituents who produce lead, zinc, and antimony.

And so I might go through with all these various items.

Now, there are gentlemen on the floor from Texas. All through these items are wool parts; take the linings to saddles and harness, white serge and the wool parts, dutiable at 142 per cent. These can be imported free of duty under the provisions of this bill. Where are your Texas men who want high duties on wool under the new Democratic program? Are you going to vote for it? Not only that, but your harnesses and horse blankets, and so on. Here is spraying machinery. I said to an official in the Treasury Department this morning, "Is that admitted as an agricultural implement under the bill?" He said, "It is a matter of doubt." I said, "You can not raise potatoes without it." He said, "It might be construed as a special instrument." I said, "You could not raise fruit without it; we are spraying all the old apple trees in New England, and we have to have the spraying machine in order to bring them back to life again." California fruit farms must have spraying machines. You have got to admit every one of them under the terms of this bill.

Now, here is the McCormick reaper. There is not a schedule in the tariff bill, not one, but that will be absolutely smashed to pieces under this privilege of admitting free finished and unfinished parts of these and like articles.

And so I might go on. And then we come to the International Harvester Co. Now, I am not in sympathy with the International Harvester Co. or any other trust. I do not believe that J. P. Morgan wants any sympathy from me. I did not have the committee report to read last Monday night, but I read the newspaper coming down from Connecticut, and in it I found the annual report of the International Harvester Co. for 1910. Their preferred capital stock is $80,000,000, common stock $60,000,000. They earned last year $21,000,000 net income. They paid a dividend on the common stock of $3,200,000; on the preferred stock of $4,200,000. They had a surplus of $7,300,000 and undivided profits this year, after paying dividends, of $8,684,000. Total surplus was $16,000,000. They are not objects of sympathy. They do not ask it. They came before us, all these manufacturers two years ago, and they said frankly, "We are perfectly willing that you should put these specified articles on the free list and we will take our chances with the rest of the world—that will give us an equal chance."

Now, you will not tell that to your farmers in the South and West; you will not tell them that the Payne bill already does this, but it does do it. You want them to think this is a new proposition, a new discovery which you have made. You are two years behind the times and you always are. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, the International Co. did

$100,000,000 worth of trade last year. How was that trade divided up?

It was divided up in this way. On harvesting machinery, tillage implements, and so forth, United States trade, $37,000,000; foreign trade, $25,000,000; total, $62,000,000. Wagons, spreaders, gasoline engines, and so forth—notice what you are getting into, gasoline engines and parts thereof free as agricultural implements—United States, eighteen millions; foreign trade, eight millions; miscellaneous goods, fibers, and so forth, ten millions. Now, gentlemen, do you know what you have done? Under that provision of finished or unfinished parts you have given them at least $10,000,000 a year—at least that. Take agricultural implements. How many reapers and binders in the whole, as a complete machine, are going to be imported into the United States, if they are absolutely free? Not one. The freight would stop it. What have you done? They have got their factories on the other side, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] told us the other day, in three or four European countries. Will they move over there and send the finished machines here? No; because they are largely made of lumber, which they can get cheaper here than they can in Europe.

But they will get the finished metallic parts over there from their own factories on the other side and make an assembling shop here, and get every penny of duty on those things remitted under the terms of your bill. You talk about helping the farmer! Do you suppose you will get those agricultural implements one single cent cheaper because of this? Do you not know they can make those implements cheaper by getting the parts made on the other side and using the lumber here? It is not only so with agricultural implements. Any manufacturer would select and make up the things at home from material which he could get at the best advantage at home, and he would import the finished parts made from materials which he could get at the best advantage abroad, and so make simply an assembling shop of the United States. The remark that I made when I came in, that the room as it then looked reminded me of the way an American workshop would appear by and by, was justified by the fact that under this policy experienced machinists and mechanics will be looking in vain for work, while men who are simply assemblers will be left in the almost deserted shops under your policy. You can not get away from that proposition. It is human nature to do it, and, of course, they will do it.

Now, take up patented articles. Do you expect the farmer is going to buy any patented agricultural machinery any cheaper? But the manufacturer can make it cheaper, and he will take the profit. So that instead of contributing to the benefit of the farmer by your proposition, you are directly and absolutely putting from 10 to 15 per cent of the cost of production of these articles right into the pockets of the trusts, and they do not need it. It is a work of supererogation in most cases. They are getting along pretty well as they are. Why should a Democratic majority come in here and build up their business and make additional profits for them under these circumstances, under the plea that they are going to help the farmer? On all patented articles this means reduced cost to the producer, less revenue to the Government, and the same price to the consumer. I think the time is coming, and it may be somewhat radical for me to say it, but I think the time is coming in this country when the United States in granting a monopoly under a patent will reserve to itself in some way the right to determine at any time whether the price at which the product is sold is reasonable or not.

Now, under this first schedule how much do we consume? In all these figures I give you Democratic authority, as I have from the beginning. We consume $90,000,000 worth annually. What are we giving away? England, Germany, and France are our only competitors. We have free trade with England now in plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins. But this bill opens our market to the whole world, not only on these things, but on every conceivable kind of agricultural tools and implements, such as scythes, hoes, shovels, axes, pruning knives, traction engines, and all kinds of farm machinery. The market of Great Britain is open and free to-day to us on all of these things. Not so with Germany and France. What do they charge us? To get into Germany our manufacturers pay on cultivators, potato diggers and harrows, 12 per cent duty; on plows, 9 per cent; on forks for hay and manure, and so forth, 4 per cent; on motor-driven plows and reaper machinery, 6 per cent; on thrashing machines, 7 per cent; on other agricultural machines, 12 per cent; on wagons and carts, 6 per cent; and on all of them alike, 11 per cent to get into France, and you say come over and take this magnificent market of 92,000,000 of people and keep your doors closed to us. That is your Democratic policy.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman's whole argument seems to be directed in the interest of the American manufacturer. He pays no attention to the consumer. Our bill is designed for the relief of the American consumer.

Mr. HILL. Not at all; it is the other way. I am complaining that by your legislation your are benefiting the trusts and not helping the consumer. You will not benefit the farmer, and I am complaining that you will deprive the United States Government of needed revenues, and I regret that the gentleman has not yet succeeded—I regret on my own part—in getting hold of the drift and tendency of my argument. [Applause on the Republican side.] So much for the market of the world given free on agricultural implements. Let us take up the next proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman such time as he may wish to use.

Mr. HILL. I will take but little time; I am going through it hurriedly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman permit a question here?

Mr. HILL. At any time.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. How will it help any trust to give free the American market for the machinery of which you speak?

Mr. HILL. It is helping the trusts——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Which trust?

Mr. HILL. We give them the privilege of importing finished or unfinished parts made by the cheaper labor of Europe, and I have seen it, and will tell you of it if I have the time, not from statistics, not from consular tables, but from my own personal observation and experience. You allow them to bring them in here free, and so lessen the revenues, and yet have no possible way by which the price to the consumer is to be lessened, especially on patented articles. [Applause on the Republican side.] My friends, you have a good deal to think about when you tackle 4,000 items in a tariff bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Ask him another question.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] suggests that I ask you one more question.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I asked the gentleman a while ago how permitting the American consumer to have a free market in machinery will help any trust, and you have not explained that to me; but I will ask the gentleman what particular trust will be benefited by allowing——

Mr. HILL. And I have said already, the International Harvester Co., which makes their machines on the other side. They can import them, if profitable, complete; that is, made up. You give them the privilege of importing such parts as they can make cheaper over there, such parts as cost them more here, put them together, and you have no way in the world of compelling them to sell their product cheaper to the American farmer. Now, will you help or hurt them?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Does the gentleman mean to say the International Harvester Co. has a factory on the other side?

Mr. HILL. I stated that the gentleman from Illinois the other day named three or four countries in which they had their factories.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Why have they taken their money and labor from this country when they can do better here, or——

Mr. HILL. They use their factories there now to supply the foreign markets. You want them to use them to bring their finished and unfinished products over here. We want the work done in American workshops.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Why do not they stay here and make their machinery——

Mr. HILL. I do not care to discuss the question with the gentleman any further, as I do not seem to be able to make it clear to him; but I want to say this to the gentleman, that there is a vast difference between criticizing, as you have been doing for 16 years, and assuming the responsibility, as you have got to do now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, the grave error that the gentleman assumes does not still answer the question I put

to him, and that is, why it is that an American monopoly finds it more profitable to go abroad and to take labor abroad than to stay here?

Mr. HILL. If I have not answered the question, I can not answer, and I shall have to ask the gentleman not to interrupt me further on that point.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Tell it over to him. Tell him it is labor, among other things. Tell it to him, so that he will understand that.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If the gentleman does not want to be interrupted, I beg his pardon.

Mr. HILL. I do not mind being interrupted, but I do not like to be asked the same question two or three times.

The next schedule is:

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed, in whole or in part, of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares—

If they had stopped there it would have been all right and the articles to be imported would have been fairly well defined and restricted. But the whole world is thrown open, for it says further:

Or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

What are they? There is not a fiber, there is not a fabric, there is not a material made on earth but that can be brought into the ports of the United States under that language free of duty. It is absolutely all-embracing, as the language is in the first section under the agricultural-implement bill. Now, there was not any necessity for your doing that, not the slightest.

There is a man in this House on the Democratic side who has made a study of this bagging question, and I am sorry he is not here, for he could have given you an intelligent proposition to refer to this House. I refer to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], who is entitled to great credit on the Democratic side, and ought to receive it from his constituents, for his earnest, faithful, intelligent effort to get free cotton bagging for them. [Applause.] But he has done it in a straightforward way. He has not put in a proposition that takes in the whole world. This is the amendment he offered to the Payne tariff bill a few years ago:

On page 2, beginning with line 3, to and including line 9, strike out the whole paragraph and insert.

"Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute or jute butts or hemp, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, not exceeding 16 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and weighing not less than 15 ounces per square yard."

Any man knows what that means. No man knows what this means in this bill. Why do you not follow the intelligent advice of men on your side who have given study to these questions in the years gone by? You put an all-embracing proviso in there that will take in every foundation fabric for every piece of oilcloth that is made in the United States and allow the trust to bring it in.

You will allow every Fertilizer Trust to bring in bags under that provision free. Do you believe the farmers of the South will get fertilizer one cent cheaper because of the little bit of duty that is taken off those bags? Do you suppose the United States Steel Trust, the largest producer of cement in the United States, will concede a fraction of a cent because of the duty being taken off bagging in which they sell the cement? The farmer does not buy the bag at all. He sends the bag back again, and every cent of rebate of duty will go into the cash boxes of these trusts.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Always.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman says "Always." The custom of trade enters into and controls these things. You have taken these duties off, and in every single case there the trust will get the benefit of it and the farmers not a single cent.

This thing goes further than you seem to have foreseen. The United States Steel Co. does not need any sympathy from the Democratic Party. The Fertilizer Trust does not need any sympathy from the Democratic Party. And yet you are forcing upon them a cheaper article for them to use—no, not a cheaper article, but the same article at a less cost—under the plea that you are giving it to the farmer, when the farmer will never know it. Now, there are three trusts that I have told you are going to be benefited by this proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, you have brought in free bagging that covers the oriental rugs that cost hundreds and hundreds of dollars apiece. Is this for the benefit of the farmers? Every yard of carpet that comes into the United States will come in with its covering free, and I do not know but that you have repealed section 18 of the administrative act, which provides that the covering on any article coming into the United States on an ad valorem basis, or on any article on which the duty is fixed by reason of value in any way, shall be dutiable. Have you thought about it? If you are going to make bags free to the farmer, why do you not make free cartons, bottles, crates, boxes, casks, barrels, hogsheads, jars, and containers of every kind which are referred to in section 18? That section provides that they shall be dutiable on ad valorem importations. Does your provision here repeal that, or does it not? If it does, you have swept millions out of the Treasury of the United States in the loss of revenue in order to get $700,000 to give to the southern cotton growers free cotton bagging. Nobody can tell what is lost.

You have gone at this thing apparently in a hurry to get this bill in here. I can not account for it in any other way. Why, the Wilson bill had this provision in regard to cotton bagging—not as clear as the amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT, but still clear enough so that you could determine what it was that was to be free under the law—"bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar materials suitable for covering cotton, composed in whole or in part of hemp, flax, jute, or jute butts," limited by the restriction of the material. But you say, "any material suitable for covering"; not only cotton, but any other agricultural product of any kind or character—potatoes, apples, grapes, or anything; anything that you see fit to put in a bag.

Now, gentlemen, I submit to you, in view of the necessities of the Treasury of the United States, that the language of neither of these schedules is wise legislation, and on either proposition the bill ought to be recommitted to the committee for further consideration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The consumption of the United States of the articles named in this clause is $26,000,000. Germany charges us 18 per cent on these things for taking them in there. France charges us 21 per cent. You propose to let them in here for nothing. Marvelous generosity!

Let us take the next item:

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Is a rose an agricultural product? Are violets agricultural products? Is the wire that surrounds your buttonhole bouquet to come in free? Who is going to draw the line? Men get their living in my country by raising those things, just as they do in the West by raising wheat and corn. Who is going to draw the line? This paragraph takes in every form of wire. I appeal to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] if this and the next succeeding section do not take in every form of wire, even wire rope, under the provisions of this bill, and every dollar of duties on those things the Treasury will lose.

Now, I will admit—I suppose all my colleagues will not agree with me in what I am going to say now—that the southern farmer has just as good a right to a free cotton tie as the northern farmer has to free binding twine. I will admit that neither ought to be free. We ought not to apply tariff rates by favoritism. I hope the time for that sort of thing has gone by and that it will never be done again; and as I said before, I regret from the bottom of my heart that the Democratic Party, in view of its criticisms of our action with regard to binding twine in the past, has now fallen from its high estate and got down to administering tariffs as a matter of privilege. It ought not to be done by anybody.

On this item the home consumption is $12,639,953, and Germany charges us on wire 14 per cent to get into her ports and on barbed wire 22 per cent, and we are to give our market to them for nothing.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather.

Does that last clause refer to the sets or does it refer to the parts? Are saddlery hardware, buckles, trace chains, and all of those things to come in free? No man can say. No man in the Treasury Department will construe that language.

Harness is to be brought in whole. It can be brought in in sets or in parts, composed wholly or in chief value of leather. Is the part to be in chief value of leather, or the whole harness? Is saddlery hardware to come in free also?

And leather—

Now, gentlemen, pay attention to this—

And leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Now, every hat manufacturer in my district will hold up his hands in glee at that proposition. Why? Because he can take

the sweat leather that goes into the hat and bring it in free. But there are men in my district who buy the skins, who finish them, or pay a duty of 15 per cent on the dressed skin, and who cut them up into sweat leathers and bag linings for the bags that the ladies carry in their hands. They do that work and that only, and this proposition will absolutely exterminate every one of them in the United States, and you know it. A leather duty of 15 per cent and the finished article coming in free. Why, there is not a rubber belt on an agricultural machine or engine but what will come in free as a finished part. There is not a leather belt, there is not a single item of the metal schedule from one end to the other but what will come in free as finished or unfinished parts.

Calfskin shoes.

Finished calfskins are dutiable at 15 per cent, shoes are to be free. Is that wise legislation? Now, stop and think of it just a minute. Just think of the consideration that must have been given to this bill to bring about this result. I am not saying that the consideration was unintelligent. I am simply saying that these gentlemen, able, skillful, wise, and good legislators, have not taken time enough to perfect this bill and put it before Congress for the considerate action of Congress, and it ought to go back to the committee, and every single schedule that I have mentioned ought to be reconstructed and rewritten.

Take a saddle. Do you stop to think that I can bring in a saddle here free, and yet the lining is dutiable at 142 per cent. You think it is made of leather. Most of them are made of pigskin. Pigskin is dutiable at 15 per cent. Saddle trees are dutiable at 35 per cent. The Payne bill cut saddlery down to 20 per cent, all the manufacturers could possibly stand. They said they could not go lower without going out of business. It went from 45 per cent down to 20 per cent in the Payne bill. You now say practically that we will wipe out the industry and turn it over to England.

Saddle trees, 35 per cent duty, and the finished product to be free. Where do you suppose the American industry is coming out under these circumstances? Two and three-quarter billion dollars of production annually affected by such legislation as that. We had a consumption in the United States on this schedule alone last year, or in 1905, according to the Democratic authority, of $493,000,000. What do you suppose it costs us to get into foreign markets? Oh, but you say we can make shoes and saddles and harnesses and sell them all over the world. Yes; I have seen them all over the world. The last time I saw them was in Belgrade and in Cologne. I have seen American shoes in foreign shop windows, and right alongside, shoes of American pattern of foreign make, and alongside of both other shoes of foreign style and manufacture, and the American shoe has sold in every case for 50 cents more a pair than any other. They were worth it. They are works of art compared with shoes made anywhere else in the wide world. They bring the money. You say it is because of the activity, because of the energy, because of the determination of the American manufacturers to carry their products to the ends of the earth, that they can do it cheaper. They do not; they get a higher price almost invariably. You do not see any cheap shoes exported. They are high-class, first-class shoes, works of art as compared with those of England, Germany, or France.

Now, what do our shoe manufacturers pay to get in there? You say they will go in for nothing. Oh, no; for Germany says that you shall pay 2 per cent on cut uppers, 12 per cent on shoes, 6 per cent on sole leather, 3 per cent on bovine leather, 5 per cent on harness, and 5 per cent on saddlery leather.

What about France? France says you shall pay 8 per cent to get in on uppers. You will not get in your soles; they will be worn out. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLMSTED. They will be walking on their uppers. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Saddlery and harness, 11 per cent, and yet you propose to give to the foreigner our market of 90,000,000 of people for nothing.

Now, I think I can safely speak about some of these industries. The shoe industry is an industry of New England. It is almost a crime for a man to be from New England on this floor, judging by the denunciation I have heard of the New England manufacturers. But the shoe industry is not a Connecticut industry. There are about nine shoe shops manufacturing shoes in Connecticut, with a half a million dollars invested. Nine shops out of 1,316 in the whole country, but I speak for an American industry anywhere [applause on the Republican side], just as much for the International Harvester Co. in Illinois as I would for an industry in my own congressional district. I stand for the protection of American labor and the equalization of cost between this and competing countries.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. What about reasonable profits?

Mr. HILL. Oh, I have answered that 50 times within the last 18 months. The gentleman from New York knows the answer just as well and probably better than I do myself, and what is the use in taking up time by answering it again?

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fences, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Dutiable raw materials, free finished products, imports not governed by styles or fashion, but a world-wide product.

Our consumption for last year, or 1905, according to the Democratic figures, was $113,000,000. What are the duties on these articles which the American manufacturer will have to pay to get into the other countries? It is well to figure the cost of this change as we go along. This is a great revolution that is impending. Wire, 14 per cent, and barbed wire, 22 per cent; that is what it costs us to get into Germany.

Now, take the next schedule—beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds. If it stopped there, I would like to vote with you.

I have been in favor of free meats for years. I am in favor of free fresh meat now. You will not let me vote on a separate schedule in this bill. You say I have got to take all these things, which will demoralize the revenue system of the United States, in order to get a desirable thing; but this schedule is just as unfortunate as any of it, taking it altogether. Let me read the rest of it:

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Do you know how much good that is going to do the farmer? Why, I see my friend from Texas here. A few days ago I got a circular from the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, and their bitterest complaint is that the United States Government will not enforce the entry of our cattle and meats under any terms—not free—into the countries of Europe. Do you know, gentlemen, you can not take cattle from this country and send them to Europe? The only country that will receive them is England. I am speaking now of France and Germany, and perhaps I ought not to say that England is the only country in Europe; but England will receive them on condition that they are slaughtered at the port of entry. France and Germany will not let them in at all. What do you gain for your farmers in giving them free meats, pickled and preserved in any manner, as well as free fresh meat? Why did you not let the President use this clause to make negotiations with Germany and France and let our meats in there? Why did you not? You can not take canned meat into Germany under any conditions, as I understand it. I did not know but there might be some doubt about that, and so I went down to the Treasury Department and consulted them, and I will tell you what they told me.

First, no cattle, except into England. In the case of Germany, as in the case of France, there is a peculiar prohibition of fresh meat. You can not take fresh meat from the United States into France and Germany unless the viscera accompanies the carcass, and you know that is impossible, going from this country. It can not be done. Why do you not let the farmer get a market for his products in consideration for the one thrown open here?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to know how in the world the gentleman expects keeping meat on the free list or canned meat off the free list to help Germany. Does Germany ever import any meat into this country?

Mr. HILL. Oh, if the gentleman had studied the question of preferential tariffs between Great Britain and her colonies, he would have found this, that she could not get from some of her colonies preferential rates, because she had nothing to give in exchange for that, being on a free-trade basis. We put ourselves on a free-trade basis, and what have we to give?

Mr. HARDY. Does putting meat on a free-trade basis affect Germany?

Mr. HILL. Why, certainly, Germany will not admit our canned meat under any circumstances, and we admit hers under this proposition free. But Germany has many other things which she desires to send here.

Mr. HARDY. Has Germany got meat enough to export?

Mr. HILL. Oh, Germany buys meat and preserves it and cans it and sends it away, just as I saw Denmark doing, buying butter from all the world and sending it back again to all the world; just as I know prunes are shipped from California to France, prepared and bottled and sent back here and sold

as French prunes. That thing is going on all of the time. Why should not we have a fair chance? Why should we surrender everything to them and demand nothing from them? The home consumption under this schedule is $614,895,219, according to Democratic authority. As my time is running out, I will publish with my remarks the duties of Germany and France on all of the items referred to in the bill specifically. Let us go now to the next schedule. If I am not much mistaken, you gentlemen from the Northwest raise durum wheat up there, especially adapted to the making of vermicelli and macaroni, and we ship both the wheat and flour to Italy and Italy ships back to us about 80,000,000 pounds of the manufactured product a year. Why should we not make that macaroni and vermicelli and send it out to all the world? This bill proposes to take all prepared cereal foods and admit them free.

Now, then, does Italy and Germany do that in fair competition? Not at all. Those Governments say to their manufacturers, "We will rebate all your duties that you pay on this American wheat coming in here when it is exported again." Is that all? No; they rebate to an extent and in such a way as to practically offer a bounty besides to get it exported into American markets, and the Democratic Party of the United States proposes to join hands with Germany and Italy in that sort of business, and by giving them a free market here help them to pay a bounty to have American farmers' products prepared and made into cereal foods on the other side of the ocean and shipped back here and sold to our own people. I want that work done here, or I want the markets open and free to both alike. I can not vote for this kind of legislation, gentlemen.

"Prepared cereal foods." What does that mean? What are prepared cereal foods? They are dutiable at 26 per cent in Germany, 45 per cent in France, and to be free in the United States. Ninety millions of people giving away their market without any equivalent concession. Our annual consumption under this schedule is $665,041,533. Take the next item, of lumber. I am in favor of free lumber. Why do not you give it to us in this bill? You have not. Let me read it:

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed—

Now, that is the language of the old law practically—

except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Why do you include shingles and laths? Because they are not in the general language of the present law, and you wanted to bring them in. Why did you not put in clapboards, which the farmer has to have on his house? The American farmer is able to have clapboards on his house. Why did you leave that off? Why did you not put in pickets and palings? The American farmer and workman is able to put pickets and palings around his home and the mechanic to fence in his little cottage. Why did you gentlemen not put those in there? You say you have given them free lumber, but you have not in this bill, not by any manner of means. Do you know it costs more to retie a railroad than to rerail it, taking one year after another? Why did you not give the railroads of this country that if you are in favor of cheaper transportation for the farmer? You said you were going to give them free lumber. You have not done it. This bill ought to go back to the Committee on Ways and Means for reconsideration on every single schedule. [Applause on the Republican side.] We consume $690,000,000 worth of that material in a single year. Now, I do not expect we are going to get much imported from France or Germany.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is not siding lumber and flooring about the most expensive lumber that goes into the ordinary farmer's house?

Mr. HILL. Except inside trimming. It is more of an item than shingles and more than laths, and ties are more of an item to railroads than the steel rails are.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In an ordinary house the trimming is not so expensive.

Mr. HILL. I had heard that statement made in regard to railroad ties, and in order to ascertain positively about it I called up the Southern Railway Co. down here and asked that question, and it is just the same down South as it is up North. Why did you not put them on the free list so as to help out with cheaper transportation?

Now, as to sewing machines. The Singer Sewing Machine Co. does not need any sympathy from Congress. They have a factory in Glasgow, employing 12,000 people there, making sewing machines to-day. They also have factories in the United States. I fancy that they can make the ordinary family sewing machine, with the cabinet case and all, cheaper than anybody else in the world, but I do not know positively.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] knows that we discussed making sewing machines free two years ago, and we did not do it because we thought they would make them over there and ship them over here. It would take away the work from American workmen. You can do it, and it will not hurt the company one particle. They can do as the International Harvester people can and probably would do. They can have the cabinet cases—and I am speaking about what I know of their methods—made here and the metallic work on the other side, ship it over here by the ton in finished and unfinished parts, and our men will lose the work and the company will make more money than they did before. And you are putting them on the free list with the hope of helping the farmer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You are overlooking the theory on which this bill is written. We have not written it from the gentleman's standpoint of the manufacturer. What we have written here is an endeavor to reduce the cost of living to the people, and when a great industry exports a very large percentage of its manufactures to a foreign country to-day, has factories abroad, it hardly seems to me it carries out the gentleman's argument that if these sewing machines go on the free list they will transfer their factories abroad and ship them back here.

Mr. HILL. Finished parts. They can not afford to ship the finished products, but the parts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But more than that. I can state—and the gentleman is on the floor, or was a few moments ago, from whom I got the information—that this very company ships sewing machines to the Orient, and lays them down, freight paid, at the wholesale price of $8.25.

Mr. HILL. I do not know about that. I will tell you what I have seen——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let me finish. They are selling them to the American people to-day from $20 to $30.

Mr. HILL. Yes; at retail, and each sale to a new customer. They are sold on time, on the installment plan, through agencies all over the country. When sold to go abroad they are shipped by the carload, and almost by the shipload. I will say to the gentleman that I have seen them by the cartload, piled up as you would pile hay on a southern farm wagon, carried up the streets of Vladivostock, in eastern Siberia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly. If the gentleman will allow me to finish.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When a great monopoly in this country ships its machines, not the surplus product, but great quantities, as the gentleman testifies himself, abroad, and yet lays tribute on the American people of three or four times their value, I am in favor of putting them on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. So am I; but I am not in favor of giving those people privileges by which they can make them cheaper here by simply assembling them and taking away the work of American mechanics and having the principal part of it done on the other side. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is my doctrine.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know how the gentleman will put them on the free list, according to his doctrine.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is just about as cheap to ship foreign pauper labor over here and have them do the work as to ship pauper goods over here?

Mr. HILL. Oh, I have heard that for many years. The hardest thing to move is a man. You can take merchandise and pack it up and ship it with a c. o. d. label, and the freight will be paid at the other end. When a man is shipped the freight must be paid in advance.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. HILL. To emigrate means to leave the home, to break the home ties, to separate the family, to go out into the world alone. It takes nerve and courage and resolution to do that. It is infinitely easier to ship the products of a man's toil from Europe than it is to ship the man himself, and you know it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. But they ship them in all the same, and the gentleman knows it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I will pass the next item, for it is getting late. The gentleman talks about free labor. Let me tell you something of what I have seen. I was riding through the city of Oxford, in England, one day, and the driver

sat on the seat in front of me. I said to him as we were driving along, "Do you own this carriage?" "No," said he; "I hire it." I asked him, "What are your working hours?"

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. There seems to be some confusion in one part of the Hall. The House will be in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to tire the House, but I want to refer to some incidents relating to the cheap labor that the gentleman suggested could be imported.

I was riding in the streets of Oxford one day in a cab, with the driver sitting in front of me, and I said to him as we went down the street, "How much do you get for driving this carriage, or do you own it?" He said, "No; I do not own it. I drive it by the week." "What are your hours? When do you begin?" He said, "From 9 o'clock in the morning." "How long do you work?" said I. "From 9 in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, and if I have a fare I stay with it until it leaves me."

I asked him, "How much do you get?" He said, "I get $2.50 a week." "How old are you?" said I. He said, "I am 55 years old." "Have you a family?" He answered, "Yes; I have a family of five." I asked him, "How in the world do you manage to live?" "Of course, I can not," he said, "but I have a son and daughter at work. The daughter is at work in a linen mill and she gets $2.25 a week, and my son is a printer and gets $2.50 a week, and we manage to get along." There were three people at work, with an aggregate income of $7.25 a week.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I will ask the gentleman to wait until I finish, and then I will answer his question. I said to this driver, "You are 55 years old. You can not save anything. What will you do when you are unable to work?" He said, without cracking a smile, "Do? Why, I expect to go to the poorhouse. What else do you suppose I have been paying poor rates for all these years?" [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. ALLEN. Does the gentleman mind telling the House what tip he paid the driver? [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Oh, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will yield for any intelligent question, and you would ask none but an intelligent one.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I was very much interested in the story the gentleman was telling, and I accept it as absolutely true, coming as it does from the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. It was true.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman, Did the driver tell him how he managed to eke out a living before that daughter and son grew to an age to be a help to him?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman must answer that for himself. I was riding through the Isle of Wight one day and I stopped to visit a little chapel near the entrance to the Queen's estate, known as Osborne. As I came out of the chapel I saw a man at work in a garden across the street, and I went over and spoke to him. I said, "I am a Yankee, and a tourist, and full of curiosity. Would you think it impertinent on my part if I were to ask you a question?" He said he would not. We were standing in front of a little one-and-a-half-story brick cottage. I said, "Do you own this house?" He said, "No, sir; I am the Queen's farmer." I said, "What do you receive as compensation?" He said, "$5 a week and house rent." Said I, "Is that the usual price here?" Now, I am stating these things in order that you may get the drift of the situation. He said, "No; the usual price is 2.75 to $3 a week in this country."

Do you know what I thought of at once? I thought of a novel called Marcella that I read once, written by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, describing the agricultural population of England under free trade:

> Men of 60 years of age and upward, gray and furrowed, like the chalk soil into which they had worked their lives; not old as age goes, but already the refuse of their generation, and paid for at the rate of refuse, with no prospect but the workhouse if the grave should be delayed.

I do not want any English free trade in the United States. Do you?

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Just excuse me a moment. I have already taken more time than I should.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to ask one question?

Mr. HILL. I said this carriage driver in Oxford told me that his daughter worked in a linen mill. I had just come from the largest linen mill in the world—the York Street Mills, in Belfast.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HILL. I will, and then I will finish my story afterwards.

Mr. HARDY. They have a high tariff in Germany. Are the laboring people any better off in high-tariff Germany than they are in free-trade England?

Mr. HILL. Now, really, I do not want to stop in my line of thought to argue out a question of that kind. If you can not draw your own conclusion from the things that I am going to tell you, from what I have seen, no argument that I could make would satisfy you.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman just answer that in one word? He can answer it yes or no, Whether the laboring man is better off in high-tariff Germany than he is in free-trade England?

Mr. HILL. All men are better off that have work to do than men who do not have it.

Mr. HARDY. Well, the gentleman can answer that——

Mr. HILL. I said I did not propose to argue this question out with the gentleman. I propose to go ahead with my statement. I visited the York Street Linen Mill, in Belfast, Ireland. I went through that mill, the largest in the world, and I saw men and women at work there. I will not trust to my memory. I have taken these figures from my diary, as they were taken down by me in the various trips I have made in different countries in the world. I saw women working at wet linen looms, a stream of water pouring on the fabric as they wove it, and their clothing wet from their hips to their feet, and standing with bare feet on the wet floors, working for $2.50 a week.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. No; I will not yield now. I will by and by.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I was going to say that I had seen that same thing in this country.

Mr. HILL. I know you do not like these things. I am not giving them to you to like. I am making this speech for the country, and not for you.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I simply wanted to tell you that I saw that very condition in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. HILL. I went into every department of that establishment. I saw them hackling flax. They took the fiber and threw it over great iron hooks and drew it out and straightened it, breathing the dust constantly into the nostrils and lungs. It is a dangerous occupation. It is a tremendously fatiguing occupation. How much do you suppose those men got for that kind of work? Three and a half dollars a week. You say this was rough, cheap work of which I have spoken. One day I stopped at Brussels and went to the Royal Lace Factory. At this lace factory there were two women clerks. It was early in the morning and the manager had not come. I tried to buy a lace collar for friends at home. I looked first at one and then at another, and finally I found one that I wanted. It had taken the first prize at the Paris Exposition. I bought it and paid for it, and I paid the duty on it when I got here, too. [Laughter.]

As I came down to the door one of the clerks followed me, and just then the lady manager of the establishment came in. The clerk told her what I had bought. The manager turned to me and said, "Sir, you need not be afraid of that piece of lace ever being duplicated." I said, "Why not?" She said, "The woman that made that lace worked on it for two years, went blind, and has since died." I said, "How much did you pay her?" She turned to me and said, "Twenty cents a day." I was sorry that I had bought it. I have bought lace in factories in Venice where they told me that 5,000 girls were working for 12 and 18 cents a day. You can not find that in New England; but you may find it if you pass this bill and pursue to the end this policy on which you have started. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Talking about iron and steel, I have seen mechanics in Japan, in Yokohama, in foundries making corework, first-class molders. What do we pay them here? Three or four dollars a day.

A MEMBER. Five dollars a day.

Mr. HILL. I have seen first-class corework castings being made in Japan from Japanese or Chinese iron, and the men got 40 cents a day. When I was in Osaka I was told that there

were 40 cotton mills running there day and night with a double shift, and the girls were earning 8 cents and the men 15 cents a day. You propose to open the markets of the United States to products of that kind of labor. [Applause on the Republican side.] The American people will not sustain you in it.

I have seen that sort of thing all over the world. Even the free traders of England would not sustain a policy of that kind. Three years ago I was going through a large factory in England, and the manager said to me: "I suppose, coming from America, you are a protectionist?" I said: "I am. Are you?" He said: "No; but I should be if I lived in the United States." [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what England thinks of you.

I will not go on with this. I have statistics made up by myself in the last 16 years. Almost every long vacation I have visited some country in the world. In 1896 I started from the north of Ireland and went through to Italy, visiting factories. I have seen men in the porcelain works at Sevres, France, working for from 60 cents to $1.40 a day. I have seen men in the Gobelin tapestry works making fabrics fit for a king's ransom, with a picture on the wall behind them and the hand loom in front of them. Occasionally the man would look behind him, but he would reproduce in the fabric in the loom every line and color in that magnificent picture. There is no work in the world that will compare with it; and they were getting from $7.50 to $15 a week. Think of it! You can see such things as these in most of the Old World countries. I have seen them in Palestine, Egypt, Servia, Turkey, China, Japan, and all over the world. I can hire a man in Siberia at $50 a year and in Japan for $10 a year.

I will not go into this any further. I want to give you my parting thought. Whatever you do, do quickly. It may not seem of consequence to you, but it is of immense consequence to 90,000,000 people. The business of the country is stagnant awaiting your action. The pending measure, crudely drawn, uncertain in its phraseology, destructive of revenue, transferring whole industries to foreign countries, tending inevitably to idle mills, unemployed workmen, and general reductions of wages, has not thus far met any enthusiastic response, even from the men who placed you in power last fall, to say nothing of those who, believing in the protective principle wisely administered, prophesied that you would attempt to destroy it. Day after day the country is warned by the advocates of this measure that this is but the beginning. And it is unblushingly admitted to be a piece of favoritism to a particular class. Where is it to end? And what becomes of the fundamental principle of the Democratic platform declarations for a tariff for revenue only and the Jeffersonian doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privilege to none"—not even the farmers?

Have you abandoned your principles at the very outset, and is the power of taxation to be exercised by you in the future as a system of political rewards and punishments? If so, you should not forget that the same people who judged us will in the future judge you, and that the condemnation which will come to you from your betrayal of their confidence will be swift and certain. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Ad valorem equivalent of duty paid on certain articles in Germany and France.

Articles.	Germany.	France.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Plows	9	11
Cultivators, extirpators, potato diggers, harrows, rakes, etc.	12	
Forks for hay, manure, etc	11	
Scythes and sickles	4	
Motor-driven plows and reaping machinery	6	
Threshing machines	7	
Other agricultural machines	12	
Wagons and carts	6	
Hoop and band iron and steel	13	36
Jute bags	18	21
Jute bagging	7	19
Uppers	2	8
Shoes	12	9
Sole leather	6	
Bovine leather	3	
Pigskins		4
Harness	5	11
Saddlery	5	11
Saddle leather	5	
Wire	14	
Barbed wire	22	
Fresh beef	24	23
Prepared beef	23	
Pork	14	16
Ham and smoked pork	15	

Ad valorem equivalent of duty paid on certain articles in Germany and France—Continued.

Articles.	Germany.	France.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Lamb	3	
Mutton		11
Bacon	10	
Sausage	4	
Lard	8	
Salted meats		18
Prepared meats		15
Rye flour	5	22
Wheat flour	26	41
Oatmeal	46	14
Corn meal		28
Prepared cereal foods	26	45
Biscuits	2	4
Sawed wood	8	14
Sewing machines	14	7
Salt	21	25

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STONE].

Mr. STONE. Mr. Chairman, there is a story of a boy who visited a circus with his father. In the course of the program a man was shot from a cannon. He landed some distance away and was immediately pounced upon by several clowns, who began to strike him on the head with clubs. Turning to his father the boy asked why, if the man was dead, it was necessary to knock him on the head. The reply was, "That is to make him deader."

This measure has been advocated with rare eloquence and force during the past 10 days by the able leaders on this side, and in rising now to address the committee on some general phases of this tariff measure I can not hope to do more than kill the opposition "deader."

Even if the opposition has not all been killed, we have the consolation of the words found in II Kings, vi, 16:

> Fear not, for they that be with us are more than they that be with them.

It might seem presumptuous in me, one of the youngest Members of this body, to join in this debate were it not for the fact that there is no American citizen whose influence is not as a member of the body politic necessary to its well-being. In this Republic no one need imagine himself too weak, too poor, or too insignificant to do a part.

The humblest citizen in this great Republic may rejoice as being a coworker with him who is the highest, assured that without fidelity on his part the efforts of others will lose something of their value, and sure that he equally with them is a part of this Nation and a maker of its destiny.

Mindful of the great responsibility that devolves upon me as one of the number who are charged with the important duty of legislating for 92,000,000 people, I rise to urge the passage of this bill.

There are those who profess to view its enactment into law with forebodings of disaster. I have been amused rather than worried by the suggestions of those who view with alarm this effort at reform. Their attacks have been most unfair in what they concealed, and entirely false as to much that they asserted. This bill may produce fear in the hearts of the few who oppress, but it will give hope to the many who are oppressed.

The people have been aroused to the need of tariff reform, and they will not yield in their demands because of dire prophecies on the part of some gentlemen of stand-pat tendencies of calamitous projects concealed beneath the harmless surface of this bill.

Under the awakened conscience and intelligent attention of the people, the person or the party will be sustained that undertakes to check this slavery of the many to the avarice of the few.

It is almost beyond belief that the people of the United States, in the very center of the most productive region of the globe and in the midst of splendid harvests, amply furnished with transportation facilities, free from pestilence, and full of energy and vigor are held up daily by trade combinations fostered by a monstrous tariff law which forces them to pay unprecedented prices for the necessaries of life. Yet the household bills of every family in the Union give full and direct testimony that this is the case. It is high time that the food supplies of our people be freed from the control of these combinations, which are paralyzing the industrial population of the country and threatening the peace and prosperity of all classes through their avaricious exactions.

Any proposition to remedy this condition is met with the charge that it is fraught with disaster to the business interests of the country, and is to be prevented by all means. The beneficiaries of high protective duties wish the people to believe that prosperity is not the result of laws operating naturally; that it does not come from the application of intelligence and industry to the resources of the earth, but that it is the artificial creation of a taxing device. They would argue that the United States has not achieved its great growth by virtue of its inheritance of fertile lands, rich mines, and noble forests, and by the industry and integrity of its people, but because the Government permits a monopoly tariff that takes from one class and gives to another class. Any talk of change in the slightest detail of this magic device for the production of prosperity is branded as sacrilegious and sure to bring down punishment upon both the just and the unjust. The friends of the system contend that any fluctuation in prices is not due to economic causes like overproduction, speculation, undue expansion, and the natural operation of supply and demand, but to a profane questioning of the infallibility of this high-protective tariff idol which has provoked his anger and brought down his wrath.

The fact that this system enables the privileged few to accumulate vast wealth is considered by its friends as sufficient justification for its establishment and as sufficient reason for its continuance. This conclusion can be based only on the assumption that a great fortune justifies itself, no matter how it is made. These persons seemingly fail to see that those who buy—the consumers—have anything to do with the question. If a certain business is making money and the workmen have labor throughout the year, all should be well with the world. When these workmen rise against the conditions which the avarice of their employers has imposed, we form organizations of relief, but we allow the system which produced the unjust conditions to continue unabated.

The world has moved, but it is a regrettable confession that in a legislative way we are still acting under the old belief that to be prosperous we must in some way rob our neighbors.

No sensible person fights wealth as such, but everyone should oppose the privileges that produce swollen fortunes on the one hand and undeserved poverty on the other. Surely the prosperity of one should be consistent with the welfare of all, and one man can not be allowed to have more than he should have without forcing some other man to accept less than he should have. We may dazzle the world by our trade statistics and bewilder the nations with our marvelous prosperity, but we must do something finer and nobler than this to justify our large claims to leadership among the nations of the world. We must stand for honesty and justice. No amount of argument will prove that many of the schedules of the present tariff law are honest and just. It enables the trusts and monopolies to exact extortionate profits and to thus increase the cost of living beyond all reasonable bounds. No reduction in tariff rates is contemplated that will injure American labor or cripple American industry. An honest and just revision is all that the people demand, but they will be satisfied with nothing less. The important fact about the present tariff as the people see it is that it is unjust and dishonest, written by the servants of special privileges for the benefit of their masters, and intended not to help the small man make a living but to help the big man make an exorbitant profit. It is no justification of such a tariff to refer to its alleged virtues as a revenue producer. This Government is not reduced to the necessity of raising its revenues by schedules which rob the people. The present tariff pays the Government about $330,000,000 a year, but it enables the trusts and monopolies to increase their profits to the extent of $4,000,000,000 a year.

The 1910 Illinois State Democratic platform contains this plank, and it expresses my sentiments and voices my policy:

> We denounce the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act as an indefensible masterpiece of injustice, legally authorizing remorseless extortions from the many to enrich the few through the operations of trusts and monopolies, which it fosters. Tariff taxation, like other taxation, should be so levied as not to discriminate against nor in favor of any section, class, industry, or corporation, and should be limited to the actual necessities of government honestly and economically administered.
>
> We insist that any law enacted with the intention of enabling individuals or corporations to levy tribute upon the American people, or to guarantee a "reasonable profit" to any class, is in violation of the Constitution of the United States and is indefensible from either a legal or a moral standpoint.

Not only does a high protective tariff bear down upon the masses of our people with a cruel and uneven hand, but it is a fruitful source of corruption. The widespread corruption which has caused the defilement of our politics did not have its origin in politics, although it finds expression and quakes publicity there. Its source is in the greed of men who, to secure tariff legislation that would give them personal advantage and add to their wealth, have stooped to bribery and the corrupt manipulation of public functionaries. The hideous power of privilege not only permeates and taints politics, but its impure hands soil the very fountains of justice. The astonishing feature of the situation is that an intelligent people have so long viewed with indifference, and in some cases even openly applauded, the men who are shrewd enough to manipulate politics to their own gain. The people have so long permitted our Government to be used for the speculative purposes of men who shamelessly debauch our public representatives that all the foreign critics dwell upon our civic degradation. Our robes must again be washed pure and white and no longer allowed to trail in the dust of this dishonor and infamy. The evil of corruption can be eradicated just as surely as wrong can be overcome by right. A redemptive war is necessary to our national existence and is sure to be won, but it will require the same high quality of patriotism as when the war drums beat and the bugles play and men go forth to battle. The honor and dignity of our great legislative bodies must be restored and the present views of foreign critics as to the sordidness of our civilization must be removed. No hypercritical obstacles should prevent this reformation, which, it must be conceded, is a consummation devoutly to be wished. The enlightened sentiment of the American people will no longer tolerate a tariff law that, by reason of the special favors it grants, leads the recipients of those special favors to debauch our electorate in order to procure its continuance.

This objectionable tariff system has heretofore been shielded behind the cloak of partisan politics, and there are those who now seek to frustrate this step toward reform by attempting to brand it as a purely partisan affair. Simple justice should never bear the stamp of partisanship.

It has been very gratifying to me to observe the scant regard for party lines in the votes upon the several measures that have already passed this House. I trust that the vote on this measure will be a further indication of the same wholesome spirit. There is an independent spirit now in evidence over the country, and it is not allied with the reactionary forces but with the forces that upbuild and uplift. Each Representative must measure up to his opportunities and convince the people of what he can do for them or he can not expect their continued confidence nor their future support. Their allegiance is to the truth and not to the man nor the party who assumes to represent the truth, but who does little to promote progress in the way of better things.

A genuine interest in popular government and the spread of progressive ideas have brought about a weakening of party ties. Hereafter political success will depend more upon merit and less upon traditional prejudices. The time of slavish adherence to party names has passed into history. Corruption never has paid any attention to party lines; honesty and decency have ceased to pay attention to party lines in order that they might triumph. With the people it is no longer a question of what is regular, but of what is right.

In order to enhance its chances of favorable consideration by the other branch of Congress and to insure its approval by the President, I should like to see this bill get a large independent vote here. I would not deny to any Republican of whatever variety the privilege to vote for this measure, and I would gladly share with all such persons the credit that is rightly due to those who secure its passage. The interests of the people transcend all questions of personal or party advantage. This should not be a party measure as party lines are now drawn. It is the people's question, and the people are sure to visit their resentment upon the person or the party who fails or refuses to apply the remedy. Tariff reduction has been demanded by the people in tones loud enough to be heard throughout the land, and the demand will not cease until it is accomplished. This demand is not only loud and deep and universal, but it is right and just and must prevail.

The fact that this particular bill is planned primarily to relieve the farmers of unjust burdens does not justify its classification by its opponents as class legislation. The blood and the brains of every vocation of life are perennially supplied by drafts upon the farming population of the country. Most of the greatest men and women of our history were born and reared on the farm. The farm has developed the potential energy and inspired the latent genius of those who are now our leaders in practically all the professions of life. We may confidently expect that in the future it will furnish the majority of those who are destined by native force of character to create the great fortunes and to wield the mighty influences of the country. We can not benefit the farmer without indirectly benefiting all classes, for upon his welfare rests the welfare of all our people.

Again, there are those who claim this bill is sectional in its character and appeal to an ancient prejudice in their efforts to encompass its defeat. No longer will that Circe's voice enable them to keep fastened upon us a system that is opposed in purpose and spirit to every principle of independence and liberty upheld by the general sentiment of the people of this country.

There is a North of waving fields and blossoming meadows and verdant pastures, with untold wealth of mine and orchard and field.

There is a great awakening South covered with billowy waves of snowy cotton, whose annual crop would buy a kingdom.

There is an East with its ambitions and its wonderful factories.

There is a West with its vast prairies and inexhaustible mines.

But these sections have all been fused as in the furnace of some great Vulcan and welded with an Odin's mighty hammer of patriotism until there is neither seam nor flaw.

There is a North, a South, an East, and a West, but they are all parts of a united and stupendous whole. The men of the North and the men of the South cherish the same sentiments of liberty, glory in the same common memories, and love the same old striped and starry banner which is the scarred and priceless legacy of a thousand battle fields.

On a hillside in Kentucky in a section of country far removed from railroads and telegraphs and the quickening touch of commerce is a vine-covered mound in a little churchyard. Within it lies the remains of a man wrapped in the Stars and Stripes, whose body was riddled with bullets at El Caney. His neighbors called him a hero, and on his tomb they have written: "Here lies the son of a Confederate soldier. He died for his country." And there is to-day no one to say nay. Forty years ago that inscription would have been erased by a million hands in contempt, but to-day no hand would be so vandal and blasphemous as to chisel out one letter. A mighty change has swept over this country of ours in four decades, a change that has betrayed itself not only in the face of nature but in the lives of the people. A new people has sprung up, a new set of conditions, a new civilization, a new patriotism, new in that it is one, from ocean to ocean, north to south; a united people, united in a common bond of commercial interest, of national ambition, and of brotherly sympathy.

The great army commanded by the Duke of Wellington was made up of regiments from all parts of the British Empire. When in camp, as with most armies, the evenings were frequently spent in singing.

Beginning with the Scottish regiments, they would sing:

Scots wha hae wi' Wallace bled,
Scots, wham Bruce has often led,
Welcome to your gory bed,
Or to glorious victorie.

Then the Irish or the Welsh regiments would follow each with their favorite song, and so on until the English squares were reached when they would start "God Save the King." At once the soldiers from all parts of the United Kingdom would join in until the whole great army as with one mighty voice was singing "God Save the King."

As representatives of the various districts and States of this Union, we will each have our heritage of local traditions and local problems, but we should stand here as Americans to glory in the triumphs and be happy in the accomplishments of one great inseparable country. We should be animated by a spirit of lofty patriotism which knows no section, no race, no sect, nor creed, and which is filled with a holy enthusiasm for the welfare of all the people, so that America may continue to draw the world unto her until her ideals shall everywhere prevail.

The words of Patrick Henry to the First Continental Congress are in a larger sense than then true to-day:

The distinction between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, and New Yorkers is no more. I am not a Virginian but an American.

Despite the efforts of the few who express and appeal to a contrary sentiment, a united America calmly and hopefully looks forth upon the world. This bill is a manifestation of that spirit of fraternity which blesses our land and treats each and every section with equal favor.

We have adopted rules that allow the maximum freedom of debate, and by making the committees elective instead of appointive the Speaker can no longer pack committees in order to block the will of the Nation and then enforce his decrees with the political death of those of his own party who oppose him.

We have voted in favor of a constitutional amendment to provide for the direct election of Senators which is calculated to make the other body of Congress more responsive to the will of the people. We have passed a bill that requires the publication of campaign funds before as well as after the election for the purpose of making every election an expression of the virtue and intelligence of the people. We have passed the measure to provide reciprocal trade relations with Canada, thereby cementing together the two great English-speaking nations in the bonds of peace, friendship, and commerce. All these things will meet the approval of the manhood and conscience of the citizenship of this Nation. Let us now pass this farmers' free-list bill and still further deserve the approval and commendation of the people.

Upon each of us rests a responsible duty to perform, which we must not shirk or give only a half-hearted attention.

The forces of the people and the forces of privilege are lined up in battle form to-day. Our integrity and destiny as a nation depend on the outcome. The people of the United States expect every Representative to do his duty to-day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413, the free-list bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. REDFIELD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JAMES MORAN.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. JACKSON to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of James Moran, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

CLOSING GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill H. R. 4413—the free-list bill—be closed when the House adjourn on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate on the pending bill be closed when the House adjourns on Saturday next. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that he also ask that the House meet at 12 o'clock on Monday instead of at 11 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that after this request is granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, the present order of the House is that it shall meet at 11 o'clock until this bill is disposed of. I ask unanimous consent that the hour for meeting on Monday next and thereafter shall be at 12 o'clock instead of 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned to meet on Friday, May 5, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HENRY of Texas, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 148) to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890 and other acts, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 17), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 8602) granting pensions to widows and minor children of United States marshals and deputy marshals whose husbands and fathers were killed while in the discharge of their official duties; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8603) to appropriate $500,000 to deepen the channel and remove the obstructions in the Arkansas River, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8604) to provide for the construction of a military road at the United States cemetery at Fort Gibson, Okla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to soldiers, sailors, and marines who served during the Civil War between April 1, 1861, and November 1, 1865, for the time intervening between the date of discharge and the date they commenced drawing a pension from the Government of the United States at the rate per month they are now paid by the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8606) to provide for the erection of a public building at Vinita, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8607) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wagoner, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8608) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bartlesville, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8609) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sapulpa, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8610) providing for the erection of a public building at Tulsa, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 8611) to regulate the importation and interstate transportation of nursery stock, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests, to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 8612) to amend an act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia, approved June 18, 1898; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8613) making drunkenness in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor and to provide a hospital for inebriates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8614) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to suspend and revoke certain licenses and permits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8615) to require the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. to build and maintain bridges, etc., over the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8616) to amend paragraph 43 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8617) for universal transfers over the street railway lines in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8618) providing for guides in the District of Columbia and defining their duties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8619) to amend "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8620) to amend an act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, approved May 7, 1906, by prohibiting the sale of poisonous hair dressing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8621) providing for the regulation and suspension of traffic and processions on highways in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8622) to amend section 4 of "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892, as to kiteflying; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8623) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8624) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1898"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8625) to protect public health in the District of Columbia by regulating the production and sale of milk, cream, and ice cream in and for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8626) to amend an act entitled "An act to distinctively designate parcels of land in the District of Columbia for the purposes of assessment and taxation, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8627) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8628) to provide for punishment for larceny of public property from the workhouse and the reformatory of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8629) to receive arrearages of taxes due to the District of Columbia to July 1, 1908, at 6 per cent interest per annum, in lieu of penalties and costs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8630) to amend the act of Congress approved April 22, 1904, authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8631) to provide an additional method for enforcing and foreclosing tax sales and tax deeds in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8632) to amend sections 680 and 686 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8633) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8634) to amend the laws for the protection of birds, game, and fish in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8635) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District," approved May 13, 1908; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8636) to amend section 895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8637) for the creation of the police and firemen's relief and retirement fund, to provide for the relief and retirement of members of the police and fire departments, to establish a method of procedure for such relief and retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8638) authorizing the extension of Barry Place NW., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8639) for the widening of Sixteenth Street NW. at Piney Branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8640) to provide for the extension of Kenyon Street from Seventeenth Street to Mount Pleasant Street, and for the extension of Seventeenth Street from Kenyon Street to Irving Street, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8641) to authorize the widening and extension of Minnesota Avenue from Pennsylvania Avenue SE. to its present terminus near Eastern Avenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8642) authorizing the extension of First Street east, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8643) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of Newton Place NW. from New Hampshire Avenue to Georgia Avenue, and to connect Newton Place in Gass's subdivision with Newton Place in Whitney Close subdivision," approved February 21, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8644) to provide for the extension of Buchanan Street NW., between Piney Branch Road and Sixteenth Street, and the abandonment of Piney Branch Road, between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8645) to authorize the construction of a municipal asphalt plant in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8646) to provide for the payment of the debt of the District of Columbia and to provide for permanent improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8647) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8648) to regulate the construction of buildings along alleyways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8649) to authorize the extension and widening of Colorado Avenue NW. from Longfellow Street to Sixteenth Street and of Kennedy Street NW. through lot No. 800, square No. 2718; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8650) to provide for plans and specifications for two high schools in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8651) providing for the appointment of two cadets from the District of Columbia to the United States Military Academy at West Point; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8652) to license operators of cinematographs, moving-picture machines, and similar apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8653) to give the District of Columbia a right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States in patent cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 8654) to provide a system of compensation for accidents in dangerous occupations thereunder, and also in jurisdictions subject to the legislative power of Congress, with a view to prevention of accident; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 8655) providing for the sale to actual settlers only of all lands heretofore granted by the United States to aid in the construction of railroad and telegraph lines in Oregon, by the acts of April 10, 1869, and May 4, 1870, that may be or become forfeited to the United States by virtue of any legal proceedings now pending; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8656) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Media, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8657) to prohibit the importation into the United States of adulterated seed and seed unfit for planting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8658) to regulate the transportation of habit-forming drugs in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 8659) incorporating the National Institute of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8660) incorporating the American Academy of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 8661) prohibiting an owner or beneficiary of any letters patent of the United States making it a condition that the purchaser, lessee, or licensee thereof shall not buy or lease or use machinery, implements, appliances, or merchandise of any person, firm, corporation, or association other than such vendor, lessor or licensor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8662) to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service, to increase the pay of officers of said service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8663) to provide for the government of the Canal Zone, the construction and occupation of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8664) to provide for the operation of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8665) to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended in 1889, relating to the regulation of steam vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 8666) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining, and to regulate the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8667) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural-delivery routes may be established; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8668) giving rural mail carriers holiday on the 25th day of December of each year; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8669) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations to be used in researches in home economics, and regulating the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8670) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes of 1878, of an act providing for soldiers and sailors acquiring homesteads in public lands of the United States and deductions of military and naval service from the time required generally to perfect title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Memorial of the Legislature of New York, favoring the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8671) granting an increase of pension to Delilah Worley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8672) granting an increase of pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8673) granting an increase of pension to William I. Goodin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8674)) granting an increase of pension to William H. Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8675) granting an increase of pension to John K. McKeen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8676) granting an increase of pension to Simel Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8677) granting an increase of pension to Fred. J. Wagner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8678) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Swander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8679) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kisling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8680) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. Noneman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8681) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Amhalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to Albert Ferren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8683) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ribar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8684) granting an increase of pension to Ira Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8685) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Slaymaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8686) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8687) granting an increase of pension to William H. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8688) granting an increase of pension to George Blanden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8689) granting an increase of pension to George Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8690) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8691) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Henry Boardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8692) granting an increase of pension to William A. Flora; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8693) granting an increase of pension to James Harruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8694) granting an increase of pension to Amos Nye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8695) granting a pension to Andrew Brandeberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8696) granting an increase of pension to Patrick W. Foley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8697) granting an increase of pension to Isaac McClelland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8698) granting a pension to John A. Shannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8699) granting a pension to Stephen White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8700) granting a pension to George W. Finlay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8701) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8702) granting an increase of pension to Truman Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8703) granting an increase of pension to Byron M. Standish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8704) granting an increase of pension to Peter L. Metz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8705) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Haven; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8706) granting an increase of pension to Martin Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8707) granting an increase of pension to Charles Colp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 8708) for the relief of Isaac F. Norman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8709) for the relief of the heirs of Job Thomas, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8710) to refer the war claim of the estate of John Sullivan, deceased, late of Stafford County, Va., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8711) to refer the war claim of John C. Newton, of Stafford County, Va., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8712) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of R. G. Johnson, administrator of Lewis W. Mann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8713) granting a pension to Thomas Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8714) for the relief of the estate of John Frazer, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8715) for relief of the estate of Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8716) for the relief of Thomas Kizer, administrator of the estate of Henry Kizer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 8717) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Hosack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 8718) granting a pension to James E. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8719) granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Meehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8720) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Moulton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8721) granting a pension to Walter F. Carman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8722) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Pendleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8723) granting an increase of pension to John N. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8724) granting an increase of pension to John H. Leslie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 8725) granting to W. J. Ladd back pay as a pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 8726) for the relief of John Preston; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAY: A bill (H. R. 8727) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Cohee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8728) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Demaree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8729) granting an increase of pension to David A. Wynegar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8730) granting an increase of pension to William S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8731) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8732) for the relief of the Western Distilleries, of Agnew, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8733) for the relief of Joseph F. Tribble; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8734) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Brownlee; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 8735) granting an increase of pension to W. G. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8736) granting an increase of pension to Abram Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8737) granting an increase of pension to F. B. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 8738) for the relief of Aun-je-gin-ewe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8739) for the relief of Ne-gaun-e-gwon-able; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8740) for the relief of Clem Bellanger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8741) for the relief of Nah-me-won-aush-e-quay; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8742) for the relief of Kay-zhe-bah-o-say; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8743) for the relief of Ne-bid-ay-aun-ah-quod; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8744) for the relief of the heirs of Kah-ge-gay-bin-ais; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 8745) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Mott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 8746) for the relief of the Ingersoll-Rand Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 8747) granting an increase of pension to Curtis Holder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8748) granting an increase of pension to William W. McAlister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 8749) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Duff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8750) granting an increase of pension to Granville Koger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8751) granting an increase of pension to William T. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8752) granting an increase of pension to James E. Newgent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8753) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Culp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 8754) granting an increase of pension to John Strauss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 8755) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8756) granting an increase of pension to John W. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8757) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8758) granting an increase of pension to George Kerns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8759) granting a pension to Luvina R. Prater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8760) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8761) for the relief of the Kanawha & Ohio Transfer Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8762) for the relief of James R. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8763) granting an increase of pension to John G. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Stetter Bros. and 7 other merchants of Canal Dover, Ohio, in opposition to the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers accompanying H. R. 6155, granting a pension to George W. Erway, of Dodge County, Wis.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of Local No. 12, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Martinsburg, W. Va., favoring the enactment of the illiteracy test; and Good Luck Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, New Creek, W. Va., favoring H. R. 15413 and other measures proposed by the Immigration Commission; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARLIN: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of heirs of Job Thomas, deceased; affidavits in the case of John Sullivan, late of Stafford County, Va.; and papers in the case of John C. Newton, of Stafford County, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of F. Mayer Boot & Shoe Co. and Bradley & Metcalf Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against placing shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Papers in support of Alfred Hosack, county of Whitley, State of Indiana, for increase in pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petitions of Parnell Club, of Boston, Mass., and Central Council, Irish County Clubs, protesting against enactment of treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: Resolutions from Local No. 5, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Gilbert, Idaho, protesting against discrimination in the handling of magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Resolutions of the National Association of Tanners, protesting against placing leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany H. R. 5743, for the relief of Joseph C. Sponogle, of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petitions of Alice M. Goodwin and others, numbering 51, and Margaret Lamontagne and 49 others, relating to the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Samuel T. Duff, of New Castle, Pa.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Granville Koger, of Franklin County, Tenn., and bill for the relief of William T. West, of Hamilton County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolutions of Camp No. 51, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of New Brunswick, N. J., favoring passage of the illiteracy test law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany H. R. 5285, for relief of Thomas S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May 5, 1911.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the beauty and simplicity of the Christian religion, which under the dispensation of Thy Providence has been revealed in the incomparable life and character of Thy Son, which has purified, enobled, dignified life. Help us in His spirit, encourage by His sublime example, to press ever toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God. In Christ Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to lay before the House the following resignation of Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD from a committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as member of the Committee on Expenditures of the Navy, and ask that it be accepted. Other duties render it impossible for me to devote to the committee referred to the attention its importance deserves.

Respectfully, ISAAC R. SHERWOOD.
Ninth Ohio District.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress.

ARMY CONTRACTS FOR SHOES.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I rise for the purpose of presenting a privileged question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 133——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the resolution be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 133.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the House of Representatives full information, as follows, with regard to certain

statements made by Hon. ROBERT E. DIFENDERFER, of Pennsylvania, in the House on April 25, 1911:

First. What proportion of the contracts for Army shoes during the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911 were awarded to the firm of Hermann & Co.?

Second. What are the names of the individuals or firms who have secured contracts for Army shoes in the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911? What was the amount of each contract?

Third. Have any competitors been blacklisted or disqualified from bidding on any Army shoe contract in the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911? If so, what were the names of those competitors and what was the cause of their disqualification?

Fourth. What proportion of the Army shoe contracts in the fiscal years 1909, 1910, and 1911 were awarded to the lowest bidders?

Fifth. How many bidders were there for the last Army shoe contract?

Sixth. Is Shrewsbury leather required in the specifications for Army shoes?

Seventh. Did the War Department institute a test between Shrewsbury leather and Calumet leather? If so, was it found that Calumet leather was better?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve points of order until I can make an inquiry. I would like to ask the gentleman when this resolution was introduced.

The SPEAKER. April 27.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has it been 10 days——

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Eight days.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have not had a chance to investigate this question or find out why the committee have not reported the resolution. In the temporary absence of the chairman of the committee from the House, if the gentleman presses his motion at this time, I will be compelled to move to lay the matter on the table.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House, as this question is not debatable and the gentleman from Alabama is only proceeding with my consent, that I have 10 minutes to make a statement. If not, I shall be obliged to have a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for 10 minutes in which to make a statement——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Without affecting the parliamentary situation.

The SPEAKER. Without affecting the parliamentary situation——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will see that it comes under the seven-day rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has 10 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a similar resolution was passed the other day with regard to the Navy Department. This is somewhat a peculiar matter, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DIFENDERFER] has himself subsequently introduced a resolution carrying practically the same language—if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Alabama—covering exactly the same question. I am willing, if there is no objection, to offer his resolution as a substitute for mine, with certain amendments. The gentleman from Pennsylvania stated the other day that the firm of Hermann & Co. absolutely control shoes manufactured in this country for the Army and Navy. He says:

> Is not it a fact Hermann & Co. absolutely control, after freezing out every other competitor in the United States, the manufacture of shoes for the Army and Navy of the United States?

He states that this is done by putting in the specifications a requirement for the use of Shrewsbury leather, certain specifications, and he says the War Department tried Shrewsbury leather and Calumet leather and found Calumet leather was the best, but still would not take it.

He states that this firm of Hermann & Co. had used their influence with Government representatives to freeze out and place other people on the blacklist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the permanent RECORD does not show that the gentleman says that these people, Hermann & Co., had absolute control, but I hold the original reporter's notes in my hand. As soon as I found that his remarks had been changed by the insertion of the word "had," so as to make it past instead of present, I changed my resolution so as to cover three years. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DIFENDERFER] now proposes to cover 10 years in the investigation, and I am quite content.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which I am willing to substitute for my own, should be amended by putting in the words "Shrewsbury leather," which he stated was inserted in Army specifications, and that by such insertion the firm of Hermann & Co. secured our Army shoe contracts. My resolution also contains an inquiry with regard to this test which he alleges was made.

Now, I do not suppose that there is any man on that side of the House, especially any of the older Members, who seriously believes for a moment that the Army officers who look after our shoe contracts are crooks. I do not suppose that there is anything going to be found out by that resolution, but I give notice right here and now, since the days of investigations have begun, that anonymous investigations are not going to be made, and a gentleman who rises on the floor of this House can not take away the character of reputable shoemakers without having somebody say "Prove your words." And therefore I shall offer, Mr. Speaker, if the question of consideration is carried, to amend the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania so as to conform with the statement which he made on the floor of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], inasmuch as this is new matter to me and I have not investigated it, what the amendment is which he proposes to offer to the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DIFENDERFER].

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DIFENDERFER] stated that this firm of Hermann & Co. had corraled Shrewsbury leather; that Shrewsbury leather was included in the Army specifications, and that is the way the thing was done. Now, his resolution, different from mine, reads this way:

> Fifth. Whether any of the specifications for such Army shoe contracts in any fiscal year since 1901 stipulated any particular make of leather? If so, what?

I move to insert:

> Shrewsbury leather or—

In order to accentuate this question. I believe everybody knows that the Army officers are not guilty, but I want the gentleman to prove his words. So I propose to put in this:

> Seventh. Did the War Department institute a test between Shrewsbury leather and Calumet leather? If so, was it found that Calumet leather was better?

I have simply taken the statement the gentleman made on the floor of this House and want to ask that question. Otherwise I will substitute his resolution in full.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may have unanimous consent, I would like to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent——

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. What reason is there for the gentleman asking unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. He asked unanimous consent.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. A motion to discharge a committee from the consideration of a resolution of inquiry must be decided without debate. The question before the House is the question of discharging a committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the gentleman is to discharge the committee from the further consideration of this resolution. Now, I understand that the Committee on Military Affairs has this resolution under consideration; that they are actually considering it; that they have appointed a subcommittee to make investigations and report back to the full committee. I have no doubt, from the information I have before me, or from what I have heard, that that report will come in at a date in the near future. I think the very statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] shows that this resolution ought to be considered by a committee, and the language properly drafted and reported to the House, so that it can properly be passed on. Therefore I do not think that the committee ought to be discharged at this time, and for that reason I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts will be voted down.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. One moment, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman received information that it is the intention of the committee to report that resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My information came from the chairman of the committee. I recall it now, although I did not remember it when the question first came up. My information is that this resolution is being investigated by the committee, and, as I understand, a subcommittee has been appointed to look into the matter and report back to the full committee.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion, or resolution, to discharge the committee.

APPROPRIATIONS INCIDENT TO THE SESSION.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have laid before the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 2) making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to move concurrence in the Senate amendments.

These amendments, Mr. Speaker, relate particularly to the organization of the Senate itself. They first provide for certain employees essential to the transaction of the business of the Senate. The House provided for its session employees in the original resolution.

The second amendment of the Senate provides an appropriation of a thousand dollars for stationery for the committees of the Senate.

Another amendment takes care of a situation arising because of the death of a person named to do a particular work. Mr. Pitman Pulsifer had been designated in the legislative act, as I recall, or the deficiency bill, one or the other, as the person to prepare the Navy Yearbook and to supervise certain indexing work that had been put in his charge. He has died. The law provides that the Navy Yearbook should be issued annually, and a large amount of the indexing is still to be done. The Senate desires, instead of designating at this time some person permanently for the performance of the work, to reserve the control over the designation of the persons to do the work in the Committee of the Appropriations of the Senate; and inasmuch as it is a matter that peculiarly affects the work of the Senate and makes no additional appropriation, it seems to me, the House should not attempt to interfere with them in the control of that work.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Pitman Pulsifer was formerly the clerk to the Committee on Naval Affairs in the Senate, of which the gentleman from Maine, Senator Hale, was chairman. Senator Hale, as will be remembered, was afterwards made chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. Mr. Pitman Pulsifer, while serving under Senator Hale as clerk to the Committee on Naval Affairs, became very expert in reference to naval affairs, and it was provided that he should compile the Navy Yearbook and index certain Senate public documents. That work was originated only a very short time ago. Afterwards it was provided that he should index various Senate public documents and also reports and hearings of Senate committees and joint committees of the House and Senate. Now he has died. Just why it should be left to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to employ somebody to compile the Navy Yearbook I am not informed. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate has nothing to do with the Navy, and certainly has no more to do with it than the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], presiding over the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The reason given by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate was this: Not only was Mr. Pulsifer appointed as indexer, but some gentleman, whose name I do not recall at the moment, was appointed as his assistant. This fund of $6,000 was utilized to a great extent for indexing the reports of the Immigration Commission, the persons doing the work being considered particularly familiar with it and fitted for the performance of that work.

It is believed that the gentleman who has been engaged in this work, not only under Mr. Pulsifer but since his death, may prove entirely satisfactory. The statement is made that before any permanent designation is made it would be better to utilize the appropriations heretofore made under the control of the committee in the Senate until it is determined who is best fitted to do the work; and the control of this matter having been assumed by the Senate, and as Senate employees are at present engaged in the work, there is no disposition at this time, so far as I know, to interfere with the Senate control of it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] does not need any protection from this side of the House, but I can not see why, in the compilation of the Naval Yearbook, the disposition of funds should be left to the control of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, which has nothing to do with the Naval Yearbook. I can see why Pitman Pulsifer was provided for by special appropriation, because he had been the clerk of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the right-hand man of Senator Hale when he was at the head of that committee, and also when he became head of the Committee on Appropriations; but if the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is willing to let the Senate succeed to his powers, I shall not object at this time, although if this item should come in in a regular appropriation bill, I think decidedly that the objection should be made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is no doubt aware that the Naval Yearbook originated with Mr. Pulsifer when he was clerk of the Senate committee.

Mr. MANN. But Mr. Pulsifer is no longer here.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true. Apparently, whoever might have been interested properly in that matter in the House was absolutely indifferent to it. Provision heretofore had been made in the Senate that Mr. Pulsifer should not only edit the Naval Yearbook but should do this other indexing work. There might be a controversy in the Senate as to whether the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Naval Affairs should have control of the matter, but the Senator who is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs—the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]—ranks next to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate.

Mr. MANN. In the Senate, but that situation does not exist in the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Quite true; but the Senate orginated a very valuable and useful work. Members of the House in preceding Congresses who might properly have been interested in protecting their right to participate in it seem to have been indifferent to the matter.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. Everybody at both ends of the Capitol, I think, conceded that Mr. Pulsifer was peculiarly qualified to perform that work; but he is not living. Who will be selected by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to compile this work now, which is just as valuable to the House as it is to the Senate, the gentleman may know and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate may know, but I do not know.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate made the statement that the gentleman who was acting as Mr. Pulsifer's assistant is now in charge of the work; but before a permanent designation is made, they wish to ascertain the character of the work that may be done under him.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman informed whether that is a brother of Mr. Pitman Pulsifer?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is not. I do not recall the name of the gentleman, but it is not Mr. Pitman Pulsifer's brother.

Mr. MANN. I say that because Mr. Pitman Pulsifer's brother is a very capable man for that kind of work, I should say.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is a very competent man, but he has been for a great many years clerk of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, engaged in an entirely different line of work.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Ought not this to be done jointly by the Naval Committees of the House and Senate?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Probably it should.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. By the Naval Committees of the House and Senate instead of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The work has been done by certain employees of the Senate. The money was appropriated and one person was named as the law; and simply for the purpose of utilizing the appropriations already made and to continue the work, instead of attempting to designate some individual permanently. This puts it under the control of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. For the present I see no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. It would seem that it ought to be under the control of the Senate and House Naval Committees, and that it ought not to be under the control of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not certain that it should be done by either House.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will give consideration to the suggestions made by my colleague and myself when it comes to consider the regular appropriation bill or any Senate amendment to it that seems to allow the Senate to take to itself additional patronage to do work that ought to be controlled by both House and Senate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The difficulty about it would be that both Houses would be claiming patronage, and would result in increased expenditure to do the same amount of work.

Mr. MANN. I am sorry to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the interest of economy, I should prefer to let the Senate do the work, rather than to multiply expense.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. There are several similar places which the House provided for by resolution for work of this identical character. Indexing and things of that sort have been provided for by simple resolution of the House, and the resolution carried from year to year. The gentleman connected with war claims has for years been carried on an appropriation bill, or by resolution passed solely by the House, naming him in it, for the purpose of classifying and keeping up the index of claims growing out of the recent war.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the Senate has never attempted to designate the person to do that work.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think there are many things the Senate provides for that might be dispensed with, and I do not know but that this is one. However, I am glad the attention of the House and the Committee on Appropriations has been called to it, and if it is unnecessary, when we come to frame the appropriation bill, I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] can rest assured that if we can prevent it, if it is determined to be unnecessary, it will not be appropriated for hereafter. I am speaking for myself and not for the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from New York to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have asked unanimous consent, and, of course, I understand this is not a privileged matter. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker lay before the House the joint resolution and Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the House the Senate amendments to this resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, they will be voted for en gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, to place agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WILDER].

Mr. WILDER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this so-called farmers' free-list bill. With reference to the oft-repeated statement by Members of this body, that it was the greatest deliberative body on earth, and the natural disinclination of anyone to dispute it who is a Member thereof, the certain fact seems to be that it represents 92,000,000 people and the country is the greatest ever, and whether or not the body was great it is incumbent upon it, either by its inherent greatness or, if necessary, borrowed greatness, to try to square itself with the needs of the situation.

It is acknowledged that this country has more wealth than England and France combined and that its problems must be correspondingly great, and it behooves us to be liberal in reference to matters pertaining to the greatness of the country and economical in matters pertaining to waste.

I disclaim any great knowledge of the workings of this body, excepting as it has been observed from the outside for 25 years, together with a pretty close observation inside since being a Member, but wish to couple this with the claim of some knowledge of the affairs on the outside of this great body with which it has to deal and will treat largely from this standpoint, observing that the treatment will be confined mostly to the general situation and almost entirely with acknowledged facts and the deductions largely those which can be drawn therefrom, with something of an illustration along the lines that the specific must always yield to the general, for facts as recorded by history represent a summing up of the whole or, in other words, a balance sheet, and in order to understand the specific it must be read into this general summing up of the whole.

The fourth Massachusetts district, which I have the honor to represent, has few, if any, equals by way of the variety of interests or activities therein. It consists of 44 cities and towns; in about 14 of them is much manufacturing of a wide range of production. The other 30 towns are largely farming, with incidental manufacturing only. On the east are the historic towns of Concord and Lexington, with their minute men and guns, and the great watch city of Waltham. Doubtless many of you have Waltham watches in your pockets. There are then the big shoe towns of Marlboro, Hudson, Framingham, Natick, and others. I have no doubt many of you have on shoes made in some of these towns. There are the big woolen mills at Maynard; at Clinton are the mammoth Bigelow carpet mills. Carpets from these mills may be in some of your homes. The big Lancaster cotton mills are also there and a big wire industry. Leominster is the big comb town; few of you probably who have not at some time or other used a comb made in Leominster. Next Fitchburg, with its big paper mills, making the paper for both the Ladies' Home Journal and the Saturday Evening Post, its big Parkhill cotton mills, together with a large woolen and yarn industry. Besides this, steam engines and the big Dillon boiler works and many other smaller factories. There is scarcely one here, probably, who has not seen or used some of the goods made at Fitchburg. Last, but not least, is my home town of Gardner, undoubtedly the greatest chair locality in the world. Other large industries too numerous to mention are in the district. Quantities of cotton from the South; wool, leather, and lumber from the West; steel and iron from Pennsylvania and other districts, are consumed by its manufactories, which they in turn ship all over the country. The man who represents this district can not go far astray if he stands true to such a constituency. If he sees things as they are, he must cut a pretty straight track and act with fairness and firmness or he will have troubles too numerous to mention. Yet it is a grand old district.

When an expert is called to testify on the stand he is expected to qualify, but I have not time to go into the details of the various interests with which I am quite closely acquainted and with many of which in times past I have been and am still identified. I will simply state that I was brought up on a farm as a boy and still own and operate a farm of 250 acres. I have employed men since I was 17 years old. I went to manufacturing in 1884 and have exported and imported goods since that time. During the early days of the McKinley Act, among other articles, we were importing thousands of boxes of tinplate, about which I might state some interesting things, but time will not allow. I am still connected with quite a few manufacturing industries of various kinds and know the business from beginning to end. Incidentally, I am a member of the bar.

This bill before us seems to be known as the farmers' free list, ostensibly made for the relief of the farmer, although it appears to be limited to the class of farmers whom it is intended to relieve. And in passing I wish to refer to a matter which I may refer to again and which I have previously mentioned; that is, the thousands of bales of cotton from the South used by our many cotton mills—that beautiful Southland that anyone who has seen must love—and refer to the blessings that have been so bountifully bestowed upon her in the past few years, and it is passing strange, it is beyond anything I can imagine or think why it is, that the representatives of these people to-day should still be complaining of our tariff, and anything else for that matter, when they have been so bountifully and abundantly favored in the past five years. Cotton to-day is quoted at about 15 cents a pound. During the time of the famous—perhaps I might say infamous—Wilson bill, labeled by the late President Cleveland a piece of "perfidy and dishonor," the price of cotton was about 9 cents per pound.

Complaint is made now of the alleged robbing of the cotton-producing States because of a duty on cotton bagging and ties. I shall not go into the details of this, but simply call attention to the fact that an average bale of 500 pounds of cotton is worth to-day about $75, the total cost of the bagging and ties covering the bale is about $1 per bale, or about 1⅓ per cent. If the whole business could be saved and the North could give the South its packages, this per cent represents the limit of saving. At the close of the last Democratic administration the same average bale of cotton was worth about $45 and the bagging and ties cost about $1 per bale, representing over 2 per cent on the cost. Notice this is at the close of the last Democratic administration. Assuming that this is now a Democratic administration, at least in this House, and I am talking with relation to their activities, which does the Southland like better, Republican cotton conditions or Democratic cotton conditions? I do not know what might be saved if bagging and ties were free, nor is it material if 15-cent cotton can be continued, but how much of this state of affairs did the cotton-producing States bring about? They are comparatively small consumers of their cotton. On the other hand, they are comparatively small consumers of the manufactured goods of the northern factories. There is already much of this tainted northern money invested in the South, even in cotton mills. What recompense do the cotton-producing States give to the rest of the country for this magnificent price of this Republican administration they are receiving for their cotton brought about only under Republican conditions? There is no other crop raised in this country so favored. By so favored I mean in a worse condition at the close of the last Democratic administration and in better condition at the close of a Republican administration. If this argues for a change in the management of this great country I am utterly devoid of the powers of reasoning.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. WILDER. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman state what the price of cotton was during the first year or two of the McKinley administration?

Mr. WILDER. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. It was lower than it ever was in the history of the country except one year.

Mr. WILDER. I am taking the general conditions of the last Democratic administration and comparing them with the last 14 years of Republican administration on the item of cotton.

Mr. BARTLETT. What is the tariff on raw cotton that makes the tariff affect cotton?

Mr. WILDER. I have not gone into the details. I have said that in matters of great concern the details must yield to the general. Mahomet must come to the mountain and not the mountain to Mahomet. In those years of Democratic administration cotton was 9 cents, and it is now 15 cents a pound.

Mr. BARTLETT. Might I ask another question? The gentleman said that the South consumed only a small portion of the raw product of the cotton crop. Is it not a fact that for the past two years the South has consumed more of its raw product than the other mills in the country?

Mr. WILDER. I do not understand the question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says the South consumed in its factories only a small portion of the cotton crop. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the mills of the South last year and the year before consumed more of the raw product in its factories than the eastern mills and the mills situated elsewhere in this country?

Mr. WILDER. That may be true; but still they are not using the cotton after it is produced. I am saying that no considerable portion of the market for cotton or cotton goods is in the South. It is comparatively small there. On the other hand, they are using a comparatively small amount of the elements in this country that support them in their cotton producing.

Mr. BARTLETT. The trouble about it is that two-thirds, or 62 or 63 per cent is exported to foreign countries.

Mr. WILDER. The world's markets undoubtedly enter into those conditions, but the facts are as I have stated.

THE DEMOCRATIC TIMES OF 1892–1896.

While I am about it I wish to refer for a few minutes to the personal experience I had in tussling with these alleged splendid four years of Democratic rule. Because of anticipation or fear of such a result we had the panic of 1892, which appears to have been well founded, for the Cleveland second administration came in in March, 1893, and the depression following I need not refer to, as it is too well known and too awful to repeat. Suffice it to say that after struggling with large financial matters and burdens the company with which I was connected, beginning with 1893, losing at the rate of $75,000 a year, in the fall of 1895 was forced to assign. At that time I was 40 years old. I supposed I had a competence. It engulfed all I had and left me $125,000 in debt. I refused to repudiate this debt but made no headway whatever until the Dingley bill had gotten into action. After 10 years of as hard work as any man ever did I got back onto my feet and made my name good with every man who stood by. Some few sold out, a comparatively small portion of the whole, and I did not deem it necessary or honorable to pay the purchasers a profit. My experience was that of thousands of others who look with alarm and dismay at the possibility of a repetition of such times.

Another important feature I wish to mention—the relation of the balance of trade, so-called, in this country to its general prosperity—which is frequently overlooked. The balance of trade is simply the question of whether or not we sell abroad more than we buy, or buy from abroad more than we sell. It is easily understood when we apply it to our own affairs. If we sell our product and services for more money than our expenses or living, we gain the difference. So with the country, which is simply a large business enterprise.

Now, impost duties, or tariff on imports, had been reduced to such an extent that under the conditions then existing the balance had been nearly or quite reached in 1892, and inasmuch as these duties should always be regulatory as distinct from free trade or for revenue purposes, of which I will speak more later, the moment they were lowered by the Wilson bill a flood of foreign-made goods came into this country. If the result of such activity is well understood by some of the speakers on this subject, they have kept their thoughts well concealed, for they certainly have not disclosed such. The moment a large amount of foreign manufactured goods come into this country it deprives the workmen in this country of just so much work, thereby not only increasing the amount of goods in this country to be sold over what there was before the floodgates opened, but decreasing at the same time the purchasing power by cutting off the income of the purchasers.

The four fiscal years nearest corresponding to the four years of the last Cleveland administration showed the total balance of trade in favor of this country to be the comparatively meager sum of $714,117,467, including gold (whereas in three years of Republican rule next succeeding, in one year it jumped to over $500,000,000) against which must be put probably $150,000,000 annually spent abroad by Americans, leaving a net average in our favor of less than $30,000,000 per year. If there is a man in this House who wants a recurrence of those conditions, I shall be glad to have him say so. How can he expect they will be any different under the same management, although possibly by another generation? During the 14 years after the Dingley bill became effective—that is, the full fiscal years since that time—the balance of trade was in favor of this country; or, in other words, we have sold more than we have purchased abroad the enormous sum of $6,474,980,183. Deduct from this the approximate amount the American people have spent abroad, of $2,800,000,000 (and I have allowed $50,000,000 a year more for the full period than was included in the previous four years of Democratic rule, because the American people were more able to spend abroad) and we have the net amount of balance of trade in our favor $3,674,980,183, which, divided by 14 years, gives the splendid average of over $250,000,000 per year, as against the last Democratic administration's annual average of less than $30,000,000. There may be some Members in this House who would like to repeat this awful four years, but they would not if they knew what they were talking about. No man who suffered during those four years as I suffered could contemplate its duplication except with the most awful forebodings. As stated, my experience was simply that of thousands of others.

Now, just a word in relation to the Canadian reciprocity bill already passed by this House, with its relation to the farmers' free-list bill before us. I need not refer to the fact—it has been repeated often enough—that every bill passed so far by this House had been previously passed by a Republican House, excepting, possibly, with some vicious additions. But I want to compare for a few moments the essential elements of this Canadian reciprocity measure with this bill before the House, known as the farmers' free bill. First, I want to say generally that when we pit the farmer against the factory, or the factory against the farmer, it is a self-evident injustice. It has been stated many times by those more eloquent than myself that their interests are mutual and must go hand in hand if this country would prosper, and, indeed, to use the expression of another, their interests are "inextricably intermingled." Sec-

ond, I want to make a quotation about an inch long, which is the only thing I will "read into" this address. It is headed "Laurier will not go to the coronation," with a subheading, "Instead will remain at Ottawa to take charge of fight for reciprocity":

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, *April 28.*

The determination of the Canadian Government to ratify reciprocity was emphasized in Parliament to-day by the prime minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who said that he would not go to England to represent Canada at the imperial conference or the coronation of King George in June, but would remain at Ottawa and press the reciprocity agreement if the Conservative opposition persisted in obstructing the ratification of the pact.

It has been stated on the floor of this House in my hearing several times that this Canadian reciprocity measure was a lopsided arrangement in favor of Canada. If this item does not show conclusively that the Canadian Parliament does not consider it a lopsided thing in their favor, then, for a second time, I am utterly devoid of reasoning powers. The Canadian people are the nearest like our people of any nation—their conditions, their soil, their temperament, their method of living, their all. There are only about 8,000,000 of them—about the size of New York or Pennsylvania. The reciprocity measure may be to our disadvantage in some respects, and doubtless, by the quotation I have just read, the Canadians feel it will be to their disadvantage in some respects. This, I say, is the best possible evidence which we have before us that it is a fair deal. That it was so intended and worked out with the utmost care by President Taft and his assistants is beyond question. To compare this with putting items on the free list for peoples whose conditions are wholly unlike our own, in the wages earned and the conditions under which they live, besides being a hundred times greater in number, in the third instance passes my powers of reasoning. [Applause on the Republican side.]

When it comes to the theory of free trade or a tariff for revenue or any related activities, I am opposed to them. In the first place, theories—if by theory is meant a principle or a clear line of thought—while it is possible to apply such to matters of science it is absolutely impossible to apply them to human conditions. Possibly a theory might be applied to Divine conditions, but we are human, not divine. It is also possible that there may have been tariff considerations that great and wise men would stand for 25 years ago, or 15 years ago, that they would not stand for or would wish to change to-day. The gentleman from Illinois, ex-Speaker CANNON, made one of the noblest remarks the other day that I have ever heard made when his attention was called to a remark that he made in 1894 in reference to what he said at that time, about whether or not the market price of wheat was controlled in London, and he replied:

I have no pride in what I have said in former years.

And even though it was said as quoted—I think by the gentleman from Wisconsin—it seemed to make no difference with his view at the present time. So I say, because of the fact that we are dealing with human conditions, theories when we try to apply them to such become mere vagaries. Our tariff, as I have stated before, is and always must be regulatory. It is possible that the word "protection" to-day does not express the modern conditions correctly, but this term "regulatory" expresses, to my mind, my view of what a tariff should be. I mean that comparatively speaking it is immaterial whether a tariff raises any considerable revenue or not. It is well known that when a tariff is high it raises no revenue, and it only raises revenue when made low enough so that goods manufactured abroad can come into this country. To illustrate, if we buy $100,000,000 abroad on which we pay an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent the American people have to put out $115,000,000 to get these goods in from abroad, $100,000,000 going abroad and $15,000,000 going into the United States Treasury as impost duties. This $100,000,000, and for every multiple thereof an equal amount, would represent from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 of American labor, and consequently from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 of purchasing power in this country.

You say my quota of labor is too large for this amount of products, but I tell you nay; there is not only the last completing factory's pay roll, but there is the pay roll of every factory that furnishes materials and supplies for the last or completing factory, so that the entire pay roll for any $100,000,000 of manufactured goods brought in from abroad decreases our purchasing power from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000, and in many instances decreases it by the whole amount less the margins of the various manufacturers, and even much of this goes out for services of employees, transportation, and use of capital and otherwise. Now, where is the profit to this country—and this country for the purposes of this discussion must be considered as if it were yourself or a little community of people—to lose from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 in purchasing power for the sake of raising $15,000,000, and even this from ourselves, for revenue? We by far better raise this $15,000,000 by internal tax on these very people who would be glad to bear the burden if given the additional business. There are, however, certain items that can not be manufactured favorably in this country, and these are the realms in which our revenue by way of impost duties can well be raised, besides many classes of goods that can not be produced in this country at all. Personally I do not care what the tariff is on silks and satins, diamonds, wines, and other unnecessary things that people insist on buying from abroad even though they pay fancy prices therefor, because those who are able pay these duties and the whole purchase is optional. But all this, as I said before, should be regulatory so that the business of this country may prosper in the sanest fashion and should be worked to the end that the goods involving much labor used in this country should be made in this country, and, in my estimation, it ill becomes the Democratic Party, especially our friends from the Sunny South, to object to the burdens that they bear, which are insignificant at best, on their bagging and ties, so long as their cotton can be maintained at 15 cents per pound. This, gentlemen of the Democratic Party, must be credited to the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not see how you can get away from that.

Much confusion arises from the effort to solve a great problem of this sort by specific instances. One says that the price of wheat, being an article of general export, is controlled in London; another says that it is controlled where the bulk of the product is sold. Others say that we should have free beef, that we can get our surplus from the Argentine and other places. Quite likely all of these things are true under certain conditions.

It certainly is true, and facts have proven it over and over again, that there are times when a very small portion of the supply controls the price; for instance, a large wheat corner has been broken with a few millions of bushels. Northern Pacific Railroad stock some years ago went skyrocketing to $1,000 because a comparatively few shares could not be obtained; but that case in the North Dakota town where the wheat was at a higher price on our side of the street than on the Canadian side, which would, of course, be the reverse on our manufactured articles, while a necessity under the local conditions rather than a marvel, yet when these very people, on either side of the street, undertook to sell a carload of wheat of the same grade for export they would get the same price for it. Again, if we should have a shortage of wheat in this country at any time, the export or even general market would not control in any local instance, excepting at a price plus the cost of bringing the wheat from some other place. Again, the United States and Canada are large exporters of wheat, they have exported for years past, we expect they will export for years to come, and if at any time, as a matter of fact, wheat in export quantities—that is, quantities not controlled by local conditions—is exported, if the Canadian price was lower than the United States price, or vice versa, the country having the lower price would necessarily have all the export market they could supply, because the markets of the world will pay for wheat from one country of the same grade just the same as from another country.

Again, what is the use of talking about Argentine beef coming into this country and affecting the beef price here to any extent so long as this country exports cattle and beef? If Argentine's price was lower than ours, they would have all the export business, would they not, and the United States could not export against them? But these items, when they come to be worked specifically, are simply confusion. The human mind can not follow out such things specifically, and we must take into consideration what has happened in the past and from that build what will happen in the future. "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" Look what happened to this country, as I have stated from the record, under Democratic and Republican rule on the single item of cotton, that has been talked so much about in the last few days in this House. Under Democratic rule 9 cents per pound and 15 cents under Republican rule. I am willing to stake my whole hope of success and prosperity on what will happen by what has happened.

I do not understand how this can be the greatest deliberative body on earth one day and then be informed the next by some individual Member of the legislation that is to be passed in the coming days, for together they make a paradox. And for these reasons, which can be readily applied, I stand opposed to this bill. We have gone far enough at the present time with the Canadian reciprocity bill. I have little use for a steam roller,

regardless of the party operating it, and believe that all of our affairs should be treated with the utmost care, and while changes should be made continuously, they should be made with the utmost discretion, and this headlong falling asunder in our midst with the usual result should be avoided, if possible.

And may the good Lord encompass and speedily facilitate this brilliantly illumined, pyrotechnical, new Democratic steam roller in its flight down hill, backward, until it disappears altogether in the sepulcher of the demnition bow wows already yawning for it in the abyss at the foot of the hill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for 14 years the legislative and executive departments of the Government have been under the complete control of the Republican Party, and during that period the burdens of taxation have been gradually and greatly increased, the expenses of the Government multiplied many times, the number of trusts become too numerous to enumerate, the power of the special interests has become stronger each year, and they have become the most favored objects of legislation. The people in the last election repudiated that party for its faithlessness to the interests of the people and its open and flagrant violation of its platform pledges. The Democratic Party has been restored to supremacy in this Chamber, it has returned to the seat of its former power and glory, and here it will remain if it proves true to its principles and avowed purposes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ever since Congress assembled in special session our party has been engaged in an earnest effort to carry into effect our platform pledges.

In less than four weeks our party has demonstrated its faithfulness to those pledges upon which it received the votes of the people. It has taken from the Speaker of the House the power to appoint committees, and thus control legislation. It has passed through this House a joint resolution to give the people the right to elect their United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. It has passed a bill compelling campaign committees to inform the people before an election the sources of the money used for the expenses of the campaign and election. It has sought to thus give notice as far as possible of the contributions by the beneficiaries of special legislation, the favored interests. It has provided a way and will reduce the expense of this House by nearly $200,000 by cutting off useless offices. It has placed before the House this bill placing upon the free list many of the articles of necessity to the American farmer, and will pass the same within a few days, and if it does not become a law the Republican Senate and President will be responsible for the failure. Trace Republican legislation from its beginning and there has been no measure of relief to the people ever enacted by that party that carried so large a benefit as the pending bill. The farmer has always been the injured party in Republican legislation; he is the party benefited in Democratic legislation. Upon his back the Republicans placed the heaviest burdens of tariff taxation, and we relieve him of part of that load by our first tariff bill. He is the very last person considered in your legislation; he is the first one cared for in our legislation. We are proud of the fact that the creation of the Department of Agriculture in our Government was a Democratic measure, and the act creating the same was signed by a Democratic President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We boast of the great wealth of our country; the farmers created that wealth. They are the basis of the prosperity of our country. Agriculture is the oldest and most important of all industries, and our progress is measured by its development and advancement. In the prosperity of the farmer is involved and dependent the happiness and prosperity of all classes. Bountiful harvest to the farmer brings prosperity to all classes and diffuses its blessings among all the people. Failure to him brings want and misery to all. The Nation prospers when the farmer prospers, and the results are felt throughout the world. He asks no special favors from the Government, and has received none. The favors shown to the special interests by high protective laws have been to the detriment of the farmer, and upon his back have rested most heavily those unjust burdens of tariff taxation. He asks but for a fair deal, and from Republicans he has asked in vain. We propose to do justice to this large class of citizens, who have made this country the envy and pride of the world. Upon the farmer rests the burden of feeding and clothing the world, and the Republican policy has taken from him by tariff taxation a very large part of the profits of his labor. He is unprotected, and while governmental favoritism is shown to other industries he, alone and unaided, sells his products in free competition in the markets of the world. He produces more than our people can consume and must seek foreign markets, and the price of these products in the foreign markets fix the price of his products not only abroad but at home. Congress can not by law fix those prices or affect them; they are settled by a law beyond the power of Congress—the law of supply and demand. When the supply is large the price is low, and when the demand is great the price is high. Any law that seeks to change that rule is made for deception. The Republicans have for years sought to deceive the farmer by claiming omnipotent power through tariff laws, that a duty on his products enhanced the value; but to-day its most eminent followers have confessed that their professions were insincere and made only to deceive, and any duty on products that must be sold abroad was useless.

Both political parties in their last campaign promised revision of the tariff. The Democratic Party, faithful to its established custom of frankness and sincerity, promised revision downward; the Republicans simply promised revision. Candidate Taft interpreted that platform as downward revision, and upon this interpretation received the majority of the votes of the American people. How that interpretation was carried into legislation the Payne-Aldrich bill answers. How the outraged and deceived people felt is attested by the present Democratic majority in the House.

Instead of relieving the people, their burdens were increased, and the desperate attempts to show the reductions in that bill have failed, and even the so-called reductions were in name only, and prohibitive rates still continue. President Taft, in seeking to allay popular outcry and as far as possible keep afloat the battered and torn Republican ship, sought to secure the Canadian trade agreement. His own party, torn asunder by internal strife, but, as ever, loyal and subservient to the special interests, would not even grant this small measure of relief, and the Democrats aided the President in securing this result. It is not what the Democrats desired or would have secured, and it is not an answer to the popular demand for tariff reduction. It is only a step in the right direction. It is an opening of the tariff wall that has surrounded our country; it is a break in the protective policy that will lead to its overthrow. It is an acknowledgment that the Democratic policy of opening the markets to our trade will benefit our own people. It is opposed by every trust in the country, by every special interest that has grown great and powerful from wealth drawn from the people by tariff laws.

This bill placing on the free list the different items mentioned is a Democratic measure, and our party is alone responsible for it being here to-day; no Republican voted in favor of giving this House an opportunity to pass the bill. It is presented as the first answer to the people who have asked for relief and help. We are the wealthiest nation on earth. Our farms and farm property represent $25,000,000,000 of the Nation's wealth. We have 6,000,000 farms and 12,000,000 persons engaged in farming, and this represents one-third of the entire population. Our farms and their products increase in value each year. In 1910 our farms yielded a wealth valued at $8,926,000,000. Last year our corn crop was 3,121,281,000 bushels, and was worth not less than $1,500,000,000. It would have paid the interest-bearing indebtedness of the United States and bought all the gold and silver mined in all the countries of the world last year. The production of the great Steel Corporation was but little over half as much as the value of last year's corn crop.

We harvested 60,000,000 tons of hay, worth $720,000,000; 691,777,000 bushels of wheat, worth $625,000,000; and our cotton crop was worth $900,000,000; oats worth $380,000,000; tobacco, $95,000,000.

We have not only fed and clothed our own people, but sent abroad last year to feed and clothe the world $871,107,067 worth of farm products.

The first articles we mention in this free-list bill are agricultural implements. In 1905, the last year for which we have had full reports printed, the total value of agricultural implements manufactured was $112,007,344, of which we exported $20,721,741. In 1910 we exported of these articles $28,124,033, an increase of 629 per cent in 20 years. Our exportations are about one-fifth of the total amount manufactured. These goods are sold in every part of the world in competition with the world. As they meet and control the foreign market, they certainly need not fear competition with foreign-made goods at home. The tariff has prevented any competition to speak of, but these articles have sold higher here without competition than abroad with competition. Our farmers are entitled to at least as good treatment as the foreign farmer. The factories manufacturing agricultural implements have been reduced in number from 1,943 in 1880 to 648 in 1905.

The farmer abroad uses agricultural implements made here, but purchased at lower prices than sold to our farmers, yet the grain so cultivated is sold in competition with the world and with the products of the American farmer.

Our wheat growers compete with the wheat growers of Russia, England, France, Hungary, India, and all the grain-growing countries of Europe and Asia, and their products meet in the markets of the world the products of the poorest paid labor in the world.

The serfs of Russia, the oppressed peasantry of Hungary, and the people of India all pour the products of their labor into the free markets of Europe and are sold in competition with the world.

Under the Dingley law from 1898 to 1907, 10 years, the importations and duties from agricultural implements were:

Importations	$203,475
Duties	40,692

On a value of about $20,300 a year yielding annual duties of $4,000. In 18 years we have imported less than $400,000 worth of agricultural implements of all kinds, collecting duties less than $60,000 or $3,000 a year.

Our exportations are increasing yearly and our goods are found in all the countries of the world. During the last 10 years we exported agricultural implements as follows:

Agricultural implements exported.

[From the United States Statistical Abstract, 1909.]

Years.	Mowers and reapers.	Plows and cultivators.	All other.
1900	$11,243,000	$2,178,000	$2,677,000
1901	9,943,000	1,888,000	4,481,000
1902	8,818,000	2,791,000	4,677,000
1903	10,326,000	3,169,000	7,510,000
1904	11,568,000	3,537,000	7,643,000
1905	10,599,000	2,892,000	7,269,000
1906	12,150,000	4,128,000	8,275,000
1907	15,078,000	3,492,000	8,366,000
1908	13,570,000	3,139,000	7,454,000
1909	14,052,000	3,705,000	7,846,000
Total	117,347,000	30,919,000	66,198,000
1910	11,972,000	7,498,000	11,820,000

Or a grand total of $245,755,000 exported, as against about $200,000 imported for the same years. We sell to the world more than a thousand times as much as we buy from the world. We have been exporting about $20,000,000 a year, or about one-fifth of our home production, as is shown by the following:

Value of agricultural products manufactured in United States as per census reports, 1905.

1880	$68,640,000
1890	81,271,000
1900	101,207,000
1905	112,007,000

With this enormous implement production and the trifling importation, the time has come for free trade in agricultural implements. Our exports to foreign markets in 1910 were as follows:

To United Kingdom	$913,801
To France	2,960,000
To Germany	1,580,000
To Italy	471,000
To Netherlands	395,000
To Russia in Europe	5,370,000
To other Europe	2,088,000
To Canada	4,321,000
To Mexico	601,000
To Cuba	337,000
To Argentina	7,502,000
To other South America	1,337,000
To British Oceania	1,369,000
To other Asia and Oceania	621,000
To Africa	1,382,000
To all other countries	51,000

There is no necessity for a tariff upon agricultural implements, even from the protection standpoint. The only excuse for one is to assist the trust manufacturer further to plunder the American farmer. The Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] contended that placing farm implements upon the free list would be of but small benefit to the farmer, since the revenue derived from the present tariff was but $2,775 in 1905, and that this small amount of saving was so trivial when divided among the numerous farmers. This reasoning is absurd. By this process of reasoning, if the tariff rate were absolutely prohibitive and no revenue received, then it would be folly to change it, as he would say it cost the farmers nothing. The same argument would sustain all the prohibitive rates in the Payne-Aldrich bill. The fact that the revenue is so small shows that the rate is either practically prohibitive or that foreigners are unable to successfully compete with our manufacturers.

It is of vital importance to our farmers that the bagging and sacking of the agricultural products be made free of duty in order to secure the most favorable price possible. The sacks, bags, and coverings used in the transportation of agricultural products are indispensable in the marketing of these goods, and as the products themselves can not receive the benefit of any protection, as they are export products and their price fixed abroad, it is unfair and unjust that the farmer should pay tariff tax upon the sacks and bags necessary for the marketing of these products, so we put them on the free list. Hoop or band iron or steel for baling cotton or other commodities, and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products, we also place on the free list. The grain from the northern farmer and the cotton from the southern farmer are thus given equal and fair treatment. As the northern grains must be sacked, the southern cotton must be covered, and we thus reduce at once a large expense necessary in the operation of any farm.

The farmer is thus supplied the wire for baling his hay and straw without the payment of an additional sum by reason of the tariff. In the Middle West, where thousands of tons of hay and straw are annually baled for the market, this relief from exorbitant prices will be of inestimable value to the farmer compelled to prepare his hay for shipment by baling. In the past he has been forced to swell the earnings of the trusts by his contributions in the purchase of his wire. We have sought to relieve him of this burden.

Under the Wilson bill ties for baling cotton were free. In 1898, 16,265,506 pounds were imported, valued at $239,498, or 1½ cents a pound, without freight, insurance, or commissions.

The Dingley law imposed a half a cent a pound duty on all hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings for baling cotton or any other commodity.

The importations fell off at once to nothing, and it was not until 1900 that a million pounds came in. The average importations in the eight years, 1900–1907, have been about 2,000,000 pounds. All duties during that period were $84,274, or an average annual revenue of $10,534.

The duties are and have been very small, and the Government, in the interest of the cotton farmers, can well afford to make cotton ties free. The Payne bill reduced the rate of duty from one-half cent a pound to three-tenths cent, which was a proper move, but not radical enough to meet the demands of the case. For the first year of this law we imported a value of $9,389, collecting a duty of $1,498.

Wheat growers are given free binding twine, as America can compete with the world on that article, and it is apparently true that America can compete with the world in the manufacture of cotton ties.

Under the Wilson bill in 1898 the value of all importations of cotton ties free was $239,498. The value of all binding twine imported free in 1907 was $227,499, or practically the same as cotton ties in 1898 under the Wilson law. It would fairly follow from this that if binding twine is free because we can compete cotton ties should also be free. One is as able to take care of itself as the other.

On page 4825 of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House Mr. C. Lee McMillan, of New Orleans, stated that the tariff tax per bale was 4½ cents, or 22½ cents per bundle of 5 bales, under the Dingley law, or 2.7 cents per bale, or 13.5 cents, under the present law.

On the 13,000,000 bales of cotton produced in 1907, had the ties been imported the tariff duties would have been $585,000, and under the Payne law, $351,000. These ties were not all imported, inasmuch as the Government revenue for this year was but $1,498.

The difference of approximately $349,502 went to swell the profits of the American manufacturers.

Our manufacturers can produce cotton ties as cheaply as any other manufacturers, and it is not a square deal to give them a margin of nearly a half million of dollars as unearned tariff profits, profits which the American cotton farmer must pay.

It is impossible to give figures which will show the importation of wire used for baling hay, straw, and other farm products, as no separate account is kept for this particular wire.

BARBED FENCE WIRE, WIRE RODS, AND WIRE FENCING.

These articles are a necessity to the farmer. He is no longer able to maintain rail and board fences, as the price of timber is too high to be used for this purpose. He must of necessity resort to the wire fencing, and it is an item of considerable expense in his yearly accounts. He should be able to purchase

it at the lowest possible price, and for that reason we have placed it on the free list. The tariff rates on these articles have compelled our people to depend upon the great steel industry for their supply. The Steel Trust is the largest combination of wealth in the country, and this wealth has accumulated by means of tariff legislation. With absolute control of our markets, and with power to fix their prices at will, they have drawn from the American farmer a constant flow of gold to their own treasury. Not satisfied with the control of this market, they have annually exported immense quantities of their goods and furnished them abroad cheaper than to our own people. While they have fought Canadian reciprocity in the name of the farmer, yet they compel the American farmer to pay for his barbed wire and fencing 50 per cent more than they sell the same fencing to the Canadian farmer. The same is true of horseshoes and wire nails and many other of the finished products, and their love for the farmer is measured by the amount of money they can take from his pockets.

Imports of barbed and other wire for the years ended June 30, 1909 and 1910.

Barbed wire:	
Exported in 1909	$3,752,964
Exported in 1910	4,521,221
Other wire:	
Exported in 1909	3,542,627
Exported in 1910	4,676,784

We exported about as much barbed wire as all other wire combined, and sell it in all parts of the world.

In 1905 manufacturers reported a total production of all kinds of wire of $37,914,000.

We give, by this bill, to the housewife her sewing machine with the duty free. This article is no longer a luxury but a necessity and is found in almost all the homes of the people. Our machines are used in almost every country of the world, and an American traveler sees them for sale in every European port.

This is another American article that is sold abroad cheaper than at home. Recently the prices quoted for domestic and foreign use were as follows:

Sewing machines.	Domestic price.	Foreign price.
Fine	$27.50	$20.75
Medium	22.00	17.50
Cheap	18.00	12.00

I presume that these manufacturers have also urged the farmers to protest against Canadian reciprocity—they fear the least break in the wall of protection and exclusiveness. In 1905 the number of establishments making these machines was less than half those in 1880, but with thrice the capital invested, and the total value of the finished machines was $20,869,870, and the amount exported was $6,104,279, or nearly one-third of the total manufactured. These exportations increased to $7,513,852 in 1910. When such quantities are exported and sold in free competition abroad, do they need protection from competition at home?

The Payne-Aldrich bill gives a duty of 30 per cent on sewing machines.

We have no disposition to injure or cripple any American industry, but we are not disposed to allow any American industry to injure or cripple the American people. Their duty simply allows the manufacturer of these goods to absolutely control the American market from foreign competition and charge our people the price just below what the duty allows them, and then, at lower prices, to sell to foreigners in open and free competition. We simply require them hereafter to treat their customers alike and prevent the discrimination against our own people.

The first tariff bill and the one which Thomas Jefferson assisted in framing put salt on the free list. Salt is not the product of human genius or skill. Nature has produced it for human use; it is in the waters of the sea, as well as in the earth. Animal existence depends upon its supply. It is wrong to place a tax upon such an absolute necessity to both man and beast.

The removal of this duty on salt is a great benefit to the packer of pork and beef, to our butter makers, and people generally. A few people are interested in having a monopoly of the salt business, but we rejoice in giving the people free salt.

LEATHER, BOOTS AND SHOES, HARNESS AND SADDLERY.

Hides were placed on the free list in 1909, and the Democrats then endeavored to have the item here mentioned placed on the free list, but the Republicans refused to permit it. Leather is being marketed in this country at low cost and is a necessity to our people. Boots and shoes made in this country are sold throughout the world and compete in all the markets. American machinery used in this industry are superior to that of any other country, and there is no necessity of this tariff, and while we received last year $97,325 in duties from this schedule, they are of such universal use and demand that our people are entitled to them at the lowest price possible.

No industry will be injured, and millions of people will be benefited, and this is the reason for its enactment.

Leather and its manufactures—boots, shoes, and harness—may be classed among the prime necessities of life, and with hides on the free list, should be admitted free of duty. The importations and duties on such leather and its products as are affected by this bill in 1910 were as follows:

Description.	Duty.	Value.	Amount of duty.
	Per cent.		
Band and sole leather	20	$8,549	$1,709
Band and sole leather	5	947,191	47,359
Calfskins, tanned	20	22,392	4,478
Grain, buff and split	7½	106,305	7,079
Patent leather, 20 to 30 cents per pound and 8 to 20 per cent, or from	25 to 35	203,490	59,022
Tanned but unfinished	20	7,200	1,442
Tanned but unfinished	15	88,658	13,298
Skins, dressed and finished (Dingley)	20	4,484	899
Skins, dressed and finished	15	808,318	121,247
Upper leather	20	42,087	8,417
Upper leather	15	93,198	13,979
All other	20	223,321	44,664
All other	15	727,871	109,180
Philippines and Cuba		33	3
Leather cut into uppers	15 to 35	10,572	2,577
Total		3,550,133	484,057
Boots and shoes	10 to 25	171,805	22,694
Harness and saddlery	45	75,238	33,857
Total		3,797,176	540,608

From this it will be seen that our imports were comparatively unimportant. On the other hand, we imported free hides as follows:

Buffalo hides	$1,341,677
Calfskins	18,059,350
Other cattle hides	46,746,999
Goatskins	30,868,000
Horse skins	3,081,000
Kangaroo skins	415,000
Sheepskins	11,257,000
Other skins	1,843,000
Total	113,640,026
Hide cuttings	1,605,482
Total	115,245,508

There can be no valid reason for giving free entrance to $113,640,000 worth of free raw material for leather manufactures and charging from 5 to 45 per cent on the manufactured products, leather, boots and shoes, and harness. Our imports of $3,797,176 are in no sense a menace to the manufacturing class, while the revenue, $540,608, is no compensation to the consumer, who argues that while millions are conceded to the Leather Trust in free importations of raw stock at least one-fortieth as much might be permitted to have the same privilege in boots and shoes, harness, and leather.

What is the condition of our leather industry? Do we make all we need? Our imports of leather—practically a raw material—in 1910 amounted to but $3,797,176. If 92,000,000 people use only 4 cents worth of foreign leather per head per annum then it may fairly be assumed that our home manufacturers have the entire field to themselves and need protection of no kind whatever.

Our exports for 1909 and 1910 were:

	1909	1910
Sole leather	$6,887,000	$8,419,473
Upper leather:		
Kid, glazed	3,573,000	16,675,613
Patent	169,000	728,585
Splits	17,624,000	11,289,000
All other	2,159,000	
Total leather	30,412,000	37,112,671
Boots and shoes	10,305,000	13,216,237
Harness	650,000	794,936
Grand total	41,367,000	51,123,844

This is a remarkable showing for leather and leather goods, fully warranting the placing of these articles on the free list. In 1892 our exports were but $12,000,000, and the $100,000,000

mark under the impetus of free hides may fairly be expected in a few years. We sell leather and leather goods to all the world, but principally to Great Britain. We sold Great Britain sole leather in 1905 amounting to $4,400,000. Japan bought $3,400,000. Great Britain bought $10,900,000 of other leathers, while all other countries took $6,000,000. American leather was sold in Asia to more than $1,000,000. America outside of the United States bought $2,000,000, while Australasia and Africa took more than half a million. Great Britain bought $2,000,000 of our boots and shoes, four-fifths of all our exports to Europe. Canada bought $1,000,000; Mexico, $1,500,000; and the West Indies $2,000,000. Our harness and saddles found sales all around the globe.

We export far more leather than does Great Britain, about the same quantity of boots and shoes, but far less of saddles and harness. British manufacturers of boots and shoes, leather and leather goods can not compete with our manufacturers of these goods on a free-trade basis, and this bill will open the way to a freer trade, which will ultimately redound to the interest of the consumers.

For many years prominent manufacturers of boots and shoes from all parts of the country said, "Give us free hides and we will consent to free boots and shoes." Free hides have been given, and this bill will carry into effect the other part of the proposal.

We sold abroad last year over $13,000,000 worth of boots and shoes, and they were sold in free competition with the world. If our manufacturers can successfully compete with foreign-made goods in the open markets abroad, they can surely compete with foreign-made goods in our own country.

MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS.

For the year ending June 30, 1910, our importations and duties were as follows:

Articles.	Value.	Duties.
Bacon and hams	$117,880	$20,384
Beef, fresh	61,110	12,830
Extracts of meat	151,398	33,472
Venison	25,798	2,518
All other fresh	7,374	826
Lamb, fresh	3,806	608
Lard	446	58
Meats, n. s. p. f	4,559	456
Meats, prepared or preserved	451,780	112,936
Mutton, fresh	56,657	10,414
Pork, fresh	28,905	2,555
Poultry, dead	52,843	15,032
Veal, fresh	2,655	357
Total	965,211	212,446

We import less than $1,000,000 worth of meat and meat products, and the duties, $212,446, or approximately 22 per cent, can very appropriately be remitted in view of the fact that the preparation and sale of meats for the domestic market have passed under the control of the Beef Trust and its allies.

EXPORTS.

In 1909 our exports were as follows, as shown by the Statistical Abstract:

Beef products:	
Beef, canned	$1,645,822
Beef, fresh	12,698,594
Beef, salted or pickled	3,438,048
Beef, other cured	34,319
Total beef products	17,816,783
Hog products:	
Bacon	25,920,490
Hams and shoulders	23,526,307
Pork, canned	620,193
Pork, fresh	938,025
Pork, pickled	4,599,431
Lard	52,712,569
Total hog products	108,317,015
Lard compounds	6,115,307
Mutton	141,654
Oleo oil and neutral lard	19,126,741
Poultry and game	848,644
Sausage and sausage meats	997,655
All other:	
Canned	1,060,222
All other	1,783,331
Total	30,073,554
Grand total meat products	156,207,352

For every dollar's worth of meat bought outside the country we sell $156 worth. There is little danger of free trade in meat products injuring the industries of the United States.

MEAT PRODUCTION.

The special census of the United States for 1905 discloses the fact that our manufacturers and packers put up the following product values for that year:

	Value of product.
Lard, refined	$6,128,601
Sausage	8,122,904
Slaughtering and meat products, wholesale	801,757,137
Total	816,008,642

The great slaughtering houses report their lard and sausage product as a part of the total product, which accounts for the small showing of these manufacturers in the above table.

We import	$665,211
We export	156,207,352
We produce	816,008,642

By this bill we lose about $212,446 revenue. Our meat production would be largely augmented could we add the farm and home slaughter of animals.

Imports of flour, meal, and similar foods for year ended June 30, 1910.

	Value.	Duties.
Bran and mill feed	$323,486	$64,697
Bread and biscuit	137,779	27,551
Buckwheat flour	1,061	265
Corn meal	200	29
Oat meal and rolled oats	31,071	5,207
Rye flour	1,204	270
Semolina	2,504	626
Wheat flour	681,863	170,465
Wheat screenings	122,385	12,239
Oat hulls	254,192	48,667
Pearled barley	100,702	16,230
Total	1,656,597	346,246

Exports for 1909.

Oatmeal	$516,524
Bread and biscuit	716,687
Corn meal	1,549,610
Rye flour	14,600
Wheat flour	51,157,366
Bran, middlings, etc	1,222,406
Preparations for table food	1,858,646
Total	57,035,839

Production, 1905.

Manufactures of bakery products	$269,609,861
Flour and grist mills	713,033,395
Other food preparations	61,180,000
Total	1,043,823,256

Other nations have large holds on the foreign demand for flour, but the mills of the United States ship abroad more of this necessary commodity every year than the mills of all the rest of the world combined.

We have put lumber on the free list in order to allow our people to shelter themselves from the cold. The Democrats are in sympathy with the poor. In fact, our party is known as the poor man's party, and it is the highest encomium that can be given a party that it guards and protects those who are unable to protect and defend themselves.

Of the 16,000,000 families in this country, less than 5,000,000 of their houses are unencumbered by mortgages, and the remaining 11,000,000 either have no homes or have mortgaged ones. We propose to make it easier for our people to own their homes. The prices of lumber have increased so much that it is almost impossible for the man with moderate means or a fair salary to manage to build a house; it is impossible for the men with small wages to do so. The easier for our people to own their own property, the better for our country, since it will result in better citizens and a higher citizenship.

One objection made by the Republicans against this bill is that it is class legislation, and the report of the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee place their objection on this ground. What consistency in such an objection? That party has for years enacted class legislation; in fact, the tariff laws are for the benefit of certain classes; yet when we seek to relieve the farmer, who represents one-third of our entire population, from their class legislation, they protest and object and denounce it as class legislation. This measure benefits all the people, but we would support it if it limited its benefits to the farmers. Your tariff laws are class legislation, and we can not touch them without your raising this cry. It is all right for your party to pass class legislation, but when we seek to correct your vicious laws you raise this cry. We believe in equal and exact justice to all and special privileges to none, and we will restore this principle to our laws, even if we meet with your cry of class legislation.

Another objection to the bill is that it is sectional. Why? Because it gives to the southern farmer covering for his cotton and ties to hold it suitable for marketing. Both are essential to the shippers of cotton, and the southern farmers are entitled to this relief. They raised last year $900,000,000 of cotton and exported millions of dollars' worth, and helped to secure for the country a favorable trade balance. This balance is what builds up the wealth of the Nation. This cry of sectionalism is unworthy of even the Republican Party. The war has been over for nearly 50 years, and you seek to reopen the wounds of that conflict and arouse another section of the country by seeking to show that they have been discriminated against. This claim is untrue.

What more can be given the northern or western farmer? His implements of trade are being made free; every agricultural implement he uses is put on the free list. The sacks to market his grain, the wagon in which to haul it, the shovels and scoops to unload it, the wire with which to bale his hay and straw. What can be added? The Steel Trust is the injured party in the ties used in baling cotton, its profits will be lessened, and to protect this greatest of all corporations, and the one whose wealth has been taken from the people by the tariff law, we see Republican leaders raise the cry of sectionalism. It is the cry of the Steel Trust and repeated by those who would allow its plundering to continue.

As Democrats we have no political debts due to those special interests, and we rejoice at the opportunity to relieve the people of their exactions. This bill, with its inestimable benefits, will be soon presented for passage. Its support by the Democrats is assured.

We hear the same cry and protest against this bill that will be made when any schedule in the Payne-Aldrich bill is touched. The industries affected loudly protest and object, and we must disregard the protests or continue to tax the people forever on their special productions. The arguments presented are not for the good of the people, but for the very few benefited. If we wait to gain the consent or receive the approval of the people who make money from the present rates there will be no revision now or hereafter. No tariff rate can be lowered if we consult the judgment of the beneficiaries of the rates.

Our party promised to reduce the tariff, and there was no proviso to the promise that we would reduce it only after having received the approval of its beneficiaries. That was the course of the Republican Party—its first consideration was to the beneficiaries and the interests of the people were forgotten—and as they neglected the people in their legislation they were neglected by the people at the ballot box. The contest is one between the interests of the people and the beneficiaries of special legislation, who believe the people should be taxed for their enrichment. In this contest our party will not hesitate to choose. We will stand with the people and against the special interests and upon the pledges of our party platform.

The tariff is a tax or duty levied upon articles imported into this country. Articles thus imported are taxed according to the tariff schedules, and this tax is first paid by the importer, but the price of the articles is increased by the duty thus collected, and the consumer ultimately pays the same, although the money paid in the first instance by the importer goes into the National Treasury. To the extent that the tariff is protection the tax is always paid upon the article by the consumer and goes into the pocket of the protected producer. One system is legitimate taxation; the other is taxation for special interest.

A tax is not a source of wealth or a means of development. The effect of a protective tariff is to distribute unfairly the reward of labor, prevent its natural diffusion, and concentrate it in the hands of a few people. It is a tax levied by the Government on all of the people for the benefit of a favored few.

Protection is demanded in the name of labor, but labor itself is unprotected. We forbid foreign goods, but we welcome the foreign laborer. The foreign laborer competes with our laborers in every field of industry and is employed in this country in the protected industries more extensively than in the unprotected. The manufacturer is protected, the laborer is unprotected, but he must compete in the open and free market and is compelled to buy all the necessities of life in a highly protected market.

American labor is the cheapest in the world when measured by a true standard—the productiveness of labor. Our laborers are intelligent, skillful, and industrious. The wages here are larger because the work is much more efficient and the amount performed is so large.

The real price of labor is the amount of the necessaries of life that labor can buy with those wages. Wages are not measured in dollars, but in the purchasing power of the wage. The laborer does not work for the sole sake of employment, but to supply the needs and comforts of his home. What the laborer wants is the highest returns for this labor. His prosperity is measured by what is left after the necessary supplies for his home are purchased. If his wages are increased, but the necessities of life are increased in price more rapidly than his wages are, then he is poorer, though in fact his wages may be larger. In the last 10 years wages have increased 22 per cent; the cost of the necessities of life has increased 60 per cent; and the Payne-Aldrich bill gave no relief as to the cost of these necessities.

The interests which have secured the high protective rates of the present law pretend that this great amount of protection is necessary to compensate them for the higher wages they pay their workmen as compared to the wages paid by foreign manufacturers. This is a fraudulent pretense, unsupported by facts. As a matter of fact, the labor cost in many of these protected industries is cheaper at home than abroad, and in most of them the per cent of tariff duty is greatly in excess of the total labor cost paid in the manufacturing of the protected products.

The Statistical Abstract, published by the Government, shows that the value of the finished product of all the manufacturing industries of the United States for 1905, the latest date for which the Government has published the statistics, is $14,802,147,087. The amount paid in wages in said year in the production of said manufactured articles was $2,611,540,532, which gives the total labor cost for all of the said articles as 17 per cent, while the tariff rates are from 30 per cent to 100 per cent on said articles. In other words, the tariff rates cover the entire labor cost. It not only covers whatever alleged difference exists between the labor cost in this country and in foreign countries, but it also covers the entire labor cost and then gives a profit many times the cost of the labor.

The manufacturers of iron and steel in 1905 produced $941,071,093 worth of finished products, and paid in wages for their manufacture $143,809,576, or 15 per cent of the value of the finished product. And these articles are given by the Payne bill protection more than twice the entire labor cost. This is done for the alleged purpose of equalizing wages at home and abroad; in other words, they are given a protection as a bonus, in addition to full payment of the entire labor cost of production.

The cotton manufacturers in 1905 turned out $442,451,218 worth of manufactured goods, and paid in wages $94,377,695, or 21 per cent of the value of the finished product. The Payne bill gives manufacturers protection of 50.27 per cent, or 29.73 per cent above the labor cost. These rates are increased above the rates of the Dingley bill. No possible justification can be given for this increase or the extravagant protection afforded this industry under the Payne-Aldrich bill.

The manufacturers of wool products produced in 1905 goods to the value of $380,934,003, and paid in wages $70,797,524, or 18 per cent. The protection afforded this industry under the Payne law is 40 per cent above the entire cost of labor in the manufacture thereof.

The manufacturers of silk in 1905 produced $133,288,072 worth of that article, and the wages paid were $26,767,943, or 20 per cent. The protection afforded by the Payne bill is 30 per cent above the entire cost of labor.

Are these reasonable profits promised by the Republican platform after equalizing the cost of labor at home and abroad?

A tariff rate equal to the entire labor cost of the finished product would certainly be sufficient, as the amount of wages would not then be considered in competing with foreign goods and our people would be granted this great advantage, since it must be conceded that foreign manufacturers must at least pay some wages. A tariff based on an advantage covering the entire labor cost would be a great revision downward. Do the schedules of the Payne law show the same to be constructed upon the equalization of wages at home and abroad? There is not a single item in the law written upon that principle.

The Republicans claim that our great increase of wealth and our national advancement has been caused by our high protection laws. It is like all of their other claims—false—and can not be proven by the facts.

Under the low-tariff law of 1846 the census reports show greater per cent of gains in value of all farm products than in the last 10 years.

In the production of corn, the great basic product of agriculture in the Midde West from 1850 to 1860, under a Democratic tariff, there was an increase of 41.7 per cent in the United States. From 1880 to 1890, under a Republican tariff, there was an increase of 21 per cent. Under Democratic tariff, railroad mileage from 1850 to 1860 increased from 10,982 miles to 30,626,

an increase of nearly 300 per cent. From 1890 to 1900 the increase was from 166,703 miles to 194,262, or an increase of about 16¼ per cent.

The value of farms and farm property increased from 1850 to 1860 from $3,967,343,580 to $7,980,493,060, an increase of over 101 per cent. From 1880 to 1890 the increase was from $12,180,501,538 to $16,082,267,689, a little over 30 per cent. From 1890 to 1900 the increase was but a little over 20 per cent.

The value of farm animals increased between 1850 and 1860 over 100 per cent. Between 1880 and 1890 the increase was but 55 per cent; between 1890 and 1900 there was a decrease in value of $190,642,894.

Our exports increased from 1850 to 1860, 163 per cent. From 1880 to 1890 there was an increase of 2⅝ per cent. From 1890 to 1900 there was an increase of a little over 60 per cent; from 1900 to 1907, about 34 per cent.

In wealth we increased from 1850 to 1860, 125 per cent; from 1880 to 1890 the increase was 46 per cent; from 1890 to 1900 the increase was 37 per cent. The capital employed in manufacturing industries increased 89.4 per cent from 1850 to 1860; from 1890 to 1900 the increase was 50.7 per cent. From 1850 to 1860, under low tariff, rural wealth increased over 100 per cent; from 1890 to 1900, under high tariff, rural wealth increased but a little over 20 per cent. On the other hand, urban wealth doubled in every decade, except from 1880 to 1890 and from 1890 to 1900, when the increase was only 50 per cent. The average per capita wealth of the farmer remained the same from 1860 to 1900, yet that of the urbanite increased over sixfold. Of the $78,000,000,000 increase of national wealth from 1860 to 1900 but a little over one-fifth went to the farmers, who represent one-half of the population; yet of the $9,000,000,000 increase of wealth during the low-tariff decade of 1850 to 1860, over 44 per cent went to the farmers.

We are told in every campaign of the great increase in our national wealth under protection. This country is so situated and has such immense resources that its development and increase of wealth would be wonderful under any kind of tariff laws. We have fertile soil, inexhaustible mines of hidden wealth, and the most intelligent people on the globe. Prosperity is not produced by law. Prosperity comes through natural processes. It is not handed out by the President or by Congress. It comes by industry, fertility of the soil, and the intelligence of our people combined. Our country, with its broad and fertile plains, vast mines of mineral wealth, and enormous resources, will be prosperous and progressive.

Our farm property in 1850 represented one-half of our total wealth, in 1870 it represented but one-third, and to-day it is not equal to one-fifth.

We have immense wealth; the last showing was in the census report of 1904 and amounted to $107,104,211,917, yet 70 per cent of it was owned by 200,000 people, and the other 30 per cent was owned by the remaining 85,517,230 people of the country. It is said that when the directors of the United States Steel Trust meet one-twelfth of the total wealth of the country is represented around the directors' table. Five thousand men in this country actually own one-sixth of our entire national wealth, leaving the balance to be divided among the remaining 89,995,000 people.

The tariff has contributed more than all other things combined to produce this unequal distribution of wealth, stimulating, supporting, and producing trusts. These advantages are given by law. It is the duty of our party to change the system by which the money is taken by law from the man who earns it and given to the man who has not earned it. But we do not now have that power. The Senate and the President are still Republican, and the people do not expect us to control legislation. We can indicate along what lines we will legislate when given the power and authority. The people approve what we have already done and will extend our authority in the next election. We will then be able to enact laws along the lines of true Democracy. We will relieve the people from unjust and oppressive tariff taxes and receive the approval and plaudits of the American people. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am an old-fashioned Democrat. [Applause.] During the 16 years that I have been a Member of this House the House and the Senate have both been Republican, and all the important measures have been decided by a Republican majority. I came into the House in the Fifty-fourth Congress, and was a part of the flotsam that floated with the tide amid the general wreck of the Democratic Party following its failure to carry out its pledges and to properly reduce the tariff on Democratic principles as it had pledged the people in its platform in 1892 that it would do.

I was in the Fifty-fifth Congress when the Wilson bill was repealed and the Dingley bill was placed upon the statute books. Following the passage of the McKinley bill, the people who had been betrayed and had had put upon them a tariff which exceeded 52 per cent returned the Democratic Party to power upon declarations in a platform which rang throughout the country with denunciations of a tariff tax granting special privileges to a few at the expense of the many as a robbery under the form of law. The Democratic Party failing to redeem its pledges, the Republicans were returned to power in 1894. But still the demand of the people for reduced taxation was unheeded. Following the induction into power of the McKinley administration and the passage of the Dingley bill came the Spanish War. Yet even during that war, with the right of the soldiers in the field to vote, the people returned the Republican Party to power in this House by a majority of only 13.

As a result of all this, there came into being, as the offspring grown up under the fostering care of this protective tariff, innumerable trusts, until the condition of this country was almost as that described by Sir John Culpeper, in the House of Parliament, when he said:

> They are a nest of wasps—a swarm of vermin which have overcrept the land. Like the frogs of Egypt, they have gotten possession of our dwellings, and we have scarce a room free from them. They sup in our cup; they dip in our dish; they sit by our fire. We find them in the dye fat, washbowl, and powdering tub. They share with the butler in his box. They will not bait us a pin. We may not buy our clothes without their brokerage. These are the leeches that have sucked the Commonwealth so hard that it is almost hectical. Mr. Speaker, I have echoed to you the cries of the Kingdom. I will tell you their hopes. They look to Heaven for a blessing on this Parliament.

So it went on. The Republican Party, boasting of its power, with plethoric campaign chests and indifferent to the demands of the people, seemed to think that it could return itself to power as often as it wished. It built up a political machine—a veritable Frankenstein—which, like the Frankenstein of old, has destroyed its creator. Now the people, grown tired of the rule of the trusts under the Republican Party, tired of the exactions that have been made as the result of this unjust system of taxation, have again placed the Democratic Party in power in this Chamber, with the demand that we give them relief. I paraphrase the language of the great Englishman whom I have just quoted, uttered 300 years ago, when our forefathers were suffering by reason of the exactions of the favored few:

Mr. Chairman, we have echoed to you the cries of this Republic, and we will tell you what the hopes of the American people are: They look to Heaven for a blessing on this Congress; that this Democratic House may pass a bill, and that the Republican Senate may be forced to accept a bill, which will give heed to the demands of the people of the entire country for freedom from the extortions that have existed under a Republican tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I said that I am an old-fashioned Democrat, and I am. I do not believe in exercising the power of the General Government to levy taxes upon the people except for revenue; and while I would raise all the revenue necessary to carry on the Government, administered economically and justly, I would not levy a dollar for protection or to give aid or preference to one class or section over another.

But the demand for the reduction of the tariff duties and the abandonment of the high protection duties has grown stronger and stronger, until to-day the hour is fixed for the abandonment of the high protective tariff and a return to the principle of a tariff for revenue only.

The American system of Henry Clay only proposed a duty of 25 per cent, and of this system Mr. Webster in 1824 said:

> Sir, that is the true American policy which shall most fully employ American capital and labor and best sustain the whole population. With me it is a fundamental axiom; it is interwoven with my opinions; the greatest interests of the country are united and inseparable; agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing will prosper together or languish together; and that all legislation is dangerous which proposes to benefit one of these without looking to consequences which may fall on the others.

It may not be amiss to recall what Mr. Andrew Carnegie said upon this subject in 1908, and I read the following from the hearing before the Ways and Means Committee of the House:

> * * * There is no doubt about this; but, on the other hand, I have been led to the conclusion that conditions have changed so greatly in the interval that the tariff should now be viewed from a new standpoint.
>
> The writer assumes that a decided majority of our voters are agreed—
>
> First. That it is advisable for new countries to encourage capital by protective duties when seen to be necessary to develop new industries.
>
> Second. That after full and exhaustive trials, if success be not finally attained, such protection should cease, except as noted hereunder.

Third. That should the experiment succeed, protection becomes unnecessary, and should steadily but gradually be abolished, provided that the home supply of any article absolutely necessary for the national safety shall not thereby be endangered.

So much for the doctrine of protection. That there is a cult who regard that doctrine as sacrosanct and everlasting, none knows better than the writer; but its members are few and not likely to increase, since our country has admittedly developed and gained and is to continue gaining manufacturing supremacy in one department after another until it reaches a position where free trade in manufactures would be desirable for it, all the markets of the world open to her, and hers to the world. Our difficulty will then be to get other nations to agree to free trade.

There will remain importations of foreign luxuries, which should be still heavily taxed for revenue, not protection; the aim being to levy the tax that would produce the greatest revenue from luxuries. This would not seriously affect the producer since the buyer pays all duties, and demand would not be greatly affected by the higher price, since only the rich use them.

* * * * * * *

In conclusion, a "tariff for protection," which was the issue 40 years ago, should now give place to a "tariff for revenue," and therefore the strict maintenance of the present duties upon foreign luxuries paid by the rich. * * *

According to the reports of importations during the fiscal year 1910 the duties, ad valorem, levied under the present tariff laws amount to 41.92 per cent upon the dutiable importations. It is to relieve the consumers and farmers of this country that the Democratic majority has reported, and proposes to pass this bill, and to place upon the free list as many of the necessaries of life as can be done now, keeping in mind the demands of the Government for revenue. I believe, Mr. Chairman—the power to tax being the power to destroy—that Mr. Justice Miller, of the Supreme Court of the United States, laid down the correct doctrine of taxation applicable, most of all, to this kind of taxation, when he said:

To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprise and build up private fortune is none the less robbery because it is done under the form of law and called "taxation." This is not taxation, but it is a decree under legislative forms.

There is nothing of a public nature any more entitling the manufacturer to public gifts than the sailor, the farmer, or the lumberman. Our Government is based upon equality of rights. All honest employments are honorable. The State can not rightfully discriminate among occupations, for discrimination in favor of one branch or one industry is discrimination adverse to all other branches. The State is equally to protect all, giving no undue advantage or special and exclusive preference to any.

No public exigency can require private spoliation for the private benefit of favored individuals. If the citizen is protected in his property by the Constitution against the public, much more is he against private rapacity.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the rule which has guided me in determining my vote upon tariff questions is based upon the following principles which were announced in the report made by that great Secretary of the Treasury, Robert J. Walker, in 1846, when, following his lead, the Democrats passed a tariff bill of which it has been said by one of the most distinguished Republicans who ever served in this House or the Senate:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any we have ever had.

That was uttered in 1872 by Senator Allison, of Iowa, who, after long and faithful service, has been gathered to his fathers. The principle for which he contended and the thought which he suggested found abundant seed and abundant harvest in Iowa, and Iowa to-day presents men, both in this House and in the Senate, obedient to the will of the majority of the people, who have endeavored, and I apprehend will continue to endeavor, to reduce the burdens of the people, so far as tariff taxation is concerned, to the point where we shall have a tariff for revenue under an economical administration. The principles which guide me, Mr. Chairman, in my determination are briefly as follows:

First. That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government, economically administered.

Second. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Third. That below such rates discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties, or, for imperative reasons, the article may be placed in the list of those free from all duty.

Fourth. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

Fifth. That all minimums and all specific duties should be abolished and ad valorem duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluation and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

Sixth. That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

If these principles do not represent Democratic doctrine, then in the long years that I have studied and endeavored to find out what they are I have failed.

Now, we hear a good deal about the reduction of the tariff by the Democrats. It has been outlined so far as this House is concerned. President Taft himself in August, 1910, wrote a letter to the chairman of the Republican campaign committee (although he had said in 1908 at Winona that this was the best tariff ever passed before by a Republican Congress) stating that when Congress met there should be a reduction of the tariff, schedule by schedule; and before this extra session ends we expect, so far as the majority in this House is concerned, to follow the plan which was outlined by the Chief Executive and give him an opportunity to approve it.

When we come here to carry out the demands of the people for a reduction of the tariff; when we come to comply with the demands of a Republican President that a reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States shall be ratified, the purpose of which is to reduce the cost of living, and starting out in this direction by offering this free list, which will lift $300,000,000 from the backs of the toiling consumers of this country, what are we confronted with? Nothing but carp and criticism. I do not mean that the other side has criticized in a manly and statesmanlike manner, but, rather, has it been a technical, lower-court-lawyer criticism. Where has my distinguished friend from Illinois, or any other of those who have claimed to be such constructive statesmen, offered any valid suggestions? When I heard my friend from Illinois and others on that side refer to the benefits of the Dingley law and to the benefits of the Payne-Aldrich law, both of which have finally been repudiated at the polls, and heard this criticism of the verbiage and rhetoric of this bill, there came often into my mind the words of the poet:

Oh, ye wha' are sae gud yoursel',
Sae pious and sae holy,
Ye've naught to do but mark and tell
Your nebours' faults and folly.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who is generally so frank, so sincere, and so manly, instead of striking open blows at this free list, instead of taking the position that the farmer should be relieved of a tax upon his agricultural implements, upon his cotton bagging and ties, upon his plows and his hoes, upon his salt and upon his lumber, brought into play the expert capacity of an expert, critical lawyer, and undertook to split hairs, making such distinctions as—

A hair to divide
Twixt south and southwest tide.

Now, just a word in regard to agricultural implements. I would fail in my duty if I did not call attention to some things with reference to agricultural implements. We put them upon the free list. Of course, an agricultural implement is an agricultural implement; and because we have not called in and sought the advice of tariff experts, as the Republicans did when they made their tariff bill, when they called in men whose duty it is not to express what you mean, but to conceal what you mean, they term this failure upon our part "awkward, indifferent, and clumsy." For my part I would rather be called awkward and clumsy, and have my efforts bring relief to the American people from the exactions of the tariff than to have a law nicely and technically constructed, but which would be found hereafter to give no relief at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, Mr. H. E. Miles, who is the chairman of the tariff committee of the Manufacturers' Association and who is a manufacturer of agricultural implements, selling them all over the world, and selling them abroad cheaper than he sells them at home, testified before the Ways and Means Committee as follows:

I have made money every year out of the tariff graft. Not much, but still a little. The tariff barons raised their price $50,000 to me. I made a charge against the jobber of $60,000, and I know that he charged more than $70,000 for the $60,000 he paid me. Before reaching the consumer the $50,000 charges became about $100,000, to be paid by the agricultural consumer.

The manufacturer who would prosper must make a double profit—one by the shrewd management of his business and another by still shrewder manipulation in Washington.

We have no great difficulty in shopping abroad, for we could get as high prices as at home. We are so held up, however, by our supply people that to most of us there is very scant profit in foreign business.

When Congress gave us 45 per cent, we needing only 20 per cent, they gave us a congressional permit, if not an invitation, to consolidate, form one great trust and advance our prices 25 per cent, being the difference between the 20 per cent needed and the 45 per cent given.

And if, by putting agricultural implements upon the free list, we can stop this admitted tariff graft, we are willing to be general and not too specific.

But, particularly, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the question of cotton bagging and ties. Before I do that, however, I want to say that the cotton farmer of the South does not ask nor demand the enactment of tariff laws for protection at the hands of the General Government.

All he wants is a fair rate of duty, laying fairly the taxes that the burdens may be equal, and he demands no discrimination shall be made against him in favor of others. The cotton crop of the South in 1910 brought back $400,000,000 to $600,000,000 a year from abroad in gold from the sale of the raw product. I will add, that but for the sale of the raw product of the cotton farmer for the last six or seven years or more the difference between the exports and the imports of the country would have been not in our favor, but in favor of the old world. It is the cotton planter who raises the crop through all sorts of trials and difficulties, through rain and sunshine, through storm and calm, through all sorts of demands made upon him, who has enabled, not only himself, but the entire country to prosper. Last year he brought back into the country $600,000,000 surplus from the sale of the raw product, and what are we taxed for that? The western farmer had his free binding twine. The western farmer, when he exports his grain in bags made out of imported materials, has a drawback of 99 per cent.

We are told that the price of cotton is so high that we can afford to be robbed. Just think of it—that the price of cotton has been so high during a Republican administration that we ought not to object when the Bagging and Tie Trust rob us! The price of cotton, I will say in passing, was lower in 1898, under a Republican administration, than it ever has been in the history of the world except in the year 1840. I think it did go down to something below 5 cents or 4½ cents in 1898. These Republicans undertake to say, because the price of cotton has advanced to 14½ and 15 cents now—although there are 18,000,000 bales demanded for the consumption of the world and the South can raise only between eleven and twelve million bales to satisfy that demand—that they have produced the increased price!

Now, let us see what the tariff has added to the coffers of the Bagging Trust. The tariff has added $5,500,000 to our taxes in the last five years. During that time we raised 61,311,000 bales of cotton and used 429,177 running yards of bagging, or 524,000,000 square yards. The average price was so much, and the duty per square yard was six-tenths of a cent. On the bagging alone we paid to the Bagging Trust $3,147,296, or about 5 cents a bale.

For cotton ties, with the duty for a while at five-tenths cent a pound and afterwards three-tenths cent a pound, we have paid $2,300,000 in the five years, or, as I have said, we have paid this Cotton Bagging Trust $5,000,000 in five years.

Now, let us see. Under the Payne bill jute and jute butts, out of which cotton bagging is made, come in free; but the manufacture of butts into material proper to make cotton bagging is a manufacturing process known only in India and not used in this country. The materials are obtained free. Nearly 30 years ago a man named Marshall, the pioneer in this country who introduced cotton bagging into the United States and manufactured the first jute bagging ever manufactured in this country, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and declared, in answer to a question propounded by Mr. McKinley, that a duty of 15 per cent on bagging was a sufficient protection, provided jute came in free. The McKinley bill placed the duty at something in excess of that amount. That was in the Forty-eighth Congress—nearly 30 years ago—so that from that time down to the present the manufacturers of bagging have had protection under a tariff varying from 15 to 22 per cent. This infant industry has had jute butts free and a duty on cotton bagging in addition—with the exception of the period from 1894 to 1897—and to this day a discrimination is made between the southern farmer and the western farmer, in that the western farmer has his binding twine free with which he binds his grain and the cotton farmer, who brings into the country millions of dollars, is taxed for the material he uses in baling his cotton.

In the last Congress I introduced a bill undertaking to have cotton bagging and ties placed on the free list. The Senate passed an amendment to the bill and placed cotton bagging on the free list, but the provision was stricken out in conference at the instance and insistence of the Ludlow people, in Massachusetts, who are a part of the Bagging Trust, as I will endeavor to show if I have the time.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BARTLETT. I will yield for a question; yes.

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman why he called the Ludlow Manufacturing Co. the Bagging Trust?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have called it that because I have evidence here, which I will put into the RECORD, showing that they bought up and dismantled cotton-bagging mills in Galveston, Tex., and other towns in the South, and that the stock of the Ludlow Co. was issued to the men whose mills were dismantled, and those men hold that stock to-day.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I can not yield.

Mr. GILLETT. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BARTLETT. The testimony I have in my hand is more reliable than the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman has not any testimony that will show that the Ludlow Co. had anything to do with such an operation.

Mr. BARTLETT. But I have the testimony.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is mistaken; that is all.

Mr. BARTLETT. Why, I have it.

Mr. GILLETT. I should like to see it.

Mr. BARTLETT. All right. I have it right here:

Some years ago there were several independent——

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman spoke of the Ludlow Manufacturing Co. Now he is going to read——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to be courteous, and I insist that the gentleman shall not interrupt me in that way.

Mr. GILLETT. I wish to be courteous, too.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, you are not.

Mr. GILLETT. I knew you did not want to make a misstatement.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not going to make a misstatement, and the gentleman's incorrect correction can not correct what he calls a misstatement.

Mr. GILLETT. I should like to hear you read anything about the Ludlow Co. being in that operation you spoke of. I do not believe you will find it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Listen to this.

The American makers say they are three in number, consisting of the American Manufacturing Co., the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, of Boston, and the Peru Bagging Co.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLETT. You will find it was not the Ludlow Co.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I insist that for the gentleman to take my time in this way is not courteous. I will read a letter on the subject. Not only that, but the testimony was before the committee that these people themselves admitted that they dismantled the mill at Galveston and issued the stock of the Galveston concern to the people who represent the Ludlow and American companies.

Mr. GILLETT. My friend——

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not yield now. The gentleman must content himself with that.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but, not satisfied with the duty imposed by the customs authorities of six-tenths of a cent a yard on bagging, the manufacturers of bagging in this country appealed from that and endeavored to get a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem imposed, and I have a letter, to which I will call attention, and I think it will point pretty straight to this combination known as the Bagging Trust. They presented a fake case before the customs officials—the most remarkable case in the history of the country. They imported bagging made not entirely out of jute butts, but partly out of jute butts, partly out of Norwegian tow, and partly out of cotton waste.

The customs officials taxed it at six-tenths of a cent a yard; and the most remarkable thing was that the importer appealed from the decision of the customs officials and demanded that they tax the bagging at 45 per cent ad valorem under section 358, instead of six-tenths of a cent a yard under section 355 of the Payne bill. I have a letter here from a reputable man, which I will read if I have the time, stating that the same people, whom I charge to be in the Bagging Trust, took that bagging and carried it to Canada and had it imported at the port of Boston, Mass., for the purpose of increasing the rate from six-tenths of a cent per yard to 45 per cent ad valorem. I have here a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury referring me to that decision which I print in full. The Government was so dissatisfied with the decision that they have

appealed it to the Commerce Court to have that decision reversed. And these are the people who now endeavor to stand in the way of having this onerous and prohibitive tariff tax removed—not that the Government may obtain revenue, but that they, the Bagging Trust, may continue to extort from the cotton farmer exorbitant prices.

Not a trust! Why, does the gentleman deny that steel ties are made by the Steel Trust?

Mr. Chairman, I will read or incorporate with my remarks in the RECORD the documents to show the statements that I make to be true. By proofs and admissions, and statement of witnesses under oath, and of reputable gentlemen not under oath, I will show that the Ludlow Co. and the American Co. are trusts, engaged in the manufacture of bagging, and show that they and the other members of that trust yearly extort from the people who raise cotton—unnecessarily and improperly—nearly $1,000,000 for bagging. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will confront them with the proof; I will submit it in the RECORD; proof so indisputable that it will be as clearly proved to be a trust as the Steel Trust that manufactures the steel ties. No man will have the effrontery to deny that the steel ties are made by the Steel Trust.

Another thing: It is said that we get returns for our ties and bagging when we sell the cotton; that we are paid so much a pound for the ties and bagging. That is the same old story. Those who have on this floor advocated free cotton ties and bagging have had to meet it for years.

I will prove it absolutely to be a fact by men who know, that there is deducted on every bale of cotton exported 6 per cent, and there is deducted from every bale of cotton for domestic consumption 5 per cent for tare. They allow 22 pounds by agreement, enforced by the Massachusetts Mill Association; and if perchance cotton bagging and ties go to 28 or 29 or 30 pounds, then, instead of being paid for our cotton bagging and ties, they deduct 29 pounds. I say without fear of contradiction that the southern farmer does not receive pay per pound for his cotton bagging and ties.

I have abundant proof of that here, and I am prepared to give full information on the subject, if my time were not limited. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 35 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read a statement as to the value of raw-cotton exports and of gold production:

In the years from 1900 to 1909, the raw-cotton exports of the world were $3,650,577,273. [Applause.]

In 10 years the South's raw cotton brought back in gold or credits to the United States more than $3,650,000,000, to which in the total credited to this staple should be added many millions of dollars returned in exchange for exports of manufactured cotton and of cotton-seed products.

Each year this country would be debtor to Europe and the whole world but for these men striving to arise from desolation and ruin amid the ashes of their homes and smokeless chimneys, men who for 40 years have girded up their loins and marched onward, undaunted by misfortune, unterrified by unheard-of and indescribable local conditions, until to-day they stand before the country and the world, not only as the men who of this great Republic are of true American blood and true American principle, but the men who have preserved, made, and will preserve and make the prosperity of our common country substantial and lasting. [Applause.] I know them well, Mr. Chairman, and for many years I have endeavored to aid in the passage of some law that would lighten their burdens from these unnecessary taxes. I would lift them up by letting them understand that the American Congress does not make any distinction between the man that raises cotton and the man that raises wheat. [Applause.] As evidence of the value of the cotton crop, I call attention to the following, taken from the Manufacturers' Record:

Value of raw cotton exports and of gold production.

RAW COTTON EXPORTS.

Fiscal year—	
1899–1900	$241,832,737
1900–1	313,673,443
1901–2	290,651,819
1902–3	316,180,429
1903–4	370,811,246
1904–5	379,965,014
1905–6	401,005,921
1906–7	481,277,797
1907–8	437,788,202
1908–9	417,390,665
Total	3,650,577,273

WORLD'S GOLD PRODUCTION.

Calendar year—	
1900	$254,576,500
1901	260,992,500
1902	296,757,600
1903	327,702,200
1904	347,377,200
1905	380,288,700
1906	401,973,200
1907	410,555,500
1908	443,434,500
1909	457,567,300
Total	3,581,205,200

In 10 years the South's raw cotton brought back in gold or credits to the United States more than $3,650,000,000, to which, in the total credited to this staple, should be added many millions of dollars returned in exchange for exports of manufactured cotton and of cotton-seed products.

COTTON BAGGING AND TIES.

This bill proposes to admit free of duty bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton.

The rate on cotton bagging under the Payne-Aldrich bill is six-tenths of a cent per square yard, and it has been at that rate of duty since the enactment of the Dingley law, which amounts to 15 per cent ad valorem.

The manufacture of bagging for the covering of cotton was first introduced in this country by a man named Marshall, who in the Forty-eighth Congress appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and stated that a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem would be a sufficient duty and furnish all the protection that the industry then needed. In spite of that testimony, the tariff in the McKinley bill was placed at 1.6 cents per square yard, which amounted to an ad valorem duty of 32 per cent. Now, after 30 years of protection, it is said that this duty should not be removed from this necessary and important article, so far as the cotton raisers are concerned, but that they should still be compelled to pay tribute to the Cotton Bagging Trust.

At the opening of the present session I introduced bills to admit free of duty cotton bagging and ties, and the provisions of these bills are substantially incorporated in the pending measure.

WHAT THE TARIFF ON COTTON BAGGING AND TIES COSTS THE FARMER.

The following table shows the amount paid by the cotton farmers during the past five years by reason of the duty on cotton bagging and ties. This does not take into consideration the increase in the price by reason of the absence of competition and the control of the sale of these articles by the Bagging Trust and the Steel Trust:

Years.	Bales cotton.	Running yards bagging.	Price per running yard of 44 inches.	Square yards bagging.	Duty, $\frac{6}{10}$ cent per square yard.
			Cents.		
1906	13,540,000	94,780,000	0.09$\frac{1}{2}$	115,842,221	$695,053
1907	11,441,000	80,087,000	.09$\frac{1}{2}$	97,884,110	587,304
1908	13,817,000	96,719,000	.07$\frac{7}{8}$	118,212,111	709,272
1909	10,513,000	73,591,000	.06$\frac{1}{4}$	89,944,554	539,667
1910	12,000,000	84,000,000	.07$\frac{7}{8}$	102,666,666	616,000
Total	61,311,000	429,177,000		524,549,662	3,147,296

Years.	Bundles cotton ties used.	Price per bundle of 45 pounds each.	Duty.
1906	2,708,000	$1.05	[1] $609,300
1907	2,288,200	1.07	[1] 514,845
1908	2,763,400	.93	[1] 621,765
1909	2,102,600	.78	[2] 283,851
1910	2,400,000	.91	[2] 324,000
Total	12,262,200		2,353,761

[1] At $\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound. [2] At $\frac{1}{15}$ cent per pound.

This table shows the number of bales produced, the amount of bagging and ties used, and the duty upon them. It will show that the tariff has added to the burden of the cotton planters for the past five years over $5,500,000, which is the duty—$3,147,296 on bagging, combined with that on ties, $2,353,761.

IMPORTS OF COTTON BAGGING AND TIES.

TIES.

The duty on cotton ties is virtually prohibitive. The manufacture and sale are controlled by the Steel Trust—chiefly by the

Carnegie Steel Co. and the Pittsburg Steel Co., which companies fix the price.

The following table will show what importations were made and the duty collected during the years stated:

Cotton ties imported into United States from all countries, under the tariff acts of 1894, 1897, and 1909, during the years ending June 30, 1895–1910.

[NOTE.—There were no importations under the act of 1890.]

TIES FOR BALING COTTON, CUT TO LENGTHS, PUNCHED OR NOT PUNCHED, WITH OR WITHOUT BUCKLES.

(Act of 1894.)

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Rate of duty.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty collected.	Average.	
					Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem rate of duty.
		Pounds.				*Per ct.*
1895	Free of duty	11,000	$120.00		$0.011	Free.
1896	do	7,804,420	102,327.00		.013	Free.
1897	do	16,265,506	239,498.00		.015	Free.
1898	do					

HOOP OR BAND IRON, OR HOOP OR BAND STEEL, CUT TO LENGTHS, OR WHOLLY OR PARTLY MANUFACTURED INTO HOOPS OR TIES, COATED OR NOT COATED WITH PAINT OR ANY OTHER PREPARATION, WITH OR WITHOUT BUCKLES OR FASTENINGS, FOR BALING COTTON OR ANY OTHER COMMODITY.

(Acts of 1897 and 1909.)

		Pounds.				*Per ct.*
1900	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound	1,147,702	$23,191.50	$5,738.52	$0.02	24.74
1901	do	729,552	12,937.00	3,647.77	.017	28.20
1902	do	4,309,207	68,247.00	21,546.05	.016	31.58
1903	do	2,474,578	39,410.00	12,372.89	.016	31.40
1904	do	2,108,688	33,438.00	10,543.44	.016	31.53
1905	do	515,200	7,136.00	2,576.00	.014	36.09
1906	do	4,873,746	70,442.00	24,368.73	.014	34.59
1907	do	716,819	20,805.00	3,584.10	.029	17.23
1908	do					
1909	do					
1910	do					
	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per pound	499,529	9,389.00	1,498.58	.019	15.96

COTTON BAGGING.

The importations of cotton bagging for the years stated in the following table will show that in no one year has there been imported as much as one-fifth of the cotton bagging used in covering the cotton crop. Take the year 1910. There was used for that year's crop 102,666,660 square yards of bagging, whereas the imports from all countries only amounted to 16,505,542 square yards.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Rate of duty.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty collected.	Average.	
					Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem rate of duty.
		Square yards.				*P. ct.*
1898	$\frac{1}{10}$ cent per square yard	5,262,788.00	$183,524.00	$31,576.72	$0.035	17.21
1899	do	12,763,285.00	386,109.28	76,579.67	.03	19.82
1900	do	7,236,696.00	295,211.00	43,420.15	.041	14.71
1901	do	9,161,995.55	432,785.00	54,971.98	.047	12.70
1902	do	6,641,802.66	296,454.00	39,850.80	.045	13.44
1903	do	5,417,039.00	213,098.00	32,502.24	.039	15.26
1904	do	7,801,672.00	201,235.00	46,810.02	.033	17.92
1905	do	9,603,487.00	391,730.00	57,620.91	.041	14.71
1906	do	12,309,136.83	663,843.00	73,854.80	.054	11.13
1907	do	19,817,860.22	1,215,446.00	118,907.12	.061	9.78
1909	do	8,012,434.00	413,208.89	48,074.63	.052	11.63
1910	do	16,505,542.00	699,940.00	99,033.28	.042	14.15

These tables will show that while it required nearly 103,000,000 square yards of bagging for the cotton crop of 1910, there were imported only 16,000,000 square yards, and while it required 106,000,000 pounds of cotton ties, there were imported only 500,000 pounds of cotton ties.

The duty collected by the Government on cotton bagging for 1910 was $99,000 and that upon ties was $1,498; so that the amount of revenue that the Government receives from the imposition of this duty is insignificant, while the amount exacted from the cotton planter for the year 1910 upon those two articles amounted to fully a million dollars, which finds its way into the coffers of the Bagging Trust and the Steel Trust.

There has not been any excuse for the retention of the duty, and justice to the farmers demands its repeal.

From an examination of the foregoing tables it will appear that the duty imposed is almost prohibitive, and that the revenue derived by the Government is insignificant compared with the immense amount of money returned to this country from the exportation and sale of raw cotton abroad.

According to the evidence of those who have information upon this subject, there was used in the marketing of the crop of cotton each year for the past five years an average of 105,000,000 square yards, all of which is manufactured in this country except about 16,000,000 square yards.

An examination of the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in 1908 will show that the manufacture of cotton bagging in the United States is controlled entirely by three companies, who have an agreement amongst themselves which virtually makes them a trust; and while they may not be technically a trust such as to bring them within the pale of the law against trusts and combinations, yet they have an agreement between themselves which is the same so far as the sale and price fixed for cotton bagging are concerned.

But it is said that the manufacture and sale of cotton bagging is not controlled by a trust. And does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] deny that the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates is in any sense a trust? No one has yet been heard to challenge the assertion that those engaged in the manufacture and sale of cotton ties are associated with the Steel Trust. So I shall proceed to show who controls the manufacture and sale of cotton bagging in this country.

The statement of Mr. C. Lee McMillan, made to the Ways and Means Committee of this House in 1908, is as follows:

The American makers, say, three in number, consisting of the American Manufacturing Co., of New York; the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, of Boston; and the Peru Bagging Manufacturing Co., of Peru, Ind., own and control every mill in America now engaged in making new bagging for cotton.

The first two corporations agree at the beginning of each season upon a price to open the market at, and the small Peru company follows. An arbitrary list, showing differentials throughout the entire cotton belt, is strictly followed, and the price named any given point by the American Manufacturing Co. is exactly same as the one quoted same point by the Ludlow company.

Some years ago there were several independent mills engaged in this business, but the ones now surviving managed to drive the others entirely out by selling bagging below price at which the independents could make same at, and in the end the American Manufacturing Co. bought such independent mills as the one in New Orleans, in Louisville, Ky., and in Galveston, Tex., and then dismantled same, shipped such machinery as was wanted to Brooklyn and St. Louis and breaking up and selling for scrap the balance of the machinery. I think that the same process was followed when the American Manufacturing Co. bought out their New York and Brooklyn rivals. When additional machinery has been required by the Americans, they have either had it made in this country or they bought it second hand in Dundee and imported same free of duty.

There can be no doubts about the profits of the above-named concerns being very large—see how they have grown—and I ask you to take into consideration the great amount of low-grade jute butts and the vast amount of second-hand jute bagging they buy and make into yarns when you compare their cost with that of the Calcutta maker, who uses a much higher quality of raw material.

In a letter to me, dated May 6, 1911, Mr. McMillan says:

Each year both of these concerns (The American Manufacturing Co. and the Ludlow Co.) open the market upon the same day, and both ask the same identical prices for the same quality of goods to every point they trade with. The same plan as the above is carried out by the Carnegie Steel Co. and the Pittsburg Steel Co. in the sale of cotton ties.

Mr. R. Rochester, of New York, N. Y., made the following statement before the Ways and Means Committee on November 28, 1908:

Every yard of bagging used to cover the cotton crop of the United States is made by the American Manufacturing Co., 65 Wall Street, and the Ludlow Manufacturing Co., at Ludlow, Mass., which concerns have the country districted, the American selling 82 per cent and the Ludlow 18 per cent, at an agreed price.

This business has been going on for many years, the two concerns in question having gradually crushed out or absorbed all others who attempted to make bagging.

They are protected by a tariff to such an extent that it keeps out the Dundee and Calcutta bagging. For it has been the rule for many years that whenever a consignment of any foreign bagging would come in the combination (American and Ludlow) would promptly lower their prices in the market to which the foreign bagging came to a point below the cost of the foreign bagging, and would so advertise the fact and intimidate the trade as to discourage further importations.

In addition to the above combination between the American and Ludlow they also maintain a chain of brokers or so-called dealers throughout the country who, though posing as independent, are in fact emissaries of these concerns, keeping them advised at all times of the conditions in the various markets regarding the status of foreign bagging, etc., and with suggestions as to "all the traffic will bear."

But we are not confined to the testimony of third parties. The following statement was made before the Ways and Means Committee of this House, in 1908, by Mr. Thomas F. Magner, the representative of the manufacturers of jute cloth from jute butts:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS F. MAGNER, WHO REPRESENTS MANUFACTURERS OF JUTE CLOTH FROM JUTE BUTTS.

MONDAY, *November 30, 1908.*

The CHAIRMAN. On what subject do you appear?

Mr. MAGNER. Cotton bagging.

The CHAIRMAN. Please proceed.

Mr. MAGNER. I represent, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, all those manufacturers who are engaged in the manufacture of

what is known as jute cloth made from jute butts in the United States. They are the Peru Bagging Manufacturing Co., of Indiana; the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, of Ludlow, Mass.; and the American Manufacturing Co. The Ludlow Associates have a large plant, 30 acres in extent, at Ludlow, Mass. The American Manufacturing Co. have different plants, several plants in St. Louis, one at Galveston, one at Charleston, and they have two large plants in Brooklyn, New York City, my native city.

We present here to-day from all of these manufacturers a memorial. We have now in process of preparation, and later will present to the committee, a table giving the relative cost of production of this fiber, of the manufactured article, in India and in America, the amount produced, and everything relating to it, both in the production and manufacture in Calcutta and in the United States.

The memorial referred to was signed as follows:

The American Manufacturing Co., by John M. Maury, assistant secretary.
Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, by Charles W. Hubbard, treasurer.
Penn Bagging Manufacturing Co., Max W. Kraus, secretary-treasurer.

So that whenever you find one of these three corporations who manufacture and sell cotton bagging, whether before the committees of Congress, endeavoring to prevent a reduction of duty or to have it increased—in the world of trade, or in the market fixing the prices, or endeavoring to destroy competition—you will find them in company, acting in concert, through the same agents and attorneys, and pursuing the same course and methods as other trusts and combinations do and have done.

A few days ago a Member of this House from a cotton-raising State received a telegram from citizens of his State stating that they were stockholders in a bagging factory, and asking him to oppose putting cotton bagging on the free list. Upon inquiry as to where that factory was located, he received the reply that 14 years ago the bagging factory in a Southern State had been abandoned and closed, and that all the stockholders had now the same interest in the American Manufacturing Co.; that is, that the stockholders in the southern mill which had been discontinued now owned the same number of shares in the American Manufacturing Co.

This bears out the statement made by Mr. McMillan before the Ways and Means Committee in 1908, which was as follows:

Some years ago there were several independent mills engaged in this business, but the ones now surviving managed to drive the others entirely out by selling bagging below price at which the independents could make same at, and in the end the American Manufacturing Co. bought such independent mills as the one in New Orleans, in Louisville, Ky., and in Galveston, Tex., and then dismantled same, shipped such machinery as was wanted to Brooklyn and St. Louis, and breaking up and selling for scrap the balance of the machinery.

But these manufacturers of cotton bagging are not engaged solely in the business of manufacturing cotton bagging. To show that they are engaged in the manufacture of other articles and that the removal of the duty on cotton bagging will not materially injure them, I read the following letter from Mr. McMillan, of New Orleans:

C. LEE MCMILLAN & CO. (LTD.),
New Orleans, April 18, 1911.

HON. CHAS. L. BARTLETT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Doubtless the American Bagging Trust will endeavor by some means to convince the Finance Committee of the Senate that free cotton bagging will cause all of its mills to close.

Regarding same, you may state, without fear of contradiction, that said trust, in the manufacture of the bagging it now sells the cotton farmer, uses, in part, many kinds of second-hand bagging, bagging waste, and what is called "bear grass"—all of these as cheap substitutes for jute butts.

By the use of the above-named articles the trust mills will always be able to compete with foreign-made bagging.

Please refer to Tariff Hearings, afternoon session, Committee on Ways and Means, November 30, 1908, and you will read statement of Mr. Thomas F. Magner, who represented the trust before said hearing, and you will see that the American Manufacturing Co., in addition to making bagging, are among the largest producers of sisal and manila rope, also cordage.

The Ludlow Manufacturing Associates also have much to do outside of making bagging, as you will see by above-mentioned statement, viz:

Department 1 manufactures twines		pounds	11,000,000
Department 2 manufactures hemp carpet yarns	do		3,500,000
Department 3 manufactures jute carpet yarns	do		36,000,000
Department 4 manufactures upholsterers' webbing	do		1,800,000
Department 5 manufactures bagging for cotton		yards	25,000,000
Department 6 manufactures cordage		pounds	6,200,000

Respectfully submitted.

C. LEE MCMILLAN & CO. (LTD.),
By C. LEE MCMILLAN, *President.*

I have called attention to the fact that the western farmer who raises grain has for many years had the duty removed from binding twine used by him in the harvesting of his grain. Another advantage afforded by the Dingley tariff law and the Payne tariff law is the drawback provision, which provides for the refunding of 99 per cent of the duty paid upon imported goods which are in whole or in part used in the manufacture of goods which can be exported. Under this provision there is returned to the importer 99 per cent of the duty paid on burlaps or other material out of which the sacks or bags used by the farmers of the West in sacking or bagging their grain for export are made. No such privilege or benefit is granted to the southern farmer who may use imported bagging to export his cotton, or bagging made from imported material in which his cotton is baled.

HOW THE TRUST SEEKS TO INCREASE THE PRICE OF COTTON BAGGING.

I desire now to show that the cotton-bagging manufacturers of the country, not satisfied with the duty provided for on cotton bagging in section 355, have endeavored to increase the rate of duty to 45 per cent. This is manifested by the decision of the customs appraisers, a copy of which has been furnished me by the Secretary of the Treasury, as will appear from the following correspondence:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 15, 1911.

HON. C. L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, in which you request information in regard to the classification of cotton bagging, which you understand has until recently been assessed with duty under paragraph 355 of the tariff act at the rate of six-tenths of 1 cent per square yard, but is now assessed with duty at the rate of 45 per cent ad valorem.

In reply, I have to advise you that the paragraph referred to provides that bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, shall be assessed with duty at the rate of six-tenths of 1 cent per square yard.

The contention has been made by certain domestic interests that a great deal of bagging used for covering cotton is not composed in chief value of jute and is, therefore, properly dutiable under paragraph 358 of the tariff act at the rate of 45 per cent ad valorem; and protests were filed by importers at the ports of Boston and New York against the assessment of duty upon this merchandise at the rate of six-tenths of 1 cent per square yard, importers claiming that it was properly dutiable at the rate of 45 per cent ad valorem.

The Board of United States General Appraisers sustained the importers' protests, and I inclose herewith for your information copies of the board's decisions dated March 16, 1911 (T. D. 31401—G. A. 7187), and March 20, 1911 (T. D. 31403—G. A. 7189). You will observe that in these cases the Government challenges the jurisdiction of the board to review the action of the collector where the protest claimed a higher rate of duty, and I invite your attention to the department's letter of March 18, 1911 (T. D. 31397), requesting that the board's decision be reviewed by the United States Court of Customs Appeals.

The department has not as yet issued any instructions as to the classification of bagging for cotton composed in chief value of some other fiber than jute, but has this matter under consideration and expects at an early date to issue instructions upon the subject, and you will be duly advised as to the conclusion reached by the department in this regard.

By direction of the Secretary.
Respectfully,

JAMES F. CURTIS,
Assistant Secretary.

(T. D. 31401—G. A. 7187.)

Jurisdiction—Bagging for cotton not made of jute.

1. Jurisdiction of board: One purpose of the customs administrative act is to secure the accurate and truthful classification of imported merchandise.

2. Idem: Where such merchandise has been improperly classified by the collector and the importer expresses his dissatisfaction by filing a protest claiming the proper classification, the protest will not be dismissed on the ground that the rate claimed is greater than that assessed by the collector.

3. Motive not subject to challenge: The motive of the importer in expressing his dissatisfaction will not be inquired into by the board.

4. Boards vested with judicial power: The authority conferred on the several boards of United States general appraisers to hear and determine all cases and questions involved in ascertaining such classification is a judicial power, and carries with it the authority to take testimony of witnesses, to ascertain the materials of which the merchandise is composed, to correct errors of the collector, and assign the importation to the proper paragraph of the tariff act, in accordance with the claim made in the protest, if sufficiently definite and distinct and found to be correct.

5. Cotton bagging not made of jute or hemp: Cotton bagging, although suitable for covering cotton, which is made in chief value of vegetable fibers, as aloe, Russian seg, and other fibers than jute, jute butts, or hemp, is dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem under paragraph 358, tariff act of 1909, and not under paragraph 355 of said act.

United States general appraisers, New York, March 16, 1911.

In the matter of protest 444624 of L. H. A. Schwartz & Co. against the assessment of duty by the collector of customs at the port of Boston.

Before board 3 (Waite, Somerville, and Hay, general appraisers).

Somerville, general appraiser: The importation consists of new bagging, which is used for baling cotton. It was assessed for duty at 0.6 of 1 cent per square yard under paragraph 355 of the tariff act of 1909, which reads as follows:

"355. Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, not exceeding 16 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and weighing not less than 15 ounces per square yard, six-tenths of 1 cent per square yard."

The importers claim that the goods are properly dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem under paragraph 358 of said act, which provides as follows:

"358. All woven articles, finished or unfinished, and all manufactures of flax, hemp, ramie, or other vegetable fiber, or of which these substances, or any of them, is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 45 per cent ad valorem."

It is admitted and is otherwise apparent that the rate of duty claimed by the importers to be the proper one is higher than that at which the goods were actually assessed by the collector. This presents a somewhat anomalous condition.

The first question raised at the hearing was one of jurisdiction. Counsel for the Government moved that the protest be dismissed for want of jurisdiction, *because it appears that the rate claimed is higher than the rate assessed*, and that the importers therefore have suffered no pecuniary damage in any way by the action of the collector and can have no substantial standing before the board. The jurisdiction of the board in customs cases is derived from subsection 14 of section 28 of the tariff act of 1909. It is there provided—

"That the decision of the collector as to the rate and amount of duties chargeable upon imported merchandise * * * shall be final and conclusive against all persons interested therein, unless the owner, importer, consignee, or agent of such merchandise * * * shall within 15 days after, * * * if dissatisfied with such decision, give notice in writing to the collector, setting forth therein distinctly and specifically, and in respect to each entry or payment, the reasons for his objections thereto, and if the merchandise is entered for consumption shall pay the full amount of the duties and charges ascertained to be due thereon."

It is provided that—

"Upon such notice and payment the collector shall transmit the invoice and all the papers and exhibits connected therewith to the board of nine general appraisers, for due assignment and determination as hereinbefore provided; such determination shall be final and conclusive upon all persons interested therein." * * *

Subsection 12 of said section 28 provides that—

"* * * Each of the boards of three general appraisers, or a majority thereof, shall have full power to hear and determine all cases and questions arising therein or assigned thereto." * * *

The protest in this case was duly transmitted by the collector to the board of nine general appraisers, and was properly assigned for hearing to this board, designated as Board 3.

We may state by way of preliminary consideration the principles adjudged by the courts as governing their jurisdiction and that of other judicial tribunals. Jurisdiction is commonly defined as authority to hear and determine a cause. As said by the Supreme Court in Illinois Central R. R. Co. *v.* Adams (180 U. S., 28, at p. 34)—

"Jurisdiction is the right to put the wheels of justice in motion and to proceed to the final determination of the cause upon the pleadings and the evidence."

The following principle, as stated by the Supreme Court in Reynolds *v.* Stockton (140 U. S., 254; 11 Sup. Ct. Rep., 773, 777), must be considered as well established: "Jurisdiction," said Mr. Justice Brewer, speaking for the court, "may be defined to be the right to adjudicate concerning the subject matter in the given case. To constitute this there are three essentials: First, the court must have cognizance of the class of cases to which the one to be adjudged belongs; second, the proper parties must be present; and third, the point decided must be, in substance and effect, within the issue."

It follows as a deduction from this definition that where there is jurisdiction of the person and of the subject matter the decision of all other questions arising in the case is but an exercise of that jurisdiction.

A board of three general appraisers, to which a case has been regularly assigned after transmittal by the collector, unquestionably is invested with the power to take testimony and to hear and decide all questions of which they properly have jurisdiction. This has been held by the courts to be the exercise of a judicial power, which is the function of a court. Marine, collector, *v.* Lyon (65 Fed. Rep., 992; 13 C. C. A., 268); Stone *v.* Whitridge (129 Fed. Rep., 33; 64 C. C. A., 47, 50; T. D. 25154). In United States *v.* Loeb (107 Fed. Rep., 692) it was held that when the collector transmitted the protest and other papers to the board, as required by statute, the jurisdiction of the board at once attached.

The question arises as to whether any legal reason exists why an importer can not claim that his goods shall be properly classified in accordance with the requirements of the tariff act because the rate claimed is higher than that assessed by the collector. It is settled that the object of filing a protest is to advise the collector what the error complained of is, "to enable him to correct it, if he deems it proper to do so." Sadler *v.* Maxwell (21 Fed. Cas., 136; 3 Blatch., 134). Article 1463 of the Customs Regulations of 1899 and article 1072, regulations 1908, and previous regulations have uniformly recognized this duty of collectors to review their action when protests are filed, and this practice is firmly established. No restriction seems to be placed upon the collector of customs which would prohibit him, before appeal taken, from revoking an erroneous classification and making a correct one, whether at a higher or lower rate of duty, with the single restriction that the time for reliquidation should be confined to one year from the time of entry. United States *v.* Phelps (27 Fed. Cas., 521; 17 Blatch., 312); United States *v.* Leng (18 Fed. Rep., 15). Act of 1874, 18 Stat., 190.

There seems to be no doubt of the fact that the collector could have reliquidated this entry and have corrected the classification in accordance with the claim of the protest, if the facts justified it in his judgment. Why should the board be debarred from exercising a similar power?

It is urged by counsel for the Government that the importers can not be supposed to be dissatisfied with an assessment at a lower rate of duty than that justified by law. In Loeb's case, cited supra, it was held not competent to investigate the motive of the collector as to whether he was dissatisfied or not with the value of the goods as appraised, and that the jurisdiction of the board could not be abrogated by proof to the contrary. *We are clearly satisfied that the customs administrative act is designed to procure the proper classification of imported merchandise.*

If an importer makes a proper claim for such classification of goods owned and imported by him, it can not be alleged that he has no interest in the suit. His pecuniary interest might suggest a different course, but his honesty of purpose, conscientious scruples, and integrity of character may dictate a policy of strict compliance with the requirements of the law. We might suppose a case of an importer dealing in goods which have been erroneously classified at a lower rate of duty making large contracts based upon their future sale, and being subsequently brought to financial ruin by a change in such classification liable to occur by the mutation in office of public officials holding different views. Moreover, an importer may expressly exert himself to procure the assessment of a higher rate of duty, if correct, upon imported merchandise in order to protect his interest against competition, the policy of tariff acts having been held to be to promote the various industries in this country by a system of protection against similar goods of foreign manufacture imported from abroad. Corroborative of this view is the provision in section 13 of said act, which provides that a collector may appeal to reappraisement so as to correct an erroneous valuation on imported goods on the condition that he deems the appraisement "too low." This provision would not authorize such appeal on the ground that the market value was found to be too high. Such an alternative is left to the importer. No such limitation occurs in the tariff act in providing for the proper classification of imported merchandise. It has been uniformly held by the board and the courts that a protest claiming a higher rate of duty than that assessed by the collector can be properly sustained. In re De Blois, G. A. 2413 (T. D. 14691); In re Sheldon & Co., G. A. 7116 (T. D. 31017); and Wakem *v.* United States (T. D. 25827).

We may further observe that if the board is debarred from assuming jurisdiction in cases of this character it would often be impossible to correct an assessment made on imported merchandise which is admitted and proved to be clearly erroneous, both as to the material entering into its composition and its tariff classification, although the importer seeks by protest to correct the error made by the collector and in the form prescribed by the customs administrative act. The blunder of the collector would remain uncorrected, although he or some other collector at a different port might see fit to classify similar goods in accordance with the requirements of the tariff act in the case of some future importation identical in character. We do not believe this interpretation is in accord with the legislative intention, which has in view not only the correct classification of imported articles, but also uniformity of classification at every port of the country.

Assuming that the board has jurisdiction to classify the goods in accordance with the claim made in the protest, if found to be correct, we find that while the bagging in question is suitable for covering cotton, it does not fall within the description of said paragraph 355 for the following reasons, which are clearly established by the evidence: It is not composed of jute, jute butts, or hemp, within the meaning of said paragraph, but is composed in chief value of aloe and other vegetable fibers other than jute, jute butts, or hemp.

An analysis was made of the merchandise with a correct valuation of the various component fibers contained in the fabric. The following result was reached, which was in no manner challenged by any evidence introduced at the hearing. It shows the value of the fibers of nonjute origin to be 52.85 per cent of the total value and that of all fibers of jute origin to be 47.15 per cent.

	Per cent.
Jute	None.
Jute butts	5.94
Mill waste (weft)	13.93
Mill waste (warp)	6.96
Cotton tares	20.21
Sea	2.64
New Zealand tow	10.05
Aloe	40.17
Total	100.00

The facts of the case, as found, place the goods for classification in said paragraph 358, as claimed in the protest. It is a woven fabric made of "other vegetable fibers" than there specially named, and is properly dutiable at 45 per cent ad valorem.

The protest is sustained and the collector's decision reversed, with instruction to reliquidate the entry accordingly.

* * * * * * *

(T. D. 31403—G. A. 7189).

BAGGING FOR COVERING COTTON—COMPRESS LABELS.

1. Patches for covering cotton: While certain pieces of bagging, similar in size, texture, and use to the merchandise passed on by the board in Wolff's case, G. A. 7098 (T. D. 30930), may be considered as bagging suitable for covering cotton, if, however, they are made in chief value of other vegetable fibers than jute, jute butts, or hemp, such articles are subject to classification for duty under paragraph 358 of the tariff act of 1909, as woven articles of the kind there described, at 45 per cent ad valorem, and not under paragraph 355, as bagging for covering cotton, made of jute, jute butts, or hemp.

2. Jurisdiction of the board: The board, under the powers conferred by law, will proceed to classify imported merchandise in accordance with the claim made in the protest, if sustained by satisfactory evidence, and will deny a motion to dismiss such protest on the ground that the rate of duty alleged to be applicable is greater than that assessed by the collector.—Following Schwartz's case, G. A. 7187 (T. D. 31401).

United States General Appraisers, New York, March 20, 1911.

In the matter of protest 478556 of T. Aubrey Byrne against the assessment of duty by the collector of customs at the port of New York.

Before Board 3 (Waite, Somerville, and Hay, General appraisers).

Somerville, General Appraiser: The collector in this case reports that the merchandise consists of 198 pieces of jute bagging, each piece measuring 32 by 42 inches, and commercially known as cotton patches, and that it is composed of single yarns, weighs over 15 ounces per square yard, and contains under 16 threads per square inch. He further reports that the material from which the pieces are cut are commercially known as bagging for cotton, and that the goods are of the same character as those passed on by the board in Wolff's case, G. A. 7098 (T. D. 30930).

The articles in question were accordingly assessed for duty at sixtenths of 1 cent per square yard, as bagging for cotton made of jute, under paragraph 355 of the tariff act of August 5, 1909. The importer claims the articles are not made of jute, but of other vegetable fibers, and are properly dutiable under paragraph 358 of said act at 45 per cent ad valorem. The rate claimed by the importer, it will be observed, is greater than the rate at which the goods were assessed by the collector. Counsel for the Government made a motion before the board to dismiss the case for want of jurisdiction on this ground.

A similar contention arose recently in the case of protest 444624 of Schwartz & Co., G. A. 7187 (T. D. 31401). For the reasons there stated the motion to dismiss for want of jurisdiction is overruled.

The testimony clearly establishes the fact that the collector was mistaken in reporting that the merchandise was made of jute. On the contrary, an analysis was made of the merchandise both by the importer and by Dr. Lyster H. Dewey, botanist in charge of fiber plants, of the United States Department of Agriculture. There is a remarkable coincidence between the results reached by each of these analyses, both as to the percentage of the different fibers that enter into the composition

of the goods and of the value and character of these fibers. We append the following results as reached in each of said analyses:

	Dr. Dewey's percentage of value.	Importer's percentage of value.
Butts and rejections (jute origin)	0.077 to 0.133	0.106
Cotton tares and mill and factory wastes (various origin)	.298 to .293	.228
Russian seg	.081 to .093	.065
New Zealand tow and aloe	.542 to .480	.599
Total	.998 to .999	.998

We accordingly find that while the articles in question, represented by Exhibit 1, which are sometimes known as bootle bagging or bootle compress labels, may be considered as coverings for cotton, they are not composed of jute or of jute butts or of hemp, but that the fibers that enter into their composition consist in chief value of aloe, New Zealand tow, and Russian seg, and therefore fall within the description of "other vegetable fiber" and within the meaning of said paragraph 358. We find that the importation is more accurately described by the provisions of said paragraph 358 than by paragraph 355. The protest is accordingly sustained and the collector's decision reversed with instructions to classify the goods in accordance with the claim made in the protest.

This action on the part of an alleged importer of cotton bagging presents a remarkable instance of the importer insisting that the Government shall place a greater rate of duty upon his importations than the Government officials at the ports had placed upon them. And I am justified in saying that this was the result of a united effort or conspiracy on the part of those engaged in selling cotton bagging to increase the price of cotton bagging to the farmer. As illustrative of this I read the following from a letter of Mr. C. Lee McMillan, of New Orleans, a most reputable and worthy gentleman:

C. LEE MCMILLAN & CO. (LTD.),
New Orleans, April 8, 1911.

Hon. CHARLES LAFAYETTE BARTLETT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I ask you to kindly have sent me a copy of your bills placing both bagging and ties upon the free list?

The Bagging Trust has grown very bold, as the following will show:

The Bagging Trust, while it uses any fiber, new or secondhand, it can work, even including what is called "bear grass," not to mention the salt it puts in its cloth to make weight, insists that all importations be passed upon by chemist, and where any fiber other than "jute, jute butts, or hemp" is found said importations must pay 45 per cent ad valorem, or say about 0.03 cent per yard.

The Bagging Trust, in order to better control the market, often buys up more than half the foreign mills can make each season.

Last year the trust owned in warehouse here some half million yards it had imported of as good Calcutta bagging as ever went on a bale of cotton. The duty of six-tenths of a cent, as covered by paragraph 355, had been paid by said trust upon same, and the entry liquidated by the New Orleans customhouse. Some months later the trust addressed a letter to the Secretary of Treasury informing him that said trust was satisfied an error had been made in classification by collector here, as it found said bagging contained some "jute mill waste," and on that account said trust suggested that the entry in question be reliquidated and it, the trust, would be glad to pay to the Government 45 per cent ad valorem duty. The Treasury Department saw the "cloven foot" and properly declined.

Next the trust protested certain entries here of bagging, imported for the express purpose of patching the sample holes in cotton bales, the trust claiming that said bagging, because it was 32 by 42 inches and was not used at the country gin but was put on at compress, was not entitled to entry at six-tenths of a cent, but should pay 45 per cent ad valorem.

In the above cases the trust has so far lost, but in its greed for gain it got a bale of bagging, which we understand was marked "C. L. M." (one of our marks), shipped same to Canada, and had it brought in at the Port of Boston. There the collector of port assessed same at six-tenths of a cent, same as here, but the trust protested that 45 per cent ad valorem should be the rate and carried the case before the Board of General Appraisers in New York.

Read, if you will, "Treasury Decisions," of March 23, 1911 (T. D. 31403; G. A. 7189), subject, "Bagging for Covering Cotton-Compress Labels," and you will see that the board sustained the trust. And, pending an appeal, which we learn the Government has made, we have been informed here that 45 per cent ad valorem duty will be charged us.

The term "compress labels" is one coined by the trust, and we suppose you can see their motive.

For many years past bagging patches to protect cotton by covering sample holes have been imported through this port and also at Galveston, but only recently has the trust undertaken their manufacture, and no sooner than it started to make same the trust cry went up that such bagging should not be admitted under paragraph 355, as same were "compress labels" and not a covering for cotton.

Out of 80,000,000 yards or more of bagging used each year only some 15,000,000 yards, including patches, are imported.

The duty on cotton ties, although reduced from five-tenths, "Dingley bill," to three-tenths of a cent per pound by the Payne-Aldrich bill, still prohibits any importations, as we can't pay 13½ cents per bundle duty, and I so informed the Ways and Means Committee when I went before it during the autumn of 1908.

Yours, respectfully, C. LEE MCMILLAN.

Surely those engaged in the manufacture and sale of this article of commerce are not entitled to any great consideration at the hands of Congress when they ask that this prohibitive and exorbitant rate of duty shall be maintained by the Government in order that they may continue to extort from the farmers of the South enormous sums of money from year to year as a tribute to them and to their rapacity and greed.

THE COTTON RAISER NOT PAID FOR HIS BAGGING AND TIES WHEN HE SELLS HIS COTTON.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] the other day, in discussing this provision of the bill, made a statement that the cotton farmer when he sold his cotton received payment for the cotton bagging and ties used in baling his cotton at the same rate at which the ties were sold. I protested against that statement at the time, but I find that he has placed in the RECORD as sustaining the assertion made by him a letter from Mr. Gary, chairman of the board of directors of the Steel Trust. This is the same statement that has been made on every occasion when an effort has been made to remove the duty on cotton bagging and ties. I will show the inaccuracy of the statement. I received from a reliable gentleman, who is fully informed on the subject and who for years has been familiar with the cotton trade, both foreign and domestic, a letter of date May 2, 1911, which states:

To those who are upholding the claim of the United States Steel Co. that the cotton planter reaps a large profit upon the ties he uses, you may say that all European or foreign cotton buyers figure the tare for bagging and ties as being 6 per cent. The majority of the American spinners figure this tare at 5 per cent, while none of them calculate tare at less than 4 per cent.

The average bale of cotton has on it—

	Pounds.
7 yards 2-pound bagging, say	14
6 steel bands, weighing 1½ pounds each	9
Making a total of	23

So you will see that the planter gets back nothing whatever for his bagging and ties.

When it is recalled that the rate of duty upon cotton ties has been so high and exorbitant that very few have been imported into the country; that the Steel Trust, which Mr. Gary represents and of which he is the head and chief, derives the benefit from the imposition of the duty, it will be seen at once the motives that inspire the suggestion made by him.

During the debate on the Payne-Aldrich bill in the Senate, June 28, 1909, the statement was made in the Senate by a Massachusetts Senator that the farmer was paid for his bagging and ties when he sold his cotton. To refute that statement the Senator from Texas presented and placed in the RECORD the following, which I think is a complete refutation of this statement, then made and now reiterated:

Senator CHARLES A. CULBERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Yesterday Representative BURLESON telegraphed me as follows:

Antagonists of free bagging and ties contend that the spinner pays for bagging and ties when he buys cotton, and that in the end it proves a profit rather than a loss to cotton producers. I contend that 26 pounds tare is considered when market price of cotton is fixed, and want telegrams from cotton buyers and exchange officials to support my contention: Are deductions made for tare by foreign as well as domestic purchasers, and what effect does it have on price?"

And the following messages were sent in reply:

Your contention in dispatch concerning tare on cotton is true. When the farmer buys bagging and ties, he pays therefor some 9 cents per bale more than he would pay if free. When a spinner buys from his farmer he deducts from the worth of the cotton the amount of his loss by bagging and ties. Therefore the spinner does not pay the tariff profit that goes to the manufacturers of bagging and ties, and the farmer does. But even if the spinner did pay, antagonists' argument is not strengthened, because spinner would add excess to manufactured product and thus increase the cost to consumer. In either case, the trusts collect the profit and the people pay.

W. B. THOMPSON,
President New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

It is a well-known fact that all buyers on both sides of the Atlantic allow in the prices they pay fully enough, if not more than enough, to offset the weight of bagging and ties on a bale. As a general thing, 6 per cent is allowed for tare by foreign spinners. While all spinners practically buy on the basis of tare, care is generally taken that allowances always equal and frequently exceed actual tare.

HENRY G. HESTER.

All cotton sold for export deducts 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties. Domestic mills claim 4 to 5 per cent tare.

NORMAN EUSTIS,
Acting Chairman Cotton Factors' Association.

Cotton sold for export carries 6 per cent deduction for tare. Domestic mills calculate about 5 per cent.

NEW ORLEANS COTTON BUYERS & EXPORTERS' ASSOCIATION,
A. M. WEST, *President.*

Cotton exporters calculate 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties; eastern spinners 23 to 25 pounds per bale. Carolina Mills Association rule 4 reads: "On compressed cotton the tare should not exceed 24 pounds and on uncompressed cotton 20 pounds per bale." Cotton producers pay for their bagging and ties. Any spinner will give more for 500 pounds net cotton than for a bale weighing 500 pounds gross, including bagging and ties.

C. LEE MCMILLAN.

You doubtless know as well as I do that every spinner calculates in buying cotton what allowance to make for tare on bagging and ties, and, as the same amounts to between 5 and 6 per cent, no one ever overlooks it.

* * * * * * *

C. LEE MCMILLAN.

In the testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1908 I find the following:

Mr. GRIGGS. I want to settle one matter that I think you understand very thoroughly. An intimation was made here this morning that the farmer resells his bagging. What tare is taken off for bagging and ties at the factory?

Mr. MCMILLAN. Six per cent is the allowance calculated upon; 30 pounds for each 500-pound bale of cotton.

Mr. GRIGGS. At 9 cents a pound, that would be how much?

Mr. MCMILLAN. That would be $2.70.

Mr. GRIGGS. That the farmer loses in the price of cotton, because it is taken off the price of cotton. I do not believe it is deducted absolutely, but that is taken into consideration in fixing the price of cotton.

Mr. MCMILLAN. In other words, he does not sell bagging and ties at the price of cotton, but their weight is deducted in the final account.

Mr. GRIGGS. And it amounts to $2.70 per bale?

Mr. MCMILLAN. Yes, sir.

I now read the following from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27, 1909, showing that I then furnished evidence which was, and now is, a complete refutation of the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the letter he had printed in the RECORD from the representative of the Steel Trust, Mr. Gary.

This contention, I knew, was not capable of being sustained by proof. To show what the truth is, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and myself sought and obtained the information contained in the telegrams we received, and which are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 25, 1909.*

Hon. W. W. GORDON,
Savannah, Ga.:

Opponents free bagging and ties claim producer is paid for same at price of cotton by spinner without deduction for tare. Please wire what deduction is made for bagging and ties, and in what way and how considered in fixing price. Does rule apply to both foreign and domestic spinners?

C. L. BARTLETT.

SAVANNAH, GA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. C. L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Offers from Europe name a price which includes cost of freight, marine insurance, and 6 per cent tare on a 500-pound bale. Six per cent would be 40 pounds, which covers 16 pounds for 8 yards of bagging, 8 pounds for 8 ties, and 6 pounds for natural drying of cotton and consequent shrinkage in weight; nominally, the farmer is paid for bagging and ties, but the spinner can't spin them. He sells them for junk; consequently the price he offers is a figure arrived at after deducting what his loss will be on the bagging and ties; also is true that farmer in reality is not paid for bagging and ties. American spinners usually get 28 pounds tare, and also deduct from price they pay for cotton the loss they will sustain on the bagging and ties.

W. W. GORDON.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your contention in dispatch concerning tare on cotton is true. When the farmer buys bagging and ties he pays therefor some 9 cents per bale more than he would pay if free. When the spinner buys from the farmer he deducts from the worth of the cotton the amount of his loss by bagging and ties. Therefore the spinner does not pay the tariff profit that goes to the manufacturers of bagging and ties and the farmer does. But even if spinner did pay, antagonists' argument is not strengthened, because spinner would add excess to manufactured product and thus increase the cost to consumer. In either case the trust collects the profit and the people pay.

W. B. THOMPSON,
President New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

It is a well-known fact that all buyers on both sides of the Atlantic allow in the prices they pay fully enough, if not more than enough, to offset the weight of bagging and ties on a bale. As a general thing 6 per cent is allowed for tare by foreign spinners. While all spinners practically buy on the basis of tare, care is generally taken that allowances always equal and frequently exceed actual tare.

HENRY G. HESTER.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Referring to my previous dispatch for your information, Carolina mills have a rule that they will not allow for more than 24 pounds bagging and ties on a compressed bale and 20 pounds on an uncompressed bale. If bagging and ties exceed that in weight, the seller must refund the difference.

C. LEE MCMILLAN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton exporters calculate 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties; eastern spinners, 23 to 25 pounds per bale. Carolina mills' rule 4 reads: "On compressed cotton the tare should not exceed 24 pounds, and on uncompressed cotton, 20 pounds per bale." Cotton producers pay for their bagging and ties. Any spinner will give more for 500 pounds net cotton than for a bale weighing 500 pounds gross, including bagging and ties.

C. LEE MCMILLAN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

All cotton sold for export deducts 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties; domestic mills claim 4 to 5 per cent tare.

NORMAN EUSTIS,
Acting Chairman Cotton Factory Association.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton sold for export carries 6 per cent deduction for tare; domestic mills calculate about 5 per cent.

NEW ORLEANS COTTON BUYERS' AND EXPORTERS' ASSN.,
A. J. WEST, *President.*

These telegrams are from gentlemen of the highest character and standing in the business world, whose word will be accepted by all who know them as absolutely the truth.

Gen. W. W. Gordon, of Savannah, Ga., is a prominent cotton merchant, a buyer and exporter of cotton for many years, and who is in every way qualified by information, knowledge, and experience to give testimony on this subject; and there can be no question that his statements contain the absolute truth.

Mr. Chairman, I have done what I could to aid in lessening the burdens of those who are engaged in the production of the world's greatest staple; I have introduced these bills to take away from them the burdens of taxation. I have sought in every Congress to have it done, and now the hope seems about to be realized. God grant that it may, and that the just and thoughtful men of both parties and from every section in this Congress will give to the people who are so much entitled to receive it the same freedom from unjust taxation that the farmers of the North and West have so long enjoyed. Justice demands that it be done. None but a few favored trusts—combined corporations—have been heard to oppose.

THE YEOMANRY OF THE UNITED STATES.

I have investigated somewhat and compared the various conditions of our fellow men in the principal countries of Europe and the United States, and especially in the South, and I have come to the conclusion that there is not a people on earth, taken as a whole, so highly favored in the substantial blessings of life as the yeomanry of the United States, and especially of the South. True, there are other countries and States that surpass us in wealth and power, in military strength, in magnificence and display of expensive arts, but there is none which can so justly lay claim to the character of a free and happy people as those I have the honor in part to represent.

The future of this country is full of exciting hope. But it depends in the largest measure on the tillers of the soil whether that hope shall be realized or not. The neglect to improve our agriculture will be followed by the decay of all else we ought to cherish in morals and government as well as in arts, for a well-cultivated soil produces not grains, grasses, cotton, corn, fruits, but another and far more precious crop—men—men who know their rights and dare maintain them; a bold, honest and intelligent people, the just pride and the sure defense of every nation. [Applause.]

The child may now be born whose old age will look upon the American people and see them 300,000,000 strong—the southern cotton-raising States, now with 20,000,000 inhabitants, doubling every 22½ years, 60,000,000 strong. With such a population, living under a government of equal laws, with no special privileges to the favored few or sections, moving onward and upward with the energies which freedom alone can inspire, and aided by the highest science in making the most of their natural advantages, what shall prevent their success? Who shall curb the career of such a people or set a limit to its deep-founded strength? [Applause.] The great poet, Milton, himself never dreamed of a power so boundless or a people so blessed, not even in that enraptured vision when he saw "a mighty and puissant nation, rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks," or like "an eagle renewing her mighty youth and kindling her undazzled eye at the full blaze of the midday beam, purging and unscaling her sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance." The man who, with his senses open to the truth, would thwart such a destiny or refuse to aid to accomplish it is either careless or untrue, not only to his country, but to the best interest and highest hopes of the human race. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I shall neither afflict the country nor the committee with a speech on the tariff. I will say, however, that I shall record my vote for the pending bill with a great deal of pleasure, because it is the first measure for the real benefit of the American farmer which has been seriously

proposed in this House since I have been a Member of it. While, as I have said, I shall not discuss the tariff, I do want to say in passing that my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader of the minority, reminded me very much a few days ago—I will not say when displaying his ignorance on the subject, but when he made certain interrogations as to farming implements—of a young man in the city whose father decided it would be better for him to spend a year or two on the farm and get some practical information. He had never been in the country in his life. He knew nothing about chickens and pigs and ducks and things of that kind. Shortly after he reached the farm he was sent out one morning to feed the fowls. He scattered the corn. This farmer had a quantity of chickens and a large number of ducks—these broad-billed muscovies.

These ducks got in amongst the chickens, and those of us who have lived upon the farms and know something of that life, know how when you feed a lot of chickens and ducks together the ducks, instead of picking up the corn a grain at a time, come along with their immense bills and just shovel it in. This boy saw that, and he had, what I fear sometimes our friends on the other side do not have, a sense of justice and fair play. So, acting upon that notion, he took out a pocket-knife and began to catch those ducks and trim their bills down to a point like the chickens. The farmer came along in the meantime and said, "What do you mean; what are you doing this for?" The young man replied, "These ducks are simply shoveling it all up and depriving the chickens of their fair share, and I thought it was nothing but right to trim their bills and make them get down and pick fair with the rest of them." [Laughter and applause.]

The object of this bill, as I understand it, is to make the protected interests of the country get down on a dead level with the farmer and pick their living with the rest of us.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, without going into the tariff proposition, I want to call the attention of the House and the country to another question which, it seems to me, involves the integrity of the proceedings of this House. During the six years that I have been here I have heard gentlemen complain, not only in private conversation, but on the floor of the House, of the fact that the House had lost the respect of the American people, that the House had given up prerogative after prerogative until it had become a sort of byword with the people of the country, and that they, the people, no longer held that respect for it which they had in the olden days. Having this condition of affairs in mind, I introduced recently a resolution, which I desire to ask that the Clerk will read in my time, for I want to get it into the RECORD, and I believe that when gentlemen consider it carefully they will see that it will, if adopted, work a reform much needed in the management of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives be, and the same are hereby, amended by adding thereto an additional rule, to be known as Rule XLIV, and to read as follows:

"Rule XLIV. No Member shall be permitted to have printed in the RECORD any speech or portion of a speech not actually delivered by him upon the floor of the House, except upon condition that immediately preceding and connected with such speech or portion of speech there shall be printed in the RECORD in bold, black-faced type the words: 'The following remarks were not delivered in the House and are simply inserted here on request of Hon. ——— ———,' naming the Member whose remarks are to be so printed: *Provided*, That no Member shall under any condition be allowed to print in the RECORD any portion of any article, writing, speech, or document not of his own composition, other than statistical information, except he actually reads or quotes the same while on the floor and when he is actually addressing the House."

Mr. Chairman, upon investigation of this subject I find that it has at different times created discussion in both Houses of Congress. As far back as 1852, on May 20, Mr. Clingman, of North Carolina, I believe, in correcting the Globe, after stating that the report of the proceedings in the Globe for a certain day showed that while he held the floor he gave way to a certain Member who made a speech, occupying several columns, and that he then proceeded with his own speech, making no reference to the interjected speech, said:

Now, the fact is just this, that a gentleman from New York said he wished that I would give him the floor for a single moment, and that his object was to notify the House that he intended to publish a speech. I told him, of course, that I had no objection—it is a pure matter of taste. I then informed the House that I had given him the floor for that purpose. I made that statement, and he made the statement to the committee, that he intended to publish a speech. I took it for granted that all of that would go into the Globe. If that had been done, everybody would then have seen that the speech which followed had not actually been delivered in the House, and I and other gentlemen should have been relieved of all responsibility of answering it. Several gentlemen have come to me, and said they considered such a thing a fraud on the House. I will not use such a strong expression myself. I have no objection to the publication of speeches in the Congressional Globe that have not been delivered here; but the fact that they were not delivered ought to be known and understood.

On December 23, 1852, Mr. Stanley, of North Carolina, by unanimous consent, offered a resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the reporters of the House of Representatives be directed hereafter not to report in the Daily Globe, as part of the proceedings of the House, speeches not made in the House.

Amended by adding—

Provided, That nothing in this resolution shall prevent any Member from correcting or revising the reporters' notes.

This resolution as amended was passed by the House.

On May 23, 1860, the House was considering certain amendments to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The fourth amendment was as follows:

Provided further, That the reporters of the House shall not report any remark made by any Member who is not first recognized by the Speaker or Chairman who may be presiding at the time; and that nothing said in the House, declared to be out of order, or that is said by one Member without leave when another is upon the floor, nor anything not actually said in debate, shall be reported. (Rejected by a vote of 75 yeas to 82 nays. Cong. Globe, 36th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2284–2285.)

On July 20, 1867, Mr. Ashley, of Ohio, asked unanimous consent that certain gentlemen who had prepared speeches on a veto message of the President and who had no opportunity to deliver them should be allowed to print them in the Globe. Mr. Ross, of Illinois, said that he would not object to the printing of those already prepared, but if the request were broad enough to permit Members to go home and prepare speeches to be thus printed he would object. Consent was limited to those already prepared. (Cong. Globe, 40th Cong., 1st sess., p. 757.)

On February 21, 1870, the Senate passed a concurrent resolution, as follows:

No speech not actually delivered in Congress shall be printed in the Globe. (Cong. Globe, pt. 2, 41st Cong., 2d sess., p. 1457.)

And I may say here that that is a substitute offered by Senator Conkling, of New York, to the original resolution offered by another Senator. I am quoting some of these authorities to show the committee and the country that abler and wiser men than some of us who are now studying this question have seen the evils of it and have undertaken to correct this proceeding, which is, in effect, without any notice, a fraud upon the country.

On December 23, 1884, Senator Vest, of Missouri, submitted to the Senate a concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the reports in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be an accurate transcript of the proceedings and the debates of the two Houses of Congress, and that no speech shall be published therein which was not spoken in the Senate or in the House of Representatives; and such speeches shall be printed as they were actually delivered, except verbal corrections made by the author of the speech, and by no other person; and that when speeches are reserved by their authors for correction they shall be returned to the reporter of the House in which they were delivered within one week, and if not so returned they shall then be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the original notes of the reporter. (Cong. Rec., vol. 16, pt. 1, 48th Cong., 2d sess., p. 423.)

Now, Senator Vest made a speech on that subject at that time, and I have copied an extract from it, which I wish to call to the attention of the committee. He said:

Good faith between the people and their servants, public morality, and decency demand that the abuses now existing should be remedied. What could be more ruinous to the cause of truth than the daily printing of debates which have no existence? What can be more demoralizing and disheartening to the young and honest reader of the RECORD than the discovery that the Representative whom he has been taught to admire as an exemplar of all public virtues is a public cheat and fraud? (Cong. Rec., vol. 16, pt. 1, 48th Cong., 2d sess., p. 423.)

Senator FRYE, in discussing that resolution, said this:

I remember very distinctly reading in the RECORD a speech which was made about the manufacturers of New England, and charges were made that the operatives in those mills were slaves, that they were almost starved to death, that they were treated more inhumanly than the slaves of the South ever were treated. A constituent of mine called my attention for the first time to it and wanted to know if I was not present attending to my duty and why I had permitted a thing of that kind to go unchallenged.

That was when Senator FRYE was a Member of the House.

Well, it was one Saturday when nobody was there except the Speaker of the House of Representatives and six other Members, each one of whom had a long speech to deliver and each one of whom perhaps read 5 or 10 minutes and then printed about a 2-hour speech. That seems to me the most serious difficulty about the matter. (Cong. Record, vol. 16, pt. 1, 48th Cong., 2d sess., p. 424.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have read those extracts because I wanted them to go into the RECORD. I want to say now that on two occasions I have availed myself of this rule—I am not pretending that I have not done that. One was a speech which I delivered to the legislature of my State, which I did not care to repeat here, and one was a speech recently, before the last adjournment, on the shipping bill, and I did not get time to deliver it.

But, look at it as we may, it is in effect a deceit, it is a fraud, it is wrong, and the RECORD as published to-day does not speak the truth.

Now, if a gentleman writes an essay and he thinks there is such merit in his composition that the great American public ought to read it, he ought not to be averse to printing it as an essay; he ought not to be averse to putting the public upon notice that the speech was not delivered, but only prepared, by him; and that he thought there was such merit in its composition that the people of the country ought to have the benefit of the product of his brain.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, we are perpetrating a fraud upon the people when we do it. I have heard some intimations about the preparation of speeches that I am not going to mention here. I want to say this: I have not, although I have invoked the rule twice and printed speeches that I did not deliver, denied that they were mine. The bad grammar, the bad spelling, and everything else, were mine. Nobody else was responsible for them, and I do not intend to go far enough to ask anybody to correct either my spelling or my grammar.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's spelling would be corrected by the Government Printing Office, regardless of his motion.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman speaks of a rule. Really, there is no rule permitting the thing to be done which the gentleman is now opposing, is there?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is a custom, and there is a rule; yes. Because when a Member gets upon this floor and asks unanimous consent, such consent is always given, and this custom has become as inexorable and as unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. And no man can stay on this floor all the time—I have tried that—to watch the RECORD. The moment the objector goes out, somebody repeats his request and it is granted and the speech goes in anyhow.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask further this question. I do not mean to be in opposition to what the gentleman is saying. He is discussing the matter very clearly. Suppose we do adopt the resolution and it becomes the rule of the House. Can it not be suspended by unanimous consent at any time, and will not objection still have to be made? That is what I want to ask.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Possibly so; but I want to say this to the gentleman: I am going to introduce—as was introduced by Senator Vest and these other gentlemen—a joint resolution, requiring the concurrence of both Houses and the signature of the President. That has the force and effect of law, and I do not understand that this House, by unanimous consent, can waive it.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, we can practically reach the matter in another way. There is now a rule of the House that prohibits the entertaining of a motion to draw seats during the life of a Congress, after they are once drawn. That rule has always been observed, and it would not be in order for the Chair to put an unanimous request for the redrawing of seats after they are once drawn. Now, it would be very easy to make it out of order to present a request for unanimous consent to print in the RECORD. If the gentleman will permit me a moment further, I will say that for several years past I have at various times taken occasion to comment on this same abuse, and I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that it is a constant reflection upon the membership of this House that we should tolerate a method of misrepresentation to the country of our activities here.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky is an expert parliamentarian, and I take it that his statement of the effect of a rule of that kind would be absolutely correct.

Now, I want to say this——

Mr. SIMS. Let me make a suggestion in that connection, that we now have a rule, as I remember, that it shall not be in order for the Speaker to entertain any motion or request to use this Hall for any purpose other than that designated by the law and the rules. And yet I have seen a request of that kind made and submitted, and not being objected to it was declared as ordered. It was done in the case of Col. Goethals, you know, when he gave his lecture on the Panama Canal in this Hall.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] one minute more.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion: This would not only, if adopted, make the RECORD speak the truth and put us right before the country, but it would be a measure of economy. We would save in the composition, we would save in the amount paid to the railroads for hauling these immense volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all over this country. Senator FRYE stated, I think—one of those experienced gentlemen did—that when he first became a Member of Congress one volume of the Congressional Globe sufficed for the record of a short session of Congress and two volumes for the record of a long session. To-day when you get a copy of the RECORD of a session of Congress delivered at your town you have got to get a dray to have it hauled to your house.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I desire to present these few remarks and put the data in the RECORD in order that gentlemen may look into this matter and think it over and see if we can not get some rule here that will preserve the integrity of this House and challenge the respect of the American people which this House once enjoyed. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening for more than two weeks now to the great speeches delivered before this the greatest body of men upon the globe, and although I am a new Member I can not longer refrain from presenting my views in this presence and to the country in reference to the two twin bills, the reciprocity bill, just passed, and the free-list bill now under consideration.

Adhering to the resolution adopted by the West Virginia Legislature instructing her Senators and requesting her Congressmen to vote for the reciprocity bill, I cast my vote for that measure, believing, too, at the same time, that it was right. Some remarkable speeches were made against that bill. How some of these stand-pat Republicans could speak against the bill and then vote for its passage I am at a loss to comprehend, unless they wanted to be recorded for and against the bill, so that whichever way the die is cast they would be at least halfway on the winning side. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You stand-pat Republicans have sinned away your day of grace. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The men of your party—I mean the patriotic Republicans who love their country and to whom their country's good is higher than party perfidy are the insurgents or independent Republicans of this country—you meet them everywhere, both here in Congress and in the country, and as a rule wherever you find one you find in him a patriotic and honest man, the noblest work of God. The Republican Party has been a great party, but the party of Lincoln, of Grant, Blaine, Conkling, and McKinley is not the Republican Party of to-day. Your leaders—not all of them, but nearly all—have descended into a commercial party, and in order to secure campaign contributions so that elections could be carried with money have formed a joint stock company with the trusts and special interests of the country, until to-day the trusts and special interests are more powerful than even the Government itself in your stand-pat policies. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Your great party is divided both here and at home. Even the old Union soldiers are losing heart and faith and are voting the Democratic ticket. They fought for, and still want, a fair deal. They are opposed to ring rule. They are opposed, and so are their children, to graft and corruption in any form. They still love this country, and they have taught their children to love Old Glory and the sentiment that that flag represents. They do not want to see it trailed in the mire, either at home or abroad. They feel neglected here at Washington, are hurt and feel resentful, and you can not blame them. Their boys, long since grown to manhood, are, in thousands of instances, all over the land, proclaiming their political independence, and are resenting the neglect shown their fathers, and are turning their backs upon the party of trusts and special interests on that account, as well as in order to save this great Republic from its impending doom; yes, they are studying, thinking of the past and future, turning and voting for those old-time Jeffersonian cardinal principles of "equal rights for all and special privileges for none." [Loud applause on the Democratic side and among the insurgents.]

In the name of justice, where are we drifting? How soon shall we reach the end of our present course? There exists a seething caldron of oppressed, dissatisfied, and poverty-stricken humanity throughout our common country. Some say it is because of foreign immigration, and I think this is a great source of our internal troubles in certain directions. Others say it is because of discrimination. Others say it is because of special privileges being granted by the Government to those who have no love for their fellow man, except to use him and impoverish him. God help us to save this Republic. [Loud applause.]

I was amazed the other day at the apprehensions expressed about annexation of Canada by Mr. PRINCE, of Illinois, but this was so in the case of the Louisiana purchase act, as you will remember. That act had its bitter enemies on the floor of Congress; yet the bill went through, and the future generations have revered the name of the President, the Senators, and Congressmen who stood out against magnified public sentiment at that time, as now, and made it possible to annex that beautiful, fertile, rich, and great country to this Republic. But my friend, the distinguished Congressman from Illinois, found fault with the President—the President of my country and his—and he went so far as to insinuate that the President of this country was playing into the hands of the Democratic Party. He did not say it in so many words, but away down in his heart it seems to me that he felt it.

Why has it become necessary for the President of the United States to convene Congress in extraordinary session twice in two years, the second time in history? In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it is because the President sees the tendency of the times. I disagree with many of the stand-pat Republicans. I think the President is an honest man, and you shall not abuse him except over our protest. I think the President sees the process of disintegration which has set in within the Republican ranks, and in order to save, if he can, the remnants of the old guard of his party, he has convened us here, hoping that the Democrats will help him save the Republic and the people from the ravages of trusts and unholy greed. While he knows we are patriotic and want to upbuild this Nation and help the humble people of this country, you stand-pat Republicans are in hopes we will fall out among ourselves, and, as some of our opponents say, will go to pieces. But mark you, the signs of the times in the rear and in front point to the fact—and I hope you will not think hard of me when I say it—that you Republican standpatters are now, if you never have been before, right up against the real proposition in this country. The people have warned you in 1910 by their votes. You have played so long, and have transacted business to such an extent with the special interests, and have given them so many special favors in order that they may give you money to carry your elections, that your people and my people have become not only skeptical and suspicious, but they are demanding an account of your stewardship. They fear that all is not well, and in justification of that fact you see before you now a young man, a straight Democrat, who comes from a district that heretofore has been nearly 6,000 Republican, and one of the most wealthy districts in this country, including the Great Kanawha and New River coal fields, succeeding a stand-pat Republican. Since I have been of age I have never seen the Republican Party so torn asunder and rent in pieces as it is in that great district to-day, and that is so because the rank and file of that party feel that they have been neglected here in Washington. They feel that there is more due them than they have received; and in that they are right. They feel that the principles for which Lincoln stood, for which Grant stood, and that McKinley advocated, are no longer the sentiments that actuate the Republican Party of this Nation. In order, as the boys say, to "hog the ring," you standpatters have gobbled up everything fore and aft, in and out of sight, or loose at both ends, and you have neglected the people at home until the time has come during your administration when poor men in the country can hardly afford to have meat on their tables three times a day. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

It is a sad thing to think about. It is an awful thing to think of the poor people at home in all of our districts, morning, noon, and night, looking to Washington and hoping for relief from the tyrannical and heartless trusts, while here in the Halls of Congress there are men playing to the galleries and the country, endeavoring to make such a record as will enable them, two years from now, to steal again into the White House. In the meantime they are so neglecting the people at home that it is growing harder and harder for the poor people to live. I say again, where are we drifting? [Loud and spontaneous applause.]

The time has come in this country when the standpatters have said that Canadian reciprocity would act detrimentally to to the agricultural interests of the United States. By their speeches they have played upon the sentiment of the country and have tried, with the wonderful aid of the Paper and Steel Trusts, to work up the prejudice of the farmer. But they can not maintain that position, because of the fact that the opening of that new country will afford to the American farmer, when the tariff wall is torn down between the two countries, more extensive market for his product, thereby giving him better prices. When they are forced from the position that reciprocity will be detrimental to the American farmer then they go back and say to the country, "We must look after the laboring people." How well have you, Mr. Standpatter, looked after the laboring people? It has been said upon this floor by very distinguished men that the American workman is the best-paid workman in the civilized world, and you have repeatedly used that old, catchy, prejudicial, and crude Republican, now threadbare, argument, "We do not want to bring American labor in competition with foreign pauper labor." This is your last stand, and when this ground is cut from under your already divided house, your fall will be great. You will then fall upon your knees and you will pray long and loud, but if you remember, "The prayers of the wicked availeth nothing." Your time has come; you must go. Your books have been audited by the people, and the defalcation discovered, and the prison of public opinion is staring you in the face. Your countenances have fallen before the gaze of a long-suffering but triumphant, God-fearing, liberty loving, but outraged people. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Listen while I tell you the truth, as it will do you good, and I do not mean to be hard on you, although you have treated my people and yours so badly, and practiced deception so long, I can hardly refrain from saying some bad words. [Applause.]

I want the record I make here to-day to speak for itself to my people at home. They have been good to me, and my heart swells with gratitude and affection for them. I want to speak the truth. I want the poor men who work in the mines and on the hilltops and in the valleys, in the factories, on the railroads, and who feel neglected and can hardly keep the grim and gray wolf from the door on account of high cost of living—and it is not only so in my district, but in the district of every Congressman within the sound of my voice—I want them to know the facts. Stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 44, of the Sixty-first Congress, page 3256, you will find the average product of the American laborer as well as the European laborer. Listen, oh listen, to the truth. It is there stated that the annual output of the American laborer is $2,450. The average annual output of the Canadian laborer is $1,455; Australia, average annual output, $900; French, average annual output, $650; England, average annual output, $556; Germany, average annual output, $460. I maintain that the man of average intellect can see from these statistics that the American wage earner earns nearly twice as much as the Canadian and does not receive twice as much pay. That the American laborer produces nearly three times as much as the Australian and hardly receives twice as much for his toil. That the American produces nearly four times as much as the Frenchman and does not receive twice as much pay. That the American laborer produces nearly five times as much as the English laborer and does not receive twice as much pay. That the American laborer produces nearly six times as much as the German laborer and receives but a little over twice as much pay. Now, where is your argument about "foreign pauper labor"? [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] These statistics were used by a Republican United States Senator, and I challenge a contradiction from any Congressman on this floor. This shows that according to the productiveness of the American toiler he is the poorest-paid workman in the world, except in China and a few other uncivilized countries, which we do not seriously consider in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And yet you charitably inclined, stand-pat Republicans, in the face of that Republican authority, undertake at this late day in your career, when you are passing away, to make the impression on the people that the American wage earner is the best-paid laborer in the world. I say again, according to his productive capacity, as shown by these statistics, he is the poorest-paid wage earner in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My district produces more coal and better coal and cheaper coal than any other one district, except the anthracite, in the United States. You stand-pat Republicans have made it hard on our coal operators. The men feel they are overcharged at the company stores, and yet it is a fact that the prices are fixed by the trusts you have created, until the coal operator in my district makes less profit in his store than ever before in the history of his business.

But I am proud to say that they are reliable men of pluck and determination, of purpose in life, who through sunshine and storm have stood by public enterprise and have made the community better for having lived in it. Their word, when once given, is as good as a Government bond, and because of their faithful devotion to their business I am proud to proclaim that West Virginia will soon become the greatest coal-producing State in this Union. May God bless her people and their destiny. Our farmers, merchants, railroads, and toilers are all

hoping and praying that the Government at Washington may again be brought into closer relationship with the rank and file of a Christian people. They have read in the Good Book that Christ drove the money changers from the Temple, and are now consoled that the slimy hands of the wicked trusts are being broken loose from Washington by the advance guard of an unterrified but steady Democracy, aided by business men, toilers, old Union soldiers and their sons, all making up an irresistible band of patriarchs, who commenced in 1910, and will finish in 1912, the job of driving the "money changers" out of Washington, thereby repeating history, redeeming and restoring this Government to the people. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, they have told us, and incorporated in the RECORD up to date, in effect, that they are opposed to any free-list bill. They are the party of protection, and I do not mean to be unkind or ungenerous when I suggest that that old name of the "party of protection" ought to be changed to the "party of the trusts and special interests."

I want the record I make here to show that from the Payne-Aldrich-Cannon-Gaines tariff and free-list bill of 1909, beginning on page 68 and running over to page 79, the country will observe that in every line in these pages are listed commodities and things produced in this country and put on the free list—a Republican free list. But the country will also observe that the things incorporated on the free list in these pages are not the things produced by the trust manufacturers in this country.

I will read from that tariff and free-list bill: On page 69 they put on the free list "apatite." Men can not afford to have good appetites now; things are too eternally high. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I notice on page 70 of the Republican free-list bill that they have "balm of Gilead." We are going to give the people by our free list the balm of new hope, of better life, by improvement of living conditions, better wages, and cheaper commodities. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I note on page 70, at the bottom, they put on the free list "blood, dried, not specially provided for in this section." We propose to give the people, and to place on the free list, the things required to rehabilitate and rejuvenate the ambition of men by taking the tariff off of the rich foods, that the toiling masses may have, free of tariff, meat, breadstuffs, vegetables, wearing apparel, and some of the good things of life that the Republican trusts have been living so long upon—the common people in the meantime almost starving for. You remember the story of Lazarus seeking the crumbs from the rich man's table. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We want none of your dried blood—we want new and honest blood turned into the heart of our body politic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I see, on page 71 of that magnanimous free-list bill, that they have "catgut," "worm gut," "not manufactured," of course. We do not care anything about the "catgut," or "worm gut," either. The poor people do not want them—they never have eaten them yet. We are going to put on the free list, for the benefit of the people, beef, mutton, pork, hominy, and beans, and thereby go you standpatters one better. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I notice, on page 72 of that magnanimous Republican free-list bill, the words "cotton," "cotton waste or flocks." We are going to go you one better and give the cotton farmers, and all other farmers, free of tariff, agricultural implements, and protect them from the ravages of the trusts by taking the tariff off the cotton bagging that the cotton farmers, and not the trusts, shall live thereby, be prosperous, and enabled to lay up a competency for the rainy days of life. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I notice, a little further down on the same page, that the Republicans put on the free list "cuttle-fish bone." It is a sight to look at these things. We propose to give them free, without the "cuttle," fish, take the tariff off of fish, that the people can have fresh fish to eat, and let the bones go toward fertilizing the soil. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Let the trusts have the cuttle-fish bone awhile, so that the shoe may get on the other foot just one time in life. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I see, a little farther down on the same page, free "dragon's blood dried"—no, "dragon's blood"; I do not want to misquote it, because it is bad enough. We give them, on our free list, a new life, full of hope and gratitude, by the fulfillment of Democratic campaign pledges, each one of which we have filled up to date, and are going clear down the line, in a conservative, sane, and business-like manner in the interest of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You standpatters had just as well get ready and take your medicine like good, game men. I notice, on page 73 of this charitably inclined free-list bill, they have "ergot" on the free list. We are opposed to abortion and in favor of "multiplying and replenishing the earth." No Roosevelt Republican could have voted to put "ergot" on the free list. [Loud laughter and applause on all sides.] I notice, a little farther down on the same page, that they give to the people free "fence posts of wood." We go them one better and give them free wire to complete the fences, as farms could not be protected without fence wires nailed onto the posts. And the reason the Republicans did not give them free wire was because they did not want to offend the Wire Trust. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Nor is that all. On page 73 you find the Republicans have given the people free of tariff "fossils." The Lord knows they have plenty of them to spare. They do not know what to do with them except to give them to the "dear people." Their very souls are on fire with love (?) for the "people," but it is too late—"almost persuaded now to believe." They can not longer cover or hide from the searchlight of truth. Since November last they have pricked their ears up like a fox in the woods which was only snapped at. The gun will go off in 1912, and the foxy standpatters will be swept off the Hill. The people will come into their own. It was once said "when ——— (certain people) fall out, honest men get their dues." Take your old "fossils," go home and crawl under the bed, and play with the cats. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, sir, on page 74, they take the tariff off of "hones and whetstones." They are not trust products yet. How about the razors? They are trust products and are protected by a tremendous tariff (see page 18, paragraph 152), so that the poor man who has to shave at least once a month or his wife will drive him to the woods, has to contribute to the trust money every time he shaves himself. [Applause.]

On the same page, 74, they graciously put on the free list free of tariff "leeches." God knows the trusts and special interests (leeches) have long since sapped the financial life blood out of the common people by way of tariffs on the necessaries of life until they can well afford to put "leeches" on the free list, and look at them around this Capitol, drawing salaries, on the pay rolls and doing so little, if any, service. They look like wood ticks that disturb my hounds in summer time until they get full of blood and drop by the wayside. Away with your free "leeches," the people have no use for them. [Loud applause.]

On the same page, 74, they have given the "dear people" free "loadstone;" neither is that a trust product. I am not surprised at this generosity; they have given the people the gold-brick racket so long they must devise another scheme or they are lost. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, the standpatters must have the miners' vote or they can not stem or navigate the stream, the current of which is becoming dangerously swift, and on page 75 they put on the free list "Miners' rescue appliances, designed for artificial breathing, necessary in presence of poisonous gases," used always successfully after the explosion when hundreds of poor women are made widows and children made orphans—all cast upon a cold and uncharitable world, homes broken up, loved ones gone forever, treachery to take the place of kindness, devotion, and love. Great God, have mercy upon us all! Guide us aright, that public servants may draw nearer and closer to those bereaved, deserving but neglected, useful toilers. [Loud and long applause.]

When a sane and reasonable fellow-servant bill or a proper employers' liability act is proposed to protect the employer and the employee alike, you standpatters have either killed it or made it possible for the courts to declare it unconstitutional. [Applause.] You deserve that which you will surely receive. Honest employers want their employees protected by a sane and reasonable law. Coal operators are often broken up financially and always rendered miserable by explosions. The phantom of funeral processions of their faithful men lingers with them day and night. The dead bodies of trust magnates lie in state at some public place for days and are viewed by thousands. The bodies of poor miners, often not recognizable as the result of terrific and deadly explosions, are laid away to rest forever in an unmarked tomb. No man would desire to cripple or impede the progress of coal operators or developers of the country, because he would be an enemy to public development and progress, and while protecting them, men of purpose and official integrity should lose no opportunity to protect, encourage, and render hope of a better life and better conditions to the men who delve beneath the hills and valleys of our country. [Long and loud applause.]

I see on page 77 of that bill they have put "sheep dip" on the free list. Neither is this a product of the trusts. The peo-

ple will not longer take chances on getting either the measles or the mumps by a continuation of present conditions, high cost of living, misery, want, and woe. They have proposed and are going to have a change. They want, instead of the "dip," fat mutton to put on their tables at a cost within reach of toiling men. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

On the same page we find on their free list "shrimps, shellfish and silkworm eggs." They are not products of the trusts—not cornered yet. What on earth can we do with them? How can the laboring man live upon them? [Applause.] The Democrats will pass the free-list bill, under discussion, and give men and their families, free of tariff, wholesome meats, breadstuffs, flour, corn meal, bacon, beans, and some dessert. They have to come. They are to be had, and we are pledged. We will make good and let a Republican Senate, as the standpatters are in charge there, take the responsibility of defeating the will of a long-suffering and now indignant people, and you will find that body losing prestige in the country and its membership in the stand-pat column. [Applause.]

We have passed the bill to elect Senators by direct vote. Let the Senate kill it if they want to, and the people will fasten the responsibility where it belongs. [Applause.]

I see the article 675 on their free-list bill is "skeletons and other preparations of anatomy," and article 680 of the same free list is "spunk." [Laughter.] The people want to bury their own dead and enjoy the right of burying them in a decent manner and not be taxed to death by their Government for doing so. We are opposed to the skeleton business. Let the dead past bury its dead. We are turning to the future. The dawn of a new era is upon us. The old-time Jeffersonian Democratic principle of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" is being rehabilitated, new recruits are falling into line, and the voice of the mighty is being heard upon the land as well as upon the high seas. History is repeating itself. There is a just God who still lives in Israel, and the curse of the American people is now being visited upon the trusts and special interests, which have grown so powerful that they own the stand-pat element of the Republican party—body, boots, and breeches; and I want to say here and now to this Congress and the American people that I believe it is the sense of this Congress that the patriotic element of the Republican Party of this country is found within the growing ranks of the insurgent or progressive element of that great party. [Prolonged applause.] And yet, if a toiling man feels imposed upon and undertakes to assert his God-given and constitutional rights, you standpatters have made it possible for a tyrannical employer to enjoin him and made it impossible for him to enjoy the benefits of that constitutional right which provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law and the judgment of his peers. Away with your free-spunk idea. You profess one thing and practice another. All men are presumed to be created free and upon an equality before the law. Yet you would encourage him to be spunky and have his spunk free, too, and at the same time put him in jail if he follows your advice.

Article 650 on this free list is "tar and pitch of wood," not produced by the trusts, but the people say they can not live upon tar and pitch of wood, but they are now going to burn tar all over the anatomy of the Aldrich and Cannon wing of the G. O. P. [Continued applause.]

The next article—696—on their free list is "tobacco stems"—after the leaf is stripped off and controlled by the powerful and wealthy Tobacco Trust, which fixes the price of tobacco so high that men are chewing yellow root of the woodland rather than enjoy a good chew of tobacco or smoke even a Wheeling stogie. The tariff is so high that people can not afford to enjoy such luxuries. They have lately offered poor men free of duty "tobacco stems." Oh, my, how generous in these old days, when men of all parties are after you. [Long applause.]

The next item I find, page 78, on their free list is "turpentine"—not a trust article. All I have to say is that the people commenced in November, 1910, and they will complete the job in 1912. [Great applause and continued laughter.]

One more word, as my time has nearly run. As to Canadian reciprocity, statistics show that during the past five years we sold in Canada nearly $500,000,000 worth more of agriculture and general products—principally agriculture—of the United States than Canada sold to us. This was made up of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, hogs, cattle, horses, sheep, mules, goats, farming implements, machinery, coal, coke, oil, clothing, and everything we produce. Canada has her tariff the same as we have. We have 92,000,000 people; Canada about 7,000,000, of whom nearly 1,800,000 emigrated from the United States, have made their homes there, and they want to enjoy reciprocal trade relations with us. We have everything to gain and comparatively nothing to lose. We have redeemed our pledge and complied with instructions. I am a farmer also, and that which will promote the interest of my farms will help my neighbor farmer. Where does the principal opposition come from—the Paper Trust? I would rather vote for the city and country newspapers and magazines that they might get rid of the tariff on paper and be enabled to give the people reading matter on reasonable terms than vote for any trust I have ever been oppressed by. [Loud and long applause.]

Your high tariff has lived out its usefulness in this country. The "baby" has grown and thrived off of the fat of the land until it has become incorrigible, oppressive, tyrannical, humiliating everywhere and abusive even to its mother, until the neighbors are all mad. The neighbors and even members of the same family have disagreed and are ready to fight, and you will see a battle royal fought in 1912. The people against the trust. The baby (now giant) will meet his first and final Waterloo at the hands of the Democratic host, aided by insurgent or progressive Republicans and patriotic men all over this land. Men are determined to and will have a fair deal. Babylon fell; the Roman Empire was humiliated; France had her bloody revolution; Napoleon, the greatest general of all, was exiled; Mexico her internal strife—all because of oppression. [Applause.] Ireland—God speed the day when she wins her independence. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Not the old but the new Aldrich, Payne, Cannon, Commercial Republican Party, now of trust and special interests, is falling at the hands of a suffering Christian people, regardless of servitude or previous conditions, and great will be the fall thereof. We are a reunited, aggressive (in the interest of all the people), irresistible, yet sane and courageous Democracy. We must sit steady in the boat. [Long and tumultuous applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The House will please come to order. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

[Mr. FARR addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, there seem to be Members. Members everywhere, but mighty few are here. Now, that is perhaps looked upon with different sentiments. The older Members undoubtedly would miss the crowd. We younger and more timid ones escape the crowd and congratulate ourselves.

The course of many Republican Members on this side of the House, in support of the Canadian pact, impliedly invites us to the utmost independence and freedom of action on this measure. From the other side has come emphatic oral invitations to support this bill as a companion bill to the reciprocity measure. Whether that companionship is regular and legitimate or is a mere illicit affinity will hereafter be determined. Of that pact the Chicago Republican platform of 1908 did not advise the public; neither did the Democratic platform at Denver warn the people.

With these considerations I have listened to the invitations from across the way. Several were delivered very courteously. One I remember was hurled at us like a projectile from a 400-pound Kentucky catapult. He was as fierce about it as was old Daniel Boone in battle with a "painter" and the "varmint" showing fight. The third was the gentleman from Alabama with a mingled invitation and warning in that peculiar and humorous fourteenth-amendment dialect. It sounded like the entertainment of a minstrel end man and left one in doubt as to whether it was to be heeded or simply heard, enjoyed, and ignored.

In deliberating on this invitation I have considered several matters. You are the party in power. If we had not read it in the papers, we would have heard it here. I listened to all the debates of this session, and 23 gentlemen solemnly referred in orotund voice to Democracy's being "intrusted with power." Whether you were intrusted with power or whether it was simply taken away from the Republicans, and being left around loose and you happening to be there, gobbled it, I do not know. You have frequently referred to your large majority and our depleted ranks. I presume the extraordinary modesty as to what you propose to do to us and to the country is owing to your careful consideration of the way that the people, of whom we have heard so much in your speeches, saw fit to vote. You undoubtedly have well considered that the total number of votes cast for the several Members of the majority amounted to

3,607,410, while the total number of votes cast for the several Members of the minority amounted to 3,425,033, a difference of only 182,377, as the affirmative expression of the people; that in this classification your vote amounted to 51⅛ per cent; ours, 48⅞ per cent; a little wider than the Canadian line; no wider, relatively, than the aisle which divides us.

If we eliminate those States congressionally undebatable—that is, those which change for neither rhyme nor reason—the total number of votes cast for the majority Members herein would be 3,079,737, and the total number of votes cast for the minority Members would be 3,344,317; your vote was 47½ per cent; ours 52½ per cent. In this classification I refer to certain States that can not be moved by rhyme and others that can not be swayed by reason.

At the election last fall the total votes cast for the Democratic candidates for Congress was 5,721,580, and that for the Republican candidates was 5,592,814, the Democratic plurality being only 128,766, or 1 per cent of the votes cast for the candidates of the two parties. While the total votes cast for the Democratic candidates for Congress was 5,721,580, the total opposition vote was 6,320,180, and of the whole vote cast for all candidates for Congress the Democrats lacked 598,600 of a majority. The Democratic candidates received only 47½ per cent of the total votes cast.

However, if you have anything on your bargain counter in the interest of my agricultural and live-stock district, I shall be pleased to invest, regardless of party lines, but I want to be reasonably sure that the investment will be an asset and not a liability. The new system of government by caucus has few points ahead of government by injunction. The latter always involves some evidence and a measure of deliberation. It does not, like the former, include only organization, discipline, and execution. For that reason I approach the matter cautiously, so as to know whether you want to divide something with us or want us to help you bear some burden.

Your bill for which you ask support is charged on this side, and practically admitted on the other, to be the means of redress for the wrong or damage of the Canadian pact. A sort of "hush money" for the injury committed. What are its claims? It will deprive the Treasury of $10,000,000 of revenue. That is scarcely a virtue. The real claim of every speaker on that side seems to be that it will save money for the farmers; hence it is called "the farmers' free-list bill." If it stands that test, in the interest of my district I shall vote for it.

The average farmer in my district pays out, on the average, for lumber, shoes, harness, fence wire, salt, and sewing machines two to four hundred dollars annually. He produces grain, which goes into flour, meal, and so forth, and live stock, which is converted into meats, in the sum of $1,000 to $2,000. The same law and logic by which you would cheapen these articles to the farmer when he purchases would cheapen the other articles when he went to sell, the taking off of the tariff being your only modifying cause.

It would effect the saving in fresh and preserved meats, flour, grit, cereals, and so forth, $151,848,718 says the New York World, quoting from the advocates of the law. My personal estimate would make it many millions more. That is based upon the supply now. As our raw products must be sold to corporate and private combines and independent concerns which will reduce them to the form above named, it does not take much of a philosopher in business to see who will lose that $151,848,718, and when we consider that the relatively larger portion of this loss must fall on the farmers and live-stock men of the Northwest, and when we recall that that amount is more than one-half of all the saving to all the people through the United States on all the articles named in this bill, the man who says it is not sectional, or that it is really in the interests of the farmer, is in a mighty close row of stumps. How much of that $151,848,718 loss would have to be borne by Boston, New York City, and that part of the country lying south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi? Why not be frank about it and say it is sectional, intended to be so? Say further, "This bill was not intended to be for the farmers, but the farmers are getting more than they are entitled to. In our combination we have the votes and we are going to make them divide." There seems to be a little reciprocity in this bill, but it is reciprocity like the fish giving its body to the barbed hook for the toothsome angleworm. There is more bondage than freedom in that farmers' free-list bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is some alliteration which seems to help the sound, but if alliteration is all you want prefix the word "fraudulent" to the name, viz, "Fraudulent farmers' free list," and you will have more alliteration and incidentally more truth. [Applause on the Republican side.] I must decline to vote for this bill in its entirety. I do not want to violate the pure-food law, which requires the label to correspond with the goods. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I received a letter the other day from a friend in which, among other things, he discussed the bill now under debate. He said it reminded him of a gun which a Yankee was trying to sell to an Irishman. He said, "Pat, this gun will shoot two kinds of shot and in two directions. These small shot will go out at the barrel, the slugs will go out at the breech." Says Pat, "The small shot will go out at the barrel—that is where the bird is, isn't it?" "Yes." "And the slugs will come out at the breech; that is, where I would be?" "Yes." "Well, that is bigger game than I am hunting for, so keep your gun. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The public is wondering what farmer in the caucus or what farmers' organization from outside recommended that the meat and cereal schedules of this bill be made a part of a favoring farmers' free list.

Now, if you want to do a little proselyting for your bill, strike out the meat and cereal schedules, which include the products of nearly 90 per cent of the northwestern farmers' annually produced wealth; make it in deed what you have named it and you will obtain some assistance from this side. As it stands now the farmers' free list is a misnomer. "What's in a name?" To paraphrase the inspired William, "Dog fennel by any other name would smell just as loud." [Applause on the Republican side.]

You can remedy this, and strictly within the rules of the game. I appeal to Cæsar for the benefits of the imperial procedure announced at the Baltimore winter meeting. That was an event not wholly forgotten nor, perhaps, forgiven. I note they cut down the Democratic majority in Baltimore the other day several thousand on account of it. It was given out by the press that tariff changes contemplated would be schedule by schedule. When so tried, no schedule would be played against another, and logrolling would be eliminated. I have not heard it alleged that the press was misinformed. In any event, I have asked by bills, and now in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee, for the articles favorable to the farmers to be placed on the free list, and shall ask the benefit of the schedule-by-schedule treatment of our grains and live-stock products. We do not want to be tried with those shoe fellows, and I thought the party which said "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" would not deny the farmers and stockmen what you propose giving to the wool, cotton, and steel people. You can eliminate by amendment these two schedules from the bill and redeem your Baltimore promise. You can not refuse to do so without violating that pledge. You can do this also without embarrassment, as the defenders of other schedules have not to my knowledge asked the separation.

I am reminded that the cereals are controlled by the trusts. That certainly can not be correct, because when everything else was being thrown wide open in which the farmer was interested, the majority would not have closed the door to that little sweetening which might have come in in the various crackers, breads, and so forth, involved in the following quotation from this bill: "Biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened." That would have been an excellent opportunity to have swatted the Sugar Trust.

But that "linked sweetness, long drawn out," from a bakery on a free-trade shore through our ports to the American farmer's palate was all too sweet a boon to be given him whose prosperity is being assailed at every turn of this congressional road. [Applause on the Republican side.] That exception is a companion piece to the exception of ebony from the lumber free list. That was explained by a facetious Democrat from our southern border, where the American ebony trees grow, "That exception is made to show that we protect whatever is black." [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] For a similar reason rosewood and mahogany were excepted, so that the speeches prepared with the time-honored cradle, altar, coffin, antiprotection perorations might not have to be changed.

I wish to speak especially of the meat schedule, because that, in point of value and volume, affects my State more than anything else, excepting, of course, grain and its products. It is the policy of our people, in order to save and conserve the soil, rich and fertile, which has been wrested from an apparent desert, to encourage live-stock and dairy products instead of drain and waste of grain raising. Meat constitutes the largest product of the animal. In the bovine species hides constitute

the second. The reduction in value of any large part will reduce the value of the entirety. I assume this to be true, for a number of reasons. First, the Committee on Ways and Means so considered it, or the tariff would not be taken off meats in this bill.

Again, the last 18 months have demonstrated that the taking of the duty off hides not only reduced the value of the hides, but relatively reduced the value of the steer. You will recall that the Payne tariff bill removed the duty from cattle hides. Several gentlemen on this floor referred to the advance in value of hides after the removal of the duty. That statement is not economically correct. Following the passage of that bill there was a magnificent advance in everything that the farmer and cattle raiser produced, and that advance was fairly well maintained until some six months ago, when it became apparent that the country's tariff policy was to be changed, or at least unsettled.

It might be said in passing that for the first year after the passage of the Payne bill the farmers and live-stock raisers of this country enjoyed unprecedented prosperity. The bill itself, of course, was not *above* criticism; but it is unlike the old Wilson bill, which was *beneath* criticism, subject only to condemnation. See President Cleveland's reason for not signing. I would not work up your feelings against the dead.

In the advance of meats following the passage of the Payne Act, anyone familiar with the course of prices knows that beef advanced less and more slowly than poultry, mutton, or pork. In these last three there had been no material assault on any of their factors. Further, the price of cattle made a strong, substantial, and continuous general advance, while the price of hides advanced slightly for a brief period and then subsided and declined. After six months on the free list hides had dropped $2 per hundred and have never since been within $2 of the price commanded August 4, 1909. A comparison of price of hides week by week and quarter by quarter, with the average price of steers at Omaha market on cattle, of which I am a patron, shows that during the period of advance of cattle and hides the average per cent of advance on cattle was about 14 per cent more than the advance of hides, and when prices began to decline the decline of price of hides was an average of about 14 per cent greater than the decline of cattle, showing the market price of each article on or about August 4, 1909, as a basis for percentage and that date as the focal date. These figures, together with my observation from time to time, being interested in those markets, convinces me that the removal of the duty from hides reduced the value of that particular product and also reduced the value proportionately of cattle. Why was it reduced? I note the importation of hides for a year preceding the removal of the tariff to be $20,344,974.68; for the year after, $49,803,231.82. The Government lost on revenue $3,034,735.62, and every cattle owner lost in value of his property or the prices obtained in the market about 14 per cent of the hide value, amounting to from 50 cents to $2 per head. Not being aware that this loss entirely went to American workmen, and being convinced that it did not go to the shoe wearers, I would be willing to put the shoe manufacturer of the East on the same basis as the manufacturer of hides in the West.

Prices of hides and steers August 4, 1909, and every three months following, and the increased or decreased price as related to August 4, 1909; the per cent of increase or decrease each three months to the original price; and the total per cent of increase or decrease for the six periods of three months each following August 4, 1909:

Date.	Hide price.	Over Aug. 4.	Under Aug. 4.	Per cent over.	Per cent under.	Steer price.	Over Aug. 4.	Under Aug. 4.	Per cent over.	Per cent under.
1909.										
Aug. 4	$17.50					$6.85				
Nov. 10	18.00	$0.50		0.028		7.60	$0.75		0.109	
1910.										
Feb. 9	15.00		$1.90		0.106	$6.40		$0.45		0.063
May 12	15.85		1.65		.094	7.70	.65		.094	
Aug. 11	15.00		2.50		.142	7.30	.45		.065	
Nov. 10	15.25		2.25		.128	6.85	(1)	(1)		
1911.										
Feb. 2	12.75		4.75		.272	6.05		.80		.131

[1] Steer price the same on Aug. 4, 1909, and Nov. 10, 1910. Hide price as given by Shoe and Leather Reporter, Chicago price. Steer price as given by Omaha Daily Bee.

Price of hides and steers on January 6, 1910, and on the same day of each week following, together with the price on the same day of the week for the year 1909. Thursday's prices quoted:

Date.	Hides.		Steers.	
	1910	1909	1910	1909
Jan. 6	$17.75	$15.85	$6.90	$6.85
Jan. 13	17.75	15.85	6.65	6.60
Jan. 20	17.25	15.85	6.65	6.60
Jan. 27	17.25	14.15	5.65	6.05
Feb. 3	17.00	15.75	6.30	5.90
Feb. 10	16.50	15.85	6.40	5.95
Feb. 17	15.65	15.85	6.60	5.75
Feb. 24	15.50	15.85	7.05	5.75
Mar. 3	15.15	15.00	7.10	6.05
Mar. 10	14.25	14.50	7.25	6.50
Mar. 17	13.85	14.25	7.55	6.15
Mar. 24	14.25	14.25	7.80	6.35
Mar. 31	14.65	14.25	7.70	6.45
Apr. 7	14.85	14.25	7.80	6.45
Apr. 14	15.00	14.50	7.65	6.35
Apr. 21	15.00	14.35	7.75	6.15
Apr. 28	15.00	15.75	7.60	6.25
May 5	14.75	15.75	7.45	6.35
May 12	15.65	14.35	7.70	6.70
May 19	15.75	16.25	7.70	6.70
May 26	16.00	16.25	7.70	6.75
June 2	15.00	16.75	7.70	6.75
June 9	15.75	16.75	7.70	6.75
June 16	15.75	16.35	7.85	6.55
June 23	15.15	16.35	7.60	6.50
June 30	14.85	16.85	7.60	6.60
July 7	14.35	16.75	7.80	6.65
July 14	14.35	16.75	7.65	7.85
July 21	14.25	17.50	7.35	6.75
July 28	14.00	17.50	7.35	6.80
Aug. 4	14.50	17.50	5.70	6.85
Aug. 11	15.00	17.00	7.30	6.29
Aug. 18	15.50	16.50	7.35	7.20
Aug. 25	14.35	16.65	7.65	7.25
Sept. 1	15.50	16.85	6.35	7.25
Sept. 8	15.50	16.85	6.40	7.35
Sept. 15	15.50	16.85	6.40	7.35
Sept. 22	15.50	17.00	6.25	7.60
Sept. 29	15.75	18.00	6.25	7.60
Oct. 6	16.00	18.00	6.25	7.60
Oct. 13	16.00	18.00	6.00	7.60
Oct. 20	15.75	18.00	6.00	7.60
Oct. 27	15.75	18.00	6.00	7.50
Nov. 3	15.50	18.00	6.85	7.50
Nov. 10	15.25	18.00	6.85	7.60
Nov. 17	15.00	17.63	5.90	7.75
Nov. 23	14.85	17.85	5.90	7.65
Dec. 1	14.75	17.85	6.35	7.60
Dec. 8	14.50	17.75	6.45	7.60
Dec. 15	14.50	17.75	6.45	7.60
Dec. 22	14.00	17.65	6.35	6.90
Dec. 29	14.00	17.00	6.35	6.90
	1911.		1911.	
Jan. 5	13.25	15.85	6.25	6.85
Jan. 12	13.25	15.85	6.20	6.60
Jan. 19	13.25	15.85	6.35	6.00
Jan. 26	13.00	14.15	6.35	6.05
Feb. 2	12.75	15.75	6.05	6.20
Feb. 9	13.00	15.85	6.20	5.15
Feb. 16	13.00	15.85	6.20	5.75
Feb. 23	13.00	15.85	6.15	5.75
Mar. 2	13.00	15.00	6.05	6.05
Mar. 9	12.75	14.50	6.15	6.50
Mar. 16	12.75	14.25	6.15	6.15
Mar. 23	12.75	14.25	6.10	6.35
Mar. 30	12.75	14.25	6.12	6.45
Apr. 6	12.75	14.25	6.20	6.45
Apr. 13	12.75	14.50	6.20	6.35
Apr. 20	13.00	14.35	6.15	6.15
Apr. 27	13.15	15.75	5.85	6.25

Average price of hides for first 17 weeks of 1909, $15.06 per hundred pounds.

Average price of hides for first 17 weeks of 1911, $12.95 per hundred pounds.

Average decrease of hides for first 17 weeks of 1911 under 1909 is $2.11.

Average price of steers for first 17 weeks of 1909, $6.23 per hundred pounds.

Average price of steers for first 17 weeks of 1911, $6.16 per hundred pounds.

Average decrease of steers for first 17 weeks of 1911 under 1909 is $0.07.

Average decrease of hides for first 17 weeks of 1911 under 1909 is 14 per cent.

Average decrease of steers for first 17 weeks of 1911 under 1909 is 1 per cent.

Price of hides: "Heavy native steers," as given by Shoe and Leather Reporter.

Price of steers: "Good to choice beef steers," as given in Omaha Bee for South Omaha.

But I have not discussed this hide proposition merely to rebuke the shoe manufacturers. I think it demonstrates this further important fact to the cattle owners and raisers that the duty removed from not only beef but pork and mutton and other forms of meat will largely reduce the value of their holdings and the selling price of cattle, hogs, and sheep. The charge

is made now against the meats, just as was made under the Payne bill against the hides, that they are controlled by the trusts. No one would go further than I in punishing a trust or in curbing its power. But when I taught school I was not one of those sentimental pedagogues who, in administering a punishment, assured the subject that it was hurting me more than it was him. [Laughter on the Republican side.] In cases of that kind the young culprit always escaped, and I do not believe in the system now that in order to punish a trust we must wound or slay ourselves. During the year following the removal of the duty from hides, from the plains of Argentina, Mexico, and Canada came vast shipments through our free ports of those foreign hides, and the American producer, with his valuable lands and in his inclement climate, where shelter must be provided and expensive labor paid for the care of his cattle, was compelled to compete for the American market to the home producers' financial loss. In Argentina, with its mild climate and the broad pampas clothed with luxuriant grass; on the vast open areas of Australia and New Zealand; and on the hillsides and valleys of Mexico, where lands are cheap, where shelter is inexpensive, where labor is poorly paid, graze countless millions of cattle and sheep, with the means already established for their slaughter. They are to be loaded and shipped to the most inviting port. Where will they find it? The greatest meat eaters of the world are in the United States. They are the people most able to purchase. More than that, their customhouses will not have to be settled with, while in nearly every other port a duty must be paid. Is there any question in anyone's mind as to who is going to suffer? Nay, more; if the Americans desire to compete in the world's market with their meat products, they may seek France and meet a duty there of an average of about 4½ cents per pound; in Germany they are held up for about 4 cents per pound. Should they seek our friend Canada on the north, they are met with the demand under our reciprocal arrangement for 1½ cents per pound. Even if they start across the Mexican border in an attempt to feed the various individuals engaged on either side of the riot going on down there, in order to enter their ports they must pay a duty of about 2½ cents per pound.

Whom do you think you are getting by doing this—the trusts you so abhor or the American farmer and cattle raiser? What grudge has the majority caucus against the farmer? Under the Payne bill they got our hides, under reciprocity you get our bullocks, and under this proposed law you will get our carcasses. Nothing left of profit to us, not even the tails; they went with the hides. And next you propose to get into our wool.

The inordinate desire to get these trusts at whatever expense reminds me of a story told by Joe Price, a neighbor, long since gone to his reward. Joe was a good-natured, prosperous individual. He had a happy home, and in the course of years was developing a Rooseveltian family. There came a time when, on consultation, it was concluded they might need the services of a maid, and Joe was commissioned to interview a possible candidate. Joe described the home, the work that was to be expected, wages to be paid, and her various privileges. She then began to cross-examine him, and the first question was, "How many children are there?" Joe answered, "Six, with prospects." [Laughter.] She said, "I will not work there while there are so many children." Joe retreated, telling her he would go and see what he could do. He came home and his wife asked him if he succeeded in employing the maid. He said, "Yes; on condition." "What is the condition?" Joe said, "That we kill off the children, and I didn't want to do that without consulting you." [Laughter.] I would like to assist you in getting these trusts. We ought to get them, but if by getting them we have to kill off or injure the two biggest industries of my State, I would like to consult with the people first. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Who are we legislating for? Is it for America and America's industries or is it for the foreigner and his investments? To make this matter a little more concrete, the American farmer and cattle raiser has forced from a reluctant soil and adverse conditions a development and prosperity that is satisfying to him and in which the country should take a national pride. He is a large buyer of the articles which pay tribute at our customhouse and liberally supports this Government. More than this, it has been many times asserted on the other side of the House that we will soon have an income tax, and when that comes, his property and income, open to inspection of the world, will bear more than their relative burdens to support this Government. Under this bill our Mexican friend from the south will have access to our markets free, contribute nothing to the support of our Government, and when the American farmer would cross the border to sell a surplus, whether Diaz, Madero, or some other unpronounceable rules, he is compelled to "stand and deliver" at the customhouse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have two or three minutes more.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Do you desire to oppress the farmer; and, in doing so, do you place such a small estimate upon his intelligence as to think he can not see through the fallacies of this bill? It seems to me you are expressing more interest and favor to the Mexican greaser than you are to the American granger. As your bill stands now, you should not have the support of any farmer or cattle raiser, or anyone interested directly or indirectly in those lines. You will have to make a better bill and a different one before it will be a true farmers' free list. You have offered to us what you call the bread of life. Upon inspection we find it to be a poisoned sandwich. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] is recognized.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I have received two or three letters from Mr. C. W. Dickinson, a representative of the La Crosse Plow Co., of La Crosse, Wis. These letters deal particularly with the agricultural-implement problem and the production of implements abroad, especially in Canada. I do not fully agree with the sentiments therein expressed with reference to Canadian reciprocity, but the letters contain valuable information with regard to the foreign market for agricultural implements and the cost of their production. I therefore ask unanimous consent to print them in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. That leave has already been given.

Following are the letters referred to:

LA CROSSE PLOW CO. (INC.),
La Crosse, Wis., April 17, 1911.

Hon. JOHN J. ESCH, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We understand that it will be the plan of the House at the present session of Congress to endeavor to put agricultural machinery upon the free list, largely to meet the views of the farmers and in partial compensation for what they think they will suffer because of the adoption of the reciprocity agreement with Canada. I trust you will not consider it out of place for me to give expression of opinion concerning that policy.

My own belief, after some study of the proposition, is that the farmers of the United States, for the same class and quality of agricultural machinery, are buying their agricultural implements cheaper than the farmers of any other section of the world, either of United States or domestic manufacture. I am well aware of the fact that there is a widespread impression that the contrary is the case. Yet I know that one of the largest manufacturers of agricultural machinery in the world for years took the position that they would not attempt to ship into the United States or to enter the United States for manufacturing purposes for the United States market, for the reason that the profits on agricultural machinery in the States was less than it is where they do manufacture, and that where they do manufacture the profits were less than they were in other portions of the world. That manufacturer is making practically the same class of machinery as is most generally in use in the United States, and it would stand to reason that if such be the case the American farmer is buying his machinery as cheap as he can, tariff or no tariff.

Now, we wish to be understood as not objecting in the slightest degree to taking off every penny of duty on machinery imported into the United States, providing the duty on all raw material entering into the manufacture of agricultural machinery is also removed and the manufacturers of the United States are given equal privileges in other countries largely manufacturing agricultural machinery. We believe, if the proposed measure be adopted, that the farmers of the United States will be very much disappointed at the result. But that feature of the case we will not discuss at this point.

What we contend at this point is that it would be the grossest kind of injustice for the United States to open its doors to a market comprising the farmer portion of 92,000,000 of people without any protective duties whatever and allow our competitors on the outside to keep up their tariff wall and keep the United States out of their own markets. More pointedly than any other country, I am referring to the Canadian market. There are several institutions in Canada manufacturing substantially the same class and grade of agricultural machinery as is manufactured and in general use in the United States who would become immediate competitors of the American manufacturers if they desired to accept what they themselves claim to be the narrow margins obtainable in the United States market. The Canadian market comprises the farming element of some six, or possibly seven, million people, but also a vast territory in the Canadian Northwest that is rapidly filling up, and to a considerable extent, with wide-awake, progressive American farmers; and to the extent that this market exists and grows it is desirable to the manufacturers of the United States as well as to the manufacturers of Canada. The Canadian farmers in the Northwest take more kindly to the very latest and most highly improved agricultural machinery more freely than do the farmers of any other portion of the world. It is a well-known fact that Canadian manufacturers have procured in the United States the most approved type of United States made machinery, taken them to their shops and duplicated them almost line for line and casting for casting, and marketed them to the Canadian farmers. The Canadian manufacturers are, in the main, the only manufacturers in the world of a class of agricultural machinery that would be satisfactory to the mass of the American farmers, and would therefore probably be about the only ones that would be competitors with the United States manufacturer. Of course,

we do not know what competition might arise if all tariffs were removed and the French and German and English manufacturers were free to copy American models, and, with their cheap labor, manufacture for the American market; but as the condition is at present the Canadian manufacturers are the only ones making a line of machinery that would be satisfactory to the American farmer. Now, we submit, would it be justice to the United States manufacturer to open up his vast United States market to these Canadian manufacturers by throwing down the tariff cost of entering into the United States and permit the Canadian manufacturer to retain the protection of the 15 per cent duty against the import of the United States agricultural machinery into his market, comparatively limited as it is? That is, at the best, if the tariff wall were entirely eradicated in both directions the United States manufacturers would be gaining a market among approximately only 6,000,000, while the Canadian manufacturers would be gaining a market found among 92,000,000 people. Surely, it seems to the writer, that the American farmer could not ask that such a gross injustice should be imposed upon the United States manufacturer for the possible and hazy benefits he thinks he might secure by putting the agricultural implements upon the free list.

The writer supposes that the most ardent believer in free trade will concede that it is a distinct advantage to any community to have spent within its borders the money that may be put out in wages for manufacturing purposes, and that, even though the most pronounced free-trade principle should prevail in the United States, adherents of such a principle still would desire to see manufacturing in the United States highly prospering.

We call attention to the fact that in the past few years, and we presume largely on account of the 15 per cent differential that the British colonies give to each other, some of the largest manufacturers of the United States have built vast manufacturing plants in Canada for the purpose of supplying the Canadian market, and incidentally, perhaps, other British colonies favored by the 15 per cent differential, and pay out large sums of money in wages that are being spent within the Canadian lines, and thus building up the Dominion of Canada, all of which is, in the main, directly at the expense of the interests of the United States. That is, had a reciprocity agreement been made with Canada years ago at the time Canada itself was a beggar for the reciprocal agreement the efflux of United States manufacturers and wages into Canada would never have taken place. Several large manufacturers of agricultural machinery were among the number flitting to Canada. Now, if such loss of United States manufacturing, and of wages paid in the United States, has accrued to the benefit of Canada under the tariffs as they had been during the past few years, it is wise to ask the question, What will occur if the United States puts agricultural machinery absolutely on the free list while Canada retains its tariff wall against the manufacturers of the United States? Unquestionably, except so far as freights might modify the proposition, it would be to the interest of every manufacturer in the United States to move over to Canada and get the benefit of what Canadian market he can without duty, to get the benefits of the trade with the British colonies allowing the 15 per cent differential, and he can retain his United States trade just the same as he had it before, inasmuch as he would have no duty to pay for shipping his Canadian-made goods to his United States customers. The writer knows of two quite large concerns that have been very seriously considering in the recent past the project of entering Canada for manufacturing purposes, and he knows that one of the concerns has been approached by at least two different localities in Canada with the offer of large inducements to establish manufacturing plants within the Dominion.

If the present conditions had been sufficient to cause careful consideration of such a proposition, we think you can see that the condition as it would exist by throwing down the United States tariff wall and leaving the Canadian tariff wall standing, would be to cause such concerns to clinch the proposition and move out of the United States; and with them would go large investments of capital in the United States and large payments of wages to employees, which are now distributed in the United States.

The newspapers reported within the past few days the reorganization of one of the large United States manufacturers, and the statement that a Canadian factory has been included in the deal and that there will be an immense enlargement of the Canadian factory for the purpose of manufacturing for the Canadian market.

We wish to assert again that, while we do not object on general principles to putting agricultural implements on the free list, we do most strenuously object to the principle of opening up the United States market for the benefit of our Canadian neighbors and permitting them to retain their tariff against the United States manufacturers. We believe that it would be one of the greatest economic mistakes into which the United States has ever blundered.

While it is not exactly germane to the subject, it might not be amiss to take some notice of what is alleged to be a widespread belief that there is an Agricultural Implement Trust, inasmuch as some people have acted and there has been legislation proposed in the belief that such a thing exists. As a matter of fact, there is no more a trust in the manufacture of agricultural machinery than there is in the breathing of air; and no investigation that was ever made has ever been able to unearth even the remotest appearance of such a trust. There is neither trust, combination, or other device for controlling the manufacture or the price of agricultural machinery. This concern has absolutely no interest in or with the International Harvester Co. beyond being direct competitors with them in the manufacture of several lines of agricultural machinery. But the International Harvester Co. is only one of several manufacturers of harvesting machinery that is in direct competition with them in harvesting goods. Possibly they control by manufacture the market for a very large percentage of harvesting machinery, but outside of harvesting machinery they neither manufacture nor control more than a very small portion of the other agricultural machinery used by farmers. Deere & Co., of Moline, are probably one of the two largest manufacturers of plows, including cultivators, harrows, and some other lines of farm machinery, in the United States, and have recently reorganized their subsidiary concerns, consisting of their own branch houses and their own separate factory heretofore existing under separate forms of organization, and I understand have also bought outright one of the largest manufacturers of hay tools in the United States, but which Deere & Co. were not heretofore manufacturing. But it is shrewdly surmised on the part of other manufacturers and very large competitors of Deere & Co. that the underlying motive for this consolidation is that they may be in better shape to enter the list as a direct and powerful competitor of the International Harvester Co. in its strongest line, namely, harvesting machinery.

But there are many large and powerful manufacturers who are the direct competitors of both the International Harvester Co. and of Deere & Co. outside of the harvesting line, without a single community of interest except those general interests which pertain to all people engaged in the same line of business. They are all direct, active, and progressive competitors of each other and of Deere & Co. and the International Harvester Co., except as to harvesting machinery which they do not manufacture and in the sale of which, as a rule, they have absolutely no interest.

To one who understands the actual conditions the idea of there being anything that in the remotest degree approaches a trust or a combination or a monopoly in agricultural machinery is absurd. We suppose the International Harvester Co. is abundantly able to take care of themselves—at least they seem to be able to do so without any help from us—but whatever may be the character of their organization, beneficial or otherwise to the consumers of the United States, the fact remains that they are an entity by themselves and should be judged upon the merits of their own institution, just as we claim we are entitled to be judged by the merits of our own institution, and the attempt should not be made to couple them with the other and independent manufacturers of agricultural machinery in the United States.

I thank you cordially for such attention as you may be able to give my presentation of free listing agricultural implements for the benefit of the farmers of the United States, and if there is any question that you desire to ask of me that I am able to answer I shall be very glad to give it to you freely.

I might say further that this company does not have one dollar of trade with Canada.

Yours, truly,

C. W. DICKINSON.

LA CROSSE PLOW CO. (INC.),
La Crosse, Wis., April 27, 1911.

Hon. JOHN J. ESCH, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I have your esteemed favor of the 24th instant in re H. R. 4412.

Yes; I heartily indorse the reciprocity bill as it was submitted by the President, believing—

First. That every phase of the subject had been very carefully thought out by very competent people on behalf of the United States and in the belief, at least of the gentlemen who negotiated the agreement, every interest had been carefully protected.

Second. That I have not been able yet to be convinced that the interests of the farmers will be prejudiced by the adoption of the agreement as submitted.

Third. That the time to secure a reciprocity agreement is when both parties can be brought together. I have heretofore laid before you the information I got in two or three trips through the manufacturing end of Canada, in which I found a very hostile and growing sentiment against any reciprocity agreement with the United States unless the United States pay very heavily for the privilege as compared with what they would have had to pay at the time Canada was a suppliant for an agreement and was refused on the part of the United States. It is my belief, if the agreement is not cinched at this time, that at any future time an agreement may be sought the development of Canada will put her in position to demand very much more from the United States than it is demanding in this agreement. Canada has not, in this agreement, yielded very much to the manufacturers of the United States, and undoubtedly, under the existing regulations, the already rapid development of the manufacturing interests of Canada will go on apace. This is evidenced by the fact that, notwithstanding the pending treaty, one of the largest plow manufacturers in the United States, if not the largest, has consummated arrangements whereby a Canadian plant that comes to them in the deal is to be very greatly enlarged for the manufacturing of their goods in Canada.

I think you have possibly misunderstood my letter as seeking to retain protection for the American manufacturer of agricultural machinery. I was born in the hotbed of protection, have always believed, and do yet, in the theory of protection. But I have always felt that whenever any industry in the United States is able to get out and compete in the markets of the world for trade, while still paying United States wages, the time has passed when that industry needs protection. I believe, in the main, that the United States manufacturer of agricultural machinery is competing in the markets of the world, but not so much in quantity or in price as in quality. At any rate, the La Crosse Plow Co. is perfectly willing to take its chances in holding its business in the United States whether the duty on farm machinery be retained or abolished. We were satisfied, however, with the treaty, although we could not hold it to be a perfect product. We very rarely get such things in negotiations. There has to be give and take.

But the "free list" is an entirely different proposition, even as regards agricultural implements. In opposing the free list so far as pertains to farm machinery we are not doing it because we object per se to farm machinery being placed on the free list, but that it would be closing the door to ever getting Canada to put farm machinery on its free list. Here is the opportunity for a trade, and for Congress to omit this opportunity is what I would call a most serious economic blunder. And I believe you see the full force of my reasoning in that respect; that you see that if farm machinery is placed on the free list and Canada maintains its duty of 15 per cent, as fixed in the reciprocity agreement, it would be to the advantage of every United States manufacturer to pull up his plant and put it in Canada, because he would have all of the advantages of the protective duty of 15 per cent in Canada and would be able to ship his product as freely into the United States as when his factory is located in the United States. If United States manufacturers have found it advantageous to erect in Canada expensive plants and invest large amounts of money in transacting Canadian business, and possibly business with the British colonies, and with the attendant advantages of the expenditure of large sums of money in wages, how much more emphatic will be the inducement for them to follow that plan when Canada retains a 15 per cent duty and the United States takes the duty all off.

But, in my judgment, the farmers of the United States will not get $1 of advantage in putting farm machinery on the free list. They certainly will not so far as getting Canadian-made machinery is concerned. In my judgment, it will cost the United States manufacturer in Canada as much to produce his goods as it does now in the United States. Labor may be cheap, but it is nowhere near as effective. The Canadian manufacturer in the main buys his materials from the United States rolling mills and has to pay the duty. His freights are about the same as the United States manufacturer has to pay. To be sure, they allow the British rolling mills the preferential duty of 15 per cent, but neither the British nor German or other European rolling mills put

out a product that is nearly as available for agricutural machinery as do the rolling mills of the United States. We have never bought any foreign iron and steel, but I know a very large concern manufacturing cars that did try it on and found there was such an inaccuracy in the rolling as to make the stock practically unsuitable for their purpose.

I state again what I have said before, that one of the largest manufacturers of agricultural machinery in the world, and making probably as large a line of variety of machinery as does the International Harvester Co., refused to enter the United States for manufacturing purposes for the reason that the prices in the United States were unattractive to it as compared with the prices that we are getting in their own country and in other foreign countries. That is evidence enough that the prices are already as low in the United States as the United States farmer can hope to secure. But, in addition to that, of course, we have to know very well what the limits of profits are in our own business.

But in addition to this line of reasoning is this, that it is of no possible interest to the United States farmer whether or not the United States manufacturer gets into the Canadian market free of duty—whether or not the United States farmer has to compete against the Canadian grain raiser, that feature of the case is of no possible financial interest to him. If the United States tariff on Canadian-raised grain is entirely taken away he has to compete, if there is competition, no matter at what price, the Canadian farmer buys his machinery. That competition will be the same whether the Canadian farmer gets his United States-made goods with or without a duty. It will neither enhance nor lower the price of his grain, that there is or is not a Canadian duty on United States-made machinery. Neither is it a financial interest to the United States farmer that the Canadian farmer gets his United States-made farm machinery with or without a duty, even if the United States farmer is protected by duty on grain, meats, and other products.

The whole problem, therefore, as to machinery on the free list is one involving the interests of the United States manufacturer to get into the Canadian market on the same terms that the Canadian manufacturer gets into the United States. And I can not see that it has anything to do at all with the fate of the reciprocity agreement. I do not feel competent to discuss the merits of the other articles on the free list. I am not sufficiently acquainted with their markets in this country and abroad. I do feel that I know a little something about farm machinery.

I do not know that it is necessary to discuss the reports that seem to be circulating so freely in the congressional halls in regard to the selling of United States-made machinery in foreign markets at much less prices than the same machines sell, in the United States. I recollect that some years ago there was a report made to Congress that United States-made harvesting machinery was selling for a very large percentage less in some foreign countries than it sells in the United States. Later information came to me that in instituting this comparison of prices a harvester with a grain-binder attachment was the basis of prices in the United States and an old-fashioned reaper with no binder attachment, and that can scarcely be sold in any section of the United States at any figure, in use in foreign countries, was the standard for the foreign price. I do know this, and everyone may know it who takes the trouble to post himself, that there are large sections of foreign countries which prefer to use a harvesting machine of the reaper type rather than to pay the price for an up-to-date fully equipped binder machine.

A statement was made, either in a report or in a speech in the House about a week ago, that wagons that sell in the United States for $135 and $150 (I am not positive which of the figures was named, but the United States price was very, very much higher) sell in foreign countries for $100. The inference was that the statement referred to ordinary farm wagons. I know something about wagons. We and our branch houses and agencies sell the entire output of the Smith Manufacturing Co.

For a long period, when I was sales manager, it was my business to fix the dealers' prices on wagons. Our Mr. Levis, now sales manager, was for a long time sales manager for a wagon company, selling goods all over the United States and in Canada. We neither of us know of any place in the United States where an ordinary farm wagon retails for as much as $100, the price, it was claimed, the wagons sell for in the foreign countries, and for which from 25 to 50 per cent greater price was asked in the United States. It is among the possibilities that in the extreme West, where the freights are very high and where the dealer has a cinch on the trade, the retail price of an ordinary farm wagon, say, 3-inch skein, with a 2-inch tire, ⅝ inch thick, would retail for $100, possibly some more, but we do not know of any such place.

Mr. Levis traveled over Canada, selling wagons to the jobbing trade, and was thoroughly familiar with the Canadian prices. He states to me that his price to the Canadian dealer was invariably the same price at the factory as the United States dealer pays, and it costs the Canadian dealer the freight and the duty. And he further states—what in a general way I know to be true—that the price of the Canadian manufacturer is the United States price plus the freight and the duty.

The Mexican market could secure its wagons by car shipment, and the price there would be dependent upon the factory price plus the freight and whatever duty there may be. But in the rest of the world the foreign market must pay not only the factory cost and profit and the freight, but also for the complete boxing of the wagon, to bring it within the requirements of ocean shipments, and the freight on that boxing. How utterly unreasonable, then, was the assumption that a wagon of given dimensions could be sold anywhere in the world at a less price than it can be or is sold in the United States. You are an ex-farmer, and you know that when you bought wagons you took into consideration differences in size of skeins, width of tire, the way the wagon was ironed up, etc. While I was handling the sales department I had difficulty with my travelers reporting competitive prices in the trade, in that they were very, very apt to leave out the specifications of construction of the wagons and make their comparison on the naked basis of prices alone. And many and many a time I have shown the traveler that his dealer, in order to beat down his price, was comparing the price of a 3-inch skein, 3 by ⅝ inch tire wagon, with our wagon, with 3¼-inch skein, 3 by ¼ inch tire, and other dimensions larger, heavier, and more costly in proportion. Any reports of prices on wagons in foreign countries and the United States, you can see, would have to be weighed with a great deal of caution for the same reason.

You probably know that there is a wagon put up for the large farmers of the West and Northwest, made very, very heavy, to haul very heavy loads, provided with a grain tank, built of planks with extended sides over the wheels, like some of our coal wagons, requiring very heavy ironing, all to adapt it to hauling in one wagon what would require two or more ordinary farm wagons to carry. It would be a very easy thing for some one who is not up on wagons to find that such a wagon sells, as it might reasonably do, freights considered, in some parts of the West, at $125 or $135, and in his ignornance compare that price with the price in some other quarter of the world on an ordinary farm wagon. You can see, therefore, the necessity of scrutinizing any report of that kind with the utmost vigilance.

Reverting to the reciprocity agreement itself, of course we understand, and you do, too, that any modification on the part of the United States means the killing of the agreement. It would have to go through another process of negotiation in order to embody in it any attempted reformation of the document. I do not wish to be understood that there are not manufacturers of farm machinery who would object to putting machinery on the free list per se. Of course it would follow as a matter of course that if we find ourselves unable to compete with foreign manufacturers we must immediately make the endeavor to put ourselves in position to do so. At the present time the Canadian manufacturer is the only one, we believe, in the world who makes a grade of goods that approaches United States standard of perfection, and it is for that reason largely that we are not fearing the placing of farm machinery on the free list. We find it hard enough to meet the high standard required by the United States farmer as it is, and do not fear that any of the low-grade machinery made by other foreign manufacturers than the Canadian is going to interest him. Of course, we do not know what English and German manufacturers might do when we throw down the bars and they copy our models and manufacture with their cheap labor, and freights from the foreign country are made to the Missouri River jobbing points, the Twin Cities, Denver, etc., as low as the freight rates are made from, say, the manufacturing concerns in Ohio to the same points. But that is a contingency that we believe will finally adjust itself.

Yours, truly,

C. W. DICKINSON.

LA CROSSE PLOW CO. (INC.),
La Crosse, Wis., May 1, 1911.

Hon. JOHN J. ESCH,
Congress Hall, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In a recent letter I called your attention to the improbability of the statement that wagons are selling for a less price in foreign countries than they do in the United States—meaning a wagon of the same weight, ironing, etc., all having a bearing on the merits of the selling price of wagons in the United States, and to some extent having a bearing on the price of farm machinery generally in the United States and foreign countries.

The secretary of one of the very largest wagon companies refutes the proposition. He says he does not know of a farm wagon selling anywhere in the United States for $100—the price it is claimed they were selling for in foreign countries. It is possible the speakers or the committee were referring to a spring wagon, which is a pleasure vehicle and, strictly speaking, not a farm wagon at all, and the varieties of style, finish, etc., in which such spring wagons or pleasure vehicles are put up are multitudinous, and it would be impossible for a man to compare prices in two different countries without having the wagons before him, and then he would have to be an expert.

But as touching the price at which wagons sell in the United States and the innuendo of enormous profits in manufacturing wagons, my correspondent calls attention to the fact that in the last seven years in the neighborhood of 20 wagon factories have either busted or gone out of business, and he says there is not a place in the United States where the International Harvester Co. could obtain as much as $100 for any farm wagon they build.

Yours, truly,

C. W. DICKINSON.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH].

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I stand for protection to the American laborer and the American manufacturer. [Applause on the Republican side.] I was elected upon the Republican ticket. I was not sent here to take part in constructive legislation for the benefit of any other country. I can not support the measure which is now receiving the consideration of this House. It is called the farmers' free-list bill. That is a misnomer. The whole bill, from beginning to end, rings with a principle that would encourage foreign manufacturing, and that should be the title of it.

I as a Republican have no right to complain of the action of the majority, for they are in control of the legislation of this House, and it has been announced by the friends of the bill that it would be put through the House just as it is presented. No Member can vote on any item in this bill separately, but must vote for it as a whole. By the Canadian reciprocity pact a duty of $1.25 is removed from lumber. Salt is upon the free list. There was no duty placed on fence posts by the Payne-Aldrich Act, so that you see some of the articles are already on the free list. Hides are already on the free list, and the benefit accruing to the farmer by this measure will in no manner compensate him for his loss. But I know that much talking is useless and will avail nothing.

The bill has a catchy title, "to place on the free list," and its purpose is to admit free of duty beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, and other similar products of the farm.

It also presents a number of manufactured articles to be admitted free into this country, and I claim that it is unfair.

What is the purpose of admitting manufactured articles into this country free of duty, when you must pay a duty upon the same manufactured articles if you undertake to sell them in any other country? I say that the law as it stands now is one which will permit every country on the globe to ship into this

country free of duty these manufactured articles which the farmers use, provided that that country is willing to allow the same articles of American manufacture to be shipped free into its territory, and nothing can be fairer than that.

This bill is a blow at the live-stock industry of this country, which is one of the principal money getters of the American farmer. Last year the value of cattle alone in this country was estimated at $717,000,000 and upward, sheep more than $332,000,000, and swine $436,000,000 and over. If you destroy the market of the farmer for his live stock, how can he buy farm implements? But you say that we must reduce the cost of living, and to do so you would destroy this great American industry.

The title of this bill, as I say, is catchy. It is styled the farmers' free list. This is a misnomer; it properly should be styled "A bill for the encouragement of foreign manufacturing"; and it will not and does not allow or pretend to give to the American laboring man a single day's work. Every day's work put upon the articles imported under it will rob the American laborer of a day's work and send the pay therefor to foreign countries. It is absolutely against the interest of American labor and is of direct force and benefit to foreign labor. You can not have products manufactured in foreign countries and furnish labor to the workmen of this country. Neither will it bring the benefit to the American farmer that is intended, although you may reap the political effect. The farmers of my district are, generally speaking, protectionists, and they, together with their Democratic brothers, will see that there is no benefit in this bill, either to them or the masses whom it is sought to benefit. Indeed, they will see and realize directly the contrary, and that the wholesaler or possibly the retailer is the one to reap the profit. None of the farmers of my district purchase directly from the foreign manufacturer.

Foreign-made goods are first purchased by the wholesaler, who in turn sells to the retailer, who sells to the farmer, so that all the bill will accomplish will be that the wholesaler may purchase his goods made by foreign pauper labor cheaper; but that the farmer will purchase this foreign-made product any cheaper after it has passed through the hands of the wholesaler and the retailer is very problematical.

This bill is intended to make the American manufacturer sit up and take notice, and upon this floor and in this Chamber speeches are made by our Democratic friends on the other side which, in effect, if not so calculated, tend to discourage, impede, and destroy the business of every manufacturer and manufacturing establishment in our land. Why is the business of the manufacturer and the producer so berated? Is the business not legitimate? Is a man an enemy of his country because he employs labor? Do the Democrats of this great lawmaking body want to destroy the manufacturing institutions of our land, and want all our products manufactured in foreign countries? What encouragement is there to the manufacturer to engage in or even to continue his business? What hope is there for the future welfare of American labor in free trade? And while we are all proud of our land, which is admitted to be the best in the world, which was built up under and had its greatest prosperity under a protective policy, I am led to the inquiry, Are we legislating for our Republic?

Recently a large factory moved from my home city, for a goodly consideration, to another town. We all disliked to see it go, Democrats and Republicans alike, and I am sure that the townsfolk where it relocated all rejoiced at its arrival, Democrats and Republicans, because of the employment it would furnish; and what is true of a city inures correspondingly to a State or nation. When there is no employment of labor there is universal distress, and so important is the duty on imports that twice Congress has been called in extra session to adopt a protective-tariff measure, and it must be admitted that the McKinley bill and the Dingley bill gave to this country two periods of its greatest prosperity, and under the present law provision is made for a tariff board to determine the fair duty that should be paid upon imported articles. This board is especially equipped for this office. The present bill is a wandering free-trade orphan, upon which there has not been a hearing, and which does not even contain the tariff-for-revenue principle.

The American farmer is a protectionist; and when you admit meat free, flour free, and farm products free you strike a blow at his industry. The American laborer is a protectionist, and when you admit articles manufactured by foreign pauper labor in direct competition with his skill and industry you strike a blow at him.

Much has been said about the efficiency of the foreign laborer. I hope that the American laborer will not be obliged to do more than a fair day's work, and that for this he will receive his full share of the profits. I have worked side by side with the foreign laborer, I have employed them, and will say that they do a satisfactory day's work and get twice as much pay for it in this country as they received in foreign countries. It seems to me that if ever a proposition was proven or established (and I understand that our Democratic friends now concede it), it is the fact that wages are much higher in America than in any other country on the globe—nearly double that in any other country and five times that paid in some. How does that sound my American workmen friends?

Name some countries you would rather work in, where you would be paid more or treated better or have more golden opportunities, than America. In my early life I, as no doubt others of you, was a laboring man and as a sample of what opportunity awaits the youth of this glorious Republic you are entitled to the inspiration if any. Wealth, position, and honor are the rewards of true merit open to rich and poor alike. I for one will not strike a blow at my country's welfare or close an avenue to a worthy young man or increase the burden of the laborer.

The Republican Party recognizes the special needs of wage-workers generally, for their well-being means the well-being of all; and whatever comfort can be found in encouraging foreign manufacture or giving employment to foreign pauper labor, the Democratic Party is entitled to and can have all the credit.

The importer gets the benefit. The farmers' free list, the bill is called. Why, the farmer does not buy his plow, drag, reaper, thrashing machine, wire, meat, or biscuit of the foreign manufacturer. The best agricultural implements, the best thrashers, and the best fencing wire is made in America; the best crops produced; the best and happiest workmen, the finest schools and churches and homes, children, climate, soil, scenery are all in America. How we do love to boast of America and its grandeur and prosperity; how we do love to boast of our country and its flag. More men have fought for it—more men have died for it—than for any other flag. Oh, how the foreigners do love to get under its protective folds, and its protecting stars and stripes.

Let us be fair. Do my Democratic friends forget that there is now an act and provision of law which says to the world that plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins may be imported free of duty, provided that any of the foregoing are imported from any country, dependency, province, or colony which imposes no tax or duty on like articles imported from the United States?

Can anything be fairer than that? Is that not the golden rule? Would you find fault with the ten commandments? By this law we admit every implement of agriculture into this country free providing the country sending them will admit our manufactures on a like basis. But this is not enough. You now present this bill, which in effect allows every foreign country on earth to import the articles mentioned—implements and farm products—free into this country, while we are charged a duty of from 15 to 30 per cent when we export American-made products—articles made by the hand of the American laborer—into their country. This is certainly free trade backward. Is this called high statesmanship? These imported manufactured articles should be manufactured by American workmen. These foreign farm products should be raised by the American farmer. Now, the American farmer buys his implements of the American manufacturer and in turn the American manufacturer buys his products of the American farmer. The American manufacturer furnishes work to the American working man, who in turn buys the products of the American farm, and by working together all are benefited.

The prosperity of our country rests upon the prosperity of agriculture and our farmer can not prosper if his product is supplanted by foreign meats, flour, and similar articles.

RECIPROCITY.

A few days ago an act for reciprocal-trade relations with our sister country, Canada, was passed by this body. Practically all the Democrats voted for it, supposedly because of its free-trade principles.

This treaty is favored by Canada for the purpose of giving our American market of 90,000,000 people to Canada free for her farm products. And in this connection, in support of that proposition, I here quote a part of an interview with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the prime minister of Canada, in the Columbian Magazine, May number, who favors its adoption for that reason.

This is what he said:

We are, above all, an agricultural people; our chief wealth is the growth of those products of the temperate zone, fruits, cereals, and vegetables; and it is our boast—but a boast founded on actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables, and fruits we can, without exaggeration, beat the world. * * * Our object to-day is to open the door of the American market, to open the door of a Nation of 90,000,000, which has been closed to us for the last 50 years. * * *

Although it was part of our policy to obtain reciprocity with the United States, we have acted carefully in so doing and have not injured any industry. The only industry affected is that of agricultural implements, on some of which the duty has been reduced from 17½ per cent to 15 per cent and on others from 20 per cent to 15 per cent. It would have been pleasing, for myself at all events, to go beyond that, but we considered that if we did we would perhaps not do justice to the large body which has invested money in these establishments. The Government does not exist for the farmers alone or the manufacturers alone, or for any one class, but for the manufacturers and the farmers and for the classes which compose our nation.

Thus it is seen that the Canadian prime minister wants the American market for the Canadian farm products.

But it is said that we may need Canada in the future. If so, let us wait until that time comes. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." We do not need it now.

It is conceded that the high cost of living—which won the recent election for the Democrats and the reduction of which is given as the reason for this treaty—can not be laid to the door of the American farmer. He sold and is now selling his products slightly above cost in the market which he helped to build up.

A glance at the prices which the farmer is receiving at the present time for his products may be of interest to those who are abusing him for the high cost of living. I will insert in my remarks a weekly market report from the Charlotte (Mich.) Republican of May 4, 1911:

		Cents.
Choice steers	per pound	3½– 5
Fair to good steers	do	3 – 4
Good cows	do	3 – 3½
Old cows	do	1½– 2
Hogs, dressed	do	7½– 8
Hogs	do	5 – 5½
Calves, alive	do	4 – 5
Calves, dressed	do	7½– 8
Spring chickens	do	11 –12
Chickens, dressed	do	14 –15
Hens, dressed	do	14
Beef hides	do	7
Calfskins	do	12
Sheep pelts	each	15 –30
Butter	per pound	13 –18
Eggs	per dozen	14
Potatoes	per bushel	30
Wheat	do	82
Rye	do	80
Oats	do	30
Beans	do	$1.65

No article is named by any Member of this House, Democratic or Republican, for which the farmer is paid too much; and to protect his interest the American farmer has, by a protest that echoes throughout the Republic, expressed his disapproval of this treaty. In like manner are his interests coupled with those of the laboring man and the manufacturer, which are being assailed by this bill. And on its passage will descend the darkness of despair now appearing on the industrial horizon of our country, brought on by threats and calamity talk, to envelop and work disaster to American labor, agriculture, and manufacture. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McCOY].

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Chairman, I have observed that the new Members who speak here for the first time in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union seem to find it necessary to enter some sort of a disclaimer, and I will now enter mine, in about this way: In talking with a colleague from Georgia, also a new Member, the other day, he said to me that he thought he had reached a wise conclusion, namely, not to say anything at this session of Congress, because, as he stated, he believed that the old Democratic Members here, who had fought Democratic battles on this floor for so many years, ought now to have full swing, when we have the majority. On the other hand, one of my colleagues from New Jersey was good enough to say that he could see no harm in my talking upon this measure. So, between the upper millstone of modesty imposed by the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia and the nether millstone of encouragement received from my friend from New Jersey, I shall endeavor to grind out some sort of a grist, which I hope at the worst will not do any damage to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. [Laughter and applause.]

I have not heard all the speeches that have been made on this pending bill, nor have I had time to read all the speeches, and in both these respects I think that I may say that I am in very good company here in the city of Washington; but so far as I have been able to listen and so far as I have had time to read the speeches that have been made it has seemed to me that they have dealt principally with details and not largely with general principles, and I should like to make a few suggestions at this time, not involving details—and of course not saying anything very original about the tariff; for he would be a wise man indeed who could say anything original about the tariff—which, in my opinion, if properly considered, can not fail to aid in the correct solution of the tariff problem which is now under consideration.

DOES TAXATION CREATE WEALTH?

If a protective tariff accomplishes what its advocates claim for it, namely, the giving of protection to American producers, that result can be accomplished only by making it possible for our producers to charge higher prices than they otherwise would, and that they do charge higher prices because of the tariff is no longer disputed. A great many people call these higher prices a tribute levied by producers on the consumers, but let us call it a tax.

That customs duties levied on imports are a tax is one of the few obviously sound propositions that have not been denied by protectionists.

A protective tariff law results, then, in nothing but the imposition of two taxes. The protectionists' claim for such a law is that it produces wealth and leads to prosperity, consequently the general proposition involved is that taxation produces wealth and leads to prosperity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have admired the altruistic spirit prevailing in this body, leading Members on each side to give advice to those on the other, and animated, I hope, by that spirit, I suggest to any Member on the other side who seeks reelection in 1912, that when he makes his opening speech of the campaign, he shall state to his constituents that he bases his expectation of election on his success in maintaining the truth of the proposition that taxation creates wealth. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

PROTECTION DOES NOT RAISE WAGES.

Perhaps the one argument that more than any other has deluded voters in this country into putting the Republican Party in power is the claim that a protective tariff increases wages. I imagine that one cause of the result is that in discussing the question, it is dealt with on the basis of billions of dollars, millions of workmen, hundreds of thousands of industrial plants, and thousands of industries. Such large figures are confusing to all of us and especially to the men whose daily toil leaves them with little leisure and no strength for a careful consideration of the question.

The validity of the claim can be tested by what I may call the rule of three, which reduces it to a basis of simplicity. Lest I should mar the rule by stating it in my own language, let me read it in the words of a master of clear exposition, who says:

We will, however, pursue the protectionist doctrine of wages a little further. It is totally false that protective taxes raise wages. As I will show further on, protective taxes lower wages. Now, however, I am assuming the protectionist's own premises and doctrines all the time. He says that his system raises wages. Let us go to see some of the wages-class and get some evidence on this point. We will take three wageworkers, a boot man, a hat man, and a cloth man. First, we ask the boot man, "Do you win anything by this tariff?" "Yes," he says, "I understand that I do." "How?" "Well, the way they explain it to me is that when anybody wants boots he goes to my boss, pays him more on account of the tax, and my boss gives me part of it." "All right. Then your comrades here, the hat man and the cloth man, pay this tax in which you share?" "Yes; I suppose so. I never thought of that before. I supposed that rich people paid the taxes, but I suppose that when they buy boots they must do it, too." "And when you want a hat you go and pay the tax on hats, part of which (as you explain the system) goes to your friend the hat man; and when you want cloth you pay the tax which goes to benefit your friend the cloth man?" "I suppose that it must be so." We go then to see the hat man and have the same conversation with him, and we go to see the cloth man and have the same conversation with him. Each of them then gets two taxes and pays two taxes. Three men illustrate the whole case. If we should take a thousand men in a thousand industries, we should find that each paid 999 taxes and each got 999 taxes, if the system worked as it is said to work. What is the upshot of the whole? Either they all come out even on their taxes paid and received or some of the wage receivers are winning something out of other wage receivers to the net detriment of the whole class. If each man is creditor for 999 taxes and each debtor for 999 taxes, and if the system is "universal and equal," we can save trouble by each drawing 999 orders on the creditors to pay to themselves their own taxes, and we can set up a clearing house to wipe off all the accounts. Then we come down to this as the net result of the system when it is "universal and equal," that each man as a consumer pays taxes to himself as a producer. That is what is to make us all rich. We can accomplish it just as well and far more easily, when we get up in the morning, by transferring our cash from one pocket to the other.

One point, however, and the most important of all, remains to be noticed. How about the thousandth tax? How is it when the boot man wants boots and the hat man hats and the cloth man cloth? He has to go to the store on the street and buy of his own boss, at the market price (tax on), the very things which he made himself in the shop. He then pays the tax to his own employer, and the employer, according to the doctrine, "shares" it with him. Where is the offset to that part which the employer keeps? There is none. The wages class, even on the protectionist explanation, may give or take from each other, but to their own employers they give and take not. At election time the boss calls them in and tells them that they must vote for protection or he must shut up the shop, and that they ought to vote for

protection, because it makes their wages high. If, then, they believe in the system, just as it is taught to them, they must believe that it causes him to pay them big wages, out of which they pay back to him big taxes, out of which he pays them a fraction back again, and that but for this arrangement the business could not go on at all. A little reflection shows that this just brings up the question for a wage earner: How much can I afford to pay my boss for hiring me? Or, again, which is just the same thing in other words: What is the net reduction of my wages below the market rate under freedom which results from this system?

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Before leaving the question of wages I should like to read what the same writer says about "pauper labor." It is as follows:

"Pauper labor" had a meaning in the first half of this (the nineteenth) century in England, when the overseers of the poor turned over the younger portion of the occupants of the poorhouses to the owners of the new cotton factories, under contracts to teach them the trade and pay them a pittance. Of course the arrangement had shocking evils connected with it, but it was a transition arrangement. The "pauper laborers'" children, after a generation, became independent laborers; the system expired of itself, and "pauper laborer" is now a senseless jingle.

President Hoffstot, of the Pressed Steel Car Co., during the strike at his plant in 1909, speaking of wages, said:

When all is said and done, it's supply and demand that fix wages. The 1907 rates have nothing to do with what we pay men to-day. We buy labor in the cheapest market.

This is a frank and accurate statement by a protected manufacturer, and, I may add, a brutal one under the circumstances.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] told us yesterday of the small earnings of a cabman in Oxford, England, and his statements will be sent broadcast some day. I regret that I did not have with me when he was talking some figures which I am about to read, for I should have liked to ask him whether he had ever heard of similar figures in this country, and in that way some of the horrible conditions here could be shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD alongside of his cabman's wages.

The facts which I am about to state were learned in New York City by an investigator vouched for by the New York Child Labor Commission, and were not gathered for political purposes.

What does the gentleman from Connecticut think of these figures?

Children's white dresses are paid for at the rate of 50 cents a dozen, and the average daily output is one dozen a day, and the average working day is 13 hours.

Violets are made for 3½ cents a gross, and a mother and three girls and the grandmother earn at this work 60 cents a day.

Piecing out good feathers with strands from bad feathers, called "willowing," is paid for at the rate of 4 to 6 cents an inch. An 18-inch feather can be made in one and one-half days, and the maker gets from 72 cents to $1.08.

The average wage of an entire family at garment finishing is from 60 to 70 cents a day.

Making cigarette wrappers brings 10 cents a thousand, and a woman working from 6 a. m. to 12 p. m. can make $2 a week.

These wrappers are made for a merchant on a fashionable street, and stamped as made in Egypt, Turkey, or elsewhere, and you can have your initials on them in silver, blue, or gold, if you wish.

The housing conditions of most of the people in these employments are of the worst.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry at this point?

Mr. McCOY. Certainly.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I would like to know in what year these figures were taken in order to ascertain if it was during a time of so-called Republican prosperity.

Mr. McCOY. They were taken in 1910. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Thank you very much. It is as I expected.

Mr. McCOY. Now, whether the gentleman from Connecticut would call this labor "pauper labor" or not I do not know, but I do say that the manufacturers in this country who are employing this kind of labor—and I can cite a great many other cases of the same kind—ought to be thoroughly ashamed of themselves, and there ought to be some law, if the protective taxes are to be continued on the statute books, which would compel these men to give to these poor women and children the full benefit of all they get from the tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

PROTECTION IS MONGREL SOCIALISM.

Now, I wonder how many of our Republican friends ever stop to think that protectionism is nothing but mongrel socialism—socialism because it is State intervention with the avowed purpose of warding off the necessity for open competition; mongrel because the State permits one man to put his hand into another man's pocket on the promise of a fair distribution of what he is able to take away from him—and he is able generally to take a plenty—instead of itself taking and distributing. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I should be interested to hear the only Member of this House elected by the Socialist Party inquire of our Republican friends why they are unwilling to carry protectionism to its logical socialistic conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

A SCIENTIFIC PROTECTIVE TARIFF IS SCIENTIFIC GREED.

Mr. McCOY. The Republican national platform of 1908 announced that—

In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American manufacturers.

This dogma has come to be hailed as a statement of a "scientific" method of framing a tariff. It is obvious that a tariff law of the kind described would absolutely shut off foreign competition, and if applied would result in our paying enormously more for many things than we do even now. Mr. Aldrich was willing to apply the dogma to the utmost limit, for he said in the Hall at the other end of this building while the Payne-Aldrich-Smoot bill was being debated that in order to equalize conditions he would vote for a duty of 300 per cent as willingly as for a duty of 50 per cent.

It has been stated that the doctrine was first definitely formulated in the Republican platform of 1908, but it had been thought of as early as when Mr. Blaine wrote Twenty Years of Congress. Mr. Blaine said:

An adjustment of the protective duty to the point which represents the average difference between wages of the labor in Europe and in America will, in the judgment of protectionists, always prove impracticable. The difference can not be regulated by a scale of averages, because it is constantly subject to arbitrary changes. If the duty be adjusted on that basis for any given date, a reduction of wages would at once be forced abroad, and the American manufacturers would, in consequence, be driven to the desperate choice of surrendering the home market or reducing the pay of workmen. The theory of protection is not answered, nor can its realization be attained by any such device. Protection, in the perfection of its design, as described by Mr. Hamilton, does not invite competition from abroad, but is based on the controlling principle that competition at home will always prevent monopoly on the part of the capitalist, assure good wages to the laborer, and defend the consumer against the evil of distortion.

Mr. Blaine was right in his statement that protection is designed to shut out competition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let us not deceive ourselves into believing that the protected interests will ever be satisfied with anything less.

If I understood rightly what the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] said yesterday, he criticized the majority of the present Ways and Means Committee for making use of the evidence, so-called, given at the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee which framed the Payne bill, claiming, as I understood it, that the Democrats tacitly admitted the usefulness of that evidence by not having further hearings at this time. The trouble with the Payne Ways and Means Committee was that it failed to make proper use of information which was furnished it by various manufacturers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will cite one instance.

Last summer I asked a friend of mine, who is one of the largest manufacturers of Portland cement in this country, what advantage to cement manufacturers there was in the duty of 30 cents a barrel, and he replied that there was no advantage, adding that cement is sold in this country at as low a price as it can be delivered by English and German manufacturers f. o. b. at their factories. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I then asked him what the tariff had done to aid the building up of the cement industry to its present enormous proportions. Again he replied that it had done nothing. I asked him to what that development was due, and he informed me that one of those engaged in the business observed some years ago the operations of a rotary roaster being used at a mine in the West and was shrewd enough to see that this machine could be used in the cement business. Formerly the baking process was carried on by the use of kilns; a layer of fuel was first placed, then a layer of cement bricks, then another layer of fuel, and so on. The fire was then started and the bricks were roasted by this method. Now the roasting is done in the rotary machine, and a process which once took days now takes a few hours only. I then inquired of my friend why the duty of 30 cents a barrel was allowed to remain as one of the provisions of the tariff bill, and he stated that in his opinion it was because manufacturers in other industries who were getting the benefits of protective duties were unwilling to have the nominal

duty removed, for fear that the removal of it would be an object-lesson to consumers in this country, leading to inquiries on their part for the purpose of ascertaining whether other great industries could not be as well maintained without the alleged benefit of a tariff tax. He said that the manufacturers had told the Republican tariff framers that they preferred not to have any duty on cement. It is unnecessary to say that my friend is a Democrat [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. McCOY. I think that the facts just stated show how much sincerity there is in the claim of the Republican Party that it believes that a duty should be imposed sufficient merely to equal the alleged difference in the cost of production here and abroad.

Now, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has spoken of the testimony that was taken in the framing of the Payne bill, and has, I say, criticized us on this side, claiming that we tacitly admit that this testimony is good and usable testimony. Let me quote something that was said by the late Senator Dolliver, a Republican and a great man whose loss we all deplore. He said in a speech that he made at the other end of this building in June, 1910, as follows:

> Do you suppose that if last summer we had known that the total cost of smelting a ton of lead ore was $8 we would have been induced to put a duty of $42.50 a ton on pig lead, on the theory that labor was to be protected and a reasonable reward offered to capital? Do you suppose that if we had known that the cost of smelting copper in the United States is not materially greater than in other countries, we would have allowed a protective duty of $42.50 a ton on pig copper in all its forms? Do you suppose that if we had known that the rubber industry in the United States needs little or no protection, that at 30 per cent ad valorem every department of it was prosperous, that we were making rubber wearing apparel cheaper than it was made anywhere else in the world, that we were making rubber tires for automobiles with such profit that in Akron, Ohio, in 10 years the Diamond Rubber Co. had declared stock dividends which had increased its capital from $50,000 to $10,000,000 under the old rate—if we had known that, do you suppose the Senate would have listened with patience to the Senator from Rhode Island when, after admitting that rubber wearing apparel like boots and shoes needed no protection, he said "but there are rubber tires of automobiles?"

Does the gentleman from Connecticut think that we tacitly accept the testimony on which those fraudulent rates were based?

Now, as to the Republican methods of taking testimony and framing Republican tariff bills, listen to this, also from Mr. Dolliver:

> Not only are the attempts of lawmakers to write tariffs embarrassed by a community of interests, but in the same sense the whole field of legislation finds itself dealing in these latter years with allied syndicates, apparently unrelated, yet closely joined together for the purpose of usurping the authority of every department of our Government. The history of their brutal and sordid control of a great political party in the execution of its pledges to rewrite the tariff law on a rational basis laid down in its platform and approved by its candidate has turned out to be a mere forerunner of an organized attempt, only partly successful, to use the political departments of the Government, not even sparing our highest office, as mere playthings to be moved about by unseen hands, grown at length so bold that they venture, in the mere pride of strength, to forget their cunning.

Mr. Wickersham, the present Attorney General of the United States, says that the scenes surrounding the enactment of a Republican tariff law exhibit—

> a purely selfish scramble for Government aid, furthered by every form of misrepresentation and misinformation.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, personally, as a Democrat, I am perfectly willing to go along with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL], whom we all so greatly admire, and will quote what he said on the floor of this House within the past four weeks as a preliminary to a prophecy. He said:

> Suppose there is a nation that has coal mines, iron mines, water powers, great facilities for manufacturing, and a poor soil. Is it wise for her to take her people from the operation of the great natural resources and facilities for manufacturing with which she has been blessed and put them to the cultivation of an infertile soil? Is it not better for them to work the mines, to build up manufactures, and exchange their products with some other nation that does not have these resources, but has a fertile soil?

We have coal mines, iron mines, water powers, great facilities for manufacturing, and a wonderfully fertile soil, so nothing but stupid, greedy tariff legislation can stand in the way of our utilizing these resources to their utmost limit for the lasting benefit of all and not of the few alone.

Prophecy is a very easy art, so easy that I notice that a great deal of it is practiced upon the floor of this House on the other side of the center aisle. Now, I want to indulge in just this much prophecy. I say that if for the next five years we have a Democratic tariff and, coincidentally, five of the enormous agricultural crops such as this country frequently knows, the Democratic Party will be successful not alone in 1912, but so great will be the benefit to follow from such a tariff that we can not be sent from power in 20 years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And in conclusion I will just add a few words more, uttered by the late Mr. Justice Miller of the Supreme Court, in an opinion delivered by him while sitting in that court. Of course he was not talking about a protective tariff, because, unfortunately, no method has yet been devised by which we can bring the validity of a protective tariff to the test of a Supreme Court decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McCOY. I should like just one-half minute more.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. McCOY. Mr. Justice Miller said this in the opinion, and it accurately describes and characterizes a protective tariff:

> To lay, with one hand, the power of the Government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals, to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery, because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McHENRY].

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chairman, so many of my Pennsylvania colleagues, following their leader, Mr. DALZELL, have pleaded the cause of the trusts and protected interests in opposition to this bill, I rise to speak in behalf of the farmers and workingmen of the country in support of the measure. [Applause.]

The question now under discussion is one of vast importance to the entire American people.

This debate has been running practically without limit and without interruption for a period of 10 days.

Whatever the result of our deliberations may be, Mr. Chairman, the American people have reason to congratulate themselves once more in securing through their Representatives a free voice in this Congress and of the full restoration, in keeping with our campaign promises, of this branch of Congress to a constructive, a deliberative, and a legislative body, as originally provided by the Constitution of the United States.

The arguments for and against the measure have been ably presented. Little, if any, new argument has been advanced in opposition.

The subject is as old as the Government itself, and the brilliant array of facts and figures marshaled for and against the measure in this debate seems to leave but little unsaid.

The principles of political economy involved in the discussion are not new. They represent in marked contrast the basic principles underlying Democracy and Republicanism. The principle of protection is now undergoing the acid test of American judgment. *The last election voiced the sentiment of the people that the tariff should be lowered.* The high cost of living, which has been carried beyond the earnings of the producer and wage earner; the rapidly increasing cost of government, constantly advancing prices upon life's necessities controlled by trusts and monopolies protected by the tariff, have caused a united nonpartisan demand upon the part of both the farmers and workingmen of the country, demanding a revision of the tariff downward. [Applause.]

There is no thought so unerring in its accuracy as the public thought, and if the economic principle of protection were a satisfactory principle, working with equal fairness and bringing equal benefits to all humanity, the people would not have decided upon a change of management in their governmental affairs, as they did last November.

Their decision and direct command to the Sixty-second Congress was that we should reduce the tariff, and, so far as this branch of Congress is concerned, we shall fulfill that pledge with fidelity and with such intelligence as may be given us to perform our duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The time has come for this country to undergo a complete financial reorganization and an economic change to meet modern conditions. Those fundamental principles of political economy which might have applied in the earlier formation of the country are not applicable now. The principle of taxation and protection for infant industries which might have successfully applied 50 years ago to a population of 50,000,000 people and an area of 3,000,000 square miles can not be expected to apply with equal success and equal fairness to a population of 91,000,000 people within the same fixed territory.

We have heard much argument about this school and that school of tariff, about this fundamental principle and that fundamental principle, but the only school we recognize or the only principle we shall adhere to will be that principle which works for the good of the great mass of the people of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Capital has a right to be considered in equal fairness with labor, but capital needs no additional protection. *It certainly needs no special privilege against labor, and it is that special privilege which we, in an honest effort and with absolute fairness, shall try to remove.*

The wage earners and the farmers do not ask for special privilege, nor do they ask for special protection. But of all classes of humanity, the men and women who need protection most, if any need protection, are those men and women who are thrown into this maelstrom of life with nothing but their hands and brains with which to earn a livelihood. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These people who constitute the bone and sinew of our country, the very bulwark of the Nation, the men who dig our coal and build our railroads and bridges, who work in the shop or behind the counter, who delve into the earth for iron ore and precious metals, the farmer who tills the soil to feed the world, the women who bear their part in rearing families or who, perchance, must enter into competition with men to earn a livelihood, these are the ones in whose behalf we should legislate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Every law enacted by the National Congress is simply an agreement by and between all American citizens. In all legislation there are unavoidably some interests more directly affected than others. In this particular measure we find four interests directly affected:

(1) The Government.
(2) The farmer.
(3) The wage earner.
(4) The manufacturer.

THE GOVERNMENT.

In all legislation it is our sworn duty to serve the best interests of the Government.

The Government is best served when the interests of all the people have been best served. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Democratic theory of government is the least amount of government with the smallest tax rate consistent with an economic and progressive public policy.

The Republican theory of taxation is not how little we can get along with, but for how much will the people and the commercial interests stand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In order that we may thoroughly understand the wide scope of the measure and the benefits which will accrue to the consumer by removing the tariff tax from the articles enumerated, I ask permission to insert a copy of the bill in my remarks. This bill places upon the free list the following articles:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is either a good or bad bill. It either should or should not become a law. If we can show, first, that the Government does not need the money collected from these articles, if we can show that it is of benefit to the farmer and to the wage earner and that it is not unfair to the honest manufacturer who seeks no special advantage over his fellows—and none other has a right to our consideration—then we have proven our case, against which no reasonable argument, except the argument of the protected interests of the country, can be of avail.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY LOSES $10,000,000, WHILE THE PEOPLE GAIN $300,000,000.

It is estimated, Mr. Chairman, that the Government Treasury will lose $10,000,000 in import duties, caused by the enactment of this bill. It is also estimated, in accordance with a statement prepared for the New York World, which I give herewith, that while the Government Treasury loses $10,000,000 there is a saving to the American people of over $300,000,000:

THE FARMERS' FREE LIST—MEANS A SAVING TO CONSUMERS OF $300,000,000 A YEAR.

[Washington dispatch to New York World.]

It is expected that the farmers' free-list bill will save consumers more than $300,000,000 annually. The consumption, measured by the net supply, in values, of the articles on the free list runs as follows:

Salt, $9,540,824.
Agricultural implements, $90,637,110.
Bagging for cotton, sacks, burlaps, etc., $26,031,644.
Cotton ties, hoop or band iron, $12,639,953.
Leather, boots and shoes, harness, and saddles, $493,005,263.
Barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, etc., $113,027,205.
Fresh and preserved meats, $614,895,219.
Flour and grits, cereals and bread, $665,041,533.
Lumber, laths, and shingles, $699,599,293.
Sewing machines, and parts thereof, $8,497,460.

If the free-list bill becomes a law and prices settle down in time, as some of the advocates of the same believe they will, the consumers may save the following sums:

On salt, $4,862,005.
Agricultural implements, $13,876,541.
Bagging, sacks, etc., $6,992,099.
Cotton ties, $2,017,336.
Leather, boots and shoes, etc., $37,483,788.
Barbed wire, etc., $32,861,066.
Fresh and preserved meats, $133,493,752.
Flour, grits, etc., $18,355,146.
Lumber, laths, etc., $59,955,659.
Sewing machines, $2,549,239.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

After all, Mr. Chairman, the National Treasury is simply the people's treasury; and we propose to enact a bill that, while it causes a loss of $1 from the national pocket, it puts $30 back into the people's pockets, where it rightfully belongs, instead of into the pockets of a trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But we are asked, How shall the Government make up this shortage? The demands of our Government are already greater than our income.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of the reasons why this new Congress has been elected by the people. The people are not satisfied that the past management of the Government has been economical. One of the contributory causes for a high protective tariff has been the enormous expenditures of the Government. So great have become the extravagant expenditures that the levying of a tariff tax merely for purposes of revenue, to meet the demands of the Government, has become of itself an incidental protective tariff tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In our effort to reduce the burden of taxation upon the people it may be necessary for us to bring about some degree of reduction of governmental expenditures. For instance, if necessary, we can get along very well with one battleship per year less. If necessary, we can cut down the standing Army. Prior to the Spanish-American War we maintained a standing Army of 25,000 men. We now have about 90,000 men in the Army, and it costs about a thousand dollars annually per man to maintain the Army. Our Army expenditures alone runs about $100,000,000 annually. I am in favor of reducing our standing Army to 35,000 men—where it was before the Spanish-American War—with the addition of 10,000 men for coast defense. This is a matter to be taken up at another time. I only refer to it now as one of many ways for the reduction of governmental expenditures.

The Democratic Congress has already started the initiative in absolutely good faith to the country by reducing its own expenditures, by laying off USELESS employees that for years have been carried on the Government pay roll, some of whom were not even doing service here in Washington. Our first attempt toward economy in this direction will be over $200,000 per year.

This is just the beginning, and I now want to ask the farmers, wage earners, professional and business men of the country, Which would you rather have, this increased $10,000,000 in the Treasury and the increased tax to the American consumer of $300,000,000 per year following this tariff tax, or that tax removed and, if necessary, get along with one battleship less per year?

We are willing and ready to meet every exigency of the Government, and willing to levy every tax sufficient to meet the

normal expenses of the Government, but we shall cut down these expenditures, lower the necessity for high protection, and remove the tax from the necessaries of life wherever possible. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The passage of the reciprocity measure was the first opportunity offered us in a step toward the lowering of the tariff. In that measure we could not get all we should like to have had, but we had to take the proposition as offered us and as agreed upon by and between the commissioners of the two countries.

This free-list bill now follows as a companion measure, and is an honest effort upon our part to endeavor to equalize and distribute the benefits through all classes of American producers and American consumers. So, as far as the Government is concerned, this measure, which is for the advancement of comfort and thrift of the great mass of the American people, is a measure which will serve the best interests of the Government, and should become a law with the least possible delay.

Every measure which tends to reduce the burden of taxation to the lowest possible limit consistent with efficiency of service is in keeping with the Democratic idea of the science of modern government.

A satisfied and contented people constitute the very bulwark of every government.

The people know that there has been unfair legislation in behalf of special interests. They know that their burdens have been increased. They ask and demand relief from the extortion of trusts and monopolies, and always, be it remembered, a sovereign people like this will get what they want either one way or another. This issue of a reduction of the tariff tax and of a return to a sound governmental economy is absolutely essential for the welfare of our future Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE FARMER.

Mr. Chairman, what means this suddenly aroused interest in behalf of the American farmer upon the part of such great protection advocates as Mr. DALZELL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. MANN, and other Republican leaders?

For years the American farmers and wage earners have been knocking at the doors of Congress asking only for equal rights and equal privileges under the law. In all these years of full Republican control in every branch of the National Government the pleas of the people have been denied and legislation in behalf of the special interests of the country have gone on and on unchecked. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is said that history repeats itself, and, sir, history is about to repeat itself in this and future Congresses. The farmers and workingmen of the country, who are the producers of all wealth, are coming into their own, and from this time on will have a voice in the affairs of their National and State Governments.

With unlimited political power and backed by the uncounted millions of concentrated wealth of the financial interests of the country the Republican leaders in Congress have heretofore ignored every demand upon the part of the people for a fair deal, believing in their blind hope that under this false theory of protection and continued broken promises to American labor they might be uninterruptedly continued in office for the carrying out of the wishes of the special interests of this country whom they represent here in this Congress.

Why this touching sympathy now for the farmer upon the part of such high priests of protection as my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]? He and his associates are perhaps more directly responsible than all others for having bound the people of this country as human chattels carrying tribute to the great Steel Trust, the Lumber Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Oil Trust, and a hundred other trusts, which control absolutely nearly every article of human wear and human consumption. [Applause.]

Is it true that at last these deposed leaders have recognized the dignity and power of the American farmer and workingman?

Why this bitter fight over Canadian reciprocity? Not because it would work any harm to the farming industry of the country, but these sagacious political leaders well knew that if once the pillar of protection were removed from the farmer, that if once his eyes are opened to the nakedness and fraud of a protective tariff *as applied to his interests*, that he would no longer support the measure.

The American farmer and wage earner need broader markets. Canada is rapidly becoming one of our best customers. With a population of 92,000,000 of people our surplus production is and should be greater than the surplus production of 8,000,000 of Canada's population.

We need the Canadian market much more than the Canadians need our market. Of the same blood and soil, they are our neighbors and our friends, and there is no more reason for imposing a tax on the interchange of trade between Canada and the United States than there would be between the States of New York and Pennsylvania.

A careful analysis of our trade relations with Canada shows that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys from us more than it sells to us is a good country for us to trade with. With such a country all artificial trade restrictions should be removed.

Let me submit some Government statistics:

During five years ending June 30:	
We sold to Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703
Separating some of the important items, we find:	
Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14,172,475
Canada sold to us	2,549,211
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Meat and dairy products:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672
Total differences in our favor on above items	53,030,755

We were elected to Congress on our promise to reduce the tariff. An extra session of Congress has been called by the President for the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill. We have passed it. Why? Not because it is all we should have it to be, but because it is a step in the right direction, and the measure as agreed upon by and between the representatives of both countries could not be changed without involving years of delay and possible defeat of the measure.

Great economic reforms can not be brought about in a day or a year. A beginning must be made somewhere. Canadian reciprocity is but the beginning. Our second step is this free-list bill covering over 100 articles of direct interest to the farmer and wage earner, and schedule by schedule our work of revision will go on until a complete revision shall have reduced the tariff to a revenue basis. *Levying the heavier tax on the luxuries and lightening the burden of taxation on life necessities as provided in this bill.*

The same political argument is being rehearsed and advanced now as formerly. We are told that factories and mills are shutting down. We are told that the prices of grain are already getting lower. I want my Republican friends to answer me this question. The years 1906 and 1907 were the greatest years of industrial prosperity in the country, and in spite of all the evidences of accumulated wealth, in October of 1907 commenced one of the most bitter panics we have ever had and from which we have not yet recovered. *In 1906, prior to the panic, and when there was not a financial ripple on the sky anywhere, the price of wheat at the farm throughout the United States was 66½ cents per bushel.* If a tariff tax on farm commodities protected the farmers' market, then why these low prices in a time of great commercial activity? The answer is that the farmers' prices are fixed in the world's market and regulated by the law of supply and demand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I was born and reared on a farm. I live on a farm to-day, and am engaged in farming at the present time. I know something of farming conditions. I know something of the farmer's trials, of his pleasures, his disappointments, and his hopes. Each year brings an increasing desire to do what little may be in my power to advance their interests or elevate their conditions, and, sir, far be it from me, by word or act, to contribute to any cause which would work a detriment to the farmers and wage earners of this country, the splendid men and women who constitute the vital force of this great country. [Applause.]

You boast of your friendly interest in the farmer. I ask you to point out what you have done for him. Carry your memories back to the colonial period. At that time the farmers and laborers were the real owners of all the wealth of this country. The framers of the Declaration of Independence were all farmers, thus demonstrating that they had a con-

trolling voice in their government. Compare those times with financial and political conditions as they exist to-day, when we find that now one-eighth of all our population is owning seven-eighths of the wealth of the country, and Wall Street, through its various ramifications owning and controlling the Government.

It would appear that there is something vitally wrong either with the farming as an industry or the conditions which surround the farm. What have you done to help the farmer? Has protection helped him? No. As population increased you have forced him to take up new land, and he has been driven farther and farther west until now he has come to the shores of the Pacific.

For years and years the conditions surrounding the American farmer were such that it was almost impossible for him to make ends meet and impossible for him to keep his children at home and employed upon the farm. OUR HIGH PROTECTIVE POLICIES HAVE BEEN MORE RESPONSIBLE FOR DRIVING THE BOYS AND GIRLS FROM THE FARM, SEPARATING FAMILIES, HERDING THEM IN CITIES LIKE SERFS THAN ANY AND ALL OTHER CONDITIONS COMBINED. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican Party is brought to the door of justice; judgment was rendered upon you in the last election, and now when we are trying to make an honest effort to redeem the pledges and carry out the wishes of the people you, under the pretense of being a friend to the farmer and wage earner, would endeavor to array those vast interests to the defense of the special protected interests who have been robbing the people of their earnings for many years.

The farm represents the basic industry of America and of the world. We have but two great sources of productive wealth:

(1) The earth and its products.

(2) Human energy.

In our farm population we find a total of 35,000,000 of people, represented by six or seven million individual farmhouses, each one operating as a separate and isolated unit; each one forced to enter an open market with everything he has to sell in competition with all the world and to enter a closed and monopolized market in everything he has to buy.

He is ground between the upper and nether millstone. The farmers and wage earners can neither fix their own price upon that which they have to sell nor upon that which they must buy.

This legislation is directed against the special interests who have secured an unfair advantage over the balance of the American people. *The farmer and the wage earner must each produce a given amount of value for every dollar they receive.* That is and has been the inmutable law from the days of Adam and will continue until the days of the millennium. The farmers' and the wage earners' earning capacity is limited and fixed; their maintenance and fixed charges are permanent, while their buying capacity is circumscribed by law and is being reduced each year.

The purchasing power of the farmer's and workingman's dollar is growing less each year [applause on the Democratic side], because he always must give an equivalent of honest value of 100 cents on every dollar he produces; but under this juggling process of high finance of tariff and trust regulation, he is obliged to go into the market and exchange his sound dollar for the things which he has to buy at a fictitious value. For instance, the manufacturing cost of a reaper is, I am informed, about $55. A 20 per cent profit to the manufacturer, would make that cost $66. So giving a bushel of wheat the unit value of a dollar, it would take 66 bushels of the farmer's wheat to buy the reaper. If the number of reaper manufacturers equaled the number of farmers in the country, the reapers would be sold on a competitive basis and the farmer could buy his reaper for 66 bushels of wheat.

But we find, enabled under the patent-right laws and the protective-tariff walls, this same reaper, which he should be able to buy for $66, is fixed at a uniform price throughout the United States for all kinds of reapers at $125 each. This means that he must take 59 bushels of surplus wheat from his bin and add it to the 66 bushels of wheat in order to pay the manufacturing cost of the reaper, the additional profit which the manufacturer is entitled to, and, in addition to that, the overhead charge of the trust, and then comes the dishonest profit created by the tariff tax in the sole benefit of the manufacturer.

All this time the farmer is compelled to put 100 cents of value in the production of a bushel of wheat, as he did 50 years ago. He can not capitalize a farm which is worth $5,000 for $25,000 and charge the consumer of his product enough more money to pay him this additional charge, as the trusts are doing, nor can he form an association of 6,000,000 other farms to regulate and fix his price. His products are sold in the world's markets and are regulated by the law of supply and demand and not by the law of protection.

As a further proof of the fact that the farmer receives no benefit from a protective tariff upon his grain and other products, I give here the domestic and foreign prices of wheat, oats, cattle, and horses for the years 1905 to 1909, inclusive:

Domestic and foreign prices.

[Foreign prices are taken from Report of Agriculture and Fisheries, London, Vol. XLIV, Pt. III, 1909. Domestic prices from Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., 1909.]

WHEAT.

[Per bushel.]

	Average price in London.	Average farm price in the United States.
		Cents.
1905	$0.92	74.8
1906	.87	66.7
1907	.94	87.4
1908	1.00	92.8
1909	1.14	99.0

OATS.

	Cents.	*Cents.*
1905	54	34.3
1906	57	29.1
1907	59	44.3
1908	55	47.2
1909	57	40.5

FAT CATTLE (WHOLESALE).

[Per pound.]

	London.	Chicago.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
1905	7¾	5¾–7
1906	7¾	5¾–7
1907	8	5¾–7¾
1908	8	5¾–8½
1909	8½	5¾–10½

HORSES.

[Per head.]

	London.	New York.	Farm value.
1905	$129	$91	$87
1906	150	108	98
1907	135	131	112
1908	166	138	107
1909	173	156	107

I desire to call a witness out of President Taft's Cabinet—Secretary Wilson himself—who, in a letter to the National Grange, of February 9, 1911, relative to the prices the farmer receives, uses this language:

The United States produces surplus wheat above domestic requirements. This surplus production is sold in foreign countries. The price of our exported surplus is governed by the world's requirements, being regulated by the law of supply and demand, and the price of wheat in the United States, while we are exporting, is governed by the price at which the surplus is sold, as a general proposition. Occasionally wheat corners may interfere with the law of supply and demand and temporarily affect the price.

Wheat is never cornered until it is out of the farmer's hands and in the hands of some Chicago trust king. The price he forces up on wheat does not aid the farmer—his wheat is all sold—but the effect is that the laborer who buys his bread is held up and robbed by the millionaire who corners wheat. So this tariff on wheat of 25 cents per bushel never benefits anyone except the grain gambler, who with his corner on wheat drives up the price of the poor man's bread.

All the farmer asks in this or any other kind of legislation is fair treatment. He wants to bear his share of the burden of taxation, but he does not want to bear it all.

What has the National Government done for the farmer? Has it helped him build the 2,000,000 miles of public highways in the United States? No. Has it helped him maintain his schools? No; it has not helped in that direction to the one-tenth part of what it should. When we compare the acreage production of America with the acreage production of foreign countries with a climate and soil less favorable than ours it is quite apparent that the Agricultural Bureau of the United States is run more as a political sop to the farmer than as a matter of real and direct benefit.

I do not mean by this to criticize our able Secretary or the Agricultural Department. They have accomplished great and good work, considering the limitations placed upon them by Congress. But that Congress, under Republican management, has been occupied more with trust legislation than with farm and labor legislation can be determined by a comparison of the stability and constant advancement of trust values with the widely fluctuating farm values.

When we consider the highly developed intelligence and industry of the American farmer, the fertility of our soil, and the most favorable agricultural climate in the world, and compare our acreage production with the acreage production of other countries, it is easily apparent that we have not, as a Nation, awakened to the possibilities of our soil, nor is our Government rendering the assistance to our farm industry which it should, as can be plainly seen by the following figures which I shall give:

Average yield (in bushels per acre), 1899–1908.	United States.	Germany.	Austria.	Hungary.	France.	United Kingdom.
Oats	29.3	40.6	29.1	30.8	31.3	44.6
Rye	15.8	25.0	18.6	17.7	17.1	[1] 27.0
Wheat	13.7	28.7	18.7	17.1	20.4	32.6
Barley	26.0	34.5	26.0	23.2	23.5	34.7
Potatoes	89.8	197.3	151.4	117.8	118.0	186.4

[1] Ireland.

Now, observe the ever-changing prices of farm products. Were it not for the constantly increasing acreage of new lands, rich in virgin fertility, the farmers and the country would have been bankrupt long ago.

Average farm price per bushel December 1—Statistics from United States reports.

Years.	Wheat.	Oats.	Rye.	Potatoes.	Hay, per ton.	Milch cows, per head.	Other cattle, per head.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*			
1896	72	18	41	28	$6.55	$23.16	.....
1897	81	21	45	54	6.62	23.16	.....
1898	58	25	46	41	6.00	27.45	$20.92
1899	58	24	51	39	7.27	29.66	22.79
1900	62	25	51	43	8.80	31.60	24.97
1901	62	39	55	76	10.01	30.00	19.93
1902	63	30	50	47	9.06	29.23	18.76
1903	69	34	54	61	9.08	30.21	18.45
1904	92	31	68	45	8.72	29.21	16.32
1905	74	29	61	61	8.52	27.44	15.15
1906	66	31	58	51	10.37	29.44	15.85
1907	87	44	73	61	11.68	31.00	17.10
1908	92	47	73	70	8.98	30.67	16.89
1909	99	40	73	54	10.62	32.36	17.49

I invite a careful analysis of these official figures, and ask why protection does not help the farmer maintain his prices, as it does help the manufacturer regulate his prices.

Whether wheat sells for 65 cents per bushel or $1.25 per bushel, the farmer continues to pay a fixed or steadily increasing price for his machinery and fertilizer, but never a lower price.

Whether corn sells for 35 cents per bushel or 65 cents per bushel, the farmer continues to pay a steadily increasing price for his sugar, coffee, tobacco, and clothing.

Whether cattle sell for $15 per head or $25 per head, he continues to pay a steadily increasing price for his boots and shoes, his harness, lumber, and everything he buys.

That the farmer has reached the degree of prosperity which he has, that he has reached the power politically which he has, he owes to himself and the cooperation of his various organizations. He owes the first to the energies of himself and his family and to the divine bounty of the Creator in giving him his bounteous crops. *Protection has done nothing but rob him, and he refuses to be buncoed any longer.*

Mr. Chairman, I should not have the American farmer made to appear as being opposed to this bill. It is both an insult to his intelligence as a man and his integrity as a citizen. He neither needs nor wants protection. *At least, he does not want any unfair advantage over any other man.* Politics and panics do not concern him to the extent of driving the fear of starvation into his heart. He accepts the present and approaches the future with perfect equanimity.

The opponents of this bill tell the farmer that it would not be a good thing for him to have the tax removed from his plows, harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural implements of all kinds, barb fence wire, wire rods, fences, timber for his barn and house, sewing machines, and so forth. Then they tell the workingmen that it would not be a good thing for them to have cheaper meat, food, and clothing.

The farmer has been caricatured in the public press, in the theater, and in a private capacity since the days of public print. This tearful concern now upon the part of such high protectionists as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] would seem to be the crowning act of political caricature of this splendid type of American citizen and upon this great industry.

In all these years the farmer has not found any way of producing wheat except by the expenditure of a hundred cents' worth of value for every dollar he received from it. The proposition of the Republican Party for past years of rich protective policy has been that he must now take his dollar and pay a higher price for his machinery, made here in America, than the German, French, English, or Australian farmer will pay for the same machinery in foreign countries, including transportation and freight charges, as the following table of home and abroad prices of American manufactured articles will show:

Articles.	Home price.	Price sold at abroad.
Cultivators	$11.00	$8.40
Plows	14.00	12.60
Axes, dozen	8.25	7.20
Kettles	1.40	.85
Table knives, gross	15.00	12.00
Horseshoe nails	3.00	[1] 2.00
Barbed wire	3.00	[1] 2.60
Cut rivets	10.00	[1] 5.55
Typewritters	100.00	60.00
Sewing machines:		
Fine	27.50	20.75
Medium	22.00	17.50
Cheap	18.00	12.00
Steel rails	28.00	[2] 23.00

[1] Per hundredweight. [2] Per long ton.

Is this what you call a fair deal to the American farmer? Is it any wonder that the farmer has rebelled against these conditions? The spirit of this bill is that the farmer who has to meet the competition of the world, selling his commodities in the world's markets and in competition with all labor in all lands that he shall be permitted to enter the world's markets to buy his materials and his supplies.

It is the belief of the Democratic Party that this Government-guaranteed profit is better in the hands and pockets of the wives and children of the farmer and wage earners than to be collected and placed in the pockets of the Reaper Trust, the Timber Trust, and like combinations of American industries. [Applause.]

In this law or agreement which we now propose we neither desire nor do we work any harm to any legitimate industry or to any honest man. WE SIMPLY DESIRE TO HAVE THE LAW OF COMPETITION WHICH CONTROLS PRODUCTION APPLY WITH EQUAL FAIRNESS TO THE LAW OF CONSUMPTION AND DISTRIBUTION.

This bill is in the interest of both the American farmer and the Government.

THE WAGE EARNER.

We now come to the question of the wage earner. In using the term I include every man and woman who must toil for daily bread, whether it is by manual labor or mental efforts, whether in the walks of a profession or those of more strenuous physical exertion. Every man who is a producer is a laborer and every man ought to be a laborer. Economic conditions will never right themselves in this country until there is a return to a proper equilibrium of an adequate proportion between the producer and the consumer.

Under our economic conditions the ratio of producers to consumers is becoming less each year. Each year adds enormously to the class of nonproducers, and at the same time a constant increase in the consumers' class. So the burden of production falls more heavily upon those to whose lot the work of production falls. There is no law or agency which can stop the accumulation or concentration of wealth. *Wealth is becoming more concentrated and more powerful each year. The nearest approach to its regulation by law is to remove every element of special privilege, and when any law can be shown to give to any concern or company, trust, or corporation a special privilege or advantage, I am for the removal of that privilege absolutely regardless of what may be the temporary results.* [Applause.]

This is called the farmers' free-list bill, but it is of equal importance to the wage earners of the country. The conditions confronting the wage earners of this country in the future are not entirely free from alarm. Any condition of economics or of government which changes the ratio of country to town and city life, reducing the rural population and increasing the town and city population to the extent of such a great percentage as the coming census will show, is an unhealthy, an unnatural, and an uneconomic condition. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, we find the Government responsible in a large degree. We have drifted away from our original moorings, and listening to the seductive plea of the dollar we have forgotten the interests of the man. The wage earner, from the standpoint of production, is in the same class as the farmer, but, unlike the farmer, he has not the help of the soil, the sun, and rain, nor has he additional capital. He is dependent alone upon his own physical and mental energies which God has given him. He can do a certain number of days' work in this life and no more.

There is no loss so great as the loss to labor of a day's work. It is the capital account of the workman. He can not replace it. Nobody can. Nature has allotted him a given number of days. He can not sell them twice. He can not issue new stock and increase his capital like the manufacturer and corporation. In times of prosperity protection gives him the *little end of the increased profit*. In times of depression he must bear the *big end of the loss*, for he must bear a double loss—the loss of his earnings and the loss of a portion of his capital in every idle day, which he can not replace.

In times of business depression and low prices the manufacturer can curtail his production or shut down his plant. His loss is loss of profits plus interest charges during his suspension, which is provided for by the prudent manager in the form of an ample reserve fund.

The farmers and wage earners can not stop. They must go on or starve. If the farmer stops, the world stops and starves. Whether times are good or bad, prices high or low, the expenses and fixed charges of the farmer and workman are just the same. Of the three, the manufacturer has a distinct advantage. *He is protected by the law of the tariff and the law of monopoly, which enables him to discharge his men and curtail production and at the same time maintain the price of his manufactured article. He sells less in quantity, but seldom at a reduced price.*

The situation for the farmer and workman are directly reversed. They must both sell less in quantity and at a reduced price. But of these two the farmer is the better situated. It is he who feeds the world, and before the world is fed the farmer's family must be, and is, first provided for.

But how about the workman? I have not heard much about him in this debate. If it were not for him, neither the manufacturer nor the farmer would make any profit. He is the buyer and ultimate consumer. How does he get money with which to buy? *By selling his labor.*

When the manufacturer can not sell, he quits and lives on his reserve or credit. When the farmer can not sell, his family is still provided with three good meals a day and a home to live in, because bread, meat, and potatoes are the things he has.

But when the workman can not sell his labor—the use of his body—he must live on his savings or beg or starve. *He neither wants nor intends to do either.* All he wants is an equal fighting chance, and he will maintain the independence of himself and family without asking favors of anybody, and that is what we propose to give him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But think for a moment what it means to a workman with a family to feed and clothe and rents to pay, without work and without credit. Then, what happens to him? If you would see the results in its most pitiful form, go to the hills of Westmoreland County, in Pennsylvania, and see the evicted miners living in tents all throughout the bitter cold of a Pennsylvania winter. Think of the sufferings of a mother in childbirth under such conditions—and there have been many of them. True, this is an extreme case, but it shows the conditions of labor without employment, without a cash reserve, and without credit.

I had hoped that my colleague [Mr. DALZELL] would tell you about it, because it is in his part of the State, and we all know what a good friend of the workman Mr. DALZELL is (?). His Steel Trust so loves the laborer, and the Republican Party so loves the Steel Trust, and the laborer so loves the Republican Party that it has been a delightful family gathering at the tariff-protected election feast every two and four years. The farmers and workmen seem to have just discovered that the Carnegies always sit at the head of the table, greedily taking the best of everything, leaving nothing but the crumbs for labor, and barely that.

The workman realizes that he must accumulate a cash or property reserve fund. *But how can he do this when his living costs have advanced 60 per cent while his wages have only advanced 20 per cent? This is what protection has done for American labor.*

There will always be periods of prosperity and periods of depression due to unnatural and uneconomic conditions. The frequency of recurring panics and periods of business depression in America is evidence that our system of national taxation is builded upon a false principle of political economy. This has created other unnatural and uneconomic conditions of banking, currency, and credit to the extent of the centralization of interests and of financial and political power within the hands of a favored few, undreamed of by the fathers of our country.

What has protection done for the wage earner? It has thrown him open to the competition of the cheapest foreign labor in the world and at the same time compelling him to exchange the dollar which he has earned for the fictitious values, based upon watered stock values controlled by monopolies for the things he must buy. He must sell his labor as best he can. Like the farmer he can neither fix his price for that which he has to sell nor fix the price of that which he must buy. The labor organizations have helped him to some degree in fixing the price of his wage. But he finds an unnatural economic condition which, while giving him a 10 or 20 per cent increase in wages, has at the same time increased his living costs 60 per cent, and he finds at the end of the year, in spite of every possible household economy, that he has not been able to make any headway with which to meet an advancing old age.

What is this Government for? Who is it for? What would this world be if a few owned it all and nobody else were living in it? *The very happiness of existence and the very elements of universal prosperity are the happiness and prosperity of these working men and women of the United States. This is a fundamental principle.*

In a general way it is conceded by all. I have referred to the time when, in the Colonial period of this country, the farmers and wage earners owned all the land, and nearly every man owned his own home. Within a period of 50 years a large percentage of the wealth of the country has accumulated in the hands of a few. In no other country and under no other conditions, except under the conditions and mistaken premises of a protective tariff, could we find so many thousands of millionaires and so many hundreds of thousands of workmen who barely earn a decent living and whose plans for, and whose confidence in, the future are never free from worry.

THE LIMITATIONS OF LABOR.

The American workman can not sell a day's labor in England, another day's labor in France, Germany, and Spain, as the trust does or as the farmer sells his wheat and corn in those markets. He is confined absolutely to the home markets fixed for American labor. In addition to this the protected manufacturers say to him, "We can employ all the cheap foreign labor we want, and you must enter into competition with that labor."

Protection speaks in the Republican national platform of 1908 as follows:

> In all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a REASONABLE PROFIT TO AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

Protection says to the manufacturer, "We shall protect you against competition and *insure your profits*," but it does not say to the wage earner, "We shall protect your wages and insure you plenty of employment." It has been clearly proven in this debate that, *based upon the unit of production*, and that is the only real wage test, the American workman is the lowest-paid workman in the world. The question of whether a wage is high or low is determined by the equivalent of value produced and the purchasing power of the wage received.

During this debate the House has been burdened with endless statistics, showing the different wage scales of the world, proving that protection does not protect the wage earner.

As I have already covered more ground and occupied more time than I had expected to do, I will sum up the argument on wages by referring to the report of the Department of Commerce and Labor, which shows that the American workman must work 225 days each year to meet living expenses, as against 220 days' work for the workman in free-trade England. I am not advocating free trade. Broader and freer trade relations with the world will come in time, but they must be brought around by a process of evolution without seriously disturbing trade conditions at home. Until we adopt the income tax—which I favor—as a method of national taxation, whereby those who have profited most by special privilege in the past shall bear their proper share of the burden of government, thus lightening the burdens for the toilers of the land—until then a tariff for revenue only is and will be a governmental necessity.

But I would not have the farmer and wage earner longer deceived that a protective tariff tax on everything they buy is the way to make them rich.

The average earnings for the worker in our manufacturing establishments is less than $474 per year. Official reports further show the average annual earnings of railway employees is $650 per year. In the laborer class we find an average daily wage of less than $1.50 per day and less than 250 days' work per year.

Further, we find the highest wages paid in nonprotected work. We find 800,000 widows employed in America. We find 400,000 children under 15 years of age employed. No, my friends, your patriotic speeches telling about the glories of the Republic and what protection has done for the people sound well, but the stubborn facts and conditions remain, confronted by the insistent demands of healthy American appetites requiring three meals a day, if they can be had.

I am glad I mentioned that. It recalls your glowing picture of the higher scale of living and your talk about the extravagance of the people as accounting for the high cost of living.

If Republican Congressmen and Senators would try living for awhile on $1.50 per day for the support of a family of five, and pay rent, I think they would never accuse the American worker, whose highest average yearly earning is less than $500, of extravagance.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] proudly mentioned the fact that American people were now consuming 6½ bushels of wheat per capita, as against 4½ bushels per capita in former years. Once in a very great while even shrewd politicians like Mr. CANNON will make a serious break and unintentionally admit a truth.

Of course the people are, as the agricultural reports show, *eating more wheat and more potatoes and less meat.* Why? Because their wages will not permit meat on the table every day and every meal. Such vegetarians as Rockefeller, Morgan, Carnegie, and CANNON will say that it is much better for the people to live on bread and potatoes, but it will be difficult for the Republican managers to fool the voters again with the full-dinner-pail promise. They did it once very cleverly, and then immediately after election enacted laws authorizing the Beef Trust, the Coffee and Sugar Trusts, and others to steal the good and nourishing meats and food from his dinner pail, leaving a diet of bread and potatoes for the worker and his family, who had been thus betrayed.

If you think this is overdrawn, study the agricultural reports on wheat, potatoes, meat products, and population. If you are still an unbeliever, try the scale of food and clothing on a basis of $1.50 per day, $12 per month rent, family of 5, and 22 days' work for the month, and you will find out how much sirloin steak you will use.

The argument of the standard of living for American workers is not based on facts, and the argument that his extravagance is the direct cause of high prices is as false and misleading as all the argument in favor of protection.

Each year the American manufacturer is requiring a higher percentage of production from his labor, drawing more heavily upon the vital reserve forces of the workmen, and not compensating him with his full share of the increased profits.

The case of Andrew Carnegie is a typical case of benefits of protection to a favored few and is identical with all other protected industries.

The few are permitted through this vicious method of taxation to accumulate vast fortunes, while the laborer who has produced the wealth must be content with a mere living wage when employed and starvation when not employed.

WE WANT BROADER MARKETS.

I have in my district, Mr. Chairman, the largest car-building plants in the country. Give these plants free raw material, and the splendid workmen in those shops will make cars more quickly and cheaply than any foreign competitor possibly can. With free construction material, the able management of this company can pay the highest rate of wages and sell their cars in every market in the world at a profit and give continuous employment to their men.

But under the restrictive protective policy, compelling us to trade with one another instead of offering every inducement to reach out into the markets of the world and thus create a heavier trade balance in our favor, bringing hundreds of millions of dollars of new money into the country every year, *the protective policy as applied to developed industries is absolutely unsound from every economic viewpoint.*

American business methods, American workmen, American machinery, and American salesmanship will meet and conquer any industrial condition in the world. The broader markets will secure for American workmen continuous employment and a correspondingly higher earning capacity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When times are good the American workman employed in protected industries finds when he takes his place in the mill a strange companion at his side, who can not speak the English language. The American complains, and is arrogantly informed that the company must buy its labor where it can buy it the cheapest. So the workman finds himself in competition with the cheapest pauper labor in the world.

When the mill shuts down, this cheap foreign labor migrates back to the Old World to await the return of employment here, while the American workman must continue to feed and clothe his family and pay rent.

The American workman earns his dollar in open competition, and each dollar represents a draft on his original capital—his physical energy. Now, when his wife goes to market with that dollar she finds standing upon each side of the market place the agents of the Beef Trust, the Sugar and Coffee Trusts, the Woolen Trust, the Cereal Trust, and other trusts and monopolies, who control practically everything that must be purchased and brought within a home, exacting a few pennies of protective-tariff toll from every purchase. The workman has nothing to sell but his labor.

No, Mr. Chairman, protection does not protect the farmer, nor does it protect the laborer. When it is necessary to tax the necessities of the people in order that an industry may prosper, then we are better off, from a fundamental economic standpoint, not to have that industry. In this age of modern machinery and modern methods of scientific business management *an American industry which can not stand upon its own bottom without the favoritism of a special law to insure its profit, then that industry is a harm rather than a good in the commercial life of the Nation.*

Even though, Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to the Democratic theory of a tariff for revenue only, I would be unwilling at this time of commercial unrest throughout the Nation to attack any industry or be a contributory part to any cause which would even temporarily throw men or women out of employment.

But in this bill which we are offering, can anyone say that the United States Steel Co. needs protection? Can anyone say that the Lumber Trust ought to have protection? Can anyone say that the food, the meat, and the cereals, and the bread of the working people ought to be taxed? Can anyone say that the implements with which the farmer tills the soil and grows the crops ought to be taxed? Can anyone claim that the great American Harvester Co. ought to be protected by a special tax?

The free raw material question was taken up at the last session of Congress, and in the hope of trying to get a lower price for shoes we did take the tariff off of hides. But it seems to have benefited only the shoe manufacturers. *We are now going further, and when we find a monopoly controlling any product we are going to take the tax off the raw material and the manufactured article as well.* [Applause.]

THE MANUFACTURER.

In our commercial organization the manufacturer, the railroad, the merchant each form an integral and harmonious part in the wealth production of the farm and labor.

No one would be so foolish as to desire to work a harm to any industry. But that we have outgrown the narrow policy of protection is generally admitted by all except those who are the direct beneficiaries.

One evil begets another. Protection is directly responsible for trusts and monopolies, each becoming essential to the other. By removing the one, the laws of trade will regulate the other.

No nation can become great as an agricultural nation except by and through diversified farming. No nation can become great as a manufacturing nation except by and through diversified industries. It is the small manufacturer who lends stability to trade and wages. Protection helps combinations of capital drive the small manufacturers out of business.

The American market has become the greatest and best market in the world, and so intense has become the struggle for supremacy in the home market that we are neglecting our broader and greater opportunities in a foreign market.

Capital owes something more to labor than a mere wage. It owes it the fullest and broadest opportunity for work surrounded by such conditions of trade as shall permit it to earn and save a surplus. Labor can not reach foreign markets of its own effort, but capital can and should.

For purpose of illustration, and not because of any desire to make special mention, take the United States Steel Co. Remove from it all governmental protection which now surrounds its industry. For awhile it may work the political bluff of closing down its plants, but not for long. It will open up new markets in the Far East and South, creating a new demand and procuring their share of the trade now going to England, France, and Germany. *This would give its men steady employment. It would not reduce wages, and it would continue to pay dividends on its watered stock then as now.*

Like everything else, it moves along the lines of least resistance. Its close monopoly of the American market and the protection given it by the Government enables it by reducing wages and laying off men in slack times to pay dividends, and it is satisfied.

In the earlier effort for special privilege for infant industries this protective toll could be paid without being felt so much by the people, for there was only an occasional infant to be cared for.

But the birth of infants has become so wonderfully prolific, and each one crying for a special privilege, until it has reached the point of swapping dollars with each other in the belief that we can tax ourselves into prosperity, like the man trying to lift himself by his boot straps.

Under the law of protection we are overtrading within ourselves and destroying our home market by our shortsighted and niggardly attitude toward the farmers and toilers of the land, who are the real producers of real wealth and real prosperity.

WHICH POLICY WOULD YOU HAVE?

We find two distinct and fundamental principles of government as represented by the Democratic and Republican Parties. The Republican Party supports the doctrine and principles of Hamilton, who believed in the concentration of power and authority in the hands of a few. Hamilton did not trust the people.

Upon the other hand, we find the principles of Democracy set forth in the life and works of Jefferson, advocating as the Democratic theory of government that in a Republic like ours there should be a wider diffusion of authority and responsibility among the people. We believe in the people and trust them, and believe that Congress and the various legislative bodies of the States should respond absolutely to the wishes of the people.

Again, we find a difference in theory and principle on the question of taxation. The Republican idea is that the Federal Government should be used for purposes other than revenue. In fact, the Republican theory is that the Government should be used to levy taxes, and, under the protective theory, a tax to cover not only the difference in cost of production here and abroad but a *tax to cover and insure the manufacturer's profit*, regardless of whether or not that profit is based on efficient and economical management.

THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY IS THAT THE GOVERNMENT, AS AN INSTRUMENT OF THE PEOPLE, SHOULD USE ITS TAXING POWER FOR PURPOSES OF REVENUE ONLY. THIS BELIEF I SUBSCRIBE TO ABSOLUTELY. I AM UNWILLING WHILE I REMAIN A MEMBER OF THIS CONGRESS TO BE A PARTY TO ANY ACT WHICH PERVERTS THE USE OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF GUARANTEEING THE PROFITS OF ANY INTEREST OR ANY MAN OR ANY SET OF MEN.

For nearly 40 years the Republican Party has had unlimited control of the Government and must assume responsibility for present economic and labor conditions.

You ask me what has high protection done for the farmer? I answer that it has driven his boys and girls from the farm into the factories and mills of the town. You have been holding the farmer and wage earner up by the throat while the Machinery Trust, the Lumber Trust, the Steel Trust, the Leather Trust, and the Beef Trust have put their hands into his pockets and filched him of the earnings which belonged to the savings of his wife and his children.

What has protection done? Go down the streets of this city, or of any city, and you will find there families living in 3 or 4 rooms who ought to have 8 or 10, families living in apartments who ought to be out enjoying the sunshine and the air in homes of their own. If this protective policy is continued, the neglect of the farming industry and the workmen of the country continued, in behalf of the favored few, the work of deterioration of American citizenship and of the American Republic has begun.

What means this wave of socialism throughout the country? What means this constant conjuring of new ways and means of so-called reforms? It means that underlying all there must come an economic change of conditions for the toiler and the producer. This change must first come by removing special privilege. The voice of the people has been heard in the last election; and remember this, the people will in the end get what they want. That which they have created they will revise or amend to suit their will. Let the United States Senate beware. Let it not trifle with this great body of a wronged people and continue to legislate in behalf of the special interests; for if they do, another election will place within that Chamber a sufficient majority to give us Democratic control of the Senate, the House, and the Presidency of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The world, in a commercial sense, is constantly getting smaller. Wireless telegraphy, the telephone, the railroads have made it possible for the business man at his desk to-day to be in touch with all the world. In 1950 there will be at least 200,000,000 people in the United States to be fed, clothed, and housed. We can not go on and increase our acreage in the next 50 years as we have done in the past.

The question of feeding 200,000,000 people and of supplying the world means the thorough reorganization of the agricultural industry of the country, and more especially does it mean a thorough reorganization of industrial conditions *which will enable the man who has only his own energy to sell to make a profit over and above the cost of living in exchange for that energy.* [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this bill is in the interest of the Government. It stands for the best interests of the farmer. It stands, as no other measure has ever stood, for the best interests of the workmen. It stands, as no other measure ever stood, for the best interests of the independent manufacturer.

The Democratic Party is laboring for legislation in behalf of the producer. It means no harm to any industry nor will it work harm to any industry. It now proposes to take up the work of reorganization and of reformation and of placing our affairs, in so far as the Government is concerned, upon a sound economic basis by reducing expenses, lowering taxes, and removing special privilege wherever found.

The Democratic Party will see that the Government of the people shall simply perform its functions as originally intended by the fathers of our country. *We propose to remove the shackles of special privilege, we propose to restore to the people equal rights and equal opportunities.* [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is no politics in this question except from the viewpoint of those who choose to make it so for their own special advantage. What we desire is the common good of the country and of the people. The day of special privilege is past. Every man has an equal right to a fair deal and an equal opportunity under the law.

The taxing power of the people must be returned to the people and must be used from this time on for purposes of revenue only and not for purposes of protecting any industry, much less for the purpose of insuring a profit to special interests as provided in the last Republican platform.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] took exception to a quotation from Markham's poem entitled "The Man with the Hoe," by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

For the benefit of my friend from Wyoming and his colleagues, I shall read the poem:

Who loosened and let down this brutal jaw?
Whose was the hand that slanted back this brow?
Whose breath blew out the light within this brain?
Who made him dead to rapture and despair,
A thing that grieves not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?
Is this the thing the Lord God made and gave
To have dominion over sea and land;
To trace the stars and search the heavens for power;
To feel the passion of eternity?
Is this the dream He dreamed who shaped the suns
And pillared the blue firmament with light?
Down all the stretch of hell to its last gulf
There is no shape more terrible than this;
More tongued with censure of the world's blind greed;
More filled with signs and portents for the soul;
More fraught with menace to the universe.
What gulfs between him and the seraphim!
Slave of the wheel of labor, what to him
Are Plato and the swing of Pleiades?
What the long reaches of the peaks of song,
The rift of dawn, the reddening of the rose?
Through this dread shape the suffering ages look;
Time's tragedy is in that aching stoop;
Through this dread shape humanity betrayed,
Plundered, profaned, and disinherited.
Cries protest to the judges of the world,
A protest that is also prophecy.
O masters, lords, and rulers in all lands—

He refers, evidently to our Republican friends. [Laughter.]

Is this the handiwork you give to God,
This monstrous thing distorted and soul quenched?
How will you ever straighten up this shape;
Give back the upward looking and the light;
Rebuild in it the music and the dream;
Touch it again with immortality;
Make right the immemorial infamies,
Perfidious wrongs, immedicable woes?
O masters, lords, and rulers in all lands,
How will the future reckon with this man?
How answer his brute question in that hour
When whirlwinds of rebellion shake the world?
How will it be with kingdoms and with kings,
With those who shaped him to the thing he is,
When this dumb terror shall reply to God,
After the silence of the centuries?

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the type of man described by Markham is the result of the unchecked selfish power of special privilege in government and the power of concentrated wealth in individuals.

The type is found in the Russian serf, the Mexican peon, and the Egyptian fellah. He is found in every country of great military establishments.

Continue, sir, the policy of protection for another period of 50 years and he will be found on American soil. The Democratic Party believes that all men should dig and hoe their share in this struggle for a world living and world progress, but that no man should be compelled to dig and hoe all the days of all the years of his life for mere subsistence.

The Democratic Party has always been the party of the people. We represent the progressive and constructive party of the Nation. The standpatter must get out of the way. The march of human progress is on, and the Democratic Party is the instrument chosen by the people in carrying out their wishes. We have earned their confidence, and when the reports come in from the election of 1912 they will show protectionism and special privilege, with all their evils, cast to the four winds of the earth in the election of a Democratic President, a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENSLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to thank the gentleman from Alabama for extending me this opportunity to make a short talk on the free-list bill, and I want to submit, in the short time allotted me, not a carefully prepared speech, but some observations which in a general way have occurred to me. I have sat here in my seat for the last several days listening to the speeches made on this as well as on the other side of the House, all arguing and agonizing in behalf of the same people; and apparently some of the actors in this history making drama were almost moved to tears out of their great concern, as well as commiseration, for the downtrodden of this land—the farmer and the laboring man—that countless army of citizens who produce the wealth of this great country of ours, but for some reason or other are permitted to enjoy only a small portion of it. If it were possible for the whole citizenship comprising this Nation to hear the speeches made here in Congress, both pro and con, I wonder what effect it would have upon them, and in this connection I am of the opinion that if they believed everything and did not reason it out for themselves they would be in the same sad plight as the stranger who, traveling, came to where a number of roads crossed, began to look around for a signboard pointing the way he should go, when, finally discovering one, he read, "Take either one of these roads, stranger, and I'll be darned if you ain't lost." [Laughter.] So I am impressed that this would be the sad condition of our people, this great army of people for whom we are seeking to legislate, if, Mr. Chairman, it were not true that they are not so stupid. They study, they look beneath the surface, they familiarize themselves with conditions, and are thereby enabled to pass upon these important questions. And let me warn you on the other side of this Chamber, though I am a new Member, that no amount of oratory at this late day, after you have so recklessly and thoughtlessly betrayed every vestige of confidence reposed in you, will lure them from a sad recollection of your record and cause them to reverse the good work already so well begun. They can see the tracks you have made and know the direction you have been traveling; they know that you have been in undisputed control of the affairs of this Government for, lo, these many years, during which time they have eagerly watched and appealed to you for some recognition and relief from the burdens which bear down so heavily upon them, only to receive a renewal of your ante-election promises, which have proved empty and disappointing, and many times after elections you have increased their burdens.

Since 1896 the average man has been gradually losing his hold on the means of physical existence, until, by your own policy, you have placed your party in the attitude in which you now find it, and any attempt by you now to sway them momentarily or appease them by your eloquence is regarded as demagogy. I hope I may be pardoned if I make it too strong; but it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that some few of the Members on the other side of this Chamber have studied and they employ the Barnum theory, which was that the American people like to be deceived and humbugged. At any rate, whether the people like it or not, you propose and have practiced it upon them; but I warn you that that day has gone by. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am a raw hand in this great national factory; therefore I feel that I should proceed carefully. But I propose to say, even though I am taking a risk, I was astonished, and am astonished, at the treatment this bill has received at the hands of some of the gentlemen on the other side. You treat it lightly. You have been and are exceedingly technical. One would presume that men on the floor of this House, after having represented constituencies for years and years, would rise above those things. This, however, seems to be a part of your plan; and when I see men on the other side of this Chamber who have been the champions of the special classes against the masses opposing this bill I am convinced that it contains merit from the standpoint of the common people, and I therefore will cheerfully give it my support. In the law school I was taught not to give too much attention to technicalities, as it would cramp and narrow one's horizon and prevent him from seeing the true issues involved in the cause. This bill under consideration provides, among other things, for placing on the free list the following-named articles: Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description; leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, wire rods, wire, woven or manufactured, for wire fencing and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples, all of which articles, enumerated above, these same protected American manufacturers have been selling cheaper in foreign countries, after paying cost of transportation, than to the American farmers; and this can not be disputed by the strongest protectionist on this floor. It also places upon the free list the bread and the meat and the boots and the shoes that are so absolutely necessary to the workingmen of this country, whether they work upon the farm, whether they work in the mines, in the factory, upon our great railroads, or I care not where; so, as I see it, this ought to be sufficient to convince anyone that the passage of this bill will be of great benefit to all of our people.

In taking up this free-list bill I am reminded of the question which was asked the other day by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], Is an automobile a farming implement? Now, I would not charge the gentleman with being captious or insincere in asking that question, for such may not be true.

He may not know the difference between an automobile and a mowing machine. I recall that only a few days ago they were running some sort of motor-power lawn mower over these fine lawns about the Capitol, and I am now persuaded that this is about as near as the gentleman has ever been to a real mowing machine, and about as near as some of you gentlemen ever get to a real farming community. But do not mistake the fact, my friends, the farmers of the country know the difference between an automobile and farming implements, and that great body of men who labor, and who are usually referred to as industrial laborers, know the difference. This colloquy, therefore, emphasizes and substantiates their suspicion and makes keener their regret that this Government, baptized with the blood of patriots, supported and protected at all times by the plain people, is, under the control of the Republican Party as it exists to-day, getting further and further away in its workings from the plain people every year, and is rapidly becoming a government of, for, and by the classes instead of a government of the people. As was remarked the other day by the gentlemen from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], "when the leaders of a great party exhibit such lack of interest or knowledge concerning questions of such great importance, it means the decadence and downfall of such an organization." Lincoln's words were prophetic when, at the close of the war, he declared he could see a condition arising in this country which was appalling; that the accumulation of great wealth in the hands of a few individuals would bring more misery upon the American people than had been brought by the war between the States. What did McKinley say only a short time before the assassin's bullet laid him low? He argued for a reduction of the tariff and a curtailment of these special privileges; and to-day you find the President of the United States supporting this great Democratic principle while you of his party are opposing it. So you see your party is divided, both here and at home. Even the old Union soldiers are losing faith and confidence in you and are voting the Democratic ticket. They are opposed to "ring rule" and "bossism." They are opposed, and so are their children, to graft and corruption in any form. They love this country for which they fought, and they have taught their children to love and revere Old Glory and the sentiment that that flag represents. They do not want to see it trailed in the mire at home or abroad. They feel neglected here at Washington, and they are resentful. You can not blame them. Their boys, long since grown to manhood, are in thousands of instances all over the land proclaiming their political independence, and they, too, are resenting this neglect of and

injury to their fathers, and are turning their backs upon the party of trusts and special interests and are exercising this independence in order to rescue this great Republic from its impending doom. Then do you wonder that these old veterans, possessed of the same love for country, who were patriotic and fearless enough to risk their lives upon the field of battle to preserve this Union, are deserting your party in order to again restore this Government to the people? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is remarkable, Mr. Chairman, what food for thought the Cleveland administration affords the gentleman on the other side of this Chamber. I do not know how they could have gotten along all these years without poor old Grover as a text. He seems to have been a great asset to the Republican Party. It reminds me of the two negroes jowering. One was cursing Jeff Davis, of Confederate fame; the other darky remarked, "Nigger, you don't know what you are talking about; if it had not been for old Jeff Davis's stirring up that fracas you never would have been a free nigger." So, I think, without Cleveland and his administration you would have been stripped of arguments in all the campaigns which have come and gone since that day. I think the leaders of the Republican Party could well afford to divert a few million dollars of their campaign fund and erect a monument, the like of which the world has never seen, to the memory of Grover Cleveland. He did not do anything to warrant this on your part, but you have used that argument so often and for so long and with so much pleasure and success that I think it would be a fitting tribute as well as a deserved recognition. Now, I would be ashamed to resort to this argument longer if I were you. It was and is false from start to finish, and you have had full knowledge of its falsity all these years. Senator Dolliver, one of the greatest Republicans who has ever graced the Senate of the United States, declared only a few months before he departed this life that he could not see the connection of the panic of 1893 with the Cleveland administration, for the panic swept over this country nearly a year before Cleveland went into office.

Why have you not referred to the Walker tariff period, a time when Democratic principles were put into force and effect which brought about an era of prosperity rarely, if ever, equaled in the history of our country?

But, my friends, we are not living in the dead past, but for to-day and for to-morrow. Fifteen years have come and gone since Cleveland was at the helm of the ship of state, and the Republican Party has had undisputed control of affairs ever since that day. The people of this Nation would have continued you as guardians of their rights had you been faithful to the trust. They reached the point where they not only saw but felt that something was wrong, and radically wrong.

In your national platform you pledged relief to that great body of citizens who eat their bread in the sweat of their faces, and who have been electing you to office all these years, but they were intelligent enough to see and know that you were legislating for the classes and the "system"; that you were making millionaires and not a prosperous people; that you were placing barriers between them and the so-called captains of industry; that you were reducing them to a condition of serfdom throughout the land; and for these reasons they have reduced you to the minority on the floor of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Do you not think that they know that they, by their toil, create the wealth of this Nation? Yea, and more than that, fight the battles of this country when she is in peril, either from invasion from without or insurrection from within. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Down in my district in southeast Missouri during the last campaign the Republican spellbinders from every platform declared that the people were prosperous and happy; but, gentlemen, that did not satisfy; they had cried out for bread and you had given them a stone; they asked for a fish and you gave them a serpent. Instead of complying with their demands in reducing the tariff on the necessaries of life, as you had promised, and as was just, you increased it, and thereby increased the burdens that already lay so heavily on the toiling masses of this Nation; and for what purpose? In order to satisfy the demands of the trusts and combines of the country. Mr. Chairman, I hope and pray my God that I will live to see the day when the laws and conditions in this glorious land of ours will be so just and equitable that it will be impossible for individuals to accumulate by special privileges, at the expense of the masses, fortunes so gigantic and colossal that they know not what to do with them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They hold in their grasp, as it were, the destinies of thousands of freemen. Why, we have instances where their wealth is so great that they have actually called upon the Government of the United States to assist them in dispensing their money, or, rather, disgorging their ill-gotten gains.

Has the still, small voice whispered to them as it did to the prophet of old? Or, rather, has it not been their consciences, knowing and realizing, as they must, the methods they have employed to despoil the people? Or, instead, has it been the terrible situation that presents itself in the crowded districts of our land, where the plaintive voices of the hungry can be heard? Such a situation presents itself, and you are fully cognizant of this fact. Look about you for a moment. You see the granaries, packing concerns, and storehouses of every kind and character, wherever you may look, and where the product of man's toil can be stored; you will find all are full to overflowing. The banks of the country, especially the banks in the large cities, have more money in them than they ever have had before, and yet the great masses of our country are not sharing in this prosperity. Great numbers of our people have not 30 days between them and an execution held by a sheriff. My Republican friends, they are not asking for much—only a just portion of the wealth they produce. Is that too much? You have many, many times told the laboring man of this country you loved him and that you wanted to protect him. How have you protected him? Let us analyze conditions for a moment. We all know, those of us who have studied the history of our country and the origin of the protective system, that it was proposed for the purpose, in the first instance, to encourage men of means who lived here and induce others to come here to engage in the manufacture of articles needed at that early primitive time of our country's history, so as to foster and build them up, and thereby enable them to become strong institutions. That process of assisting infant industries continued until they became great trusts and combines, a menace to the very existence of the power that created them. The question of protection, under the original theory, is no longer present, but has resolved itself into a question now of preserving our Nation and controlling these trusts, so as to insure our liberty and perpetuate our form of government. You have made it possible to build up such vast fortunes in this country that they have become the marvel of the world. You have permitted these trusts to plunder the people.

Let me explain. Let us get at the philosophy of the system. There are always more people that consume any given article than is required in the production of it. Now, if you place a tax upon the article to be paid by the consumer for the benefit of the producer, are you not narrowing the volume of money to that extent? That seems perfectly plain. Now, this system should not and will not endure, and can not be reconciled with the theory so often proclaimed, namely, the greatest good to the greatest number. Not only that, but, mind you, all the producers do not share in the tax; you say that they do, but that is not true—the operators get it. So you see that the extra price placed upon the consumer and paid by him must necessarily narrow down until practically a few great trusts and combines are the beneficiaries of this whole tax. Let us consider that for a moment and reason a little. I think the Good Book says, "Come thou, let us reason together." There was a time, as you remember, that you argued that the tariff was paid by the foreigner, and you succeeded in deceiving the people for a while upon that sort of specious argument, but, when finally driven from that position, you were forced to invoke the sacred name of labor. You agonized with the laboring people of the country; you insisted that you wanted to protect him and that the tax was for that purpose, but in the next breath you declared that the revenue was needed to defray the enormous expenses of the Government. Now, think of that situation. Can you imagine that the $1 collected by this system of taxation will supply all three ends—first, going as dividends to the stockholders and bondholders of these great concerns so as to enable them to contribute properly to campaign funds and spend the most of their time in Europe in riotous living—or does this same dollar go to the Government as revenue or to the laboring man? It can not go to the Government if it goes to the manufacturer, nor can it go to either of those named and yet reach the laboring man. You see clearly how preposterous that position is. Before it goes to the Government as revenue you must have bought foreign-made goods. It is the only means by which the tax you pay can become revenue, excepting when you buy articles internally taxed. If you buy homemade articles, then it resolves itself into a question between the two—the employer and the employee—as to who receives the tax the consumer in that case pays. Let me make a homely illustration.

If it were possible that when we buy an article of consumption we could know just what the article we buy cost in labor

and exactly what it is taxed; as, for instance, we go into a furnishing store and examine a garment, and the clerk quotes a price of $10, we inquire of him what this $10, the price of the garment, represents. The clerk explains that it represents the raw material, whatever cotton or wool is in the garment, plus the labor that has been expended on it, transportation, and the profit to the merchant. We thereupon advise him to wrap up the garment, and upon paying for it proceed on our way, whereupon a revenue collector taps us on the shoulder and inquires what is in our bundle; and upon investigation the revenue officer informs us that there is $5 tariff duty to be paid. We would turn to the officer and ask him if that is the tariff that we have heard so much about, and if this money goes to the Treasury of the United States to defray the expenses of the Government? The officer answers us: If it is a foreign-made article, it does; but if a domestic-made article, he would say, It does not; that only in the case of purchasing foreign-made articles does this tariff go into the Treasury of the United States. Then, would we not inquire of the officer where is this money presumed to go; and he would explain to us that it goes to the manufacturer of the garment. For what purpose, Mr. Officer? The officer would then explain that it is to encourage the manufacturer who is engaged in that particular business; and, further, to enable him to pay better wages to his employees. Does the manufacturer use any portion of this money with which to pay better wages to his employees? Not necessarily. The communities where these great factories are usually located have such a supply of laborers, and competition between the men employed is so keen, that the employer does not have to pay any of this tariff to his men. He always employs the man who will turn off the most work for the least money; so that he does not have to pay out any of this $5 tariff money to the laboring men. It would be different if competition were keen between employers to get men; that is, if there were more jobs than men to fill them; but under prevailing conditions they are not compelled to pay out any of this $5 to the laboring man; it is therefore possible for them to put this tariff money in their coffers.

I would like to see a system devised akin, and in some respects bearing resemblance, to the pure-food law, so that when a purchaser buys an article he would be able to determine its relevant parts, the costs of manufacture, the tariff, and all, so that at the end of any stated period he could ascertain just how much revenue he pays the Government and just the amount he contributes to further enrich the few. In other words, to reveal the hand of the taxgatherer. Now, then, let us get back and see how the workingman fares. In addition to all these things mentioned, all these years, you have said that you wanted to protect the workingman of this country against the cheap pauper labor of Europe, and notwithstanding this, by some means or other, you have permitted the great ship companies to bring in millions of the cheapest kind of pauper labor, and they are put into active competition with the American boys in the shops, the great factories, and mines of our country. Not only that, they bring all the abominable habits and practices of their native lands with them, and in a great many instances live under conditions here such as no bright-faced, intelligent American boy would think of living under. Nor is that all. I am informed that a certain class of them send about 40 per cent of their earnings back to the country from whence they came. As was declared the other day in the course of a magnificent speech by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] on the floor of this House, they send back annually to the country from whence they came between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000. Think of it, my friends. Is that a healthy condition of affairs? No one objects to people coming to this land from any country on the face of God's earth to enjoy all our rights and liberties when they come possessed of the right motives, and propose, when they come, to study our institutions and laws with a view of becoming citizens and shouldering the burdens of Government. We welcome all who come to assume the responsibilities of citizenship, assisting us in protecting in every way possible the liberties of our country, so as to transmit this Government to those who are to follow us, with the principles underlying it as pure and unsullied as they were when our forefathers established it.

Then there is another phase to this proposition that I wish to discuss. Within the last few decades, in addition to the sharp competition that has been produced by bringing foreigners here, there have been vast improvements made in mechanics, in machinery of every kind, until we have reached the point, I have observed, that one man with improved machinery can to-day turn off as much work as three men could have done 10 years ago. Still the one man is not getting much better wages, if any, than each of the three received theretofore for the same amount of work. At any rate the saving which has resulted by reason of the change has not been shared by the one that remains, and yet the tariff, which you claim protects the laboring man, remains on the three; so you see, without further argument, in reality the machinery gets two-thirds of the protection, and there, then, begins a guessing contest between the employer and the employee to determine who gets the other one-third. The workingman guesses he will get it and the employer guesses he will not, and in all these respects you see the laboring man does not receive a square deal. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You have legislated for the benefit of the few, and you have thereby been centralizing the wealth of the country until to-day practically a few men control all the business interests and affairs of the country. For instance, it was said the other day that Carnegie in 1893, when the panic struck the country, was worth, all told, $10,000,000, and 10 years thereafter he had so organized and capitalized his properties and watered the stock that he was able to collect dividends on $360,000,000. Think of that. He started cramping the people of this country in the panic of 1893 and in 10 years' time added $350,000,000 to his wealth. It has been said on the floor of this House—and it has not been challenged or disputed—that when the 24 directors of the United States Steel Trust sit down to their table that one-twelfth of the wealth of the United States is represented in their chairs; and, further, that 1 per cent of the American people own more property than the other 99 per cent, while 5,500,000 American families, or 44 per cent of our people, own an average of only $150 per family. We boast of having something like $33 per capita.

Now, if you would add the combined wealth of a million of the wealthiest and subtract their wealth from the total volume of money and then divide the remainder among the other, say 90,000,000 of people, I declare to you there would not be $7 apiece. This condition, compared with 50 years ago, when there were not one-half dozen millionaires in the United States, makes an alarming parallel. You have permitted this condition to continue until the people have grown tired of your cant and hypocrisy; and when you failed to carry out the pledges of your last platform, made in Chicago in 1908, to relieve the masses of the burdens heaped upon them by increasing the cost of all necessaries, they revolted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You promised, in the last Congress when you were in power, to lessen the price of shoes, but instead you increased the price.

And again the people looked to you for relief from the food trusts and the cold-storage plants of this country where millions of dollars of foodstuffs, the product of man's toil, is stored; and, very often, being held for speculative purposes until decay begins, in order to compel the consumer to pay the unreasonable and extortionate prices. Do not talk to me about the farmer getting the benefit of these prices. I know, and the farmers know, and you also know that he does not. I am, therefore, glad of the opportunity that this bill affords me to appeal in behalf of the farmer and the laborer. I was born and reared upon a farm back in Jefferson County among as good people as ever lived, and spent the early and best days of my life among them; and sometimes in my soliloquy I am reminded of the poet and can appreciate his inspiration, when he wrote:

> The king sat on his jeweled throne, and he heaved a sigh that was like a groan, for his crown was hard, and it bruised his head, and his scepter weighed like a pig of lead; the ladies smirked as they came to beg; the knights were pulling the royal leg. The king exclaimed, "If I had my wish I would cut this out, and I'd go and fish. For what is pomp to a weary soul that yearns and yearns for the fishing hole! The throne's a bore and the crown a gaud, and I'd swap the lot for a bamboo rod and a can of worms and a piece of string, but there's no such luck for a poor old king." And a boy who passed by the palace high, to fish for trout in the streamlet nigh, looked up in awe at the massive walls and caught a glimpse of the marble halls, and said to himself, "Oh, hully chee; wisht I was the king and the king was me! To reign all day with your crown on straight is a whole lot better'n diggin' bait and fishin' around when the fish won't bite and gettin' licked for your luck at night."

[Laughter and applause.]

These same conditions that inspired the poet exist to-day back on my old home place; and the same good people there whom I love are but the type of people who cultivate the soil everywhere. I own a farm myself, my people are farmers, and some of my very best and dearest friends are farmers. I am, therefore, doubly anxious to secure the relief to them which the passage of this bill promises, so that I can return home, look them in the face and say, I have done my duty.

And again, referring to labor conditions, I remember that Gov. Hadley, Republican governor of Missouri, before the last election, when speaking along this line, declared that 10 per

cent of the American people did not get enough to eat. What does that mean? It means that 9,000,000 of our people, men, women, and children, are hungry and are not properly provided for. It is an appalling situation in this land of plenty, where there is an abundance of everything to supply the wants of everybody. It seems to me that instead of a panic, and our people going hungry, we should have a picnic. I say to you that prosperity, as some of you define it, does not satisfy the wants of the common people of the country, or, if it did, the factories of our land would not be crowded with little children, boys and girls, toiling for bread when they should be in school receiving such training as will prepare them to take up the responsibilities of citizenship which will later devolve upon them.

No, you did not keep your anteelection promises made to the people. But there were other things besides these mentioned that caused them to revolt. The people were discontented; they were demanding information, and how and from whom did they receive it? Why, from such men as Senator Dolliver, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and Senator CUMMINS, Republican United States Senators, who would not longer stand for the deal of surrendering the people further into the grasp of the trusts and the combines. The Sugar Trust, by means of false weights and otherwise, stole millions of dollars that should have gone into the United States Treasury, which would thereby have reduced the amount the common people had to pay; and, in addition to this, enormous sums of money were lost, strayed, or stolen from various subtreasuries over our country, yet the culprits went unwhipped of justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri five minutes more.

Mr. HENSLEY. Nor is this all. You created Federal jobs for your pets within the last 10 years to the extent of 300,000 or more; nor does it stop with that. Senator Aldrich declared in the United States Senate, that great deliberative body at the other end of the Capitol, that if he were a business man he could run this Government and save to the people $300,000,000 per annum. The enormous sum of $300,000,000 of the people's money being uselessly and extravagantly expended. Now, since you have gone out of power, been removed from the lower House of this legislative branch of Government, I wonder what must be your feelings when you have witnessed the magnificent record made by the Democrats. What have the Democrats done in the way of living up to their pledges and keeping their promises to the people? The first thing we did was to take CHAMP CLARK, "the greatest Roman of them all," and elevate him to the Speaker's chair. He, who by his rugged honesty and fidelity to every trust, as is illustrated by the maxim he used in the conclusion of his speech, "he who serves his country best serves his party best," has endeared himself not only to the people of Missouri, but to the people of our whole country, who believe in a square deal and an equal chance. [Prolonged applause.]

And the caucus, as an evidence of good faith, cut off enough surplus and useless jobs to make a saving of $183,000 annually to the people of the United States; passed the resolution providing for direct election of United States Senators; passed the bill providing for the publicity of campaign expenses before as well as after election; and the reciprocity bill; and now have under consideration the free-list bill which we, in the House, will pass. I would not, however, attempt to predict the final action of the Republican Senate in their consideration of this bill. It may meet the same fate there as the Sulloway bill and other long-delayed measures of justice met in the last Congress. However, I am only responsible to my people for my course in this House, and when I discharge fully every obligation here they will not hold me accountable for the action of the Republican Senate.

There is one thing I desire to mention here, which, as it appears to me, is proof sufficient that this House can rise above partisanship and petty things which sometimes control party caucuses, as we, actuated by patriotism and humanity, selected that old veteran and man of God, who had lost his sight in the service of his country in the Union Army, as Chaplain of this House. Republican though he is, no other name was submitted before the caucus, and, as I see it, that was as it should have been. One should at all times rise above partisanship when the demands of humanity or country are presented.

Respecting the Canadian reciprocity bill, our people, the farmers, sell a great many things to Canada and have been selling them for some time, and upon a great many of these articles the farmers have sold into Canada there has been a tariff, and the ultimate consumer in Canada is compelled to pay the extra price placed upon those articles by way of a tariff. On the other hand, Canada has many things we need upon which a tariff is also placed, and before we can get those articles we have to pay this tariff. Now, to what extent do we trade with Canada? Let us consult the Government statistics, which show as follows:

For the last five years, ending June 30, in spite of the tariff obstructions, in goods of kinds—	
We sold to Canada	$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703
Horses:	
We sold in Canada	14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,844
Difference in our favor	24,916,712

So you see the balance of trade is in our favor. How, then, can reciprocity hurt the farmer?

The free-list bill, together with the reciprocity bill, is therefore a long step in the right direction in affording relief to the farmers and laborers of this country in the way of providing free tools and implements of every kind.

It is now generally admitted that, even from the protection standpoint, no protection whatever is needed by our great corporations and trusts which manufacture hoops, bands, and ties of iron and steel, and wire such as used for baling agricultural products, together with wire strand and rope, wire rods and barbed wire and other forms of wire used for fencing. By reason of existing high duties our people are dependent for these articles on our giant steel industry, which has captured for its products a large share of the markets of the world. It is a matter of common knowledge that our manufacturers of wire, hoops, ties, and other forms of steel have for years sold, and probably now do sell, their products abroad at much lower prices than to domestic consumers. The high protection they have enjoyed has enabled them to make this unfair discrimination against our own people. The removal of the duties on these iron and steel articles generally and necessarily used by our agricultural producers, as well as by many others, will effect a considerable saving to them, and this, like the provisions of the bill generally, is a long-delayed measure of equity and justice.

I believe that we are now at a point, if not a crisis, in the history of our country and race where every citizen and freeman is called upon to exercise the very highest degree of patriotism and manhood in order to vouchsafe our liberties. When you imagine it is going to be an easy task to shake the barnacles from the old ship of state you are deluding yourself. Do you not know it is going to be a struggle wherein the souls of men will be tried to restore this Government to the people as it was originally intended? Do you not know the beneficiaries of the system, the continuation of which means untold millions in their coffers, will resort to every means within their power, every means that human skill and ingenuity can devise, to hold onto the graft which has been afforded them by their control of the Republican Party. Organizations will be perfected, individual Congressmen will be petitioned, the press of the country, if possible, will be subsidized, and space in the magazines and farm and labor journals, wherever possible, will be bought in order to continue their system of exploiting the people; and I appeal to you and to the country not to permit these organizations, such as the American Protective League and others, composed of millionaires, the beneficiaries of the tariff, to influence you from your course of duty, but be true to self, to your country, and to your God.

What we need most of all is just a spark of the old spirit of patriotism, the fire that characterized our forefathers in the establishment of this country, the spirit of manhood, if we may hope to emancipate the American people and strike the shackles from the hand of toil. As was said on the floor of the House the other day, and I repeat it, "Shall the American millions be freemen or serfs?" And I ask you, shall the Government protect those who should be protected or shall it be used as an instrument in the hands of the strong to crush the weak? Let us resolve now and henceforth to protect our liberty at any cost, uphold her hands, and not suffer her to be slain in her own

temple, and there to gaze upon for the last time the lifeless, bleeding form of what once was the only hope of humanity and a constitutional form of government; once a world power, attained by her ideals and recognition of human rights, and thereby also maintained that relation rather than by her Army and Navy. When you put the moral force behind the individual, or the Nation if you please, you have nothing to fear.

In conclusion, I wish to say that we must rest our cause with the plain people of our country, who do not expect, nor do they desire, any advantage over their neighbor. They are the hope and refuge of our country, the patriotic, God-loving, and God-serving men. Then, if we be worthy sons of worthy sires, we will, so far as we can, give to them a Government and administration which will insure a square deal and an equal chance in the race of life, and in 1912 they will renew their confidence and we our covenants, and they will place us in possession of every department of this Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ANSBERRY].

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the discussion of the reciprocity pact and of the pending measure, the farmers' free-list bill, so called, has developed on the floor of this House, in addition to a considerable fund of valuable information, two new schools of economic thought. The first, presided over by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], might be called the school of equilibrium; but this university was but short lived, by reason of the fact that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS], with the aid of a long memory and a copy of the Breeders' Gazette, assaulted it so vigorously as completely to upset the equilibrium between the factory and the farm, which this new philosophy was supposed to support.

My colleague—I may say my distinguished colleague—who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee and from the great State of Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], is perhaps the person who has charge of the destiny of the other school. The gentleman from Ohio claims to be something of an agriculturist, not a farmer; the distinction being that a farmer makes money from the farm and an agriculturist expends money on the farm.

It would be rather hard to define this new school, for the reason that when the gentleman was presenting his argument on the question of reciprocity, in his modesty he admitted that he had some considerable part in the origin of the reciprocity bill which was introduced in the Sixty-first Congress and which he supported with his voice and his vote.

These arguments, which he proclaimed so zealously for reciprocity, are in direct opposition to his position on the farmers' free-list bill. So that we have a new idea, one week a free trader—because I think witnesses summoned from his own side of the House demonstrate beyond peradventure that anyone who supported the reciprocity pact was a free trader, and I suppose that applies to the distinguished leader of the minority [Mr. MANN]—at any rate, my colleague, being opposed to the position he took on reciprocity, has destroyed his own school. In other words, one week he is a protectionist and the next week a free trader, and that would naturally put his followers in a very equivocal position. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman affected to have a great deal of regard for the manufacturers of shoes, so much so that he said in the course of his speech that the so-called farmers' free list had no thought of the manufacturers, but it only had consideration for the consumer. I say to the gentleman, in my opinion it is high time that the consumer had his day in court. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I think his day has arrived. I am advised that no inconsiderable number of shoes are manufactured in the narrow confines of my colleague's district. I had supposed that the farmers' free-list bill was a complement to the reciprocity pact, and that a supporter of the one would logically be a contender for the other. We are told by the gentleman that putting shoes on the free list strikes a blow at the very foundations of the Republican theory of protection. I agree with the gentleman, and go further, and say that his party carried a commission from the people in the last Congress to do this selfsame thing, but they violated their trust, and now we are seeking through the medium of this proposed free list to give the farmer, the laborer, the mechanic, the lawyer, and the doctor, and everyone else in this country following any useful avocation, the benefit of a competitive market.

My colleague states that he is afraid of the effect this will have upon the manufacturer of shoes. While it is not our purpose to do anyone an injustice, we think that first consideration should be given to the large number who use shoes rather than to the few who are engaged in the manufacture of them. No one disputes the proposition laid down so eloquently by the gentleman that shoes are not trust controlled. No; they are not; but leather and shoe machinery, both necessary to the manufacture of shoes, are trust controlled, and a resolution has been introduced into this House looking to the investigation of the giant monopoly engaged in the manufacture of shoe machinery which has such a strangle hold upon the manufacture of shoes. But the gentleman need have no fears as to the ability of American shoe manufacturers to take care of themselves without the intervention of a high protective tariff. When the Payne bill was under consideration Wolf Bros., shoe manufacturers, located at Columbus, Ohio, advised the Members of the Sixty-first Congress by letter that they were not solicitous for a protective tariff on the products of their factory and that they were ready and willing to meet the shoe manufacturers of the world, and, as I recall it, they did not require the alternative of free hides. My colleague says that he received no such letter. The Wolf brothers, besides being manufacturers of shoes, are the proprietors and publishers of two great newspapers in the State of Ohio which have long been supporters of the Republican Party and its policies, and it is strange that in sending out letters to Members of Congress in the Sixty-first Congress advising them of their views on this all-important question that they should have omitted my colleague from Cincinnati, who was then on the Ways and Means Committee and high in the councils of the Republican organization of the Buckeye State. Can it be that these two great journals were opposed to the policies and political associates of my colleague?

During the discussion of this bill much has been said concerning its effect on the wages of men employed in industries engaged in the manufacture of those articles contained in the free list. This is not surprising for the reason that whenever an attempt is made to lower the tariff on any product that has been receiving the benefit of special privilege a howl immediately goes up that it is an assault upon wages and wage earners. This, of course, is the veriest fallacy. Everyone who has given the subject even passing thought must agree with all who have written truthfully upon this subject, that low-priced labor does not mean cheap production, and it is the comparative, not the absolute, cost of production that determines exchanges. We have but to look around to see that even in the same occupation, wages paid for labor whose products sell freely together are generally higher in large cities than in small towns, as they are higher in new parts of the United States than in the old, as they are higher in some parts of one State than in another. The American workingmen do not have to fear in our markets the products of cheap foreign labor, but the importation to our labor markets of that labor itself. Here, then, is the fallacy with reference to the protection of American wage earners, which, while imposing duties upon goods under the pretense that they are made by pauper labor, freely admits pauper labor itself. The American Congress in the past did not consider that there was as much danger in the importation of Chinese commodities as the importation of Chinese labor. On some of the former there is a tariff which has a tendency to keep out Chinese goods, while on the latter there is an absolute prohibition which does keep out Chinese labor. Our protective tariff on commodities undoubtedly raises the price of commodities, but the raising of the price of wages has not been accomplished by this cause.

It is a fact which no one can dispute that the highest protected industries in the United States are the industries which are the most frequently affected by strikes. And why do employees strike? Protection secures the employer from foreign competition, but in no way attempts to lessen competition among those who must sell their labor. There is no provision in any tariff law compelling employers benefited by protection to share these benefits with their workmen.

The proposition that protection raises wages involves two assumptions: First, that an increase in the profits of employers means an increase in the wages of their workmen.

Second, that an increase in the wages in protected occupations involves an increase in the wages in all occupations.

To state these assumptions is to show their absurdity. Is there anyone who really supposes that because an employer makes larger profits he therefore pays higher wages?

The late Henry George, from whose great work, Protection or Free Trade, I have borrowed most of the statements made with reference to labor, relates an instance in point. He told of riding on the platform of a Brooklyn horse car and a conversation which he had with the driver, who complained bitterly of his long hours, hard work, and poor pay; how he was chained a veritable slave to his car and by so doing he could

scarcely get enough to keep his wife and family and could not save anything for a rainy day. Mr. George suggested to him the feasibility of getting the legislature or city council to pass a law or ordinance permitting the street-car company to charge a 6 instead of a 5 cent fare, so as to enable them to raise the wages of their employees. The driver, with an incredulous smile, said that that would make no difference in his condition, and further stated that if the fare was raised from 5 cents to 60 cents the company would not pay a penny more in wages. It was not a question what they made, continued the driver, but how cheaply they could get some one to take his place. With increased income the company would pay higher dividends, said the driver, or increase their stock, but would never raise the pay of their employees until compelled to.

This driver stated an elemental and basic fact. The buyers of labor, with but few exceptions, pay what they are compelled to or what their own selfish interest dictates they shall pay. Where there are two men applying for one job the wages paid for that job will be lower than if there were two jobs seeking to employ one man. Labor organizations have had by far more to do with the high wages paid in America than anything else, although in comparing the wages paid in America with the wages paid abroad many things must be considered, as many things enter into the equation. The density of population, of course, is a great factor, and the population per square mile of America as compared with the population per square mile in England or Continental Europe, of course, is much more favorable to America than England or Europe. That the tariff does have no appreciable effect upon wages and wage earners is illustrated by the fact that free-trade England pays higher wages for every line of work than does protective Germany, France, or Belgium.

A gentleman engaged in the business of manufacturing window glass, which enjoys a high protective duty, visited Washington recently for the purpose of trying to arrange for reciprocity with Canada that would permit the glass manufacturers of the United States to sell their wares in that country, and, in the course of the conversation, he stated that the glass industry was at a standstill; that wages of glass blowers had steadily decreased in spite of the high protective tariff; that recently some Belgian glass blowers had left his employment and returned to Belgium, because the wages in the United States as compared with the cost of living were not as inviting as conditions in their own country, and Belgium pays lower wages than France, England, or Germany.

I can not refrain from referring to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], who discussed this wage question in connection with the free-list bill in the House yesterday. The gentleman always affords the House much information whenever he speaks. In the course of his speech yesterday he told us of a journey that he made through Great Britain a few years ago, and I think that journey has a great historical parallel in the journey of one Mr. Pickwick, known to fame as the founder of the Pickwick Club, and Mr. Pickwick, like our distinguished colleague, while journeying through that country made notes of the things which he observed which were of interest to be reported back to the members of his famous club who were not so fortunate as to be able to travel about their native country. Both of these distinguished gentlemen summoned a cab and both engaged the cabman in conversation. The gentleman from Connecticut advised us that he asked the cab driver whether or not he was the owner of the cab. Receiving a negative reply, he further pursued the conversation by asking the wages which he received. The cab driver told him that he received but $2.50 per week for 13 hours per day. Of course our colleague gave the poor cabman a generous tip, which, of course, was just the effect the cab driver intended his story should have. But to return to our friend Pickwick. Mr. Pickwick inquired as to the age of the horse, and the cabman, after a side glance at Mr. Pickwick, answered, "42."

Thereupon Mr. Pickwick, not so gullible as some travelers, exclaimed doubtfully, "What!"

The cab driver reiterated his former statement. Mr. Pickwick carefully scrutinized the man's face, but his features were immovable; so, convinced, Mr. Pickwick noted down the fact of the horse's age.

"And how long do you keep him out at a time?" inquired Mr. Pickwick, searching for further information.

"Two or three weeks," replied the man.

"Weeks!" said Mr. Pickwick in astonishment—and out came the notebook again.

"He lives at Pentonwil when he's at home," observed the driver, cooly, "but we seldom takes him home on account of his weakness."

"On account of his weakness," reiterated the perplexed Mr. Pickwick.

"He always falls down when he's took out o' the cab," continued the driver, "but when he's in it we bears him up werry tight, and takes him in werry short, so as he can't werry well fall down, and we've got a pair o' precious large wheels on; so ven he does move, they run after him, and he must go on—he can't help it."

Mr. Pickwick entered every word of this statement in his notebook, with the view of communicating it to the club as a singular instance of the tenacity of life in horses under trying circumstances.

I was unable to follow the reasoning of the gentleman from Connecticut in that I could not see what possible effect this farmers' free bill or a protective tariff would have upon cabmen engaged in carting people about the cities of the United States. By an inspection of tariff bills I have been unable to find that any protection was ever attempted to be afforded to cab drivers in the United States in competition with cab drivers in Great Britain or anywhere else. Neither does an inspection of the farmers' free list throw any light upon the subject. It can not be that the gentleman believes that taking the tariff off of farm wagons can have any possible effect upon cab drivers in Great Britain.

We are all interested in this question of high wages, and I am sure that all of us would deem it a pleasure to pass any legislation within the bounds of reason that would have this effect. But I deny that a high protective tariff would bring about the desired results, and I say, as I said before, that men engaged in the industries which are the most highly protected, or rather employees—for unfortunately they are not all men—receive lower wages than employees of other industries not protected, and that, in other words, the men engaged in industries not protected receive the highest wages in the United States.

I need only suggest a few instances in proof of this proposition, so he who runs may read. Bricklayers, blacksmiths, carpenters, masons, painters, machinists, railroad men, and last, but by no means least, the merry plumber, receive a great deal higher wage than that paid men in any other industry, whether protected or not; and no one can contend that the product of the employees on a railroad could, by any process of reasoning, be protected by a tariff bill, and so it is with the bricklayer, the plumber, the carpenter, and others engaged in various useful avocations, carrying out the God-given mandate, earning their bread in the sweat of their face.

Consider the absurdity of a bricklayer or a plumber, a carpenter or a railroad man, engaged in their different callings, in far-away England or continental Europe, or Japan, or India, or anywhere that our friends of the minority contend that labor receives a scant wage, being engaged in the production of a commodity which could be made the subject of an import duty. Impossible, of course. And by the same token it would be impossible to draw up a tariff bill which could effect any difference in their wage. During the pendency in this country of high protective-tariff laws wages have been high and low. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is stated, and we can readily believe it, that while we were still colonies of Great Britain wages were much higher here than in Great Britain, and so it continued all the time prior to 1846, when Great Britain likewise had protective-tariff laws. Therefore we have the right to conclude that wages are not affected by the tariff, be it high or be it low.

The men and women employed in the textile industry, which receives the highest rate of protection under our protective-tariff laws, receive the lowest wage. The men engaged in the steel industry receive, comparatively speaking, very low wages. I am informed that the average wage paid by the United States Steel Corporation is between $600 and $700 per year, and it must be borne in mind that, to make up this average, we are taking into account the high-priced salaries paid the president and other pets of this corporation. No one will contend that the wages paid by the steel corporation are alarmingly high, or anywhere near commensurate with the protection afforded this concern. So it is with almost every industry that receives the benefits of high protection.

Something has been said, with reference to the farmers' free bill, of the panic of 1894. Some have called it the Grover Cleveland panic, other the Democratic free-trade panic. These are familiar arguments. We heard them in the long ago, and therefore we experience the pleasurable sensations of meeting an old friend. This argument is not so ancient, however, as the now discarded cry that the "Foreigner, not the consumer, pays the tariff," and still it is not as old as that discredited shibboleth, "Let the tariff be revised by the friends of the tariff." With reference to the alleged Grover Cleveland and free-trade panic

it should not be necessary to do so, but I shall take a few moments to once more call attention to the facts relative to the panic which began in the United States not in 1894, not in 1893, but in 1892.

The Wilson tariff bill, as all know, was not a low-tariff bill, but was as much a protective measure as the bill that preceded it. This tariff bill, which was passed in 1894, unless it could have been retroactive, could not have produced the panic which began in 1892, with the Homestead strike in Pennsylvania, long before the Democratic Party had been vested with power.

Let us examine the record. We find that when this strike began in 1892 the McKinley tariff law was upon the statute books, a Republican administration was in charge of every branch of the Federal Government and continued in charge until March 4, 1893. Mr. Cleveland was nominated by the Democracy for a third time in 1892, and the campaign issue between the two great parties, which resulted in an overwhelming victory for Democracy, was the tariff, nothing else was discussed that could obscure the issue, and upon that issue Grover Cleveland and his party were swept into power, and they, like their Republican predecessors, were given control of every branch of the Government.

It will be recalled that in addition to the solid South, Mr. Cleveland carried many Northern States, including such strongholds of Republicanism as Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, parts of Michigan, California, and North Dakota, one elector in Ohio, and but for the fact that a new voting system was being inaugurated he undoubtedly would have gotten the balance of the electors in Ohio.

I recite these things because when cornered our opponents will admit that the panic began before Cleveland was inaugurated and before the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, but that the doctor, the lawyer, the merchant, the farmer, the clerk, the clergyman, and all the others of our citizens, who, after a full and free discussion and understanding of the question at issue, had decided that they wanted the tariff reduced, and having put the machinery in motion to reduce the tariff became afraid that they were going to get what they wanted and thereupon turned tail and precipitated a panic. This idea will not bear analysis. This sort of reasoning does not appeal to the thoughtful or intelligent man, be he legislator or private citizen.

It is the old bugaboo raised by the friends of protection, whom I have shown are not the friends of high wages. This panic was a world panic. It started in the early nineties in the Argentine Republic, due to successive crop failures, and spread all over the world. The truth of the matter is that while we had a panic in this country between 1892 and 1897, trade conditions were equally bad in our neighboring country, Canada, in Mexico, in the Argentine Republic, in England, in Continental Europe, and almost everywhere in the civilized world. We have had many panics under high protective tariff laws, the most notable one being from 1873 to 1878; and during that period we had a high protective tariff law.

Again we had a panic, and a most remarkable one it was, beginning October 27, 1907, and which was more severe, as you all remember, than any panic this country has experienced in years. More banks failed during this panic in 60 days than failed from 1892 to 1897, and the Dingley high protective tariff law during this panic was upon the statute books in full force and effect. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Can the gentleman [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yield me some more time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the gentleman additional time.

Mr. ANSBERRY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], or some one in the discussion of reciprocity on the other side, said that this talk of cementing the bond between our country and our sister on the north was merely sentiment. I do not recall whether he used the term "puerile" or not, but he said, in a deprecatory sort of way, that it was sentiment.

I want you gentlemen to reflect a moment on the part that sentiment has played in the destiny of our great country. Columbus would never have discovered America but for sentiment, as with bowed head he walked the streets of the Spanish capital, deserted by royalty and mocked by the common people. What was it but the most sublime sentiment that kept his strong soul, the great soul of America's first admiral, true to its purpose? Nothing but sentiment, a sentiment which aimed to give the people of the Old World additional opportunities in the New. What was it that in the bosom of those men who in 1776 sat in convention together in the neighboring city of Philadelphia and brought forth the Declaration of Independence? Sentiment—and a sentiment of the highest kind. What but sentiment, a sentiment of patriotism, inspired the strong hearts and resolute will of Oliver Hazard Perry and his men as they built their boats on the bleak bank of Lake Erie and as they later on fought the good fight and destroyed the British fleet at Put-in-Bay? What but sentiment caused the flower of our youth to go forth and engage in the greatest struggle of which history preserves a record—the Civil War? What caused our young men to battle for the flag in the darkest days of our Republic from 1861 to 1865? Was it the $13 per month which they received in depreciated currency? No; they were not taking thought of the $13 per month. They were animated by the highest sentiment; and if you eliminate sentiment from the great address made by Abraham Lincoln on the field at Gettysburg, during the progress of that war, there would be nothing left but meaningless words. Humane sentiment caused the War with Spain, and so we have seen that sentiment has played a great part in our history, even from the time of the discovery of our country to this very day, as it has played a great part in the history of every nation in this world. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON].

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I shall vote for this bill, even if the amendments proposed shall fail. I think a number of the objections made by the gentleman from Illinois in his argument before the committee were well taken but not fatal to the bill. I think the bill would be a better one if some of the objections made by the gentleman from Illinois were concurred in. I think the bill would be an immensely better one if its scope was enlarged so as to include sugar and rice and all food products which we do not produce in sufficient quantities to supply our home consumption. I do not believe in taxing any food products, directly or indirectly, which we can not produce in this country economically and which the country is not adapted to raising. I think it is utterly indefensible to tax a necessary food product when the soil, climate, and the cost of labor are all heavily against its economical production. In proposing to place sugar on the free list, I am in accord with the Republican policy which prevailed from the end of the Civil War up to the time of the enactment by the Republicans, in control, of the McKinley law. From the time of the close of the Civil War up to the enactment of the McKinley law, which placed all sugar below No. 16 Dutch standard in color on the free list, each succeeding tariff after the close of the Civil War made a substantial reduction in the tariff on sugar, until finally all sugar below No. 16 Dutch standard in color was placed on the free list by the McKinley Act.

Our tariff on sugar in 1864 was very heavy on account of the enormous expenditure of money for the war. The tariff was from 3 to 5 cents per pound. This was reduced by the Republican tariff of 1870 to a rate of 1¾ cents to 4 cents per pound. The Republican tariff of 1883 reduced the duty on sugar and fixed the rate from 1⅜ cents to 3½ cents per pound. The McKinley Act lowered the duty on sugar still further, making the tariff on all sugar above No. 16 Dutch standard one-half a cent and placed sugar below this color on the free list, where it remained until the Democratic Wilson Tariff Act of 1894, when a tariff was placed on sugar of 40 per cent ad valorem, which, according to the prevailing prices of sugar during those three years, was more than 1 cent per pound. Now, my proposed amendment is simply in line with the doctrine of the Republican Party from the time of the war up to the time of the adoption of the McKinley law.

THE TARIFF INCREASES THE PRICE OF SUGAR TO THE CONSUMER THE FULL AMOUNT OF THE DUTY.

One of the first and essential basic facts to be determined in the discussion of the tariff on sugar is, What effect does the amount of tariff we levy have on the cost of sugar to the consumer? How much, if any, does it increase the cost? It seems to me as clear as day that the sugar in this country costs at least $1.90 a hundred pounds, the present tariff, more than it would cost if we bought our sugar in the open markets of the world. I think it costs a little more than the tariff because the tariff has placed the control of this industry in the hands of a trust, which derives more than a fair profit. I say that when granulated sugar sells in New York to the wholesaler at $4.90 per hundred it would cost him $1.90 less, or $3 per hundred, if he could purchase it in the open market. A comparison of the markets of London, New York, and Hamburg, taking into consideration the tariff rates of Great Britain and this country, shows that this is true. A review of the prevailing prices in the markets of London, Hamburg, and

New York and other sugar centers for a period of 10 years demonstrates this to be a fact. I do not suppose that there will be any dispute on this point. Mr. Lowry, of New York, recently published a pamphlet on sugar in which he presented this point clearly and forcibly. On page 1 of that pamphlet he says:

The price of all refined sugar in the United States is based on the inbound value of foreign raw sugar, plus the duty and cost of refining, and in the same way the value of raw sugar produced in Louisiana and our colonies is based on the inbound value of foreign sugars, plus the duty. Domestic raw sugar is produced in Louisiana, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines, and is in turn sold to our refiners, while refined sugar is manufactured in the domestic beet-sugar plants. So that a clear idea may be obtained of the effect of our tariff on the value of foreign and domestic raw sugar. I refer to the following sales made December 5, 1910, to the National Sugar Refining Co., of New York:

	Cents.
4,500 bags of Surinam centrifugals, at 2.315 cents cost, insurance, and freight, for 96° test, the parity duty paid New York of	4
1,000 bags Porto Rico centrifugals, delivered New York, basis 96° test, at	4
5,000 bags Louisiana centrifugals, delivered New York, basis 96° test, at	4
3,500 bags Cuba centrifugals, basis 96° test, duty paid New York, at	4

It is to be noted that the cost, duty paid and delivered to the refinery, on all of this sugar was the same, i. e., 4 cents laid down at the refiners' wharf in New York. The Porto Rico and Louisiana sugar paid no duty. The Surinam sugar paid the full duty of 1.685 cents, so that the seller of this sugar only netted 2.315 cents for his product.

We have a preferential tariff with Cuba, which permits its sugar to be admitted at 20 per cent less than the regular rates of duty, so that the importation of the Cuban sugar, above referred to, paid a duty of 1.348 cents, the seller netting 2.652 cents per pound for his product as compared with the price of 2.315 cents netted by the seller of the San Domingo sugar, and of 4 cents obtained by the sellers of the Porto Rico and Louisiana sugars.

That our sugar costs the consumer the full amount of the tariff is shown clearly by the prices of sugar that obtained in New York during the three years the McKinley Act was in force, compared with the three years immediately preceding its enactment. In fact, if we study the daily market of sugar at New York for any number of years—last past—we will find that the sugar imported from countries where full duty was paid was purchased from day to day at a price which, together with the tariff, just equaled the price of sugar purchased the same day from our colonies or from the sugar producer here. Or, to reverse the statement, our domestic sugar and the sugar produced in our island possessions sold in New York for a price in excess of the sugar imported from foreign countries equal to the difference of our tariff. And this must always be true as long as our country and its islands do not produce approximately the amount of sugar that we consume. This country and Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines only produced last year about 47 per cent of the sugar that we actually consumed, of which the United States did not produce quite one-half. The sugar planters of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands receive the same protection as the growers of sugar in this country. They get the full benefit of our tariff so the consumers in this country pay for the island sugar $1.90 per hundred more than they could purchase sugar for in the open market if there were no tariff, just as they pay the extra price for the sugar grown here.

An examination of the results of the McKinley law, which I shall refer to at length, conclusively shows my contention is correct.

OUR ENORMOUSLY HEAVY TARIFF HAS BEEN A FAILURE IN FOSTERING THE SUGAR INDUSTRY, THOUGH THE EXPERIMENT IN NINETEEN YEARS HAS COST US $1,625,000,000.

At the time the McKinley law was enacted we established a policy of promoting by taxation the culture of sugar beets. Under the McKinley Act we imported free all sugar below No. 16 Dutch standard in color and gave 2 cents a pound bounty to the producers of sugar beets and sugar cane. During the four years that the McKinley law was in operation the Government paid in bounties the sum of $36,106,000, or approximately $9,000,000 a year.

When the Democratic Party came into power in 1894 it repealed the bounty on sugar and levied a tariff of 40 per cent ad valorem on all sugar imported except Hawaiian sugar. This tariff amounted to at least 1 cent a pound. During the three years that the Wilson Act of 1894 was in force we consumed 14,414,727,289 pounds, which cost us 1 cent a pound more than it would have otherwise cost us if we could have purchased our sugar in the open markets of the world. Had we no duty, the American people would have purchased their sugar for $144,000,000 less.

In 1897 the Dingley bill was enacted, increasing the tariff to 1.95 cents a pound, or increasing it to $1.95 a hundred pounds. The duty on sugar was reduced under the Payne-Aldrich bill to 1.9 cents a pound, or $1.90 per hundred. While the Dingley and Payne-Aldrich bills were in force, from 1897 to June 1, 1910, we consumed 76,037,820,168 pounds of sugar. This sugar cost the consumer $1.90 and $1.95 per hundred pounds more than it would have otherwise cost if we had purchased our sugar in the open markets of the world. To recapitulate, our sugar cost us during the four years the McKinley Act was in force $36,000,000 more than it would have cost had we purchased our sugar in the open market. During the three years the Wilson Act was in force, $144,000,000, and during the time the Dingley and Payne-Aldrich bills were in force, up to June 1, 1910, $1,444,718,583 more, making a total cost since the McKinley law went into effect of $1,624,824,583.

When I say the sugar cost us during this time $1,624,824,583 more than it would have cost us in the open market, I am figuring on the basis of the bounty we paid during the time the McKinley law was in effect and on the basis that every 100 pounds of domestic and imported sugar cost us the full tariff duty imposed on sugar the year that it was bought for consumption.

Now, I want to ask you, What have the people of this country to show for this enormous sum of money they have expended to promote the culture of sugar beets? What has it accomplished toward this end? In 1890, the date of the McKinley law, we raised of cane and beet sugar 306,000,000 pounds. This amount was increased in 1910 to 1,775,000,000 pounds. Or, our increased production amounted to 1,400,000,000 pounds. This may be said to be a large increase, but let us compare this with our increased consumption. In 1890 we consumed 3,192,000,000 pounds. In 1910 we consumed 7,360,000,000 pounds. So our increased production, brought about by our tariff in 20 years, amounted to 1,400,000,000 pounds, but our increased consumption amounted to more than 4,100,000,000 pounds. So by spending this enormous sum we have been able to foster the beet-sugar industry in this country to the extent of increasing our production 1 pound for every 3 pounds of our increased consumption. Will anyone contend that on this showing, even if we maintain our present enormous tariff, there is any hope or prospect of supplying our home market with home-grown sugar? On the contrary, does it not show our utter failure to promote the sugar-beet industry by this frightful tariff? What is there in this history to justify us in continuing the policy? I think that this short argument shows the utter failure of this tariff to promote this industry. While our enormously heavy tariff has failed wholly in the prime object for which it was created, it has succeeded in building up one of the greatest and most greedy monopolies that this country has ever known.

I have stated what our statistics clearly show it has cost this country to foster this industry up to the present time. It is an enormous amount. It may be claimed that the price of sugar is not increased by the amount of the tariff; that this is only a theory, and that if we reduced the tariff or took it off altogether the price would not be reduced a corresponding amount. Our experience during the McKinley law shows conclusively I am right. We have in this case an actual demonstration that my contention is correct.

The law in force just prior to the McKinley Act fixed the rate on sugar from 1¼ to 3½ cents per pound. The McKinley law provided that sugar should be imported free up to No. 16 Dutch standard, in color, and one-half a cent per pound above that. The McKinley bill was introduced in this House in the spring of 1890. In fact, it was well known in the business world for some months prior to that time that such a law was proposed and would probably be enacted. The McKinley Act went into force in October, 1891. By its provisions the schedule affecting sugar did not become operative until April 1, 1891; so for a year prior to the McKinley Act's taking effect it was known that such a law would probably be enacted and known to a certainty six months before it became operative. This had the effect for a full year or more before it became a law of reducing enormously the importations of sugar and consequently lowering the price of sugar generally at least 1 cent per pound during this time. During March and February, 1891, preceding the 1st of April, the price of sugar averaged about $6.13 a hundred. This was the price in New York on the 25th day of March, 1891. On the 1st day of April, 1891, when the McKinley Act took effect, sugar dropped to $4.50 per hundred, or dropped $1.63 per hundred pounds. In order to determine the effect of the McKinley law on the price of sugar I give below a table of prices for sugar that existed in New York for granulated sugar for three years immediately preceding April 1, 1891, the day the McKinley Act went into effect, and for three years immediately following April 1, 1891, showing the price of sugar

on the dates as they appear in the table, the price being on the same dates, during each month in each year. This will show fairly, but not fully, the amount saved the consumers of this country by the McKinley law. It will be observed that the average price of sugar for the three years immediately preceding April 1, 1891, was $7.06 per hundred pounds. This amount would be at least 30 cents per hundred pounds more except for the effect of the McKinley law on sugar the year preceding its enactment, as I have mentioned.

The average price for sugar for the three years succeeding April 1 was $4.42 per hundred; or, the price of sugar for the three years immediately following the McKinley law was, on the market of New York, $2.42 per hundred less than the three years immediately preceding the date the McKinley law took effect. To better and more clearly show you the actual results of the McKinley law and its great saving to the people for the three years following the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1891, I want to give you its results in dollars and cents. During the three years mentioned this country consumed 13,117,000,000 pounds of sugar. By reason of removing the tariff on raw sugar and reducing it to one-half cent per pound on refined sugar by the McKinley Act there was saved to the consumers of this country 2.62 cents per pound, according to the market price in New York, for every pound consumed. Or, if we multiply 13,117,000,000 pounds by 2½ cents per pound we have $327,925,000 saved to the people of this country by the McKinley Act. The expenditures of our Government for the three years immediately following June 30, 1891, were $1,093,000,000. The reduction of tariff on sugar by the McKinley Act saved the people of the United States a sum equal to 30 per cent of this amount, or 30 per cent of the entire cost of running this Government during those three years.

If the McKinley law had provided for free sugar, refined or unrefined, the people during those three years would have saved $70,000,000 more. These figures which I have just given are not based on theory. They are not guesswork. They show exactly the saving that was made, and anyone can get the statistics and verify these figures if he desires to do so.

THE WORLD'S PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF SUGAR HAVE GROWN ENORMOUSLY DURING THE PAST 40 YEARS, WHILE THE PRICE HAS CONSTANTLY DECREASED.

The world's production of sugar, and likewise its consumption, have grown enormously and almost constantly from 1865 to the present time. In 1870 the world's production was over 5,000,000,000 pounds; in 1880, over 7,000,000,000 pounds; in 1890 it was over 12,000,000,000 pounds; and in 1910 it was over 33,000,000,000 pounds. While both the production and the consumption of sugar have increased enormously during this period, the price of sugar has constantly decreased. The United States Statistical Abstract shows that the average price at wholesale of sugar in foreign countries in 1870 was $4.95 per 100 pounds and in the United States $13.51 per 100 pounds. The tariff of 5 cents and our depreciated currency account for this difference. In 1880 the average cost of sugar in foreign countries was $4.18 and in the United States $9.80 per 100 pounds. In 1890—this is prior to the McKinley Act—the average cost of sugar in foreign countries was $3.28 per 100 pounds and in this country $6.27 per 100 pounds. In 1909—the latest figures that this abstract gives—foreign sugar was $2.30 per 100 pounds and in this country $4.76 per 100 pounds. While the price of foreign sugar has decreased constantly since the McKinley Act was repealed, in 1894, the price in this country has constantly increased over that during the McKinley Act—first under the Wilson Act and still more under the Dingley and Payne-Aldrich Acts. These facts are all the more remarkable when we stop to consider that the prices of all other food products have been on the increase rather than the decrease. While the consumption and the production have increased enormously, the amount of sugar raised can easily be doubled, as I will show, if the acreage should be increased from an acreage equal to two-fifths of the State of Iowa to four-fifths of that State. Is it not fair to suppose that these countries that now produce their sugar so cheaply will increase their acreage as fast as the demand for it increases?

CAN OUR TARIFF ON SUGAR BE DEFENDED ON THE GROUND THAT IT PRODUCES A LARGE REVENUE?

I do not believe that a tax on sugar can be justified on the ground that it produces a revenue. If we look upon it as a revenue producer, we can not defend it on the ground of a revenue producer unless the Government receives the benefit of it. I do not believe that we can justify a tariff on food products that are a necessity on the table of every man, rich or poor. Be that as it may, if we are going to tax the importation of sugar a penny, the Government ought to get that penny. If we are going to tax sugar $1.90 a hundred pounds the Government should get the $1.90.

The great trouble with our tariff of $1.90 per hundred on sugar, if we look at it from a revenue standpoint, is that the Government gets only a small portion of it, and every consumer of sugar pays the extra $1.90 for every 100 pounds of sugar, domestic or imported, that he consumes. It is true that the Government does receive $1.90 on every 100 pounds of sugar imported, but not one cent in taxes does the United States Treasury obtain from domestic sugar, which, by reason of this indefensible tariff schedule, is selling at $1.90 a hundred pounds higher than it would be if there were an open market. For instance, we consumed last year 7,360,000,000 pounds of sugar, which cost the consumer 1.9 of a cent more than it would have cost him if sugar had been on the free list. If we multiply this number of pounds we consumed by 1.9 of a cent, we find that our sugar cost us $139,000,000 more than it would have cost if sugar had been on the free list, of which sum the Government records show that it only received $52,000,000; or, in other words, it cost our people $139,000,000 in order that the Government might get a little over $52,000,000. That is to say that for every 52 cents the Government received as revenue it cost the people $1.39.

It is certainly bad enough to collect this $52,000,000 from a tax on sugar. How utterly indefensible, how utterly wrong it is to collect this sum in such a way and in such a manner, that every time a man pays 52 cents to the Government he must pay 87 cents additional for the benefit of those people engaged in the raising and manufacture of sugar, most of it going to the plantation owners of our island possessions and to the great Sugar Trust monopoly.

It is generally understood—and I do not doubt the truth of it—that the plantations in our island possessions, if not altogether, are largely in the hands of the great sugar monopoly, and who is the large beneficiary of this $87,000,000.

I do not think that it will be denied that a poor man and the man of moderate means and the ordinary workingman and their families consume practicaly as large a proportion of sugar consumed in this country as the rich man and his family does. The man who depends upon his wages for the care of his family finds it hard enough to feed, clothe, and educate them without being compelled to pay to the Sugar Trust and to the planters of our island possessions 87 cents every time he pays the Government 52 cents. Then, looking at this tariff from a revenue or a financial point of view, what can be more idiotic than this manner of collecting revenue? I think it far from wise to tax this food product, even though the Government got all the return from it; but what a useless and criminal waste of money to levy a tax of this kind on the people when the Government gets only 37½ per cent of the tax so imposed. If all of our $600,000,000—the revenue that we collect annually—were raised by a similar process, it would cost us more than one billion and a half annually to do so. We would soon become a bankrupt nation. Nothing but a change to a sane and wise method of raising our revenues could save us. Looking upon this tax, then, simply as a manner of raising revenue, it is an economical failure.

THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY IN THIS COUNTRY WILL NEVER BE A PROFITABLE ONE.

I think I have demonstrated that this country has not been successful in promoting the production of beet sugar. Certainly we have nothing to show for it, when we stop to think of the enormous price we have paid for the small acreage of sugar beets produced. A brief study of the cost of production here and elsewhere will show clearly that we can never hope, even under the enormous tariff we now have, to produce but a small fraction of the amount we consume. Let us examine into this question briefly. The farmers receive $5 per ton for their sugar beets at the plant, according to our Government statistics. The owners of the sugar-beet factories tell us that they can not afford to pay more than $5 per ton for sugar beets at the prevailing prices for sugar. Our statisticians tell us that the sugar beets produced in this country for a period of five years averaged about 230 pounds of sugar for every ton of sugar beets. If a farmer receives $5 per ton for his sugar beets at the market, he receives about $2.18 for every 100 potential pounds of sugar in the beets. On the best authority, I am informed that beet sugar can be produced in Austria-Hungary for $1.85 per hundred and in Germany for $2 per hundred. Two dollars per hundred is about what England pays for her sugar, and that is what we pay for the 4,000,000,000 pounds we import. Then we add that to the custom duties and we have 4 cents per pound, the prevailing market in New York. If we

remove the duty from sugar, instead of sugar retailing on the coast for about 12 pounds for a dollar and retailing in New York for about 14 to 20 pounds for a dollar, sugar would retail in the United States from 33 to 40 pounds for the dollar. In fact, we can buy our sugar, and do buy our sugar, in the open markets of the world for a less amount of money than the farmer gets for the potential sugar in the beets.

The manufacturer of the sugar beet insists that if he pays $5 per ton for beets he can not sell the manufactured sugar for less than 4 cents per pound. Then, on what theory do we expect to successfully and economically produce sugar in this country from sugar beets? Can anyone imagine that the farmer will raise the sugar beet and sell them for less than $5 per ton? Is land going to get cheaper in this country? Are we going to get our farm help cheaper? On what theory is it possible for us to produce sugar from our beets when we can not raise the beets as cheaply as we can buy the sugar abroad? It does cost large sums of money to build a sugar-beet factory. It does cost large sums of money to operate a factory of this kind. Someone must pay for this if we are going to manufacture it here. We can not economically do this when we can buy the sugar abroad for the same price that the farmer gets for his raw beets delivered at the sugar factory.

The major portion of the cost of raising sugar beets is hand labor, and we can no more hope to compete with Austria-Hungary and Germany and other beet-growing countries than we can hope to secure farm labor for $10 per month. Sugar is most cheaply produced in the Tropics, where cane grows. It is my opinion that sooner or later sugar-beet growing countries, even where beet sugar is produced most cheaply, are bound to yield to the cane-producing countries, because the cheapest sugar raised in the world is in the Tropics, where cane grows luxuriantly; and it takes but a small acreage, as I have shown, to produce the world's supply of sugar. Our sugar-beet growers can not hope to compete with the growers of sugar cane. We can no more hope to compete with them than the Arctic Ocean can compete with the Caribbean Sea in raising crocodiles.

THE FARMERS OF THIS COUNTRY WOULD NOT BE INJURED A PENNY IF NO SUGAR BEETS WERE RAISED.

It has been said that 100,000 farmers are producers of sugar and that to place sugar on the free list would result in driving those farmers out of this industry and work enormous hardships upon them. I certainly would not want, as a Member of this Congress or as an individual, to injure unnecessarily any man in any trade or profession. If sugar is placed on the free list it will not result in any such injury. The farmers engaged in the culture of sugar beets have invested in it nothing but the price of their land; they get nothing from it but the use of the land and the privilege of cultivating sugar beets, probably at a small profit, if at any profit at all. There is not an acre of land in the United States farmed to sugar beets that could not be as successfully farmed to something else, and with equal profit. If there was not a sugar beet raised in the United States the farmers' land on which sugar beets are now raised would be quite as valuable. In fact, the owners of the sugar-beet factories find it exceedingly difficult to get farmers to cultivate the sugar beet at the prices they pay for beets, and the owners claim that they are paying the farmer all that they can afford to do, in view of the prevailing price of sugar. The farmer raising sugar beets has no general market. His sole market is the price that he and the factory man agree that the farmer shall receive, and the owner of the plant never agrees upon a price that is very profitable to the farmer. The farmer can not sell the sugar beet on the open market, for there is no open market. There is just the one market for his sugar beet, and that is at the factory in his immediate vicinity.

The farmer raises about 10 tons of sugar beets to the acre, for which he receives $5 per ton, or $50 per acre. Ten dollars per acre will be a very large profit on this crop at this price, and probably the farmer does not receive that amount. It cost the people of this country last year more than $139,000,000 in order that 420,000 acres of land might be cultivated to sugar beets, for which the farmer received in gross about $50 an acre for his crop, or a possible $10 an acre profit. Then it cost the people of this country $139,000,000 that a few farmers might get $4,000,000 profit out of raising sugar beets. The farmers of this country comprise about one-third of the entire population, and they consume fully their one-third of the sugar and pay one-third of the tax. Thus, a few farmers received a possible profit of $4,000,000 at a cost to the balance of the farmers of one-third of $139,000,000, or $46,000,000; and each and every farmer knows without being told that a brother farmer who received only $5 a ton for beets will not lose a penny if he should be compelled to raise some other crop.

It cost the people of this country in 1910, $139,000,000 in order to get 420,000 acres cultivated in sugar beets. Or, it cost the people in the United States $322 in cash for every acre of sugar beets raised. The land cultivated to beet sugar would not be worth in the open market on an average more than $150 per acre. Would it not be better by far to pay every farmer $150 per acre for the land he cultivated to sugar beets last year and forever get rid of this losing proposition? We would have saved $172 last year on every acre of beets raised if we had paid the farmer the full value of every acre of land cultivated to beet sugar.

If necessary, it would be a good investment to buy every acre of land cultivated to beets, pay the cost of all our beet-sugar factories, estimated at $40,000,000 in value, and get rid of this frightful tax on sugar. We could buy every beet-sugar factory in existence in the United States, pay $150 per acre for every acre of land used to raise sugar beets, and have nearly $50,000,000 left out of the $139,000,000 that our beet-sugar industry costs us annually. It would be a far better proposition to do this than to keep on levying this enormous sum as a tax on our people.

The defenders of the present tariff on sugar base their argument largely on the ground that it would be a great hardship on the farmers of this country to reduce the tariff or entirely remove it, because it would drive them out of the business of raising sugar beets. To hear the defenders acclaim in its favor one would imagine that the industry is fast becoming a large and extensive one, and that California, Colorado, Michigan, Idaho, and many other States are devoting the major portion of their land to the culture of sugar beets, and that to reduce the tariff and drive these farmers from this industry would very materially depress, if not destroy, the prosperity of those States. One would imagine that a large part of the farm lands of those States was devoted to the culture of sugar beets. What is the truth about this? As I have stated, our Government statisticians tell us that last year 420,000 acres of land were cultivated to beets. This sounds like a large number of acres, but, in truth and fact, this acreage equals only about one-eightieth of the State of Iowa and about one four-hundredth of the State of Texas. So, if no beets were planted this year, an area of land equal to one four-hundredth of the State of Texas would have to be cultivated to corn, wheat, cotton, alfalfa, or some other farm product. If this acreage should all be planted to corn, I do not think it would affect the price of corn. If this acreage were planted entirely in cotton, do you think it would lower the price of cotton? If this acreage should be devoted to raising beef cattle, do you think it would reduce the price of meat?

Do you think the farmers of these States where beets are raised, if they were required to substitute their crop of beets to corn, wheat, barley, cotton, or the raising of grasses, such as alfalfa or timothy, would in any manner be injured by it? But, let us go further. If we were to continue to tax ourselves $139,000,000 per year to encourage the culture of sugar beets and finally succeeded in securing enough of an acreage devoted to the culture of sugar beets to supply our country with domestic sugar, how much of our cultivated land would be so used? Last year we consumed in this country 7,360,000,000 pounds of sugar. An average acre of sugar beets will produce 2,400 pounds of sugar. It will take 3,066,666 acres to produce 7,360,000,000 pounds. If every pound of sugar consumed by the people of the United States last year had been produced from beets grown in this country, they could all have been grown on an acreage equal to one-tenth of the State of Iowa or one-fifty-fifth of the State of Texas, and would have cost the people of this country $139,000,000 to secure that amount of land cultivated to the raising of sugar beets. If we were to grow enough sugar beets to supply the entire world with sugar, the comparative acreage would still be small. Last year there was consumed in the entire world 33,000,000,000 pounds of sugar. This amount could be produced from sugar beets grown on an acreage equal to two-fifths of the State of Iowa or two twenty-fifths of the State of Texas. I ask, in all seriousness, is not $139,000,000 too heavy a tax to be borne by the people of this country in order to secure an acreage of land cultivated to sugar beets equal to only one-eightieth of the State of Iowa or one four-hundredth of the State of Texas? Why should we tax ourselves one penny that this land might be farmed to sugar beets when it can be farmed equally as profitable to corn, wheat, cotton, alfalfa? Is it anything else than criminal for any great party to advocate such doctrine?

THE SUGAR TRUST IMPOSES AN EXTRA BURDEN ON THE PACIFIC COAST OF ABOUT 1 CENT A POUND.

The Pacific coast is especially interested in my proposed amendment to put sugar on the free list. We suffer more

heavily by reason of the sugar tariff and the exaction that the Sugar Trust may and do make upon us than any other part of this country. This trust practically controls the whole output of sugar from the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. That sugar from those islands, consumed on the Pacific coast, is brought direct to San Francisco, from whence it is distributed. The Pacific coast consumes about one-third of the sugar production of those two groups of islands. The remainder of the sugar is shipped to New York and Philadelphia by way of the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. On the west side of the isthmus it is unloaded from the boats onto a train and then transported to the east coast of the isthmus, unloaded from the cars and reloaded on ships, and then transported to New York and Philadelphia. The cost of shipping this sugar to the cities of Philadelphia and New York is far in excess of the cost of shipping it to San Francisco. In fact, I am credibly informed that the planters in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands receive one-fourth of a cent less per pound for that portion of their sugar delivered at San Francisco than that delivered at Philadelphia and New York. So the sugar from these islands, bought and refined by the Sugar Trust in San Francisco, costs it one-fourth of a cent less per pound for raw sugar than the balance of the Hawaiian and Philippine sugar delivered to the same trust at New York and Philadelphia. Then they arbitrarily put a price of 50 to 75 cents more on this Hawaiian and Philippine sugar that they sell in San Francisco to the wholesalers than they charge the wholesalers in New York and Philadelphia for Hawaiian and Philippine sugar delivered to them at New York or Philadelphia, consequently the sugar grown almost in sight of San Francisco and transported by water to it costs the wholesalers of San Francisco 50 to 75 cents more per hundred pounds than the same sugar costs the wholesalers in New York and Philadelphia, when it costs the trust at least 25 cents less for sugar at San Francisco.

The people of the Pacific coast not only pay the $1.90 per hundred pounds imposed by the tariff, but it costs them about $1 more than it would cost except by reason of the monopoly that the Sugar Trust enjoys under the protection of our tariff. Our statisticians tell us that every man, woman, and child in this country consumes about 80 pounds of sugar a year. It costs the people of San Francisco about 3 cents per pound more than it would cost them if they could purchase their sugar in the open market of the world. It costs every man, woman, and child on the Pacific coast about $2.40 per year more for sugar than they legitimately should pay. There are certainly 10,000,000 people in the West affected in this way. In other words, the people in the western part of the United States are paying on account of this tariff and this discrimination a sum equal to about $24,000,000, or about one-half of the revenue that the Government derives on account of the tariff on sugar. We have about 1,200,000 people in my State. The tariff and this discrimintion cost the people of my own State about $3,000,000 per annum. This excess cost amounts to about as much as it takes to run our State government. It surely costs my people more than it does to maintain our two State colleges—with about 1,500 pupils in each institution—our three State normal schools, our asylums, our penal, reformatory, and charitable institutions, and the salary of our State officials. I venture to say that the tariff on sugar costs each and every State in this Union about as much as it costs to run its State government.

Under the Canadian reciprocal agreement and this proposed free list, or practically under the reciprocity agreement alone, you are taking from the great Northwest every penny of protection heretofore accorded it against foreign competition. There is nothing left upon which there is one penny of protection, as against the only people that can or do compete with them. You make us pay to the Sugar Trust, by reason of the tariff on sugar and its monopoly, made possible by the tariff, $10,000,000 more than a like number of people pay in the East or South, and this, too, for the sugar produced at our door.

PLACING SUGAR ON THE FREE LIST WILL MATERIALLY REDUCE THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The great and growing cry in this country is the high cost of living. It is a problem which concerns every man of family who is dependent upon his wages to support his family. It is the specter which awakens him in the morning; it sits with him at his breakfast; its dogs his footsteps all day long; it retires to bed with him at night to disturb his slumbers.

To remedy this, to reduce as far as possible the cost of living, is the problem of the day. To remedy this, as far as it is within the power of this Congress to do, is our plain duty. It is no easy task. Your reciprocity bill will not do it; the passage of this free-list bill I do not believe will accomplish this to any great extent. I do not believe that the passage of this bill will reduce the cost materially of any of the necessary food products. Its tendency, I believe and hope, will be in that direction. But you can reduce the cost of living. You will reduce the cost of living very materially if you adopt the amendment I propose. By this one act you will lessen the price of sugar at least 2 cents a pound. This would lessen, and lessen very materially, the cost of living to every family in America. It is the one amendment that you can make to our revenue law that will immediately and very materially reduce the cost of living to everyone.

Sugar is one of the actual necessities of life. There is scarcely any other article that goes on the poor man's table that another food can not be found as a substitute. There are substitutes for other foods, but nothing can take the place of sugar. Sugar is not a luxury to the rich, but it is to the poor man. To my mind there is no tax levied on any article of food produced that is as indefensible and as utterly wrong as the tax on sugar.

It has been said that the tax on sugar produces $52,000,000 of revenue, and what will you do about it? It does produce $52,000,000, but that is no evidence that it is just or right. If it does produce $52,000,000 revenue, as a consequence there are 52,000,000 reasons why it should be changed.

This tax is not levied fairly on the people of this country. It rests alike heavily upon the poor, and the very poor, as well as upon the rich. It is not a tax placed on the people of this country in proportion to their wealth. You say we will lose $52,000,000 revenue. I confess it, but in doing so you will relieve the great masses of this country from paying this $52,000,000. You can shift the tax of $52,000,000 from the shoulders of the people who bear it to the shoulders of the people who ought to bear it.

The great masses of the people—the farmer, the mechanic, the clerk in the store, the workingman—are the people who pay the great proportion of this. You can save them this $52,000,000, collected as a tax on sugar, and in doing so you will also save them the additional sum of $86,000,000 that now, very largely, goes to the sugar planters and growers of Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippine Islands, and to the great sugar monopoly that controls this industry. One hundred and thirty-nine million dollars is an enormous sum to save the great masses of people of this country. It is a sum equal to nearly one-fourth of the entire expense of operating this Government. Nothing you can do will come so near to being a blessing to every poor man and every man of moderate means as placing sugar on the free list.

This country is rich; it is not impoverished. We can find some way to raise this $52,000,000 revenue without taxing sugar. We had better increase the excise tax on corporations. If we can not do it any other way, you can save $52,000,000. Your Democratic Party during the last campaign denounced the Republican Party for its extravagance in operating the Government, and you have promised the people of the country that you would save them an enormous sum when the Democratic Party got into power. If you discount 50 per cent the promises that you have solemnly made this country with reference to retrenchment and reduction in the cost of running this Government, you can easily save over $52,000,000, and you will not need this tax on sugar. Fifty-two million dollars is about 8 per cent of the cost to run our Government under a Republican administration this last year. Can you return to your constituents, in the face of the promises you have made, and say to them, "We could not place sugar on the free list because we could not save 8 per cent of what the Republican Party appropriated this last year for the cost of running the Government"? Do you think the majority of voters who gave you the splendid majority you have on that side of the House understood that you could not by rigid economy save 8 per cent of the cost of running this Government? What did you mean when you said that the Republican Party had been enormously extravagant? Did you mean that the Republicans were spending only 8 per cent more than was enough to operate the Government? Is there only 8 per cent difference between the enormously extravagant Republican administration and a most frugal Democratic one?

When you say that this farmers' free list of 100 items will greatly relieve the farmers to the extent of at least $10,000,000, I want to say that if you amend this bill by adding the one item of sugar that I propose, you will relieve the farmers alone of $46,000,000 annually, and the rest of the people of this country, who are equally deserving, of $93,000,000 more. If your $10,000,000 reduction is a good thing, why is not a reduction

of $139,000,000 more a great deal better? If it is a good thing to take the tariff off of "hoop and band iron or hoop and band steel, punched or unpunched," why is it not equally as good to take it off of sugar? There are a mighty few people in this country who make much use of or purchase "hoop or band steel" whether it is "punched or unpunched," but every one of our 93,000,000 people use sugar every day.

Why should the farmer who raises wheat, corn, cotton, or cattle be taxed for the benefit of the planters in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands? Or, to be accurate, why should he be taxed about 2 cents per pound for sugar that the Sugar Trust might exploit Porto Rico and our island possessions? It must be remembered all the time that the sugar grower and the manufacturer in those islands have the same protection under our tariff law as the producer of beet or cane sugar here has. It must also be remembered that these islands produced last year 100,000,000 pounds more of sugar than were produced in the United States. Sugar cane grows as naturally and abundantly in our island possessions as corn does in the great Central West and as cotton does in the South. Why should the grower of corn, wheat, or cotton be compelled to compete with the world in the sale of his crop and be compelled to pay nearly double the price for the sugar he buys from our island possessions than he can buy it for in the open market?

The farmer who raises our corn and wheat pays the highest wages for farm labor paid anywhere in the whole world, and why should he be compelled to sell his crop in the open market of the world and pay a bounty to our sugar growers in the islands, who employ coolie labor in Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands and Jap labor in Hawaii? Must a man who works in the shops and factories be charged 2 cents per pound more for his sugar than he otherwise could buy it in order to give employment to Japs in Hawaii and coolie labor in our other island possessions? We all want to see our island possessions grow rich and prosperous, but the people of this country ought not to be taxed that the farms in those islands may be cultivated to a crop which grows naturally and abundantly there, and where sugar can be produced as cheaply as in any other part of the world.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413 and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

And then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, May 6, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination of the Missouri River from Omaha, Nebr., to the mouth of the Platte River (H. Doc. No. 46), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8764) to promote the safety of employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip all locomotives regularly engaged in switching service with footboards and headlights; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 8765) to provide American registers for seagoing vessels wherever built, and to be engaged only in trade with foreign countries and with the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila, and for the importation into the United States free of duty of all materials for the construction and repair of vessels built in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 8766) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bangor, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FAISON: A bill (H. R. 8767) to provide for terms of the United States district court at Goldsboro, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8768) to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, pawnbrokers, and real-estate brokers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8769) appropriating the sum of $5,000 for the purpose of drilling and testing wells in precinct No. 7, in Torrance County, N. Mex., which includes the town of Estancia, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8770) providing that the act to prohibit the passage of special or local laws in the Territories, to limit the Territorial indebtedness, and for other purposes, shall not apply to irrigation districts; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 8771) for the protection and preservation of game and for the prevention of its sale during certain closed seasons in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 8772) to authorize the construction of a lighthouse upon Diamond Shoal and to provide for the purchase thereof by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8773) to change the name of Columbia Road to Ohio Avenue; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8774) to extend the provisions of the act of June 27, 1902, etc.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KONIG: A bill (H. R. 8775) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906, and all acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8776) to amend section 4886 of the Revised Statutes relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 8777) dedicating excess payments on public lands to the building and maintenance of roads and public schools; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8778) granting locations and rights of way for purposes of irrigation and other beneficial use of water through the public lands and reservations of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8779) to provide for appeals from decisions of the Secretary of the Interior to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8780) authorizing the reconveyance to United States, by States and Territories, of lands occupied, used, or needed in carrying out the reclamation law or the Carey Act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8781) regulating the suspension of final proof on land entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8782) extending the general public-land laws over the lands of the former Fort Laramie post and wood and timber reserve; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8783) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell fire-killed timber on the public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8784) to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act of June 22, 1910, entitled "An act to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8785) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Green River, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8786) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Cody, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8787) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Basin, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8788) to provide for the erection of a public building at Buffalo, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8789) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sundance, in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8790) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at New-

castle, Wyo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8791) providing for the establishment of a system of local parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8792) providing for an appropriation for an iron stairway from the foot to the summit of the Devils Tower, in the Devils Tower National Monument; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 87) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Memorial of the Legislature of Nebraska, favoring an extension of time in deferred payments in the present law on construction charges in Government irrigation projects; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AKIN of New York: A bill (H. R. 8793) granting an increase of pension to Warren G. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8794) granting an increase of pension to Ferrand H. Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8795) granting an increase of pension to George W. Beery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8796) granting an increase of pension to James Malone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 8797) for the relief of Jose G. Lovato, administrator of the estate of Hipolito Lovato, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 8798) granting an increase of pension to Solomon P. Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 8799) granting a pension to Martha Langely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 8800) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. De Coursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8801) granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Schreider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8802) granting a pension to John L. Beere; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 8803) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph Burkhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 8804) granting a pension to Ardella Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8805) granting a pension to Marilda Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8806) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8807) granting an increase of pension to William Martin Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8808) for the relief of Aaron B. Van Pelt, alias Benjamin Van Pelt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8809) for the relief of Charles W. Howard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 8810) granting an increase of pension to Luden Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 8811) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Peacock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8812) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Watts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8813) granting an increase of pension to L. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8814) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8815) granting an increase of pension to William H. Binnix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8816) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8817) granting an increase of pension to John H. Speer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8818) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8819) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Beard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8820) granting an increase of pension to James T. Sefton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8821) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McGregor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8822) granting an increase of pension to George Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8823) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8824) granting an increase of pension to Z. D. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8825) granting a pension to W. A. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8826) granting a pension to Garet Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8827) granting a pension to William S. Clinton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8828) granting a pension to John B. Carmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8829) granting a pension to J. L. Hull; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 8830) for the relief of the heirs of George A. Hon, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 8831) granting an increase of pension to William A. Percival; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 8832) granting an increase of pension to John H. Nutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8833) granting an increase of pension to David A. Mikesell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8834) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Strader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: A bill (H. R. 8835) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Goldvogel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 8836) granting a pension to Will H. Carpenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8837) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Justice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8838) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8839) granting an increase of pension to Alexander S. Loper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 8840) granting an increase of pension to Jerome S. Pinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 8841) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS: A bill (H. R. 8842) granting an increase of pension to George E. Skillings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8843) granting an increase of pension to Julius C. Deming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 8844) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Ingraham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 8845) for the relief of W. A. C. Baldwin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 8846) granting a pension to Floyd H. Morris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8847) granting a pension to John B. Garvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 8848) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 8849) for the relief of Emory Scott Land; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8850) for the relief of Henry Altman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8851) for the relief of Harry H. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8852) for the relief of Robert Foote; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8853) for the relief of John L. Baird; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8854) for the relief of Clarance D. Houck; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8855) for the relief of Herman Glafcke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8856) for the relief of Fred C. and C. Helen Fisher; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8857) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Ashley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8858) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Pearl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8859) granting a pension to Samuel S. Armstrong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8860) granting a pension to Charles Mosher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8861) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel Schiffer; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 8862) for the relief of William E. Smith, alias Lewis Perrin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8863) granting a pension to Sarah Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8864) granting an increase of pension to Ann M. Bucklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8865) granting an increase of pension to Michael White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8866) granting an increase of pension to Delors W. Kendall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8867) granting an increase of pension to Amos B. Chace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8868) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Reynold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8869) granting an increase of pension to William Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 8870) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Houser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8871) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Correll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 8872) for the relief of John McGrail; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8873) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas Kirwan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8874) granting a pension to Eliza Wichterich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8875) granting an increase of pension to James K. P. Withrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 8876) granting an increase of pension to J. W. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8877) granting a pension to Harry J. Thom; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 8878) granting a pension to Ann R. Stuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8879) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Niles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8880) granting an increase of pension to Darwin H. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 8881) for the relief of Rocco Pisano; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of Parr Bros. and 6 other merchants of Denison, Ohio, against parcels post, and the Dayton Supply Co., of Dayton, Ohio, favoring 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of citizens of Quincy, Mass., against the treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago Wireless Association, in opposition to bills restricting wireless telegraphy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Association of Tanners, in opposition to placing leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT: Papers in support of bill for relief of heirs of George A. Hon, of Jefferson County, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HANNA: Resolutions of the Harvey Commercial Club, Harvey, N. Dak., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the farmers of various towns in North Dakota, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of Harmony Lodge, No. 548, International Association of Machinists, protesting against the installation of the Taylor system at the Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: Resolutions of numerous citizens and labor organizations of Duluth, Minn., condemning the kidnaping of John J. McNamara from the State of Indiana to the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Resolution of the senate of the State of New York, favoring the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Telegram from merchants of the city of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the removal of duty on shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of National Association of Tanners, against placing leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Legislature of the State of New York, favoring direct election of Senators; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.